



Submission date: 17th May 2016

## 2016 – Study Question (Designs)

Sarah MATHESON, Reporter General  
John OSHA and Anne Marie VERSCHUUR, Deputy Reporters General  
Yusuke INUI, Ari LAAKKONEN and Ralph NACK, Assistants to the Reporter General  
**Requirements for protection of designs**

Responsible Reporter: Anne Marie VERSCHUUR

National/Regional Group	Independent member I
Contributors name(s)	Luigi A. SANSONE
e-Mail contact	lsansone@salomonesansone.com
Date	17-05-2016

### I. Current law and practice

1) Does your Group's current law provide for an intellectual property right (registered or patented) that specifically protects the outward appearance or ornamentation of an object or article of manufacture?

As set out in the Study Guidelines, copyrights and trademarks are not such rights in the context of this Study Question.

yes

Please explain:

2) If yes, what is this right called? (e.g. registered design, design patent, industrial design, industrial design patent)

References to design below are to be read as references to this right, irrespective of what it is called in your jurisdiction.

Design

3) What are the statutory requirements for such right? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain the basis and application of these requirements.

a) novelty

b) non-obviousness

c) inventive step

d) individual character

e) originality

f) aesthetic

g) ornamental

h) other, namely ...

4) Does your Group's current law deny design protection to a design with an appearance that is dictated solely by its function?

yes

Please explain:

5) If yes, what are the relevant factors to determine whether or not a design is deemed unprotectable as being functional? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain as applicable:

a) whether the overall appearance is dictated solely by its technical function

b) whether each portion of the overall appearance is dictated solely by its technical function

c) the availability of alternative appearances that can obtain the same functional result

d) the need to achieve the product's technical function was the only relevant factor when the design in question was selected

e) other, namely ...

6) Does your Group's current law deny design protection to any portions (e.g. a "feature", "element") of the overall design that are deemed functional?

yes

Please explain:

7) If yes, what are the relevant factors to determine whether or not a portion is deemed functional? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain as applicable:

a) whether the overall appearance is dictated solely by its technical function

b) the availability of alternative appearances for the portion to obtain the same functional result

c) the need to achieve the product's technical function was the only relevant factor when the portion in

question was selected

d) other, namely ...

8) What is the effect on the scope of protection of a design with one or more functional portions? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain as applicable:

a) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account when assessing infringement

b) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account when assessing validity

c) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account separately when assessing infringement, but can play a role in the overall comparison

d) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account separately when assessing validity, but may play a role in the overall comparison

e) no effect (e.g. so long as the overall appearance is not dictated solely by its technical function, all portions of the design are included in the scope of protection, irrespective as to whether any portions may be functional)

f) the Group's current law is unsettled

g) other, namely ...

## II. Policy considerations and possible improvements to your current law

9) How can the following aspects of your Group's current law be improved, if at all?

a) the definition or meaning of a "design"

b) the requirements for protection of a design

c) the treatment of functionality in the sense described in paragraph 14) of the Study Guidelines or aspects of such functionality

None of the above - in our opinion the Law as worded appears appropriate.

10) Are there any other policy considerations and/or proposals for improvement to your current law falling within the scope of this Study Question?

## III. Proposals for harmonisation

11) Does your Group consider that harmonisation in the three areas in question 9) above is desirable?

If yes to some but not all of those three areas, please state in relation to which of the areas your Group

considers harmonisation is desirable.

If yes in relation to any of those areas, please respond to the following questions without regard to your Group's current law.

Even if no in relation to any of those areas, please address the following questions to the extent your Group considers your Group's current law could be improved.

no

Please explain:

Not necessarily, please also bear in mind harmonised EU Design legislation with the European Union Designs.

12) Should there be harmonisation of the definition of an intellectual property right that specifically protects the outward appearance or ornamentation of an object or article of manufacture?

no

Please explain:

N/A - see reply to q. 11

13) If so, what should that right be called?

N/A - see reply to q. 11

14) What should the requirements for such right be? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain the basis and application of these requirements:

a) novelty

b) non-obviousness

c) inventive step

d) individual character

e) originality

f) aesthetic

g) ornamental

h) other, namely ...

15) Should design protection be denied to a design with an appearance that is dictated solely by its function?

yes

Please explain:

16) If yes, what should the relevant factors be to determine whether or not a design is deemed unprotectable as being functional? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain as applicable:

a) whether the overall appearance is dictated solely by its technical function

b) whether each portion of the overall appearance is dictated solely by its technical function

c) the availability of alternative appearances that can obtain the same functional result

d) the need to achieve the product's technical function was the only relevant factor when the design in question was selected

e) other, namely ...

17) Should design protection be denied to any portions (e.g. a "feature", "element") of the overall design that are deemed functional?

yes

Please explain:

18) If yes, what should the relevant factors be to determine whether a portion of a design is functional? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain as applicable:

a) whether the overall appearance is dictated solely by its technical function

b) the availability of alternative appearances for the portion to obtain the same functional result

c) the need to achieve the product's technical function was the only relevant factor when the portion in question was selected

d) other, namely ...

19) What should the effect be on the scope of protection of a design with one or more functional portions? Please tick any relevant boxes and explain as applicable:

a) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account when assessing infringement

b) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account when assessing validity

c) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account separately when assessing infringement, but can play a role in the overall comparison

d) any portions deemed functional will not be taken into account separately when assessing validity, but may play a role in the overall comparison

e) no effect (e.g. so long as the overall appearance is not dictated solely by its technical function, all

portions of the design are included in the scope of protection, irrespective as to whether any portions may be functional)

f) the Group's current law is unsettled

g) other, namely ...

20) If your answer to question 11) is no, is it your Group's view that a (registered or patented) intellectual property right that specifically protects the outward appearance or ornamentation of an object or article of manufacture should not be available at all?

yes

21) If yes, why?

This may not be available for purposes of Design or Patent Law, however the outward appearance may be protected under relevant provisions of copyrights Law.

22) If your answer to question 11) is no in relation to some but not all of the three areas set out in question 9) above, please state why your Group does not consider that harmonisation in that area(s) is desirable.

“Harmonization” often brings with it practical problems of interpretation which are not necessarily the same in each country. It would appear preferable if general principals of law are common in all member states (example regarding functionality issues). However for the avoidance of issues of interpretation it would appear more practical if member states’ substantive rules are not necessarily required to be identical.

23) Please comment on any additional issues concerning any aspect of the definition and requirements for protection of designs, or the role of functionality, you consider relevant to this Study Question.

No further comments to make.

Please indicate which industry sector views are included in part “**III. Proposals for harmonization**” of this form:

Summary