



Submission date: 23rd June 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 V
Contributors name(s)	Vladimir NIKA
e-Mail contact	vnika@petosevic.com
Date	23-06-2016

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.

Industrial 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

Article 113/1 of the Industrial Property Law (IPL) provides that a design is considered new if no identical industrial design has been made available to the public before the date of application filing or priority date.

b) non-obviousness

c) inventive step

d) individual character

A design has an individual nature if the general impression that it reflects on an informed user differs from the general impression reflected on the same user by any design that has become known to the public before the date of the filing of application or priority date. The level of freedom in the development of the design is taken into consideration in the assessment of individual character (art. 113/2 of IPL).

e) originality

f) aesthetic

A characteristic of the external form of a product, which gives it a particular appearance and which are not excluded from protection (art. 112/1/a)

g) ornamental

A characteristic of the external form of a product, which gives it a particular appearance and which are not excluded from protection (art. 112/1a)

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:

The law is rather unclear and is subject of interpretation on such regard. From one side when the law provides the definition of an industrial design includes the overall and any portion of the design (art. 112 of IPL). On the other side, the legal provisions concerning the protection basis of the design and in particular, the criteria of functionality (article 115/1/d of IPL), states that a design may not be protected if the "features" of appearance of a product are dictated to its functionality. Thus, it is unclear whether protection of any portions of the overall design deemed as functional is included.

However, in our opinion the word "features" might refer either to the overall or any portion of the design, so protection to any portions of the overall design is not denied.

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"

We are of the opinion that the requirement for protection of a design must clearly define whether protection is extended to the overall of the design or any portion of it.

We suggest that the word "features" in art. 112/3 should be defined more clearly as above.

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

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.

yes

Please explain:

Yes. An harmonization in all the three areas (definition of design, design requirement protection and functionality treatment) would be desirable.

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?

yes

Please explain:

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

Industrial design as design it is typical and serves to the industry sector.

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?

21) If yes, why?

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.

n/a

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.

n/a

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

Summary