

Hague Yearly Review

International Registrations
of Industrial Designs

Economics & Statistics Series



2014



Hague Yearly Review

International Registrations
of Industrial Designs

Economics & Statistics Series

2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The *Hague Yearly Review* was developed under the direction of Francis Gurry (Director General) and supervision of Carsten Fink (Chief Economist). It was prepared by a team led by Mosahid Khan; the team comprised Vanessa Behrens, Ryan Lamb, Bruno Le Feuvre, and Hao Zhou, all from the Economics and Statistics Division.

Thanks go to Thierry Bouquet, from the Brands and Designs Sector, for providing the data. Grégoire Bisson and other colleagues from the Hague Registry offered valuable comments on drafts at various stages.

Samiah Do Carmo Figueiredo and Caterina Valles Galmes provided administrative support. Gratitude is also due to Brenda O'Hanlon for editing the report, to the Communications Division for designing the report, and to staff in the Printing and Publication Production Section for their services.

Readers are welcome to reproduce the information provided in this report, but are requested to cite WIPO as the source. Data and graphs can be downloaded at www.wipo.int/ipstats/en/.

Contact information

Economics and Statistics Division

Website: www.wipo.int/ipstats

Email: ipstats.mail@wipo.int

2013 KEY FIGURES

Description	Applications/registrations		Designs contained in applications/registrations	
	Number	Growth (%): 2012-13	Number	Growth (%): 2012-13
International applications	2,990	+14.8	13,172	+5.8
International registrations	2,734	+12.0	12,806	+7.0
Designations in international registrations	15,081	+17.9	65,726	+8.9
Renewals of international registrations	2,859	-8.4	11,085	-6.6
International registrations in force	26,877	+2.3	111,881	+1.6

HIGHLIGHTS

Industrial design filings and registrations reached new highs

International industrial design applications filed under the Hague System increased to 2,990 in 2013, representing 14.8% growth compared with 2012. Growth in 2013 was considerably higher than that of the preceding two years. The 2,990 filings contained 13,172 individual designs, which equates to an increase of 5.8% on 2012 figures.

In 2013, WIPO recorded 2,734 international registrations under the Hague System. This corresponds to a 12% increase on 2012 figures. The high level of growth resulted, for the most part, from increases in registrations originating in Italy and Switzerland. The number of designs contained in these registrations rose from 11,971 in 2012 to 12,806 in 2013, corresponding to growth of 7%.

With 113 applications, Swatch of Switzerland remained the largest filer

For the second consecutive year, Swatch of Switzerland (113 applications) filed the largest number of Hague applications; it was followed by Koninklijke Philips Electronics of the Netherlands (82), the Procter & Gamble of the United States of America (US, 76), Daimler of Germany (52) and Volkswagen of Germany (51).

Among the top filers, Swatch (+32), Omega of Switzerland (+23) and the Procter & Gamble (+22) saw the largest increases in filings in 2013, while Audi (-41) and Daimler (-23) recorded the steepest decreases. For the first time, a Chinese company, Lenovo, appeared in the list of top applicants.

Switzerland overtook Germany as the largest user of the Hague System

With 658 international registrations, Switzerland overtook Germany (637) to become the largest user of the Hague System; Switzerland and Germany were followed by France (285), Italy (273) and the Netherlands (139). The top five countries accounted for 73% of all registrations recorded in 2013.

Registrations increased for the majority of the top 15 origins in 2013. Norway more than doubled its number of registrations. Finland (+76.5%) and Liechtenstein (+52.9%) also witnessed high growth, albeit starting from a low base. Austria (-26.2%), the United Kingdom (-6.1%), Luxembourg (-3.1%) and Germany (-1.8%) are the only four origins that saw a drop in registrations when compared with the previous year's figures.

The EU and Switzerland are the most frequently designated Hague members

In 2013, the total number of designations in all international registrations amounted to 15,081, corresponding to a 17.9% increase on 2012, the largest growth recorded for over a decade. The EU was the most designated Hague member, with 2,026 designations, followed by Switzerland (1,911), Turkey (1,277), Norway (806) and Singapore (712). The top five designated Hague members accounted for 45% of all designations for 2013.

All top 20 designated Hague members, except Croatia and Serbia, saw growth in designations. Tunisia, which reported just a few designations in 2012, experienced the fastest growth in 2013.

The EU and Switzerland are the most designated Hague members for design counts (i.e., the number of designs contained in registrations). In 2013, the 15,081 designations in international registrations contained 65,726 designs, of which the EU accounted for 15.5% and Switzerland for 14.1%.

Designs related to packages and containers, and to clocks and watches accounted for the largest share of total registrations

Packages and containers (Class 9), and clocks and watches and other measuring instruments (Class 10) accounted for the largest shares – 10.9% each – of total registrations. They were followed by furnishing (Class 6) and means of transport (Class 12), each of which accounted for shares of 8.4% and 7.7%, respectively. Among the top 15 classes, recording and communication equipment (Class 14; +42.5%), and tools and hardware (Class 8; +40.3%) saw the fastest growth in registrations in 2013, while clothing (Class 2; -15.3%) saw the largest decline.

Class 10, associated with clocks and watches, was the most specified class for registrations originating in Switzerland, accounting for around one-third of all Swiss registrations. Class 12, which relates to means of transport, accounted for around one-fifth of all registrations originating in Germany. Class 9, packages and containers, accounted for the largest share of registrations originating in France (14.7%).

Renewals of international registrations fell

Registrations are valid for five years, after which they must be renewed in order to remain active. In 2013, total renewals amounted to 2,859, representing a reduction of 8.4% on 2012. The decline in renewals can be partly explained by a sharp decrease in registrations in 2003 which was due to the introduction of the Registered Community Design.

Holders of international registrations of German origin renewed the largest number of registrations in 2013, accounting for 32.4% of total renewals. They were followed by registrations originating in Switzerland (24.5%), France (17.5%), Italy (7.7%) and the Netherlands (6.5%). Combined, these five countries accounted for 88.5% of all 2013 renewals, down from a high of 93.1% in 2008.

Similarly, in 2013 the number of designs contained in renewals fell by 6.6% – the largest drop since 2009.

Germany, Switzerland and France accounted for more than two-thirds of all registrations in force

The number of registrations in force (active registrations) increased from 26,284 in 2012 to 26,877 in 2013. Active registrations and active designs are highly concentrated geographically. In 2013, holders domiciled in Germany (28.7%), Switzerland (21.6%) and France (15.7%) accounted for around two-thirds of all active registrations. Those located in Italy (7.9%) and the Netherlands (6.7%) also accounted for high shares of total active registrations. Among the top 10 origins, France (-5.1 percentage points) saw the steepest decline in active registrations between 2008 and 2013, while the US (+2.6 percentage points) witnessed the largest increase over the same period.

The average fees paid per Hague international registration decreased considerably

The average fees paid per registration has continuously declined from a peak of CHF 1,942 in 2008 to CHF 1,513 in 2013. This represents a 22.1% decrease. The average fees per registration masks the considerable variation in registration fees paid by different applicants. In 2013, registration fees ranged from only CHF 456 (three registrations) to CHF 32,054 (one registration). About half of all applicants paid less than CHF 1,000, and approximately 80% paid less than CHF 2,000. Only 3.4% of applicants paid fees in excess of CHF 5,000.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM	9
-----------------------------	---

SECTION A USE OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM

A.1

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS	13
A.1.1 International applications	13
A.1.2 Top Hague applicants	14
A.1.3 Designs contained in applications by filing route (direct and Hague)	15
A.1.4 Designs contained in applications by filing route (direct and Hague) for selected Hague members	16

A.2

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	17
A.2.1 International registrations	17
A.2.2 Designs contained in international registrations	18
A.2.3 Designs per international registration	19
A.2.4 Designations in international registrations	20
A.2.5 Designations per international registration	21

A.3

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS BY HAGUE MEMBERS	22
--	----

A.4

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS BY ORIGIN	24
---	----

A.5

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE OF HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	27
--	----

A.6

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS BY CLASS	31
--------------------------------------	----

A.7

REFUSALS OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	34
---	----

A.8	<hr/>	<hr/>
	RENEWALS OF HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	35
A.9	<hr/>	
	HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS IN FORCE	40
SECTION B		
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, REVENUE AND FEES		
B.1	<hr/>	
	HAGUE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS AND REGISTRATIONS	43
B.2	<hr/>	
	REVENUE AND REGISTRATION FEES	45
SECTION C		
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN HAGUE MEMBERSHIP AND THE HAGUE LEGAL FRAMEWORK		
C.1	<hr/>	
	RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM	47
C.2	<hr/>	
	LEGAL FRAMEWORK	47
ANNEXES		
	Hague members	49
	Glossary	50
	List of abbreviations	53
	Statistical tables	54
	Table 1: International registrations via the Hague System, 2013	54
	Table 2: Renewals of international registrations via the Hague System, 2013	56
	Additional Resources	58

SUMMARY OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

The WIPO-administered Hague System for the International Registration of Industrial Designs consists of three international treaties: the London Act (1934),¹ the Hague Act (1960) and the Geneva Act (1999). If the Hague System had not been established, the procedure for protecting designs in multiple jurisdictions would involve filing separate applications with each national or regional intellectual property (IP) office. The Hague System simplifies this process by creating a single international procedure for the protection of a design in multiple jurisdictions. It makes it possible for an applicant to obtain protection for up to 100 industrial designs for products belonging to one and the same class in multiple jurisdictions by filing a single application with the International Bureau (IB) of WIPO. It also simplifies the subsequent management of the industrial design, since it is possible to record changes or to renew the registration through a single procedural step.

ADVANTAGES OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM

The Hague System lowers transaction costs for design registrations through the creation of a single application in one language, with one set of fees in a single currency denomination. Applicants are thus not burdened by having to apply at multiple offices, which would subject them to different formalities in different languages, and would involve purchasing several currency denominations and paying varying fees.

The system also simplifies the subsequent management of international registrations. Applications are handled through a single institution, which allows future amendments to registrations and renewals of registrations to be carried out by a single office (the IB) rather than requiring the designer/holder of the registration to request such amendments at multiple IP offices.

INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION AND REGISTRATION PROCEDURE


When deciding to seek protection for designs in multiple jurisdictions, an applicant can file separate applications with each office directly (“Paris route”) or file a single international application through the Hague System. Figure 1 illustrates the procedure for filing applications in multiple jurisdictions via the Paris route (under the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) and the Hague System.

An international application² is normally filed directly with the IB,³ which is responsible for carrying out an examination to verify that the application meets all formal requirements. In case of non-compliance, applicants are invited to correct the application within a three-month time limit. If corrections are not made in time, the application is considered abandoned. The IB does not undertake substantive examination (e.g., for novelty of design) and, therefore, cannot reject an application based on substantive grounds. The decision of whether or not to grant protection remains the prerogative of national or regional offices, and the rights are limited to the jurisdiction of the granting authority.

- 2 An international application does not require a prior national application or registration. It must be filed in one of the working languages – English, French or Spanish – and list the designated members (i.e., states or international intergovernmental organizations such as the European Union (EU) or the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI)) in which protection is sought.
- 3 An international application may be filed directly with the IB or indirectly through a national/regional IP office of the applicant’s choice. Under certain conditions, and under the Hague Act only, an international application must be filed through a national IP office.

¹ The London Act has been frozen since January 2010.

Figure 1: Overview of the industrial design registration process



- 1 An applicant can claim a priority date based on an earlier filing of an application, either at the IB or at a national office. However, the application used as the basis for a claimed priority date must have been filed within six months prior to the current application, or that priority date will be disregarded.
- 2 An applicant can choose to defer or expedite publication. In the case of deferment, under the Geneva Act an applicant can postpone publication for up to 30 months from the initial filing date, or the priority date, and under the Hague Act, for up to 12 months from the filing date, or the priority date.
- 3 After identifying in the *International Designs Bulletin*, the international registrations that have designated them, offices carry out substantive examination according to their respective national or regional legislation, if any.
- 4 The time limit is either 6 or 12 months from the publication date, depending on the Contracting Party.

Source: WIPO, March 2014

International applications are recorded in the International Register if they fulfill all the requirements of the formal examination conducted by the IB. The general rule is that international registrations are published in the *International Designs Bulletin* (IDB) six months after the date of international registration, unless applicants request an immediate publication or a deferment of publication.⁴ Once the registrations are published in the IDB, national and regional offices identify those international registrations that have designated their country or international intergovernmental organization, and they then carry out a substantive examination according to their respective national or regional legislation, if any.⁵ If an office refuses to issue protection, it must notify the IB of the refusal within six months from the date of publication of the international registration in the IDB.⁶ In the case of refusal, applicants have the same right of appeal as those that file directly with the national or regional office.⁷ However, if the IB does not receive a notification of refusal from a national or regional office within the prescribed time limit, the international registration is considered valid within that jurisdiction and has effect as a grant of protection in the jurisdiction concerned.⁸

International registrations are valid for a period of five years and may be renewed for at least two additional five-year periods. The maximum duration of protection by each designated Hague member depends on the locally applicable legislation. The IB administers the renewal process.

For more information on the Hague System, visit: www.wipo.int/hague/en/.

- 4 An applicant can defer publication for up to 12 months under the Hague Act or 30 months under the Geneva Act.
- 5 Some offices carry out substantive examination for every design, whereas others automatically issue protection for designs barring opposition by third parties.
- 6 Under certain circumstances, and under the Geneva Act only, the time period for notifying the IB of refusal is 12 instead of 6 months.
- 7 The applicant can appeal against a refusal according to the rules and regulations outlined in domestic/regional legislation of the office refusing protection. The IB is not involved in this procedure.
- 8 In some cases, national or regional offices notify the IB that protection is granted for an international registration by sending a statement. However, where an office does not provide the IB with a Statement of Grant, the international registration is nevertheless valid unless the office refuses the registration and communicates the refusal to the IB within the prescribed time limit (i.e., within 6 months or 12 months, as the case may be).

SECTION A

USE OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM

This section explains the key trends in use of the Hague System for the International Registration of Industrial Designs. The data reported cover applications, registrations, refusals, renewals and active registrations (i.e., those currently in force). The global trend is briefly described, followed by a breakdown of data according to countries of origin, designations of Contracting Parties – hereafter referred to as Hague members – and classes under the International Classification for Industrial Designs (Locarno Classification). The global trend data are reported from 2003 onwards in order to provide a historical overview, while the majority of the indicators focus mostly on 2013 activity. Figures and tables show data for selected countries and Hague members, whereas the annex provides data for all countries and Hague members. This report focuses primarily on registrations rather than applications, since a formal examination of the application results in the registration of most international applications.

A.1

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS

A.1.1 International applications

International industrial design applications filed under the Hague System (Hague international applications) increased to 2,990 in 2013, representing growth of 14.8% on 2012. This


marks the seventh straight year of growth in international applications. The 2013 growth rate is considerably higher than the growth rates of the preceding two years. Interestingly, Italy alone accounted for 60% of the 2013 growth.

The high growth in applications witnessed in 2008 (+46.5%) and 2010 (+32.6%) was partially due to the expansion in membership of the Hague System, which made this system more attractive to applicants seeking protection for their designs across a large number of countries.⁹

The substantial drop in applications after 2002 can be explained by the availability of the Registered Community Design (RCD) issued by the European Union's (EU) Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM). OHIM began accepting applications for RCDs in 2003, offering an alternative single application process for registering designs across all EU member states. The EU's accession to the Hague Agreement in 2008 helped to reverse the negative, low growth trend seen in the years prior to that. Its accession enabled applicants to file a single Hague international application that could designate the EU as a whole, thereby giving applicants the benefits associated with an RCD while also allowing them to designate non-EU Hague members.

⁹ In 2008, eight new members joined the Hague System, including the EU, which has received the largest number of designations since 2010 (see A.5.1).

Figure A.1.1 International applications



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.1.2 Top Hague applicants

For the second consecutive year, Swatch of Switzerland (113) filed the largest number of Hague applications, followed by Koninklijke Philips Electronics of the Netherlands (82), the Procter & Gamble of the United States of America (US, 76), Daimler of Germany (52) and Volkswagen of Germany (51) (Table A.1.2).¹⁰

Among the top applicants, Swatch (+32), Omega of Switzerland (+23), and the Procter & Gamble (+22) saw the largest increases in filings in 2013, while Audi (-41) and Daimler (-23) recorded the steepest declines.

All of the top applicants are European, except for the Procter & Gamble and The Gillette Company of the US, and Lenovo of China. For the first time, Lenovo is included among the top applicants. Germany, with ten, has the highest number of companies appearing in the top applicants list, followed by Switzerland's five.

Table A.1.2 Top Hague applicants

2013 Rank	Applicant's name	Origin	Hague international applications		
			2011	2012	2013
1	SWATCH AG (SWATCH SA) (SWATCH LTD.)	Switzerland	79	81	113
2	KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NV	Netherlands	64	67	82
3	THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY	United States of America	167	54	76
4	DAIMLER AG	Germany	55	75	52
5	VOLKSWAGEN AG	Germany	38	40	51
6	ALFRED KÄRCHER GMBH & CO. KG	Germany	15	25	38
6	THE GILLETTE COMPANY	United States of America	56	29	38
8	SOCIÉTÉ DES PRODUITS NESTLÉ SA	Switzerland	47	43	30
9	LIDL STIFTUNG & CO. KG	Germany	28	32	29
10	OMEGA SA (OMEGA AG) (OMEGA LTD.)	Switzerland	5	4	27
11	HERMES SELLIER SAS	France	15	29	19
12	HANSA METALLWERKE AG	Germany	8	5	16
13	KOZIOL IDEAS FOR FRIENDS GMBH	Germany	5	16	15
14	AUDI AG	Germany	0	54	13
14	BAYERISCHE MOTOREN WERKE AG	Germany	6	6	13
14	HANS GROHE SE	Germany	8	11	13
17	KRONOPLUS TECHNICAL AG	Switzerland	0	3	12
17	LEIFHEIT AG	Germany	12	9	12
17	RENAULT TRUCKS SAS	France	0	6	12
17	SAVERGLASS	France	3	23	12
21	LENOVO	China	0	0	11
21	MAPED	France	14	11	11
23	HILTI AG	Liechtenstein	5	6	10
23	NOKIA CORPORATION	Finland	3	9	10
23	SG ARMATUREN AS	Norway	0	0	10
23	THUN SPA	Italy	8	22	10
23	TURLEN HOLDING SA	Switzerland	4	7	10
23	VOLVO TRUCK CORPORATION	Sweden	0	4	10

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014


¹⁰ Applicants domiciled in a non-member country can file applications for international registration if they have a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the jurisdiction of a Hague member country/region.

A.1.3 Designs contained in applications by filing route (direct and Hague)

Applicants seeking design protection in foreign jurisdictions can either file applications directly with national or regional IP offices or, where requirements are met, make use of the Hague System. Figure A.1.3 presents the breakdown of the number of designs contained in non-resident applications filed via the direct route and via the Hague System.¹¹ Reporting design counts (i.e., the number of designs contained in applications) rather than application counts provides a better comparison between the two filing routes, due to institutional differences that exist across IP offices. In particular, some offices allow applications to contain more than one design for the same product or within the same class, while other offices allow only one design per application.¹²

In 2012, non-resident applications filed at offices of Hague members contained approximately 95,400 designs, of which 56.9% were filed through the Hague System. Since 2004, the overall shares of Hague non-resident designs in total non-resident designs (Hague plus direct) have followed a downward trend. The Hague share has declined from 82.2% in 2004 to 56.9% in 2012. This can be attributed to the fact that, before 2003, applicants domiciled in EU member states filed their applications as non-residents directly with other EU member states or via the Hague System, where applicable. However, the EU's introduction of the RCD in 2003 enabled these EU residents to file a single application directly with OHIM in order to seek protection within the EU as a whole. Applicants seeking protection only in the EU made greater use of OHIM than of the Hague System, as reflected by the low Hague share for two large Hague members, namely the EU and Germany (see Figure A.1.4).

Figure A.1.3 Designs contained in non-resident applications by filing route (direct and Hague)



Note: Direct application data are available only up to 2012; therefore, 2013 Hague designation data are not included. The direct route refers to applications filed directly with national or regional IP offices of Hague members only. The Hague route refers to designations received by offices via the Hague System. For the sake of simplicity, designations are referred to as applications received via the Hague route.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

¹¹ 2012 is the latest year for which data on direct applications at national/regional IP offices are available.


¹² For example, only one design per application is allowed for direct filings at Singapore's national IP office. However, when designating Singapore via the Hague System, up to 100 designs can be included in a single Hague application.

A.1.4 Designs contained in applications by filing route (direct and Hague) for selected Hague members

Figure A.1.4 breaks down designs contained in non-resident applications by filing route for selected Hague members. The Hague share in total non-resident designs varied across IP offices – from 8.6% for Germany to 97.8% for Armenia. For all reported Hague members, except the EU and Germany, the Hague System accounted for over 60% of designs contained in non-resident applications.

Applicants who seek protection in Hague member countries primarily use the Hague System. However, it is also possible for applicants to use the Hague System to seek protection in their respective “home” jurisdictions. For example, the IP office of Switzerland received resident applications for 4,054 designs in 2012, of which 52.6% were filed through the Hague System. Similarly, the EU received resident applications for 5,860 designs filed via the Hague System, representing 8.6% of total resident filings. For the majority of IP offices, the share of total resident filings received via the Hague System in 2012 was low.

Figure A.1.4 Designs contained in non-resident applications by Hague member and filing route (direct and Hague): selected Hague members, 2012



Note: Direct application data are available only up to 2012; therefore, 2013 Hague designation data are not included. The direct route refers to applications filed directly with national or regional IP offices of Hague members only. The Hague route refers to designations received by offices via the Hague System. For the sake of simplicity, designations are referred to as applications received via the Hague route.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.2

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS


A.2.1 International registrations

International applications are recorded in the International Register if they fulfill all the requirements of the formal examination conducted by the IB. In 2013, the IB recorded 2,734 international registrations, corresponding to an increase of 12.0% on 2012 (Figure A.2.1). The strong growth in registrations was mainly due to increases in registrations originating in Italy and Switzerland, which together accounted for two-thirds of the total growth. The

2013 growth rate is considerably higher than those of the preceding two years, and marks the eighth consecutive year of growth in registrations.

The overall trend for international registrations mirrors that for international applications.¹³ Registrations were at peak levels prior to 2003, after which, and in conjunction with applications, they declined considerably. The explanations given in A.1.1 also apply in understanding the increases and decreases in the number of registrations issued. However, international registrations rebounded strongly in 2008, when the EU became a member of the Hague System. The largest year-on-year growths in international registrations occurred in 2008 and 2010.

Figure A.2.1 International registrations



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

¹³ As the examination of an application carried out by the IB is a formal rather than a substantive one, a high proportion of applications result in international registrations. Granting industrial design protection within a particular jurisdiction is, ultimately, at the discretion of the national or regional office of a Hague member designated in the international registration.

A.2.2 Designs contained in international registrations


The Hague System allows a single international registration to include up to 100 different designs, provided they relate to products of the same class listed in the Locarno Classification. Focusing on the number of designs contained in international registrations provides a more accurate depiction of the volume of registrations based on the Hague System.

Figure A.2.2 presents the total number of designs contained in registrations (design counts) between 2003 and 2013. The total number of designs increased from 11,971 in 2012 to 12,806 in 2013, corresponding to 7% growth.

Switzerland accounted for the bulk of the total 2013 growth. The design count growth rate (+7%) was below that for registrations (+12%), resulting in a slight decrease in the average number of designs per registration – from 4.9 in 2012 to 4.7 in 2013.

Although applicants can include up to 100 designs per international registration, the average number of designs per registration was much lower and has fluctuated between only 4.7 and 5.7 over the past 10 years. Similar to the overall trends seen in A.1.1 and A.2.1, the number of designs decreased considerably between 2003 and 2006, after which they began an upward trend. The explanations given in A.1.1 also apply in understanding the decreases and increases in design count data.

Figure A.2.2 Designs contained in international registrations




Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.2.3 Designs per international registration

Figure A.2.3 presents the distribution of the number of designs contained in registrations, with the left-hand graph displaying the cumulative share of total registrations and its right-hand counterpart showing absolute numbers. In 2013, 39% of registrations contained a single design, 16.5% contained two designs and 9.4%

contained three designs. The number of registrations with a single design increased significantly on last year, from 32.7% in 2012 to 39.0% in 2013, while the share of registrations containing two and three designs declined slightly over the same period. In 2013, approximately 11% of all registrations contained more than 10 designs. Only 2 registrations contained the maximum 100 designs allowed under the Hague System.

Figure A.2.3 Distribution of designs per international registration, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.2.4 Designations in international registrations


The Hague System allows applicants to register up to 100 designs in multiple jurisdictions by filing a single application. When filing an international application, applicants designate the Hague members in which they wish to seek protection. Therefore, designations made via the Hague System give a picture of the breadth and flow of design protection.

Figure A.2.4 presents trends in the total number of designations contained in Hague international registrations. In 2013, the total number of designations amounted to 15,081, representing a 17.9% increase on 2012. This marks the fourth consecutive year of growth, and the 2013 growth rate is the fastest witnessed in the past 10 years. The increase in the number of designations in recent years can be attributed to both an increase in registrations issued (see Figure A.2.1) and the expansion

of the Hague System itself. For example, Norway became a Hague member in 2010 and, by 2013, it is now the fourth most designated Hague member (see Figure A.5.1). Similarly, Oman, a recent member of the Hague System, has become the 13th most designated member.

The average number of designations per registration has been increasing since 2010. On average, there were 5.5 designations per registration in 2013, a considerable increase from the 2010 level, but substantially lower than for years prior to 2008. Between 2003 and 2007, the average number of designations per registration varied from 11.1 to 12.4. In 2008, there was a sharp decrease in the average number of designations per registration, which can be attributed to the EU's accession to the Hague Agreement. This made it possible to seek protection within all EU member countries at once via the single designation of the EU rather than having to designate each individual EU member country separately.

Figure A.2.4 Designations in international registrations



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.2.5 Designations per international registration


As already outlined, the average number of Hague member countries in which applicants seek protection was 5.5 in 2013. Figure A.2.5 shows that this average is skewed to the left due to a large number of registrations containing only a few designations – 58.4% of all registrations included up to three designations. The left-hand graph shows the cumulative share, whereas the right-hand one shows absolute numbers.

Registrations containing two designations were the most common overall, accounting for 26.4% of total registrations, followed by registrations containing either one or three designations (16% each). The EU is the

most frequently designated member for registrations with a single designation, and the EU and Switzerland together are the most frequently designated members for registrations with two designations. The shares of registrations with one, two, three and four registrations in 2013 is similar to those seen in 2012. However, the share of registrations with five designations increased from 4.8% in 2012 to 7.1% in 2013.

Approximately 90% of all registrations included up to 14 designations, whereas the remaining 10% included between 15 and 58. Registrations containing 23 and 24 designations were also popular with a combined share of 6.6% of all registrations. Only one registration designated 58 Hague members in 2013.

Figure A.2.5 Distribution of designations per international registration, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.3

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS BY HAGUE MEMBERS


Data reported in this subsection are based on those relating to Hague members rather than on those referring to the origin of the applicant, which can be different for a given registration. To file an application for an international registration, applicants must satisfy one of the following three conditions: the applicant must be a national of a Hague member country; reside in the territory of a Hague member; or have a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the jurisdiction covered by a Hague member.¹⁴ The third condition makes it possible for an applicant whose country is not a Hague member to file an application for an international registration.

For example, applications filed by an applicant whose country is not a member of the Hague System, such as the US, and whose commercial establishment is located within a Hague member country, such as Switzerland, are considered Hague member data for Switzerland. This is in contrast to origin data (see Subsection A.4), which are based on the true origin in instances where the origin is not the same as the Hague member via which the application was filed. In the example above, the application is allocated to Switzerland when referring to Hague member data, but to the US when referring to origin data.

Figure A.3.1 presents the trend in international registrations and designs contained in international registrations for the top five Hague members during the 2008-13 period.¹⁵ Registrations for the top five members, except Turkey and Switzerland, have followed an upward trend.

Registrations decreased in Switzerland in 2012. Despite an increase in 2013, its registrations remain below the peak reached in 2011. The combined share of the top five Hague members has decreased from 95% in 2008 to 90% in 2013. The numbers of designs contained in registrations for the top five Hague members show a trend similar to that for registrations, but with larger volumes.

Figure A.3.1 Trend in registrations and designs contained in registrations for the top five Hague members



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

¹⁴ Hague members include intergovernmental organizations such as the EU and OAPI.


¹⁵ The top five Hague members are selected based on 2013 registrations.

Figure A.3.2 depicts the share of registrations and designs for the top 10 Hague members. The top 10 members accounted for 95.6% of total 2013 registrations. All top 10 members, except Turkey, are located in Europe. The EU (39.2%) accounted for the largest share of total registrations, followed by Switzerland (28.2%), Germany (10.3%) and France (9.8%). Among the top 10 members, the EU (-2 percentage points) and France (-1.5 percentage points) saw the largest declines in share in 2013 compared to the previous year, while Switzerland (+1.6 percentage points) and Norway (+1.2 percentage points) saw the largest increases over the same period.

The top 10 Hague members for design counts and registrations are almost identical. The difference is that Bulgaria and Singapore appear in the top list for design counts but not for registrations, while Croatia and Poland appear in the top list for registrations but not for design counts. For the top 10 Hague members, except Germany and Norway, the shares of design counts are similar to those of registrations. Germany's design count share (13.1%) is higher than its registration share (10.3%), while Norway's registration share (2.5%) is higher than that for design counts (1.2%).

Comparing 2012 and 2013 design count shares for the top 10 Hague members shows that the EU's share declined from 43.2% in 2012 to 39.7% in 2013, while that of Switzerland increased from 23.8% to 27.6% over the same period. For all other members, the change was low – less than one percentage point.

Figure A.3.2 Share of Hague members in total registrations and designs contained in registrations: top 10 Hague members, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.4

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS BY ORIGIN


This subsection presents registration data by the country of origin of the applicant. This differs from subsection A.3, which presents registrations based on the Hague member affiliated with the applicant. The origin of the applicant is defined by the listed address of the first-named applicant. This section, therefore, includes countries that are not members of the Hague System, such as the US.¹⁶ Country of origin data provide information on the true origin of the holder of a Hague international registration rather than the location serving as the basis for an application for registration.

Figure A.4.1 depicts international registration data for the top 15 origins. Holders residing in Switzerland ac-

counted for the largest number of international registrations (658), followed by those in Germany (637), France (285), Italy (273) and the Netherlands (139). Among the top five origins, Switzerland and Italy saw double-digit growth between 2012 and 2013. Italy, in particular, has been growing substantially each year since 2008. The US ranked sixth with 133 registrations. The substantial 49.4% growth in 2013 compensates for the large drop seen in registrations by holders residing in the US the previous year.

The majority of the top 15 origins saw growth in registrations over the 2012-13 period (Figure A.4.1). Norway, a recent Hague member, more than doubled its number of registrations issued. Finland (+76.5%) and Liechtenstein (+52.9%) also recorded high growth rates, albeit from low baselines. Austria (-26.2%), the United Kingdom (-6.1%), Luxembourg (-3.1%) and Germany (-1.8%) are the only four origins that saw a drop in registrations.

Figure A.4.1 International registrations for the top 15 origins, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

¹⁶ Applicants domiciled in a non-member country can file applications for international registrations if they have a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the jurisdiction of a Hague member country/region.

Figure A.4.2 presents data based on design counts for the top 15 origins. Design counts depict a trend similar to that for registrations, although with some differences. For example, Germany is ranked first for design counts rather than Switzerland (Figure A.4.1). Similarly, the US ranks higher than the Netherlands in terms of design counts. This indicates that, on average, registrations from Germany contain more designs per registration (5.9 designs) than those from Switzerland (4.6), and registrations from the US (4.9) contain more designs than those originating in the Netherlands (2.7).


Both China and Greece have low rankings when considering registrations, but their registrations contained, on average, 9.8 and 50.5 designs, respectively. This higher number of designs per registration moves these two origins into the list of top 15 origins for design counts.

Similar to registrations, the majority of origins listed saw growth in designs between 2012 and 2013. Four origins saw decreases in the number of designs contained in registrations over the same period. China, Greece and Liechtenstein saw considerable growth in design counts;

however, this is due to low 2012 baselines. For example, the number of designs originating in China increased from 8 in 2012 to 127 in 2013.


Figure A.4.3 presents the distribution of the number of designs contained in international registrations for the top six origins for 2013. The distribution of designs per registration differs vastly across origins. The Netherlands (61.2%) had the highest share of single-design registrations, whereas Germany (19.5%) recorded the lowest single-design registrations. For the top six origins, except Germany, registrations containing up to two designs accounted for the bulk of their registrations. The share of registrations with more than 10 designs was highest for Germany (13.5%) and France (13%). In contrast, only a few registrations originating in the Netherlands contained more than 10 designs. As outlined earlier, international registrations can contain up to 100 designs, but not a single registration from any of the top six origins contained 100 designs. The largest numbers of designs contained in a registration were: 81 for the US, 69 for France, 68 for Germany, 67 for Switzerland, 65 for the Netherlands and 22 for Italy.

Figure A.4.2 Designs contained in international registrations for the top 15 origins, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.4.3 Distribution of designs per registration for the top six origins, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.5

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE OF HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS


The Hague System simplifies the process of multinational registration by creating a single international procedure for protecting a design in multiple jurisdictions. Applicants list the Hague member countries/regions in which they wish to protect their designs (i.e., designated members). This subsection presents statistics on designations to provide insight into the geographical coverage of international registrations.

In 2013, the total number of designations in all international registrations amounted to 15,081, corresponding to


a 17.9% increase on 2012, the largest growth recorded for over a decade. The EU was the most designated Hague member, with 2,026 designations in 2013, followed by Switzerland (1,911), Turkey (1,277), Norway (806) and Singapore (712) (Figure A.5.1). The ranking of the top three designated members – the EU, Switzerland and Turkey – has remained unchanged since 2009. However, their combined share of total designations has declined from a peak of 37.6% in 2011 to 34.6% in 2013.

Among the top 20 designated Hague members, Croatia and Serbia were the only members with fewer designations in 2013 than in the previous year. All other reported Hague members saw growth in designations. Tunisia, albeit starting from a low base, recorded the fastest growth between 2012 and 2013.

Figure A.5.1 Top 20 designated Hague members, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.5.2 Designs contained in registrations for the top 20 designated Hague members, 2013

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.5.2 reports data on the number of designs (design count) contained in international registrations for the top 20 designated Hague members. The trend for design counts is similar to that for registrations, albeit with higher volumes. For example, the EU's design count is 10,178, compared to only 2,026 for registrations. For the top 20 designated members, the average number of designs per registration ranged from 5 for the EU to 3.2 for Montenegro and Oman.

Table A.5.3 presents a breakdown of the number of designs contained in registrations for the top 10 origins and designated Hague members. The EU received just under two-thirds of its designations from only three countries – Switzerland (28.4%), Germany (26.3%) and France (10.1%). Designs contained in registrations from Switzerland accounted for the largest share of all designations in seven of these top 10 designated Hague members, while Germany accounted for the largest share in the remaining three members. Designations are skewed towards two origins – Germany and Switzerland. These two countries combined accounted for the bulk of all designations in the reported Hague members – ranging from 54% in Singapore to 71.9% in Liechtenstein.

Table A.5.3 Designs contained in registrations for the top 10 origins and designated Hague members, 2013

Origin	Designated Hague member (number of designations)									
	European Union	Switzerland	Turkey	Norway	Ukraine	Singapore	Morocco	Croatia	Monaco	Liechtenstein
Austria	146	168	45	36	19	21	0	31	8	8
Belgium	130	124	55	50	44	20	15	29	11	6
France	1,029	1,000	552	227	315	523	510	61	443	137
Germany	2,674	3,374	1,923	774	735	305	238	729	104	251
Greece	202	0	202	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Italy	690	802	538	105	122	250	114	74	129	153
Netherlands	173	218	134	142	93	95	3	24	20	11
Switzerland	2,891	2,420	1,556	1,189	1,051	1,120	915	624	892	975
Turkey	287	31	35	31	90	27	0	67	24	24
United States of America	626	370	422	18	36	35	14	1	3	3
Others	1,330	780	531	579	406	243	114	243	90	138
Total	10,178	9,287	5,993	3,152	2,911	2,639	1,923	1,884	1,724	1,706

Origin	Designated Hague member (share of designations (%))									
	European Union	Switzerland	Turkey	Norway	Ukraine	Singapore	Morocco	Croatia	Monaco	Liechtenstein
Austria	1.4	1.8	0.8	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.0	1.6	0.5	0.5
Belgium	1.3	1.3	0.9	1.6	1.5	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.6	0.4
France	10.1	10.8	9.2	7.2	10.8	19.8	26.5	3.2	25.7	8.0
Germany	26.3	36.3	32.1	24.6	25.2	11.6	12.4	38.7	6.0	14.7
Greece	2.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Italy	6.8	8.6	9.0	3.3	4.2	9.5	5.9	3.9	7.5	9.0
Netherlands	1.7	2.3	2.2	4.5	3.2	3.6	0.2	1.3	1.2	0.6
Switzerland	28.4	26.1	26.0	37.7	36.1	42.4	47.6	33.1	51.7	57.2
Turkey	2.8	0.3	0.6	1.0	3.1	1.0	0.0	3.6	1.4	1.4
United States of America	6.2	4.0	7.0	0.6	1.2	1.3	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.2
Others	13.1	8.4	8.9	18.4	13.9	9.2	5.9	12.9	5.2	8.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0


Note: The top ten origins are based on the number of designs contained in Hague registrations.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.5.4 presents the distribution of the number of designs contained in registrations for the top six designated Hague members. Of all international registrations designating Singapore, nearly half (46.1%) of them contained a single design. This was the highest percentage among these top designated members. In contrast, the 34.6% share for the EU was much lower. For all reported designated Hague members, around three-quarters of total registrations contained up to five designs. Relatively

few registrations included a large number of designs. For example, less than 10% of all registrations designating Norway, Singapore, Turkey and Ukraine contained more than 10 designs. Although few registrations contained a large number of designs, two registrations that designated the EU contained 100 designs – the maximum number permitted under the Hague System. The share of single-design registrations in 2013 was higher than in 2012 for these Hague members.

Figure A.5.4 Distribution of designs per registration for the top six designated Hague members, 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.6

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS BY CLASS

As outlined earlier, the Hague System makes it possible to register, via a single registration, up to 100 industrial designs belonging to the same class of the International Classification for Industrial Designs established under the Locarno Agreement. Table A.6.1 shows the distribution of the total number of international registrations by class.

Packages and containers (Class 9), and clocks and watches (Class 10) accounted for the largest shares –

10.9% each – of total registrations, followed by furnishing (Class 6) and means of transport (Class 12) with shares of 8.4% and 7.7%, respectively. Hague registrations for 10 classes, such as relating to animal care articles (Class 30), musical instruments (Class 17), and accident prevention and rescue equipment (Class 29) were the least often specified classes in 2013 – each class accounting for less than 1% of all registrations.

Among the top 15 classes, recording and communication equipment (Class 14; +42.5%), and tools and hardware (Class 8; +40.3%) saw the fastest growth in registrations in 2013, while clothing (Class 2; -15.3%) saw the largest decline.

Table A.6.1 Total registrations by class

Class	Year			Growth (%): 2012-13	2013 Share (%)
	2011	2012	2013		
Class 9: Packages and containers	313	257	297	15.6	10.9
Class 10: Clocks and watches	226	242	297	22.7	10.9
Class 6: Furnishing	172	199	230	15.6	8.4
Class 12: Means of transport	141	207	210	1.4	7.7
Class 7: Household goods	165	159	170	6.9	6.2
Class 26: Lighting apparatus	96	144	151	4.9	5.5
Class 23: Heating and cooling equipment	141	130	129	-0.8	4.7
Class 32: Graphic symbols and logos	138	98	117	19.4	4.3
Class 14: Recording and communication equipment	66	80	114	42.5	4.2
Class 8: Tools and hardware	82	77	108	40.3	4.0
Class 11: Articles of adornment	103	114	103	-9.6	3.8
Class 25: Building and construction elements	58	81	92	13.6	3.4
Class 15: Machines, not elsewhere specified	66	74	88	18.9	3.2
Class 2: Clothing	75	98	83	-15.3	3.0
Class 3: Travel goods	77	75	76	1.3	2.8
Class 19: Stationery and office equipment	55	62	72	16.1	2.6
Class 13: Equipment for producing electricity	61	41	62	51.2	2.3
Class 24: Medical and laboratory equipment	51	44	54	22.7	2.0
Class 28: Pharmaceutical and cosmetic products	71	46	53	15.2	1.9
Class 21: Games, toys, sporting goods	52	69	52	-24.6	1.9
Class 20: Sales and advertising equipment	22	23	46	100.0	1.7
Class 1: Foodstuffs	9	14	34	142.9	1.2
Class 4: Brushware	22	13	23	76.9	0.8
Class 31: Machines for preparing food or drink	25	14	18	28.6	0.7
Class 5: Textile piecegoods	21	14	14	0.0	0.5
Class 22: Arms, articles for hunting and fishing	14	13	8	-38.5	0.3
Class 16: Photographic apparatus	7	12	8	-33.3	0.3
Class 18: Printing and office machinery	6	1	8	700.0	0.3
Class 27: Tobacco and smokers' supplies	10	14	7	-50.0	0.3
Class 30: Animal care articles	4	15	5	-66.7	0.2
Class 17: Musical instruments	8	7	4	-42.9	0.1
Class 29: Accident prevention and rescue equipment	6	3	1	-66.7	0.0
Total	2,363	2,440	2,734	12.0	100.0

Note: For full definition see: www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/locarno/.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Table A.6.2 presents a breakdown of all 2013 international registrations by class and top five countries of origin. On an aggregate level, Classes 9 and 10 were specified the most (Table A.6.1). However, there is considerable variation in the classes specified in registrations among the top five origins. Class 10, associated with clocks and watches, was the most specified class for registrations originating in Switzerland, accounting for around one-third of all Swiss registrations. This should come as no surprise given that Swatch AG was the top Hague applicant (Table A.1.2). Class 12, which relates to means of transport, accounted for around one-fifth of all registrations coming from Germany, which was

partly due to the use of the Hague System by the German car manufacturers Daimler AG, Audi AG and Volkswagen AG, which were among the top Hague applicants (see A.1.2). Class 9, packages and containers, accounted for the largest share of registrations originating in France (14.4%). Registrations from Italy specified Class 6 (furnishing) and Class 26 (lighting apparatus) the most – approximately 14% each. For registrations originating in the Netherlands, Class 7 (household goods) accounted for the largest share of total registrations (18.7%), partly due to the large number of applications filed by Philips Electronics (see A.1.2).

Table A.6.2 Registrations by class and origin, 2013

Class	Number of registrations					Share of registrations (%)				
	CH	DE	FR	IT	NL	CH	DE	FR	IT	NL
Class 1: Foodstuffs	7	6	3	3	0	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.0
Class 2: Clothing	11	12	20	14	0	1.7	1.9	7.0	5.1	0.0
Class 3: Travel goods	18	16	13	12	3	2.7	2.5	4.6	4.4	2.2
Class 4: Brushware	6	3	6	0	1	0.9	0.5	2.1	0.0	0.7
Class 5: Textile piecegoods	3	5	1	2	0	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.0
Class 6: Furnishing	28	70	24	40	10	4.3	11.0	8.4	14.7	7.2
Class 7: Household goods	49	26	15	24	26	7.4	4.1	5.3	8.8	18.7
Class 8: Tools and hardware	25	19	12	6	5	3.8	3.0	4.2	2.2	3.6
Class 9: Packages and containers	39	42	41	19	10	5.9	6.6	14.4	7.0	7.2
Class 10: Clocks and watches	226	27	17	7	2	34.3	4.2	6.0	2.6	1.4
Class 11: Articles of adornment	34	19	16	14	3	5.2	3.0	5.6	5.1	2.2
Class 12: Means of transport	8	125	22	14	3	1.2	19.6	7.7	5.1	2.2
Class 13: Equipment for producing electricity	15	12	11	2	2	2.3	1.9	3.9	0.7	1.4
Class 14: Recording and communication equipment	25	16	11	11	8	3.8	2.5	3.9	4.0	5.8
Class 15: Machines, not elsewhere specified	12	39	3	9	7	1.8	6.1	1.1	3.3	5.0
Class 16: Photographic apparatus	1	0	2	1	1	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.4	0.7
Class 17: Musical instruments	1	0	2	0	0	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Class 18: Printing and office machinery	5	0	0	0	0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Class 19: Stationery and office equipment	8	37	12	1	2	1.2	5.8	4.2	0.4	1.4
Class 20: Sales and advertising equipment	11	7	3	17	0	1.7	1.1	1.1	6.2	0.0
Class 21: Games, toys, sporting goods	7	10	4	7	2	1.1	1.6	1.4	2.6	1.4
Class 22: Arms, articles for hunting and fishing	2	2	0	0	0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Class 23: Heating and cooling equipment	27	56	4	11	5	4.1	8.8	1.4	4.0	3.6
Class 24: Medical and laboratory equipment	18	6	3	3	9	2.7	0.9	1.1	1.1	6.5
Class 25: Building and construction elements	21	21	6	11	1	3.2	3.3	2.1	4.0	0.7
Class 26: Lighting apparatus	12	30	21	36	8	1.8	4.7	7.4	13.2	5.8
Class 27: Tobacco and smokers' supplies	1	2	0	2	0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.0
Class 28: Pharmaceutical and cosmetic products	4	7	4	1	14	0.6	1.1	1.4	0.4	10.1
Class 29: Accident prevention and rescue equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Class 30: Animal care articles	3	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Class 31: Machines for preparing food or drink	2	1	0	0	14	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	10.1
Class 32: Graphic symbols and logos	29	21	9	6	3	4.4	3.3	3.2	2.2	2.2
Total	658	637	285	273	139	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: For full class definitions see www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/locarno/. Switzerland (CH), Germany (DE), France (FR), Italy (IT) and the Netherlands (NL)

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Table A.6.3 International registrations by class and designated Hague member: top 10 classes and top 10 designated members, 2013

Class	Designated Hague member (number of designations)									
	EU	CH	TR	NO	SG	UA	MC	ME	LI	MA
Class 6: Furnishing	180	163	70	46	40	23	16	22	17	17
Class 7: Household goods	114	116	78	55	46	34	7	19	13	10
Class 8: Tools and hardware	81	73	31	25	11	15	4	7	14	6
Class 9: Packages and containers	221	162	106	71	47	74	34	38	22	22
Class 10: Clocks and watches	275	278	216	166	206	186	181	149	163	163
Class 12: Means of transport	140	149	131	60	18	57	11	19	11	25
Class 14: Recording and communication equipment	76	68	51	43	31	25	11	8	15	9
Class 23: Heating and cooling equipment	77	97	70	35	22	38	3	22	12	17
Class 26: Lighting apparatus	97	103	67	38	31	20	10	17	11	14
Class 32: Graphic symbols and logos	97	67	41	22	15	14	11	5	4	13
Others	668	635	416	245	245	208	140	117	128	112
Total	2,026	1,911	1,277	806	712	694	428	423	410	408

Class	Designated Hague member (share of total designations, %)									
	EU	CH	TR	NO	SG	UA	MC	ME	LI	MA
Class 6: Furnishing	8.9	8.5	5.5	5.7	5.6	3.3	3.7	5.2	4.1	4.2
Class 7: Household goods	5.6	6.1	6.1	6.8	6.5	4.9	1.6	4.5	3.2	2.5
Class 8: Tools and hardware	4.0	3.8	2.4	3.1	1.5	2.2	0.9	1.7	3.4	1.5
Class 9: Packages and containers	10.9	8.5	8.3	8.8	6.6	10.7	7.9	9.0	5.4	5.4
Class 10: Clocks and watches	13.6	14.5	16.9	20.6	28.9	26.8	42.3	35.2	39.8	40.0
Class 12: Means of transport	6.9	7.8	10.3	7.4	2.5	8.2	2.6	4.5	2.7	6.1
Class 14: Recording and communication equipment	3.8	3.6	4.0	5.3	4.4	3.6	2.6	1.9	3.7	2.2
Class 23: Heating and cooling equipment	3.8	5.1	5.5	4.3	3.1	5.5	0.7	5.2	2.9	4.2
Class 26: Lighting apparatus	4.8	5.4	5.2	4.7	4.4	2.9	2.3	4.0	2.7	3.4
Class 32: Graphic symbols and logos	4.8	3.5	3.2	2.7	2.1	2.0	2.6	1.2	1.0	3.2
Others	33.0	33.2	32.6	30.4	34.4	30.0	32.7	27.7	31.2	27.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Top 10 classes selected, based on the total registrations as reported in Table A.6.1. For full class definition, see www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/locarno/. EU (European Union), CH (Switzerland), TR (Turkey), NO (Norway), SG (Singapore), UA (Ukraine), MC (Monaco), ME (Montenegro), LI (Liechtenstein) and MA (Morocco)

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

The share of the top five classes in total registrations ranged from 44.9% for France to 57.3% for Switzerland.

Table A.6.3 provides a distribution of international registrations by class for the top 10 designated Hague members. The distributions (i.e., the share of total designations) of each of the top classes are of a similar magnitude for the top 10 designated members. In 2013, Class 10 (clocks and watches) was the most prominent class for all reported members. For example, Class 10 accounted for around 40% of total designations received by Monaco (42.3%), Morocco (40%) and Liechtenstein (39.8%).

Class 9 was also prominent in designations received by each of the top 10 members – the share ranged from 11% for both the EU and Ukraine to 5.4% each for Liechtenstein and Morocco. Means of transport (Class 12) was a popular class for designations received by Turkey (10.3%), Ukraine (8.2%), Switzerland (7.8%) and Norway (7.4%).

A.7


REFUSALS OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS

Designated offices can refuse to grant protection for an international registration where the registration is subject to opposition from a third party, and when it fails to meet the necessary criteria, such as novelty, as specified in national laws. If an office refuses to grant protection, it must notify the IB of this decision within the applicable time limit, usually six months from the date on which the registration was published in the *International Designs Bulletin* (IDB).


Figure A.7.1 presents the total number of refusals received by the IB since 2005. The bar chart shows considerable year-on-year variation in numbers of refusals. In 2013, a total of 119 refusals were issued, which is considerably lower than the peak witnessed in 2011 (231), but higher than the 82 issued in 2012.

Refusals represent only a small fraction of total designations. For the 2005-13 period, refusals represented less than 1% of all designations in registrations. This is partly due to the fact that a number of offices do not carry out substantive examination and, therefore, automatically issue protection for designs barring opposition by third parties. A small number of Hague members accounted for the majority of these refusals. Of the 119 refusals in 2013, Egypt accounted for 27.7% of the total, followed the Syrian Arab Republic (25.2%) and the Republic of Moldova (24.4%). Only six Hague members accounted for the large majority (95.8%) of all refusals.

Figure A.7.1 Refusals of international registrations




Refusals of international registrations by designated Hague member (%), 2013



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.7.2 depicts the refusals of international registrations for 2013 broken down by Locarno Classification. At least one Hague international registration was refused by a Hague member for 23 of the possible 32 classes. Class 9 (packages and containers) accounted for the largest number of refusals, followed by Class 32 (graphic symbols and logos) and Class 13 (tools and hardware).

Figure A.7.2 Refusals by class, 2013

Note: Class 9: Packages and containers; Class 32: Graphic symbols and logos; Class 13: Equipment for producing electricity; Class 11: Articles of adornment; Class 12: Means of transport; Class 10: Clocks and watches; Class 26: Lighting apparatus; Class 3: Travel goods; Class 19: Stationery and office equipment. For full class details see www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/locarno/.


Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.8

RENEWALS OF HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS

International registrations are valid for a period of five years and can be renewed for two additional five-year periods. The maximum duration of protection in each country/jurisdiction depends on the legislation of the granting authority. International registrations must be renewed in order to remain valid. During the renewal process, holders can designate all or only some of the Hague members designated in the initial registration. Holders can also opt to renew all or some of the designs contained in the initial registration.


In 2013, total renewals amounted to 2,859, representing a reduction of 8.4% on 2012 (Figure A.8.1). This is the first year renewals have fallen since 2009. The 2012 growth was largely due to the increase in registrations in 2002 and the record number of renewals in 2007. The sharp declines in 2008 and 2009 were due to large drops in registrations in 2003 and 2004. The 2013 decline in total renewals can be partly explained by a sharp decrease in registrations in 2003 and by a drop in renewals in 2008.

Figure A.8.1 Renewals of international registrations

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

The trend in the number of designs contained in total renewals (design renewals) is similar to that for registration renewals. In 2013, total registration renewals contained 11,085 designs. Following the 13.9% increase in 2012,

design renewals fell by 6.6% in 2013 – the largest drop since 2009 (Figure A.8.2). On average, there were 3.9 designs per renewal in 2013, a ratio that has remained more or less stable since 2009 – ranging from 3.7 to 3.9.

Figure A.8.2 Designs contained in renewals of international registrations

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014


The aggregate data for renewals, as shown in Figure A.8.1, mask differences across origins. Figures A.8.3 and A.8.4 provide breakdowns of registration renewals and design renewals (designs contained in renewals of registrations) by origin. Except for Germany, the trends in renewals for the other top five origins were more or less stable between 2008 and 2012. Germany, in contrast, saw a sharp increase in 2013.

In 2013, four of these origins saw considerable decreases in renewals compared to the previous year – Italy (-29.6%),


Germany (-23.6%), France (-16.7%) and the Netherlands (-8.4%). Switzerland was the only listed origin to experience growth in 2013, reaching the same number of renewals recorded in 2008, with a 23.5% increase on 2012.

Holders of international registrations originating in Germany renewed the largest number of registrations in 2013, accounting for 32.4% of the total renewals, followed by Switzerland (24.5%) and France (17.5%). Combined, these five countries accounted for 88.5% of all 2013 renewals, down from 93.1% in 2008.

Figure A.8.3 Renewals of international registrations for the top five origins



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.8.4 Designs contained in renewals of international registrations for the top five origin

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Renewals data based on design counts show a profile similar to that for registration data, but with larger volumes (Figure A.8.4). The top five origins were identical with regard to both registrations and design counts. Germany and Italy had higher shares in renewals of registrations in terms of design counts, while the opposite was true for France, the Netherlands and Switzerland. On average, renewals of registrations originating in Italy contained 4.6 designs, compared to 4.1 for Germany, 3.8 for France, 3.3 for Switzerland and 3.1 for the Netherlands.

Table A.8.5 lists renewals of international registrations and design renewals for selected designated Hague members. In 2013, holders of international registrations designated Switzerland the most frequently in their renewals – for both registrations and designs contained in these registrations (2,290 and 9,284, respectively). France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux also received large numbers of designations in renewals (each receiving more than 1,400 registration renewals and more than 5,400 design renewals). The top five designated Hague

members accounted for 37.8% of total registration renewals in 2013 – which is similar to their 2008 share (37.2%). Renewals of designs showed an almost identical profile.

All the reported Hague members, except Ukraine and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, had lower volumes of registration and design renewals in 2013 compared to 2008. Ukraine saw growth in both registration and design renewals, while the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia recorded growth in design renewals over the same period. Spain saw the fastest declines in both renewals of registrations (-64.6%) and design renewals (-67%). Comparing designations in renewals (Table A.8.5) with designations in new registrations (Figure A.5.1) highlights the shift in designation patterns that has occurred since the EU's accession to the Hague Agreement in 2008. France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Spain were the top 20 designated Hague members for renewals, but not a single EU country is listed among the top 20 for designations in new registrations.

Table A.8.5 Top designated Hague members in renewals of registrations

Designated member	Renewals of registrations					Design renewals				
	2003	2008	2013	Growth rate (%) 2008-13	2013 Share (%)	2003	2008	2013	Growth rate (%) 2008-13	2013 Share (%)
Switzerland	2,831	2,588	2,290	-11.5	10.5	11,292	10,920	9,284	-15.0	11.3
France	2,942	2,549	1,523	-40.3	7.0	11,740	11,185	5,667	-49.3	6.9
Benelux	3,006	2,638	1,494	-43.4	6.9	11,723	11,656	5,635	-51.7	6.8
Germany	2,897	2,499	1,432	-42.7	6.6	11,420	11,150	5,528	-50.4	6.7
Italy	2,909	2,605	1,486	-43.0	6.8	11,495	11,342	5,489	-51.6	6.7
Tunisia	1,789	1,487	783	-47.3	3.6	7,044	6,677	3,300	-50.6	4.0
Egypt	1,793	1,523	752	-50.6	3.5	7,053	6,870	3,040	-55.7	3.7
European Union	714	..	3.3	2,993	..	3.6
Monaco	1,021	914	736	-19.5	3.4	4,514	3,732	2,979	-20.2	3.6
Liechtenstein	1,030	916	720	-21.4	3.3	4,410	3,448	2,711	-21.4	3.3
Spain	2,015	1,766	626	-64.6	2.9	7,691	7,942	2,617	-67.0	3.2
Greece	775	1078	611	-43.3	2.8	3,042	5,203	2,577	-50.5	3.1
Turkey	513	..	2.4	2,190	..	2.7
Montenegro	..	777	631	-18.8	2.9	..	3,142	2,149	-31.6	2.6
Morocco	1,787	1,065	518	-51.4	2.4	6,998	4,674	2,107	-54.9	2.6
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	320	613	568	-7.3	2.6	846	1,938	2,054	6.0	2.5
Hungary	1,008	919	562	-38.8	2.6	3,315	3,416	2,041	-40.3	2.5
Serbia	..	778	597	-23.3	2.7	..	3,142	2,004	-36.2	2.4
Ukraine	..	419	589	40.6	2.7	..	1,169	1,908	63.2	2.3
Slovenia	594	849	474	-44.2	2.2	2,460	3,729	1,780	-52.3	2.2
Others	8,895	8,613	4,119	-52.2	18.9	33,838	31,735	14,249	-55.1	17.3
Total	35,612	34,596	21,738	-37.2	100.0	138,881	143,070	82,302	-42.5	100.0

Note: The selection of the top 20 designated Hague members is based on design renewals in 2013.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

A.9

HAGUE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATIONS IN FORCE

Industrial designs can be maintained for up to 15 years, with the law in some countries/regions providing for longer protection. By examining the number of international registrations in force (i.e., active registrations), one can better understand the volume of industrial designs that currently benefit from protection.

Figure A.9.1 presents the total number of active registrations over the 2003-13 period. The number of active registrations increased from 26,284 in 2012 to 26,877

in 2013. Between 2003 and 2008, the number of active registrations declined substantially from approximately 35,000 to 26,000. This decline, as seen in A.2.1, was driven by a drop in new registrations due to the introduction of the RCD. Since 2008, the yearly volume of active registrations has hovered around 26,000.


The number of designs contained in active registrations (active designs) has followed a similar trend over time, increasing by 1.6% in 2013 (Figure A.9.2). Active designs saw a steady decline between 2003 and 2009, but since then, the number of active designs has slowly increased, from 104,350 in 2009 to 111,881 in 2013. On average, each active registration contained 4.2 designs in 2013, a ratio that has remained more or less stable since 2008.

Figure A.9.1 Active international registrations



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.9.2 Designs contained in active international registrations



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014


Figure A.9.3 depicts the total number of designations in active registrations (active designations), providing an insight into the geographical scope of these registrations. Active designations have fallen from approximately 370,000 in 2003 to approximately 217,000 in 2013. This decline, which began in 2003, can be attributed to the fall in active registrations. The decline was prolonged in 2008 and 2009, despite the growth in registrations associated with the EU's accession to the Hague Agreement, which enabled applicants to designate the EU as a whole rather than individual EU member countries separately. On average, the number of designations per active registration in 2013 was 8.2, a figure that has remained unchanged since 2012.

Active registrations and active designs are highly concentrated geographically. In 2013, Germany (28.7%), Switzerland (21.6%) and France (15.7%) accounted for around two-thirds of all active registrations (Figure A.9.4). Italy (7.9%) and the Netherlands (6.7%) also accounted for high shares of total active registrations. Among the

top 10 origins, France (5.1 percentage points) saw the fastest decline in active registrations between 2008 and 2013, while the US (2.6 percentage points) witnessed the largest growth over the same period.


Figure A.9.5 depicts the share of active designs for the top 10 origins. The profile of the top 10 origins with regards to active designs is similar to that pertaining to active registrations. However, there are a few subtle differences. For example, in 2013 Sweden is one of the top 10 origins in terms of active registrations, but not in terms of active designs. In contrast, Austria is included in the top 10 ranking for active designs, but not for active registrations. For 2013, the share for each origin, except Germany and Switzerland, of active registrations and designs are of a similar magnitude. Germany's active designs share is 2.3 percentage points greater than its registrations share, while Switzerland has a higher active registrations share (22.1%) compared to active design share (20.4%).

Figure A.9.3 Designations contained in active registrations



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014


Figure A.9.4 Active registrations for the top 10 origins



Note: The selection of the top 10 origins is based on the 2013 total.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure A.9.5 Active designs for the top 10 origins



Note: The selection of the top 10 origins is based on 2013 total.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

SECTION B

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, REVENUE AND FEES

This section provides a few indicators on the administrative performance of the Hague System. B.1 focuses on the handling of applications (processing and publication) by the IB, and B.2 reports fee data for international registrations and revenue generated by the Hague System.

B.1


HAGUE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS AND REGISTRATIONS

Applications for industrial designs are filed in paper form or through the IB's electronic filing (E-filing) system. Figure

B.1.1 presents the total number of Hague international applications together with their distribution by medium of filing. Electronic filing in English was introduced in 2008 and, as of 2010, it has been possible to file in French and Spanish as well. Electronic filing has steadily increased over the years, and became the chosen filing method for the majority of all Hague applications just one year after its introduction.


As highlighted earlier, an applicant can file for industrial design protection in either English, French or Spanish. In 2013, the largest share (77%) of applications were filed in English, whereas most of the remaining applications were filed in French (Figure B.1.2). Spanish-language

Figure B.1.1 International applications by medium of filing



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure B.1.2 International applications by language of filing



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014


filings accounted for less than 1% of the total. This can be explained by the fact that Spanish became a working language of the Hague System only as recently as 2010. Moreover, Spain is the only Spanish-speaking country that is a member of the Hague System. The share of English-language filings increased from 66% in 2008 to a peak of 79.5% in 2010, after which it has slightly decreased over the past three years.

Reproductions of designs contained in international registrations can be published in black and white or in color. In 2013, almost 72% of Hague international registrations contained black and white reproductions (Figure B.1.3). However, the share of black and white has decreased from 77.5% in 2008 to 71.8% in 2013.

International registrations are published in the *International Designs Bulletin* (IDB) six months after their date of registration, unless applicants request an immediate publication or a deferral of publication. The publication of international registrations can be deferred up to 12 months under the Hague Act, or up to 30 months under the Geneva Act.


The IB published 2,734 registrations in 2013, of which 46.4% were published immediately, 43.4% were due for publication on the default publication date, and 10.2% contained requests for deferred publication (Figure B.1.4). From 2012 to 2013, the share of immediately published registrations decreased, while that of deferred and of default publication slightly increased.

Figure B.1.3 Publication of international registrations – black and white versus color



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Figure B.1.4 Publication of international registrations



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

B.2

REVENUE AND REGISTRATION FEES


The IB collects fees for its services relating to the application for, as well as registration and maintenance of, industrial designs. These fees consist of a basic standard fee per application together with a fee for each Hague member designated. In 2013, the IB collected 5.78 million Swiss francs (CHF) as shown in Figure B.2.1, corresponding to 5.6% growth on 2012, and representing the fastest growth recorded since 2010. Total revenue generated by the Hague System has increased for all years except 2006 and 2009, with the highest year-on-year growth achieved in 2008 (+14.3%) and 2010 (+14.8%). The high growth for these two years can be explained by the strong growth in Hague applications (Figure A.1.1), which was driven by the accession of the EU to the Hague Agreement.

In 2013, revenue from IB fees grew by 4.3%, while designation fee revenue grew even more by 7.3%. The share of IB fees in total fees has declined from 65.4% in 2005 to 55.5% in 2013.

The IB collects the standard and individual designation fees on behalf of designated Hague members and distributes these fees accordingly. In total, CHF 2.57 million was distributed to Hague members in 2013 (Table B.2.2). The EU received the largest share, with 30.5% of the total, followed by Switzerland (12.3%), Ukraine (3.9%), Norway (3.7%), Serbia (3.4%) and Kyrgyzstan (3.3%).

The top five designated members received 53.8% of all fees distributed in 2013, which is 4.6 percentage points higher than their combined 2012 share. The EU saw a considerable jump in its share, increasing from 25.2% in 2012 to 30.5% in 2013. In contrast, Germany (-1.2 percentage points) and Benelux (-1.1) saw the largest decreases in fee revenue.

Figure B.2.1 Total revenue collected by the International Bureau



Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Table B.2.2 Fees distributed to Hague members by the International Bureau: top 20 members


Hague member	Fees (Swiss francs)			2013 Share (%)
	2011	2012	2013	
European Union	722,454	603,032	784,420	30.5
Switzerland	268,733	308,172	317,256	12.3
Ukraine	80,081	89,128	99,579	3.9
Norway	62,520	73,735	95,220	3.7
Serbia	76,673	105,228	87,119	3.4
Kyrgyzstan	66,444	52,133	83,973	3.3
Turkey	54,942	60,115	75,397	2.9
Georgia	55,516	63,624	67,982	2.6
Morocco	62,646	63,072	67,088	2.6
Republic of Moldova	58,220	55,776	63,018	2.5
Croatia	66,206	77,859	61,758	2.4
Germany	74,399	80,844	55,444	2.2
France	57,610	64,183	42,545	1.7
Singapore	33,121	34,536	42,066	1.6
Benelux	58,027	62,588	39,380	1.5
Monaco	35,154	37,365	38,335	1.5
Italy	57,683	60,700	38,257	1.5
Liechtenstein	30,562	35,757	36,875	1.4
Montenegro	24,556	28,945	34,337	1.3
T F Y R Macedonia	25,075	30,436	32,751	1.3
Others	357,470	407,703	406,867	15.8
Total	2,328,092	2,394,931	2,569,667	100.0

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

The registration fee for a given industrial design application is determined by a number of factors. These include, among other things, the number of designations, the filing method, the specific members designated, and the number of designs contained in the application. Figure B.2.3 presents the average fee per Hague international registration as well as the distribution of fees as a share of registrations.

The average fee per registration has continuously declined from a peak of CHF 1,942 in 2008 to CHF 1,513 in 2013. This represents a 22.1% decrease. This decline coincides with both the reduction in the average number of designs per registration (Figure A.2.2) and the average number of designations per registration (Figure A.2.4), as well as the increase in electronic filing.¹⁷

The average fee per registration masks the considerable variation in registration fees paid by applicants. In 2013, registration fees ranged from CHF 456 (three registrations) to CHF 32,054 (one registration). Approximately 50% of applicants paid less than CHF 1,000, and approximately 80% paid less than CHF 2,000. Only 3.4% of applicants paid fees in excess of CHF 5,000.

Figure B.2.3 Registration fees

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

¹⁷ Electronic filing offers advantages to applicants in terms of lower fees for applications containing many reproductions of industrial designs. If the application is filed in paper format, reproductions are subject to an additional fee per page beyond the first page.

SECTION C

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN HAGUE MEMBERSHIP AND THE HAGUE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

C.1

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE HAGUE SYSTEM

Brunei Darussalam became party to the Geneva Act in 2013.

On December 31, 2013, the Hague Union comprised 61 members, 46 of which were party to the Geneva Act.

C.2

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The Assembly of the Hague Union in September 2013

The Assembly of the Hague Union in September 2013 adopted amendments to Rules 1(1)(vi), 7(4)(c), 8, 16(3) to (5) and 26(1) of the Common Regulations under the 1999 Act and the 1960 Act of the Hague Agreement. The amendments to Rule 1(1)(vi) referred to an electronic interface available on the WIPO website or any electronic interface having the same contents and format; amendments to Rules 7(4)(c) and 8 referred to an indication of the identity of the creator in the international application and to an oath or declaration of the creator; amendments to Rule 16(3) to (5) allowed the holder of an industrial design to pay the publication fee, at the latest, three weeks before the expiry of the deferment period; and amendments to Rule 26(1) completed the list of relevant data to be published in the *International Designs Bulletin*.

The Assembly took note of the proposed amendment to Section 202 of the Administrative Instructions for the Application of the Hague Agreement and of the proposed new Section 205. The amendments to the Administrative Instructions concerned communications between users of the Hague System and the IB through user accounts made available on the WIPO website. After the said consultation, the Director General modified the Administrative Instructions accordingly.

The amendments to the Common Regulations as well as to the Administrative Instructions came into force on January 1, 2014.

Third Session of the Working Group on the Legal Development of the Hague System for the International Registration of Industrial Designs

The third session of the Working Group was held in Geneva from October 28 to 30, 2013. The Working Group discussed, among other matters, means of transmission of certain types of documents and other material under Rules 7(5)(f) and (g) of the Common Regulations through the intermediary of the IB to the offices requiring them, and the public availability of information relating to amendments to an industrial design that is the subject of an international registration following a procedure before a national/regional office.

Amendments to the Administrative Instructions for the Application of the Hague Agreement

The third session of the Working Group favorably considered the proposal to add a new Part Nine concerning confidential copies to the Administrative Instructions. After the said consultation, the Director General modified the Administrative Instructions accordingly. The amendments came into force on January 1, 2014.

Termination of the 1934 Act of the Hague Agreement

Hague members party to the 1934 Act had agreed to freeze the application of the 1934 Act as of January 1, 2010, with the aim, ultimately, of terminating the 1934 Act. In 2013, Benin and Senegal communicated their consent to the termination of the 1934 Act. The remaining Hague members party to the 1934 Act that have not yet consented to its termination are Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt and Suriname. The 1934 Act will be terminated once all members party to it have given their consent.

HAGUE MEMBERS

In 2013, the Hague System comprised 61 members.

African Intellectual Property Organization (99)	Lithuania (99)
Albania (60 and 99)	Luxembourg (60)
Armenia (99)	Mali (60)
Azerbaijan (99)	Monaco (34, 60 and 99)
Belgium (60)	Mongolia (60 and 99)
Belize (60)	Montenegro (60 and 99)
Benin (34 and 60)	Morocco (34 and 60)
Bosnia and Herzegovina (99)	Namibia (99)
Botswana (99)	Netherlands (60)
Brunei Darussalam (99)	Niger (60)
Bulgaria (60 and 99)	Norway (99)
Côte d'Ivoire (34 and 60)	Oman (99)
Croatia (60 and 99)	Poland (99)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea (60)	Republic of Moldova (60 and 99)
Denmark (99)	Romania (60 and 99)
Egypt (34 and 99)	Rwanda (99)
Estonia (99)	Sao Tome and Principe (99)
European Union (99)	Senegal (34 and 60)
Finland (99)	Serbia (60 and 99)
France (34, 60 and 99)	Singapore (99)
Gabon (60)	Slovenia (60 and 99)
Georgia (60 and 99)	Spain (34 and 99)
Germany (34, 60 and 99)	Suriname (34 and 60)
Ghana (99)	Switzerland (60 and 99)
Greece (60)	Syrian Arab Republic (99)
Hungary (60 and 99)	Tajikistan (99)
Iceland (99)	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (60 and 99)
Italy (60)	Tunisia (34 and 99)
Kyrgyzstan (60 and 99)	Turkey (99)
Latvia (99)	Ukraine (60 and 99)
Liechtenstein (34, 60 and 99)	

London Act 1934 (34)

Hague Act 1960 (60)

Geneva Act 1999 (99)

GLOSSARY

This glossary provides definitions of key technical terms and concepts.

Applicant: An individual or other legal entity that files an application for an industrial design. There may be more than one applicant in an application.

Application: The formal request for the protection of industrial designs at an IP office, which usually examines the application and decides whether to grant or refuse protection in the jurisdiction concerned.

Application date: The date on which an IP office or the IB receives an application that meets the requirements for registration of an industrial design.

Class: Refers to the classes defined in the Locarno Classification. Classes indicate the categories of products for which industrial design protection is requested. (See “Locarno Classification”).

Contracting Party (Hague member): A state or inter-governmental organization that is a member of the Hague System. The expression “Contracting Party” includes any state or intergovernmental organization party to the 1999 Act and/or the 1960 Act of the Hague Agreement. The entitlement to file an international application under the Hague Agreement is limited to natural persons or legal entities having a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment, or a domicile, in at least one of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement, or being a national of one of these Contracting Parties, or of a member state of an intergovernmental organization that is a Contracting Party. In addition, but only under the 1999 Act, an international application may be filed on the basis of habitual residence in the jurisdiction of a Contracting Party.

Designation: The specification, in an international registration, of a Hague member’s jurisdiction in which the holder of the registration seeks protection for industrial designs.

Direct filing: See “National route”.

Filing: See “Application”.

Filing date: The date on which an IP Office or the IB receives an application that meets the minimum requirements for registration of an industrial design.

Hague international application: An application for international registration of an industrial design filed under the WIPO-administered Hague Agreement.

Hague international registration: An international registration issued under the Hague System, which facilitates the acquisition of industrial design rights in multiple jurisdictions. An application for international registration of industrial designs leads to its recording in the International Register and the publication of the registration in the *International Designs Bulletin*. If the registration is not refused by the IP office of a designated Hague member, it will have the same effect as a registration made under the law applicable in that member’s jurisdiction.

Hague route: An alternative to the Paris route (direct route), the Hague route enables an application for international registration of industrial designs to be filed using the Hague System.

Hague System: The abbreviated form of the Hague System for the International Registration of Industrial Designs. This system consists of several international treaties – the London Act, the Hague Act and the Geneva Act. The Hague System makes it possible for an applicant to register up to 100 industrial designs in multiple jurisdictions by filing a single application with the IB. It simplifies the process of multinational registration by reducing the requirement to file separate applications with each IP office. The system also simplifies the subsequent management of the industrial design, since it is possible to record changes or to renew the registration through a single procedural step.

Industrial design: Industrial designs are applied to a wide variety of industrial products and handicrafts. They refer to the ornamental or aesthetic aspects of a useful

article, including compositions of lines or colors or any three-dimensional forms that give a special appearance to a product or handicraft. The holder of a registered industrial design has exclusive rights against unauthorized copying or imitation of the design by third parties. Industrial design registrations are valid for a limited period. The term of protection is usually 15 years for most jurisdictions. However, differences in legislation do exist, notably in China (which provides for a 10-year term from the application date) and the US (which provides for a 14-year term from the grant of the design patent).

Intellectual property (IP): Refers to creations of the mind: inventions, literary and artistic works, and symbols, names, images and designs used in commerce. IP is divided into two categories: industrial property, which includes patents, trademarks, industrial designs and geographical indications of source; and copyright, which includes literary and artistic works such as novels, poems and plays, films, musical works, artistic works such as drawings, paintings, photographs and sculptures, and architectural designs. Rights related to copyright include those of performing artists in their performances, producers of phonograms in their recordings, and those of broadcasters in their radio and television programs.

International Bureau (IB): The international applications are filed directly with the International Bureau of WIPO or indirectly through an IP office of Contracting Party. The International Bureau handles processing tasks with respect to Hague applications and the subsequent management of Hague registrations.

International Designs Bulletin (IDB): The official publication of the Hague System containing data on new international registrations, renewals and modifications affecting existing international registrations. It is published on the Organization's website at www.wipo.int/hague/en/bulletin/.

International Register: A register maintained by the IB concerning international registrations of industrial designs.

International registrations in force: International registrations that are currently valid. To remain in force, international registrations must be renewed by paying renewal fee to the International Bureau after each five-year term of protection. The period of protection of a designation of a Contracting Party in an international registration must be at least 15 years, subject to renewal of that designation. However, depending on domestic laws in individual Contracting Parties, the period of protection may be longer than 15 years. For example, under the legislation of Switzerland the period of protection of industrial design registrations is 25 years, subject to renewal.

Locarno Classification: The abbreviated form of the International Classification for Industrial Designs under the Locarno Agreement used for registering industrial designs. The Locarno Classification comprises a list of 32 classes and their respective subclasses with explanatory notes and an alphabetical list of goods in which industrial designs are incorporated, with an indication of the classes and subclasses into which they fall.

National route: Applications for industrial design protection filed directly with the national IP office of, or acting for, the relevant state/jurisdiction (see also "Hague route"). National route is also called the "direct route" or "Paris route".

Non-resident application: An application filed with an IP office of a given country/jurisdiction by an applicant residing in another country/jurisdiction. For example, an industrial design application filed with the Swiss IP office by an applicant residing in France is considered a non-resident application for the Swiss IP office. Non-resident applications are sometimes referred to as foreign applications.

Origin: The country of residence (or nationality, in the absence of a valid residence) of the applicant filing an industrial design application. The country of the applicant's address is used to determine the origin of the application.

Opposition: An administrative process for disputing the validity of a granted industrial design right that is often limited to a specific time period after the right has been granted. For the Hague System, opposition rules are defined by national laws; however, national IP offices must provide a refusal process on the grounds of opposition within 6 or 12 months (depending on the Hague member concerned) from the publication date of the international registration in the *International Designs Bulletin*.

Paris Convention: The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, signed in Paris on March 20, 1883, is one of the most important IP treaties. It establishes the “right of priority” which enables an applicant, when filing an application for an IP right in countries other than the original country of filing, to claim priority of an earlier application filed up to six months previously.

Paris route: An alternative to the Hague route, the Paris route (also called the “direct route”) enables individual IP applications to be filed directly with an office that is a signatory of the Paris Convention.

Priority date: The filing date of an earlier application on the basis of which priority is claimed.

Publication date: The general rule is that international registrations are published in the *International Designs Bulletin* six months after the date of registration, unless applicants request an immediate publication or a deferral of publication. Publication of an international registration can be deferred up to 12 months under the Hague Act or 30 months under the Geneva Act.

Regional application: An industrial design application filed with a regional IP office having jurisdiction over more than one country or region. There are currently three regional offices that are members of the Hague System: the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP) and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM) of the EU.

Regional registration: An industrial design right granted (registered) by a regional IP office having jurisdiction over more than one country.

Registered Community Design (RCD): A registration issued by the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM) based on a single application filed directly with this office, seeking protection within the EU as a whole.

Registration: An exclusive right for industrial designs, issued to an applicant by an IP office. Registrations are issued to applicants so that they may exclusively exploit their industrial designs for a limited period of time.

Renewal: The process by which the protection of industrial design rights is maintained (i.e., kept in force). This usually consists of paying renewal fees to an IP office at regular intervals. If renewal fees are not paid, the registration will lapse.

Resident application: An application filed with an IP office by an applicant residing in the country/region in which that office has jurisdiction. For example, an application filed with the German IP office by a resident of Germany is considered a resident application for the German IP office. Resident applications are sometimes referred to as domestic applications. A resident grant/registration is an IP right issued on the basis of a resident application.

Statement of Grant: A voluntary communication from an IP office to the IB, informing it that an industrial design has been granted protection within its jurisdiction.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO): A United Nations specialized agency dedicated to the promotion of innovation and creativity for the economic, social and cultural development of all countries through a balanced and effective international IP system. Established in 1967, WIPO’s mandate is to promote the protection of IP throughout the world through cooperation among states and in collaboration with other international organizations.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EU	European Union
IB	International Bureau
IDB	International Designs Bulletin
IP	Intellectual Property
RCD	Registered Community Design
OAPI	African Intellectual Property Organization
OHIM	Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

STATISTICAL TABLES

The following tables present the number of international registrations and renewals in 2013, together with the number of designs they contained. Only countries or Hague members indicated as origins or designated members in 2013 are reported. This includes both Hague members and non-members. The inclusion of non-members reflects the possibility for applicants to claim entitlement in a Hague member country/region even if they are domiciled in a non-member state. For instance, applicants domiciled in the US can file an international registration if they have a commercial establishment in a Hague member

country/region, for example, Switzerland. In such a case, the US is listed as the country of origin. However, the US cannot be designated on an international registration, because it is not a Hague member.

Tables 1 and 2 report data by origin and designated member. Using Croatia as an example, the tables can be read as follows: applicants from Croatia filed 18 international registrations containing 27 designs. The IP office of Croatia was designated in 397 international registrations containing 1,884 designs.

Table 1: International registrations via the Hague System, 2013

Name	Origin ¹		Designated member	
	Number of registrations	Number of designs	Number of registrations	Number of designs
African Intellectual Property Organization	n.a.	n.a.	91	520
Albania	2	36	273	1,049
Armenia	256	941
Australia (a)	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
Austria (b)	31	184	n.a.	n.a.
Azerbaijan	271	1,004
Belgium (c)	43	177	0	0
Belize	186	650
Benelux	n.a.	n.a.	75	530
Benin	7	16
Bosnia and Herzegovina	351	1,392
Botswana	39	136
Bulgaria	20	95	37	199
China (a)	13	127	n.a.	n.a.
Côte d'Ivoire	13	91
Croatia	18	27	397	1,884
Cyprus (b)	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
Czech Republic (b)	6	40	n.a.	n.a.
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	50	190
Denmark	20	68	49	300
Egypt	232	931
Estonia	1	2	21	130
European Union	n.a.	n.a.	2,026	10,178
Finland	30	168	24	152
France	285	1,397	125	753
Gabon	8	11
Georgia	278	1,026
Germany	637	3,785	135	804
Ghana	37	94
Greece	4	202	55	321
Hungary	7	33	16	51
Iceland	5	9	85	288
Ireland (b)	2	3	n.a.	n.a.
Israel (a)	1	1	n.a.	n.a.
Italy	273	964	61	379
Kyrgyzstan	237	862
Latvia	5	5	26	143

Name	Origin ¹		Designated member	
	Number of registrations	Number of designs	Number of registrations	Number of designs
Liechtenstein	26	166	410	1,706
Lithuania	4	23	58	393
Luxembourg (c)	31	107	0	0
Mali	2	2
Malta (b)	1	1	n.a.	n.a.
Monaco	2	4	428	1,724
Mongolia	230	884
Montenegro	1	2	423	1,368
Morocco	2	2	408	1,923
Namibia	42	169
Netherlands (c)	139	380	0	0
Niger	5	5
Norway	69	149	806	3,152
Oman	352	1,139
Poland	18	68	25	63
Portugal (b)	8	95	n.a.	n.a.
Republic of Moldova	279	979
Romania	5	24	32	137
Russian Federation (a)	5	5	n.a.	n.a.
Rwanda	25	73
Sao Tome and Principe	24	49
Senegal	15	37
Serbia	9	24	293	1,231
Singapore	7	9	712	2,639
Slovakia (b)	3	9	n.a.	n.a.
Slovenia	15	37	76	670
Spain	20	108	64	367
Suriname	16	39
Sweden (b)	57	167	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland	658	3,006	1,911	9,287
Syrian Arab Republic	43	133
T F Y R of Macedonia	1	1	406	1,581
Tajikistan	224	796
Tunisia	340	1,251
Turkey	76	303	1,277	5,993
Ukraine	4	7	694	2,911
United Kingdom (b)	31	97	n.a.	n.a.
United States of America (a)	133	656	n.a.	n.a.
Unknown (a)	1	7	n.a.	n.a.
Viet Nam (a)	1	22	n.a.	n.a.
Total	2,734	12,806	15,081	65,726

n.a. not applicable

¹ Origin is defined as the stated address of residence for the holder of the international registration.

(a) Not a member of the Hague System. Applicants from this country are able to file via the Hague System by claiming commercial activity or domicile in a country or in the jurisdiction of a regional office that is a member of the Hague System. The IP office of the country cannot be designated by an applicant that uses the Hague System.

(b) Member of the Hague System via membership in the European Union.

(c) IP office is the Benelux regional office.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

Table 2: Renewals of international registrations via the Hague System, 2013

Name	Origin ¹		Designated member	
	Number of renewals	Number of designs	Number of renewals	Number of designs
African Intellectual Property Organization	n.a.	n.a.	1	1
Albania	175	633
Antigua and Barbuda (a)	1	8	n.a.	n.a.
Armenia	164	541
Australia (a)	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
Austria (b)	14	48	n.a.	n.a.
Belgium (c)	53	172	0	0
Belize	178	416
Benelux	n.a.	n.a.	1,494	5,635
Benin	75	379
Botswana	21	148
Bulgaria	6	28	315	959
Canada (a)	1	4	n.a.	n.a.
China, Hong Kong SAR (a)	2	3	n.a.	n.a.
Côte d'Ivoire	76	312
Croatia	2	5	347	1,351
Czech Republic (b)	15	61	n.a.	n.a.
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	376	1,086
Denmark	5	28	0	0
Egypt	1	1	752	3,040
Estonia	26	75
European Union	n.a.	n.a.	714	2,993
Finland	12	127	0	0
France	500	1,883	1,523	5,667
Gabon	53	107
Georgia	241	764
Germany	927	3,826	1,432	5,528
Ghana	2	2
Greece	7	36	611	2,577
Hungary	1	1	562	2,041
Iceland	1	2	37	191
Italy	219	1,006	1,486	5,489
Japan (a)	1	1	n.a.	n.a.
Kyrgyzstan	246	657
Latvia	22	92
Liechtenstein	6	31	720	2,711
Lithuania	6	45
Luxembourg (c)	12	44	0	0
Mali	7	14
Monaco	1	2	736	2,979
Mongolia	288	839
Montenegro	631	2,149
Morocco	6	18	518	2,107
Namibia	21	148
Netherlands (c)	185	577	0	0
Niger	7	14
Poland	4	5	0	0
Republic of Moldova	3	51	416	1,242
Romania	1	6	484	1,746
Senegal	83	514
Serbia	597	2,004
Singapore	349	1,416

Name	Origin ¹		Designated member	
	Number of renewals	Number of designs	Number of renewals	Number of designs
Slovakia (b)	1	2	n.a.	n.a.
Slovenia	8	11	474	1,780
Spain	6	6	626	2,617
Suriname	86	422
Sweden (b)	8	37	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland	700	2,338	2,290	9,284
Syrian Arab Republic	17	135
T F Y R of Macedonia	2	22	568	2,054
Tunisia	783	3,300
Turkey	12	44	513	2,190
Ukraine	3	3	589	1,908
United Kingdom (b)	31	140	n.a.	n.a.
United States of America (a)	97	493	n.a.	n.a.
Unknown (a)	3	13	n.a.	n.a.
Total	2,859	11,085	21,738	82,302

n.a. not applicable

(a) Not a member of the Hague System. Applicants from this country are able to file via the Hague System by claiming commercial activity or domicile in a country or in the jurisdiction of a regional office that is a member of the Hague System. The IP office of the country cannot be designated by an applicant that uses the Hague System.

(b) Member of the Hague System via membership in the European Union.

(c) IP office is the Benelux regional office.

Source: WIPO Statistics Database, March 2014

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The following resources are available on the WIPO website:

Information on the Hague System

www.wipo.int/hague/

Online services


www.wipo.int/hague/en/services/

Hague statistics

www.wipo.int/hague/en/statistics/

IP Statistics

www.wipo.int/ipstats/



For more information
contact **WIPO** at www.wipo.int

World Intellectual Property Organization
34, chemin des Colombettes
P.O. Box 18
CH-1211 Geneva 20
Switzerland

Tel: +4122 338 91 11
Fax: +4122 733 54 28

WIPO Publication No. 930E/14
ISBN 978-92-805-2480-2