



WIPO Economics & Statistics Series

2012

WIPO IP Facts and Figures



WIPO Economics & Statistics Series

2012

WIPO IP Facts and Figures



INTRODUCTION

The World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO) 2012 IP Facts and Figures provides an overview of intellectual property (IP) activity based on the latest available year of statistics. Due to the time involved in collecting and reporting statistics to WIPO, most national and regional IP office statistics refer to 2010. This publication covers four types of industrial property – patents, utility models, trademarks and industrial designs – and serves as a quick reference guide. It therefore focuses on application data only, which is the most often used measure of IP activity. Trademark application data refer to class counts (the number of classes specified in applications) in order to better compare international trademark activity across offices. The tables and graphs presented enable a comparison of IP activity across offices and through the use of the WIPO-administered Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), Madrid and Hague systems in 2011.

The data used are taken primarily from the WIPO Statistics Database, which is based on WIPO's Annual IP Survey and on data compiled by WIPO in processing international applications filed via the PCT, Madrid and Hague systems. Data can be downloaded from WIPO's IP Statistics web pages. As far as possible, all statistics are compiled using the same definitions so as to ensure international comparability. Please note that due to the continual updating of missing data and the revision of historical statistics, data provided in this publication may differ from previously published figures and from data available on WIPO's web pages.

Readers are welcome to use the information contained in this publication, but are requested to cite WIPO as the source. For more in-depth analysis of WIPO and/or national office IP statistics, you are invited to visit the following links:

- IP Statistics
www.wipo.int/ipstats
- World Intellectual Property Indicators
www.wipo.int/ipstats/en/wipi/index.html

Contact Information

Economics and Statistics Division

e-mail: ipstats.mail@wipo.int

TABLE OF CONTENTS

USER GUIDE	6
A. GLOBAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TRENDS	12
A.1. TRENDS IN APPLICATIONS	12
A.2. RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT APPLICATIONS	13
A.3. APPLICATIONS BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION	14
A.4. APPLICATIONS BY INCOME GROUP	15
B. PATENTS AND UTILITY MODELS	17
B.1. PATENT APPLICATIONS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES	17
B.2. PATENT APPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES	18
B.3. PCT INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS	19
B.4. TREND IN FILING ROUTES: DIRECT VS. PCT SYSTEM	20
B.5. PATENT APPLICATIONS BY FIELD OF TECHNOLOGY	21
B.6. UTILITY MODEL APPLICATIONS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES	22
B.7. UTILITY MODEL APPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES	23
C. TRADEMARKS	24
C.1. APPLICATION CLASS COUNTS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES	24
C.2. APPLICATION CLASS COUNTS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES	25
C.3. MADRID SYSTEM INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS	26
C.4. TREND IN FILING ROUTES: DIRECT VS. MADRID SYSTEM	27
C.5. TOP CLASSES SPECIFIED IN APPLICATIONS	28
C.6. APPLICATION CLASS COUNTS BY INDUSTRY SECTOR	29

D. INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS	30
D.1 APPLICATIONS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES	30
D.2 APPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES	31
D.3 HAGUE SYSTEM INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS	32
D.4 TREND IN FILING ROUTES: DIRECT VS. HAGUE SYSTEM	33
D.5 TOP CLASSES SPECIFIED IN APPLICATIONS	34
ANNEX	35
I. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY APPLICATIONS BY OFFICE	35
II. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS VIA THE PCT MADRID AND HAGUE SYSTEMS BY ORIGIN, 2011	39
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES	42

USER GUIDE

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Applicant: An individual or other legal entity that files an application for a patent, utility model, trademark or industrial design. There may be more than one applicant in an application. For the statistics presented in this publication, the name of the first-named applicant is used to determine the owner of the application.

Application: The procedure for requesting IP rights at an office, which examines the application and decides whether to grant or refuse protection. Application also refers to a set of documents submitted to an office by the applicant.

Class count: The number of classes specified in a trademark application or registration. In the international trademark system and at certain offices, an applicant can file a trademark application that specifies one or more of the 45 goods and services classes of the Nice Classification. Offices have either a single- or multi-class filing system. For better comparison of international trademark application activity across offices, this difference in filing systems must be taken into consideration. For example, the offices of Japan, the Republic of Korea and the United States of America (US) as well as many European offices have multi-class filing systems. The offices of Brazil, China and Mexico follow a single-class filing system, requiring a separate application for each class in which applicants seek trademark protection. To capture the differences in application numbers across offices, it is useful to compare their respective application and registration class counts.

Designation: The specification in an international registration of a Madrid or Hague member's jurisdiction in which holders of registrations seek protection for their trademarks or industrial designs.

Grant: Exclusive IP rights conferred to an applicant by an office. For example, patents are granted to applicants (assignees) to make use of and exploit their inventions for a limited period of time. The holder of the rights can prevent unauthorized use of the invention.

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

Hague international registration: An international registration issued via the Hague system, which facilitates the acquisition of industrial design rights in multiple jurisdictions. An application for international registration of an industrial design 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, the international registration will have the same effect as a registration made in that jurisdiction.

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 (currently frozen), 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 International Bureau of WIPO. It simplifies the process of multinational registration by reducing the requirement to file multiple 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 date of registration).

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, utility models, 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 Patent Classification (IPC): An internationally recognized patent classification system. The IPC's hierarchical structure consists of sections, classes, subclasses and groups. IPC symbols are assigned according to technical features in patent applications. A patent application can be assigned multiple IPC symbols, as it may relate to multiple technical features.

Locarno Classification (LOC): The abbreviated form of the International Classification for Industrial Designs under the Locarno Agreement used for registering industrial designs. The LOC 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.

Madrid international application: An application for the international registration of a trademark filed under the WIPO-administered Madrid Agreement or Madrid Protocol.

Madrid international registration: An international registration issued via the Madrid system, which facilitates the acquisition of trademark rights in multiple jurisdictions. An application for international registration of trademarks leads to its recording in the International Register and the publication of the registration in the WIPO Gazette of International Marks. If the registration is not refused by the IP office of a designated Madrid member, the international registration will have the same effect as a registration made in that jurisdiction.

Madrid system: The abbreviated form of the Madrid System for the International Registration of Marks, which is established under the Madrid Agreement and the Madrid Protocol and is administered by WIPO. The Madrid system makes it possible for an applicant to register a trademark in a large number of countries by filing a single application at their national or regional IP office that is party to the system. The Madrid system simplifies the process of multinational trademark registration by reducing the requirement to file multiple applications at each office. It also simplifies the subsequent management of the mark, since it is possible to record changes or to renew the registration through a single procedural step. Registration through the Madrid system does not create an "international" trademark, and the decision to register or refuse the trademark remains in the hands of the national and/or regional office(s). Trademark rights are limited to the jurisdiction of the trademark registration office(s).

Nice Classification: The abbreviated form of the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of Registering Marks under the Nice Agreement. The Nice Classification is divided into 34 classes for goods and 11 for services.

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 application filed with the USPTO by an applicant residing in France is considered a non-resident application for the USPTO. Non-resident applications are sometimes referred to as foreign applications. A non-resident grant or registration is an IP right issued on the basis of a non-resident application.

Paris route: An alternative to the PCT, Hague or Madrid routes, 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.

Patent: A patent is a set of exclusive rights granted by law to applicants for inventions that are new, non-obvious, and commercially applicable. It is valid for a limited period of time (generally 20 years), during which patent holders can commercially exploit their inventions on an exclusive basis. In return, applicants are obliged to disclose their inventions to the public in a manner that enables others, skilled in the art, to replicate the invention. The patent system is designed to encourage innovation by providing innovators with time-limited exclusive legal rights, thus enabling the innovators to appropriate the returns on their innovative activities.

PCT application: A patent application filed through the WIPO-administered Patent Cooperation Treaty (also referred to as an international patent application).

PCT National Phase Entry (NPE): The decision by a PCT applicant to enter the national phase before a national or regional patent office is referred to as national phase entry. It consists of the submission of a written request and payment of fees and must be carried out within 30 months from the priority date of the application (longer time periods are allowed by some offices).

PCT system: The Patent Cooperation Treaty, an international treaty administered by WIPO, facilitates the acquisition of patent rights in a large number of jurisdictions. The PCT system simplifies the process

of multiple national patent filings by reducing the requirement to file a separate application in each jurisdiction. However, the decision of whether to grant patent rights remains in the hands of the national and regional patent offices, and patent rights remain limited to the jurisdiction of the patent-granting authority. The PCT international application process starts with the international phase, during which an international search and possibly a preliminary examination are performed, and concludes with the national phase, during which national and regional patent offices decide on the patentability of an invention according to national law.

Registration: Exclusive rights, notably for trademarks and industrial designs, issued to an applicant by an IP office. For example, registrations are issued to applicants to make use of and exploit their trademark or industrial design for a limited period of time and can, in some cases, particularly in the case of trademarks, be renewed indefinitely.

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 Japan Patent Office (JPO) by a resident of Japan is considered a resident application for the JPO. 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.

Trademark: A trademark is a distinctive sign that identifies certain goods or services as those produced or provided by a specific person or enterprise. The holder of a registered trademark has the legal right to exclusive use of the mark in relation to the products or services for which it is registered. The owner can prevent unauthorized use of the trademark, or a confusingly similar mark, so as to prevent consumers and the public in general from being misled. Unlike patents, trademarks can be maintained indefinitely by paying renewal fees. The procedures for registering trademarks are governed by the rules and regulations of national and regional IP offices. Trademark rights are limited to the jurisdiction of the authority that registers the trademark. Trademarks can be registered by filing an application at the relevant national or regional office(s), or by filing an international application through the Madrid system.

Utility model (UM): Like a patent, a UM is a set of rights granted for an invention for a limited period of time, during which UM holders can commercially exploit their inventions on an exclusive basis. The terms



and conditions for granting UMs are different from those for “traditional” patents. For example, UMs are issued for a shorter duration (7 to 10 years) and, at most offices, UM rights applications are granted without substantive examination. The procedures for granting UM rights are governed by the rules and regulations of national IP offices, and rights are limited to the jurisdiction of the issuing authority. The UM terminology refers to UMs and other types of protection similar to UMs. In this publication, innovation patents in Australia and short-term patents in Ireland are considered equivalent to UMs.

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.

A. GLOBAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TRENDS

A.1. TRENDS IN APPLICATIONS

Applications	Year			Growth (%) 2008-09	Growth (%) 2009-10
	2008	2009	2010		
Trademark*	5,473,000	5,185,000	5,588,000	-5.3	7.8
Patent	1,915,000	1,846,000	1,979,000	-3.6	7.2
Industrial Design	557,000	587,000	669,000	5.4	14.0
Utility Model	313,000	399,000	496,000	27.5	24.3




Note: Total applications worldwide are WIPO estimates rounded to the nearest thousand.
* Refers to class counts, i.e., the number of goods and services classes specified in trademark applications.

Each year, WIPO conducts a survey of approximately 150 national and regional intellectual property (IP) offices around the globe to collect statistics on filing activity for trademarks, patents, industrial designs and utility models. The latest year for which complete statistics exist is 2010. The above figures are based both on actual numbers of applications received from over 100 offices as well as on estimates made for offices for which statistics are not available for recent years.

Over 5.5 million goods and services classes were specified in the estimated 3.6 million trademark applications filed worldwide in 2010, and patent applications neared the 2 million mark. Historically lower than trademark and patent counts, applications for industrial designs were close to 670,000 and utility models approached 500,000.

After decreasing in 2009, trademark¹ and patent applications saw a return to growth in 2010. Industrial design and utility model applications continued their growth. Trademarks and patents showed similar growth rates of over 7%. In contrast, industrial designs and utility models exhibited double-digit growth rates, which are largely attributed to high growth in the number of applications filed at the IP office of China.

A.2 RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT APPLICATIONS, 2010




At offices worldwide, applications consist of those filed by applicants domiciled in the jurisdiction represented by the office (residents) and by applicants whose domicile is located outside that jurisdiction (non-residents).

The global percentage of applications filed by residents varies by type of IP. Globally, residents file the majority of applications with their respective IP offices, which reflects a preference for seeking protection within domestic markets. However, the shares of resident and non-resident applications of the totals vary significantly from one office to another. This is demonstrated in other WIPO statistical publications.²

In 2009, an estimated 71% of all trademark applications (class counts) were filed by residents with their domestic office. This figure increased to 73% in 2010. For the other three forms of IP, the resident share remained almost unchanged from the previous year. For patent applications filed in 2010, the resident share was 62% and totaled 89% for industrial designs. At 98%, almost all utility model applications were filed domestically.

- 1 In this publication, trademark application statistics refer to class counts, i.e., the number of classes specified in applications, in order to improve comparison of international trademark activity across offices. See "Class count" under the Definition of Terms in the User Guide.
- 2 World Intellectual Property Indicators: www.wipo.int/ipstats/en/wipi/index.html

A.3 APPLICATIONS BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION, 2010




Note: The numbers of applications of each form of IP are estimated for the offices in each region for which data are missing and, when totaled, are represented as percentages of WIPO-estimated world totals.

The concentration of filing for these four types of IP protection varies across the world's six main geographical regions³. Asia and Europe show relatively high shares of applications received for trademarks (class counts). Together, they accounted for over 75% of all trademark filing activity worldwide.

With shares ranging from 41 to 89 percent, offices in Asia accounted for the largest filing concentration for trademarks, patents, industrial designs and utility models. For example, Asian offices received approximately half of all patent applications worldwide, whereas the offices of North American countries received about a quarter of all patent applications. North American offices did not account for any utility model applications, because they do not offer this type of protection.

Nearly 10% of all trademark applications were destined for protection in the Latin American and Caribbean region and 2% in Africa, whereas these two regions had lower shares of the other forms of IP discussed here.

3 Regions are defined by the United Nations (UN), available at unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm. Although the geographical terms used by WIPO may differ slightly from those defined by the UN, the composition of regions remains identical.




* LAC = Latin America & the Caribbean

In contrast to the previous pie charts, which show the global distribution of a particular type of IP application across geographical regions, the above bar chart shows the shares of applications for each form of IP received by offices in these regions.

Patent and trademark applications accounted for nearly equal shares of the total applications received by offices in North America. In Asia, slightly over half of all applications received were for trademarks. In the remaining four regions, trademark applications totaled between 77 and 89 percent of all IP applications received. Utility model applications comprised 10% of total applications at Asian offices, compared to 2% or less at offices in the other regions.

A.4 APPLICATIONS BY INCOME GROUP, 2010




Similar to filing intensity by geographical region, these figures show the distribution of applications by four income groups⁴.

⁴ These groups are defined by the World Bank, available at data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups

At 48 and 70 percent, offices of high-income economies saw the largest proportions of global trademark and patent filing activity. However, offices of upper-middle-income economies received the majority of industrial design (68%) and utility model (87%) applications, with China alone accounting for 63% and 83%, respectively.

Despite low filing activity of around 3% or less for patents, industrial designs and utility models, lower-middle-income economies accounted for 10% of global trademark application class counts.

Offices of low-income economies received no more than 1% of total applications across all forms of IP discussed here.




The distribution of IP applications within each income group shows that economies of both the high- and upper-middle-income groups received the same share (62%) of their total applications in the form of trademarks, compared with over 80% in the lower-middle- and low-income groups.

For high-income economies, 32% of their total applications were for patents, compared with less than 15% in each of the other income groups. Filing intensity for industrial designs was highest in upper-middle-income economies (13% of total applications), with only 3 to 4 percent of total applications for the other groups. This higher share can be attributed to China, which accounted for over 60% of all industrial design activity worldwide.

B. PATENTS AND UTILITY MODELS

B.1 PATENT APPLICATIONS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES, 2010




Note: India* - 2009 data are used.

Office	Application Year			Share of total (%): 2010	Growth (%): 2009-10
	2008	2009	2010		
Total	1,915,000	1,846,000	1,979,000	100.0	7.2
United States of America	456,321	456,106	490,226	24.8	7.5
China	289,838	314,604	391,177	19.8	24.3
Japan	391,002	348,596	344,598	17.4	-1.1
Republic of Korea	170,632	163,523	170,101	8.6	4.0
European Patent Office	146,150	134,580	150,961	7.6	12.2
Germany	62,417	59,583	59,245	3.0	-0.6
Russian Federation	41,849	38,564	42,500	2.1	10.2
Canada	42,089	37,477	35,449	1.8	-5.4
India*	36,812	34,287	-	1.9	-6.9
Australia	26,346	23,681	24,887	1.3	5.1
Brazil	22,917	21,944	22,686	1.1	3.4
United Kingdom	23,379	22,465	21,929	1.1	-2.4
France	16,419	15,693	16,580	0.8	5.7
Mexico	16,581	14,281	14,576	0.7	2.1
China, Hong Kong SAR	13,662	11,857	11,702	0.6	-1.3
Others	158,586	148,759	182,383	9.2	22.6

Note: Application numbers are a sum of direct filings and PCT national phase entries received by offices.

*Share of total applications is based on 2009 total and growth is based on 2008-09 figures.

- not available




The top 15 offices received, in 2010, over 90 percent of the estimated 1.98 million total patent applications filed worldwide. The top three offices alone – the United States of America (US), China and Japan – received about 62% of the total, representing a 2% increase over their 2009 combined share. The top five offices, three of which are located in Asia, each received between 150,000 and 500,000 applications.

In this list of top offices, China overtook Japan to rank second position in 2010. Brazil changed places with the United Kingdom (UK) to become the eleventh top office in terms of patent applications.

Between 2009 and 2010, nearly two-thirds of these offices saw growth in the numbers of patent applications received. China's high growth of 24% was twice that of the European Patent Office (EPO), which placed second in terms of growth. The US returned to growth after stagnating in 2009. Australia, Brazil, the EPO, France, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation also returned to growth after having experienced declines in 2009. The offices of Canada, Germany, Hong Kong SAR, Japan and the UK were the exceptions, with continued decreases in the numbers of applications received, albeit at much lower rates than those witnessed in 2009.⁵


B.2 PATENT APPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES, 2010



In order to provide more than a simple ranking of offices and to show patent filing activity over a wider geographical scope, Figure B.2 gives the total number of patent applications received by offices of selected middle-income and low-income economies in 2010. These offices were chosen based on geographical distribution and data availability. Where available, statistics for all offices across the globe are reported in the annex.

5 See WIPO Facts and Figures 2011: www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/freepublications/en/statistics/943/wipo_pub_943_2011.pdf

B.3 PCT INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS



The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) system facilitates the process of seeking patents internationally by reducing the requirement to file a separate application in each jurisdiction in which protection is sought.


In contrast to statistics provided by national and regional offices, WIPO maintains a complete collection of 2011 statistics for the international phase of the PCT system. International applications continued to see growth for a second year at almost 11%, reaching nearly 182,000 in 2011. This is the highest growth recorded since 2005 and the highest number of applications received to date.

Rank	Applicant	Origin	Published PCT applications			Change compared to 2010
			2009	2010	2011	
1	ZTE CORPORATION	China	517	1,868	2,826	958
2	PANASONIC CORPORATION	Japan	1,891	2,153	2,463	310
3	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.	China	1,847	1,527	1,831	304
4	SHARP KABUSHIKI KAISHA	Japan	997	1,286	1,755	469
5	ROBERT BOSCH CORPORATION	Germany	1,588	1,301	1,518	217
6	QUALCOMM INCORPORATED	United States of America	1,280	1,675	1,494	-181
7	TOYOTA JIDOSHA KABUSHIKI KAISHA	Japan	1,068	1,095	1,417	322
8	LG ELECTRONICS INC.	Republic of Korea	1,090	1,297	1,336	39
9	KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.	Netherlands	1,295	1,433	1,148	-285
10	TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON (PUBL)	Sweden	1,241	1,147	1,116	-31

Note: Due to confidentiality requirements, PCT data are based on the publication date.

In 2011, ZTE Corporation of China, specializing in telecommunications equipment and network solutions, became the largest applicant of the PCT system. The list of top 10 PCT applicants includes companies operating in, among other fields, communications, electronics and automobiles. Of these applicants, six are domiciled either in China, Japan or the Republic of Korea, reflecting the high activity of applicants from Asia. Applicants from the US, the Netherlands and Sweden included in this list showed decreases in the numbers of applications published in 2011 compared to the previous year.

B.4 TREND IN FILING ROUTES: DIRECT VS. PCT SYSTEM



Note: Direct application data are available only up to 2010; therefore 2011 PCT national phase entry (NPE) data are not included.

When seeking protection for an invention abroad (outside the domestic market), a patent applicant can choose to file multiple applications with foreign offices directly – via the direct or Paris route – or file a single international patent application via the PCT system. When a PCT international application enters the national phase at a national or regional patent office, it is referred to as a national phase entry (NPE).

The share of NPEs in total non-resident applications has continued along a gradual upward trend over the years, showing an increased preference for using the PCT system to seek patent protection internationally. Over half (54%) of all the patent applications that offices receive from abroad arrive via the PCT system.

Total non-resident patent applications received by offices in 2010 numbered 750,000, which is comparable to the 763,000 received in 2008, but with a higher share received in the form of NPEs.

B.5 PATENT APPLICATIONS BY FIELD OF TECHNOLOGY, 2010

Field of Technology	Published applications	Share of total (%)
Electrical engineering		
Electrical machinery, apparatus, energy	104,543	6.9
Audio-visual technology	71,762	4.7
Telecommunications	50,723	3.3
Digital communication	66,773	4.4
Basic communication processes	14,591	1.0
Computer technology	117,576	7.7
IT methods for management	20,485	1.3
Semiconductors	66,787	4.4
Instruments		
Optics	56,641	3.7
Measurement	68,977	4.5
Analysis of biological materials	9,464	0.6
Control	26,074	1.7
Medical technology	66,689	4.4
Chemistry		
Organic fine chemistry	43,142	2.8
Biotechnology	32,875	2.2
Pharmaceuticals	56,203	3.7
Macromolecular chemistry, polymers	25,014	1.6
Food chemistry	24,424	1.6
Basic materials chemistry	37,536	2.5
Materials, metallurgy	33,010	2.2
Surface technology, coating	29,528	1.9
Micro-structural and nano-technology	2,466	0.2
Chemical engineering	32,238	2.1
Environmental technology	23,209	1.5
Mechanical engineering		
Handling	38,029	2.5
Machine tools	39,142	2.6
Engines, pumps, turbines	44,339	2.9
Textile and paper machines	27,868	1.8
Other special machines	43,419	2.9
Thermal processes and apparatus	26,925	1.8
Mechanical elements	42,386	2.8
Transport	61,713	4.1
Other fields		
Furniture, games	38,612	2.5
Other consumer goods	28,914	1.9
Civil engineering	50,805	3.3


Note: The IPC-technology concordance table (available at: www.wipo.int/ipstats/en) was used to convert IPC symbols into 35 corresponding fields of technology. The data relate to published patent applications.

Sources: WIPO Statistics Database and EPO PATSTAT Database

Patent applications span a wide range of technologies. Every patent application is assigned one or more International Patent Classification (IPC) symbols. WIPO has developed a concordance table to link these symbols to their corresponding field(s) of technology.


In 2010, computer technology (117,576) and electrical machinery (104,543) accounted for the largest numbers of applications, with a combined share of 15% of all published applications. Applications in the fields of technology of analysis of biological materials, and micro-structural and nano-technology were the lowest, each representing less than one percent of the total.

B.6 UTILITY MODEL APPLICATIONS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES, 2010



Office	Application Year			Share of total (%) 2010	Growth (%): 2009-10
	2008	2009	2010		
Total	313,000	399,000	496,000	100.0	24.3
China	225,586	310,771	409,836	82.6	31.9
Germany	17,067	17,306	17,005	3.4	-1.7
Republic of Korea	17,405	17,144	13,661	2.8	-20.3
Russian Federation	10,995	11,153	12,262	2.5	9.9
Ukraine	9,600	9,205	10,685	2.2	16.1
Japan	9,452	9,507	8,679	1.7	-8.7
Turkey	2,992	2,882	3,033	0.6	5.2
Spain	2,682	2,560	2,640	0.5	3.1
Italy	2,200	2,307	2,456	0.6	6.5
Brazil	3,218	3,122	1,988	0.4	-36.3
Czech Republic	1,183	1,382	1,608	0.3	16.4
Australia	1,255	1,320	1,465	0.3	11.0
Thailand	1,515	1,467	1,328	0.3	-9.5
Belarus	967	1,119	1,089	0.2	-2.7
Poland	719	780	945	0.2	21.2
Others	6,164	6,975	7,320	1.5	4.9

Note: Application numbers are a sum of the direct filings and PCT national phase entries received by offices.



Of the nearly half a million utility model applications filed around the world in 2010, 83% were received by the IP office of China. This high share shapes the distribution of applications according to geographical region and income group but shows, nonetheless, the importance placed on this IP right by applicants seeking to protect their inventions in China. It should be noted that 99% of all utility model applications in China are filed by domestic applicants.

The approximately 86,000 remaining applications filed worldwide were distributed among the other top 15 offices, 5 of which are in Eastern Europe.

Compared to 2009, China saw a 32% increase in the number of utility model applications received. This was less than the 38% growth witnessed from 2008 to 2009. Brazil and the Republic of Korea, however, exhibited double-digit decreases in utility model applications.

Applications in Belarus, Germany, Japan and Thailand fell in 2010 after having experienced growth in 2009. Conversely, the offices of Spain and Turkey saw a return to growth in applications in 2010.

B.7 UTILITY MODEL APPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES, 2010





Figure B.7 shows the total number of utility model applications received by offices of selected middle-income and low-income economies in 2010. These offices were chosen based on geographical distribution and data availability. Where available, utility model applications for all offices are reported in the annex.

C. TRADEMARKS

C.1 APPLICATION CLASS COUNTS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES, 2010



Office	Application Year			Share of total (%): 2010	Growth (%): 2009-10
	2008	2009	2010		
Total	5,473,000	5,185,000	5,588,000	100.0	7.8
China	699,323	832,818	1,080,769	19.3	29.8
United States of America	401,566	360,131	377,964	6.8	5.0
France	244,035	260,488	294,359	5.3	13.0
OHIM	250,123	249,315	279,553	5.0	12.1
Germany	251,064	223,626	221,345	4.0	-1.0
Russian Federation	181,992	185,812	206,963	3.7	11.4
Japan	201,718	187,140	192,496	3.4	2.9
Republic of Korea	202,006	181,602	171,984	3.1	-5.3
Turkey*	152,148	137,384	-	2.6	-9.7
Brazil	121,712	112,661	125,654	2.2	11.5
Canada	-	-	123,581	2.2	-
Australia	110,732	101,351	107,862	1.9	6.4
Mexico	84,287	81,937	94,457	1.7	15.3
Italy*	120,388	92,823	-	1.8	-22.9
Switzerland	93,013	88,392	80,365	1.4	-9.1
Others	2,358,893	2,089,520	2,230,648	39.9	6.8


Note: Application numbers are a sum of the classes specified in direct applications and classes specified in Madrid system designations received by offices.

OHIM: Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market of the European Union

Japan's application class count is calculated based on the average number of classes specified in applications which is provided by the office, combined with Madrid designation class counts.

- not available

* Share of total application class counts is based on 2009 total and growth is based on 2008-09 figures.



Trademark applications in this section refer to the total number of goods and services classes specified in applications and are a sum of: 1) classes specified in applications filed directly with offices; and 2) classes specified in Madrid system designations received, where applicable, by these offices.⁶

⁶ See "Class count" under the Definition of Terms in the User Guide.

When comparing class counts, China's office increased its share of total applications from 13% in 2008 to 19% in 2010, followed by the US with nearly 7% of the total. The top 8 offices received over half of all applications filed worldwide.

In addition to its high numbers of applications, China saw the highest annual growth (30%) from 2009 to 2010. In contrast, the offices of Germany, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland experienced declines in their class counts.

C.2 APPLICATION CLASS COUNTS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES, 2010




Figure C.2 shows the total number of classes specified in trademark applications received by offices of selected middle- and low-income economies in 2010. These offices were chosen based on geographical distribution and data availability. Where available, trademark application class counts for all offices are reported in the annex.

Many offices in middle- and low-income economies have considerably high numbers of trademark applications compared to other forms of IP, showing the emphasis placed on trademark rights in these markets.

C.3 MADRID SYSTEM INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS




The Madrid system makes it possible for applicants to register a trademark in a large number of countries by filing a single international application with their national or regional IP office (if it is party to the Madrid system). This system simplifies the process of multinational trademark registration by reducing the requirement to file multiple applications at each office.

In contrast to statistics provided by national and regional offices, WIPO maintains a complete collection of 2011 statistics for the Madrid system. After witnessing a decrease in 2009, Madrid system international applications resumed their upward trend in 2010 and, in 2011, finished at more than 42,000, slightly above the 2008 pre-economic crisis level.

Madrid international applications						
Rank	Applicant	Origin	2009	2010	2011	Change compared to 2010
1	NOVARTIS AG	Switzerland	136	118	125	7
2	PHILIP MORRIS BRANDS S.A.R.L.	Switzerland	47	137	110	-27
3	BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM PHARMA GMBH	Germany	52	112	98	-14
4	KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.	Netherlands	38	76	92	16
5	RICHTER GEDEON NYRT	Hungary	70	8	89	81
6	NINGBO RUIHUA ELECTRONICS PLASTICS CO., LTD.	China	-	-	85	-
7	SOCIÉTÉ DES PRODUITS NESTLÉ S.A.	Switzerland	51	68	80	12
8	BMW AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT	Germany	-	42	75	33
9	BSH BOSCH UND SIEMENS HAUSGERÄTE GMBH	Germany	64	65	74	9
10	JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA NV	Belgium	61	66	68	2

Three of the top 10 Madrid system applicants were based in Switzerland, as well as three in Germany. The three pharmaceutical companies listed dominated as a group. All but one of these applicants are from Europe, the exception being Ningbo Ruihua Electronics Plastics Co, LTD in China, which appeared for the first time in this list of top Madrid applicants.

C.4 TREND IN FILING ROUTES: DIRECT VS. MADRID SYSTEM




Note: Direct application data are available only up to 2010; therefore 2011 Madrid designation data are not included.

When seeking protection for a trademark abroad (outside the domestic market), an applicant can choose to file multiple applications with foreign offices directly – via the direct or Paris route – or file a single application with their domestic office via the Madrid system. Once a Madrid international registration is issued, holders can use this to designate any of the 87 members of the system simultaneously to seek protection for their trademarks. These designations have the same effect as an application filed directly with an office.

After a peak of 55% in 2008, the share of Madrid designation class counts in total non-resident application class counts declined for the second consecutive year to 47%. In 2010, offices received approximately 1.5 million non-resident applications/designations from foreign applicants, corresponding to just over a quarter of the over 5.5 million total application class counts in 2010 (see A.2). This is comparable to the number of non-resident applications/designations received by offices in 2009, albeit with a lower share received in the form of Madrid designations.

C.5 TOP CLASSES SPECIFIED IN APPLICATIONS, 2010



Note: These figures are based on class statistics available for 105 offices.

Class 3 - Bleaching preparations and other substances for laundry use; cleaning, polishing, scouring and abrasive preparations; soaps; perfumery, essential oils, cosmetics, hair lotions; dentifrices.

Class 5 - Pharmaceutical, veterinary and sanitary preparations; dietetic substances adapted for medical use, food for babies; plasters, materials for dressings; material for stopping teeth, dental wax; disinfectants; preparations for destroying vermin; fungicides, herbicides.

Class 9 - Scientific, nautical, surveying, electric, photographic, cinematographic, optical, weighing, measuring, signaling, checking (supervision), life-saving and teaching apparatus and instruments; apparatus for recording, transmission or reproduction of sound or images; magnetic data carriers, recording discs; automatic vending machines and mechanisms for coin-operated apparatus; cash registers, calculating machines, data processing equipment and computers; fire-extinguishing apparatus.

Class 16 - Paper, cardboard and goods made from these materials, not included in other classes; printed matter; bookbinding material; photographs; stationery; adhesives for stationery or household purposes; artists' materials; paint brushes; typewriters and office requisites (except furniture); instructional and teaching material (except apparatus); plastic materials for packaging (not included in other classes); playing cards; printers' type; printing blocks.

Class 25 - Clothing, footwear, headgear.

Class 29 - Meat, fish, poultry and game; meat extracts; preserved, frozen, dried and cooked fruits and vegetables; jellies, jams, compotes; eggs, milk and milk products; edible oils and fats.

Class 30 - Coffee, tea, cocoa, sugar, rice, tapioca, sago, artificial coffee; flour and preparations made from cereals, bread, pastry and confectionery, ices; honey, treacle; yeast, baking-powder; salt, mustard; vinegar, sauces (condiments); spices; ice.

Class 35 - Advertising; business management; business administration; office functions.


Class 41 - Education; providing of training; entertainment; sporting and cultural activities.

Class 42 - Scientific and technological services and research and design relating thereto; industrial analysis and research services; design and development of computer hardware and software.

For a complete list of the 45 class definitions, refer to the International Classification of Goods and Services under the Nice Agreement: www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/

Many offices use the International Classification of Goods and Services under the Nice Agreement to classify trademark applications into one or more of its 45 classes. The breakdown of applications by class offers insights into the relative importance of trademarks for different goods and services. The first 34 of the 45 classes indicate goods and the remaining 11 refer to services. At the 105 offices for which direct application and/or Madrid designation statistics broken down by class are available for 2010, the top 10 classes accounted for just over half of all classes specified in trademark applications. Combined, the top five classes specified in trademark applications accounted for nearly one-third of the total. Four of the top 10 classes relate to services and, together, the 11 service-related classes accounted for about 33% of all classes specified in applications. Class 35 (advertising, business management, business administration, and office functions) has occupied the number one position since 2005. The highest ranked class indicating goods was Class 9, which comprises, among other things, scientific, photographic and measuring apparatus and instruments, as well as data processing equipment and computers. Class rankings differ for individual offices.⁷

C.6 APPLICATION CLASS COUNTS BY INDUSTRY SECTOR, 2010



Note: Class groups were defined by Edital 2011.

Agricultural products and services: 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 43

Chemicals: 1, 2, 4

Construction, Infrastructure: 6, 17, 19, 37, 40

Household equipment: 8, 11, 20, 21

Leisure, Education, Training: 13, 15, 16, 28, 41

Management, Communications, Real estate and Financial services: 35, 36

Pharmaceuticals, Health, Cosmetics: 3, 5, 10, 44

Scientific research, Information and Communication technology: 9, 38, 42, 45

Textiles - Clothing and Accessories: 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34

Transportation and Logistics: 7, 12, 39


For a complete list of the 45 class definitions, refer to the International Classification of Goods and Services under the Nice Agreement: www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/

This indicator breaks down the 45 Nice classes into 10 categories or groups based on their respective industry sectors for 105 IP offices worldwide. These class groups do not always contain the same number of classes. In addition, some class numbers could be associated with several categories but for the sake of simplicity, they have been assigned to only one. The class groups may consist of both goods and services classes.

Figure C.6 depicts the distribution of trademark applications across various sectors of the economy. No one category seems to dominate for trademark applications; however, there are a few, such as “chemicals” and “transportation and logistics”, for which trademark protection is sought less frequently. Six of the ten groups each comprise more than 10% of the total share of classes specified in applications, with agricultural products and services accounting for the highest share with over 15% of the world total. Like class rankings, the shares of class groups differ across offices.⁷

D. INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS

D.1 APPLICATIONS FOR THE TOP 15 OFFICES, 2010




Office	Application Year			Share of total (%) 2010	Growth (%): 2009-10
	2008	2009	2010		
Total	557,000	587,000	669,000	100.0	14.0
China	312,904	351,342	421,273	63.0	19.9
Republic of Korea	56,750	57,903	57,187	8.5	-1.2
Japan	33,569	30,875	31,756	4.7	2.9
United States of America	27,782	25,806	29,059	4.3	12.6
OHIM	20,143	20,288	21,898	3.3	7.9
Turkey	7,243	7,092	7,920	1.2	11.7
Germany	5,941	5,900	6,285	1.0	6.5
India*	6,557	6,092	-	1.0	-7.1
Australia	6,077	5,136	5,863	0.9	14.2
Brazil	2,761	5,292	5,501	0.8	3.9
Canada	5,282	4,269	5,142	0.8	20.4
France	4,473	4,846	4,891	0.7	0.9
Indonesia	4,307	4,563	4,066	0.6	-10.9
Russian Federation	4,711	3,740	3,997	0.6	6.9
Thailand	3,820	3,873	3,614	0.5	-6.7
Others	54,680	49,983	60,548	9.1	21.1

Note: Application numbers are a sum of direct applications and Hague system designations received by offices.

OHIM: Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market of the European Union

*Share of total applications is based on 2009 total and growth is based on 2008-09 figures.

- not available




IP offices have either a single-design or multi-design filing system. Due to data limitations and for the sake of simplicity, this difference has not been taken into account in this publication.

China, with over 420,000 filings, increased its share of total industrial design applications filed worldwide from 50% in 2009 to 63% in 2010. The next four highest ranking offices are the Republic of Korea, Japan, the US and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM), each having received between about 20,000 to 60,000 direct applica-

tions and Hague system designations combined. Their aggregate share of 84% shows the very high concentration of industrial design applications at the top 5 offices. All other offices received fewer than 8,000.

Canada and China both had the highest year-on-year growth, with 20% each, followed by the offices of Australia, the US and Turkey, which each saw double-digit growth. In contrast, the Asian offices of India, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea and Thailand, and all saw year-on-year decreases.


D.2 APPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED OFFICES OF MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME ECONOMIES, 2010



Like for the previously mentioned forms of IP, Figure D.2 provides more than a simple ranking of offices and shows industrial design filing activity over a wider geographical scope. To this end, it gives the total number of design applications received by offices of selected middle-income and low-income economies in 2010. These offices were chosen based on geographical distribution and data availability. Where available, industrial design application statistics for all offices across the globe are reported in the annex.

Malaysia, Morocco, South Africa and Viet Nam each received between 1,400 and 1,750 design applications in 2010. Another group of countries comprised of Colombia, Peru, Romania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia also received similar numbers of applications similar to one another.

D.3 HAGUE SYSTEM INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS



The Hague system makes it possible for an applicant to register up to 100 industrial designs in multiple jurisdictions by filing a single international application with the International Bureau (IB) of WIPO. It simplifies the process of multinational registration by reducing the requirement to file multiple applications with each IP office.

There were a total of 2,531 international applications filed in 2011. This year marked the fifth consecutive year of growth in the number of international applications filed via the Hague system. The year 2008 saw a large jump in the number of Hague applications due to the accession of the European Union (EU) to the Hague Agreement. As a result, a single Hague application can lead to design protection across all EU member states, as well as in countries members of the Hague system located outside the EU, for example Switzerland and Turkey.


Rank	Applicant	Origin	Hague international applications			Change compared to 2010
			2009	2010	2011	
1	THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY	United States of America	110	129	167	38
2	THE SWATCH GROUP MANAGEMENT SERVICES AG	Switzerland	81	75	70	-5
3	KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.	Netherlands	33	87	64	-23
4	THE GILLETTE COMPANY	United States of America	37	44	56	12
5	DAIMLER AG	Germany	20	36	55	19
6	SOCIÉTÉ DES PRODUITS NESTLÉ S.A.	Switzerland	12	24	47	23
7	VESTEL BEYAZ ESYA SANAYI VE TICARET ANONIM SİRKETİ	Turkey	..	52	40	-12
8	VOLKSWAGEN AG	Germany	32	46	38	-8
9	LIDL STIFTUNG & CO. KG	Germany	36	20	28	8
10	BRAUN GMBH	Germany	25	30	25	-5

The list of top Hague system applicants ranges from companies that produce, among other things, household and personal hygiene products to those that manufacture watches and vehicles or that produce foodstuffs. Four of the top 10 Hague system applicants are based in Germany. For the third year running, the Procter & Gamble Company of the US filed the highest number of applications. The second and

third largest filers were The Swatch Group Management Services AG (Switzerland) and Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. (Netherlands), although both filed fewer applications in 2011 than in the previous year.

Two of the top 5 applicants in 2011 were from the US, which is not a member of the Hague system. It is possible for companies from non-member countries to make use of the Hague system if they have an industrial or commercial establishment in a Hague member country/region.⁸

D.4 TREND IN FILING ROUTES: DIRECT VS. HAGUE SYSTEM




Note: Direct application data are available only up to 2010; therefore 2011 Hague designation data are not included.

When seeking protection for an industrial design abroad (outside the domestic market), an applicant can choose to file individual applications with foreign offices directly – via the direct or Paris route – or file a single application with the IB of WIPO via the Hague system. Once a Hague international registration is issued, holders can use this to designate any of the 60 members of the system simultaneously to seek protection for their designs. These designations have the same effect as applications filed directly with an office.

In 2010, 11% of all industrial design applications were filed by non-residents, i.e., applicants seeking protection for their designs outside of their respective countries (see A.2). This shows that applicants are primarily interested in protecting industrial designs in their domestic markets. Of the over 500,000 design applications filed annually between 2006 and 2010, between 68,000 and 86,000 were filed abroad by non-residents. This five-year period shows that between about 13 and 16 percent of these non-resident applications were received in the form of designations via the Hague system.

⁸ For more information on the Hague system, visit: www.wipo.int/hague/en/

D.5 TOP CLASSES SPECIFIED IN APPLICATIONS, 2010



Note: For a complete list of the 32 class definitions, refer to the International Classification for Industrial Designs under the Locarno Agreement: www.wipo.int/classifications/nivilo/

Many offices use the International Classification for Industrial Designs under the Locarno Agreement to classify industrial design applications into one or more of its 32 classes. The breakdown of applications by class offers insights into the relative importance of industrial designs for different goods. The top 10 classes accounted for nearly two-thirds of all classes specified in design applications.

Ranked in order, class numbers 6 (Furnishing), 9 (Packages and containers) and 2 (Clothing) were the top three classes specified and, combined, accounted for nearly a quarter of the total. The top 4 to 10 classes each accounted for similar shares of 5 to 6 percent of the total.

ANNEX

I. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY APPLICATIONS BY OFFICE, 2010 (2009 in italics)

Office	Applications			
	Trademark class count	Patent	Industrial Design	Utility Model
Afghanistan	-	-	-	-
African Intellectual Property Organization	-	448	209	-
African Regional Intellectual Property Organization	-	-	-	-
Albania	8,774	341	183	1
Algeria	5,275	806	230	n.a.
Andorra	2,897	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Angola	-	-	-	-
Antigua and Barbuda ¹	1,783	-	-	n.a.
Argentina	69,565	4,717	1,676	218
Armenia	9,208	142	172	45
Aruba	-	-	-	-
Australia	107,862	24,887	5,863	1,465
Austria	9,233	2,673	982	882
Azerbaijan ²	7,680	-	2	-
Bahamas	-	-	-	n.a.
Bahrain	12,574	-	-	n.a.
Bangladesh	10,231	342	896	n.a.
Barbados	-	-	-	-
Belarus	14,041	1,933	480	1,089
Belgium ³	-	760	-	n.a.
Belize ⁴	-	-	99	n.a.
Benelux	74,718	n.a.	1,305	n.a.
Benin ⁴	-	-	9	n.a.
Bermuda	-	-	-	n.a.
Bhutan ¹	1,485	-	-	n.a.
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	-	-	-	-
Bonaire, Saint Eustatius and Saba ¹	94	n.a.	-	n.a.
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12,563	65	243	n.a.
Botswana ²	1,794	-	29	n.a.
Brazil	125,654	22,686	5,501	1,988
Brunei Darussalam	-	42	31	n.a.
Bulgaria	20,201	260	226	178
Burkina Faso	-	2	4	3
Burundi	-	-	-	n.a.
Cambodia	-	-	-	n.a.
Cameroon	-	-	-	n.a.
Canada	123,581	35,449	5,142	n.a.
Cape Verde	-	-	-	n.a.
Central African Republic	-	-	-	n.a.
Chad	-	-	-	n.a.
Chile	75,061	1,076	493	69
China	1,080,769	391,177	421,273	409,836
China, Hong Kong SAR	52,602	11,702	2,525	614
China, Macao SAR	6,754	62	73	14
Colombia	25,990	1,872	400	188
Comoros	-	-	-	n.a.
Congo	-	-	-	n.a.
Cook Islands	-	-	-	n.a.
Costa Rica	12,635	1,220	67	15
Côte d'Ivoire ⁴	-	-	14	n.a.
Croatia	21,886	278	780	112
Cuba	3,588	231	19	n.a.
Curaçao	1,288	n.a.	-	n.a.

Office	Applications			
	Trademark class count	Patent	Industrial Design	Utility Model
Cyprus	3,717	8	-	n.a.
Czech Republic	38,020	982	457	1,608
Democratic People's Republic of Korea ²	3,302	8,057	69	n.a.
Democratic Republic of the Congo	-	-	-	n.a.
Denmark	4,346	1,768	210	235
Djibouti	-	-	-	n.a.
Dominica	-	-	-	n.a.
Dominican Republic	-	339	79	n.a.
Ecuador	16,195	694	162	44
Egypt ²	9,763	2,230	287	n.a.
El Salvador	-	-	-	-
Equatorial Guinea	-	-	-	n.a.
Eritrea	-	-	-	n.a.
Estonia	6,583	97	94	166
Ethiopia	-	-	-	-
Eurasian Patent Organization	n.a.	3,329	n.a.	n.a.
European Patent Office	n.a.	150,961	n.a.	n.a.
Fiji	-	-	-	n.a.
Finland	14,615	1,833	187	n.a.
France	294,359	16,580	4,891	484
Gabon ⁴	-	-	11	n.a.
Gambia	-	-	-	n.a.
Georgia	9,238	359	243	63
Germany	221,345	59,245	6,285	17,005
Ghana ²	2,231	-	22	n.a.
Greece	4,607	744	269	30
Grenada	-	-	-	n.a.
Guatemala	9,175	381	45	10
Guinea	-	-	-	n.a.
Guinea-Bissau	-	-	-	n.a.
Guyana	-	-	-	n.a.
Haiti	-	-	-	n.a.
Honduras	-	-	-	-
Hungary	14,657	696	227	275
Iceland	8,792	76	138	n.a.
India	-	34,287	6,092	n.a.
Indonesia	-	5,638	4,066	642
Iran (Islamic Republic of) ¹	7,005	-	-	n.a.
Iraq	-	-	-	n.a.
Ireland	7,407	792	54	n.a.
Israel	9,279	7,306	1,617	n.a.
Italy	92,823	9,619	1,368	2,456
Jamaica	-	-	-	n.a.
Japan ⁵	192,496	344,598	31,756	8,679
Jordan	5,971	474	84	n.a.
Kazakhstan ¹	9,210	-	252	133
Kenya	3,544	197	76	-
Kiribati	-	-	-	n.a.
Kuwait	-	-	-	n.a.
Kyrgyzstan ¹	5,901	140	149	16
Lao People's Democratic Republic	-	-	-	n.a.
Latvia	7,276	185	87	n.a.
Lebanon	-	-	-	n.a.
Lesotho ¹	1,604	-	-	n.a.
Liberia ¹	1,677	-	-	n.a.
Libya	-	-	-	n.a.
Liechtenstein ⁶	8,114	n.a.	305	n.a.

Office	Applications			
	Trademark class count	Patent	Industrial Design	Utility Model
Lithuania	8,051	114	73	n.a.
Luxembourg ³	n.a.	100	n.a.	n.a.
Madagascar	4,864	43	286	n.a.
Malawi	-	-	-	-
Malaysia ⁷	26,370	6,463	1,677	-
Maldives	-	-	-	n.a.
Mali ⁴	-	-	8	n.a.
Malta	865	19	4	n.a.
Marshall Islands	-	-	-	n.a.
Mauritania	-	-	-	n.a.
Mauritius	-	16	7	n.a.
Mexico	94,457	14,576	3,540	610
Micronesia (Federated States of)	-	-	-	n.a.
Monaco	9,805	11	379	n.a.
Mongolia	8,009	179	260	129
Montenegro	9,600	159	266	n.a.
Morocco	29,829	1,034	1,415	n.a.
Mozambique ¹	2,417	-	-	-
Myanmar	-	-	-	n.a.
Namibia ²	2,091	-	34	n.a.
Nauru	-	-	-	n.a.
Nepal	-	-	-	n.a.
Netherlands ³	n.a.	2,767	n.a.	n.a.
Netherlands Antilles ⁴	1,750	n.a.	10	n.a.
New Zealand	31,423	6,636	1,298	n.a.
Nicaragua	-	-	-	n.a.
Niger ⁴	-	-	5	n.a.
Nigeria	-	-	-	n.a.
Norway ¹	19,649	1,813	955	n.a.
Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market	279,553	n.a.	21,898	n.a.
Oman ²	4,495	-	171	n.a.
Pakistan	15,734	1,094	549	n.a.
Palau	-	-	-	n.a.
Panama	10,271	468	70	2
Papua New Guinea	-	-	-	n.a.
Paraguay	22,102	365	271	n.a.
Peru	26,372	300	377	80
Philippines	24,597	3,393	845	621
Poland	45,480	3,430	1,755	945
Portugal	31,381	545	402	127
Qatar	-	-	-	n.a.
Republic of Korea	171,984	170,101	57,187	13,661
Republic of Moldova	13,558	143	288	211
Romania	31,122	1,418	487	73
Russian Federation	206,963	42,500	3,997	12,262
Rwanda	-	-	-	n.a.
Saint Kitts and Nevis	-	-	-	n.a.
Saint Lucia	-	-	-	n.a.
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	-	-	-	n.a.
Samoa	-	-	-	n.a.
San Marino ¹	3,618	-	-	n.a.
Sao Tome and Principe ²	1,302	-	16	n.a.
Saudi Arabia	-	931	-	n.a.
Senegal ⁴	-	-	12	n.a.
Serbia	17,212	329	329	101
Seychelles	-	-	-	n.a.

Office	Applications			
	Trademark class count	Patent	Industrial Design	Utility Model
Sierra Leone ¹	1,847	-	-	n.a.
Singapore	32,273	9,773	1,926	n.a.
Sint Maarten (Dutch Part) ¹	93	n.a.	-	n.a.
Slovakia	14,163	282	93	387
Slovenia	10,764	453	176	12
Solomon Islands	-	-	-	n.a.
Somalia	-	-	-	n.a.
South Africa	30,549	6,383	1,747	n.a.
Spain	73,487	3,779	1,826	2,640
Sri Lanka	6,244	460	284	n.a.
Sudan ¹	2,399	-	-	n.a.
Suriname ⁴	-	-	15	n.a.
Swaziland ¹	1,835	-	-	n.a.
Sweden	25,497	2,549	585	n.a.
Switzerland	80,365	2,155	2,515	n.a.
Syrian Arab Republic ²	6,009	-	54	n.a.
T F Y R of Macedonia ¹	9,301	-	371	n.a.
Tajikistan	5,151	10	5	150
Thailand	37,656	1,937	3,614	1,328
Timor-Leste	-	-	-	n.a.
Togo	-	-	-	n.a.
Tonga	-	-	-	n.a.
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	-	n.a.
Tunisia ⁴	-	-	20	n.a.
Turkey	137,384	3,357	7,920	3,033
Turkmenistan ¹	5,283	-	-	n.a.
Tuvalu	-	-	-	n.a.
Uganda	-	-	-	n.a.
Ukraine	57,362	5,312	2,196	10,685
United Arab Emirates	-	-	-	n.a.
United Kingdom	76,637	21,929	3,604	n.a.
United Republic of Tanzania	-	-	-	n.a.
United States of America	377,964	490,226	29,059	n.a.
Uruguay	9,304	784	108	53
Uzbekistan	10,922	632	133	175
Vanuatu	-	-	-	n.a.
Vatican City State (Holy See)	-	-	-	n.a.
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	-	-	-	-
Viet Nam	52,040	3,582	1,717	255
Yemen	4,165	75	62	n.a.
Zambia ¹	1,963	-	-	-
Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-

2009 data are in *italics*

n.a. not applicable

- not available

1 Direct trademark application class count data are not available; therefore only Madrid designation statistics are reported.

2 Direct trademark application class count data are not available; therefore only Madrid designation statistics are reported. Similarly, industrial design data are not available, thus only Hague designation statistics are reported.

3 Trademark and industrial design applications are filed with the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP).

4 Direct industrial design application data are not available; therefore only Hague designation statistics are reported.

5 Trademark application class count is calculated based on the average number of classes specified in applications, which is provided by the office, combined with Madrid designation class counts.

6 Patent applications are filed with the Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property.

7 Patent applications include utility model applications.

II. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS VIA THE PCT, MADRID AND HAGUE SYSTEMS BY ORIGIN, 2011

Origin	International applications		
	PCT	Madrid	Hague
Albania	-	-	-
Algeria	4	3	-
Andorra	3	-	-
Antigua and Barbuda	1	-	-
Argentina	24	-	-
Armenia	6	32	-
Australia	1,739	987	1
Austria	1,346	804	22
Azerbaijan	6	5	-
Bahamas	9	-	-
Bahrain	-	3	-
Barbados	110	-	-
Belarus	14	203	-
Belgium	1,191	-	42
Belize	6	-	-
Benelux	-	1,920	-
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	-	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6	21	2
Botswana	-	-	-
Brazil	564	-	-
Brunei Darussalam	-	-	-
Bulgaria	28	189	16
Burundi	3	-	-
Cambodia	-	-	-
Cameroon	3	-	-
Canada	2,922	-	3
Chile	118	-	-
China	16,403	2,149	5
China, Hong Kong SAR	-	-	1
Colombia	56	-	-
Congo	1	-	-
Costa Rica	3	-	-
Côte d'Ivoire	2	-	1
Croatia	47	218	19
Cuba	10	3	-
Curaçao	-	10	1
Cyprus	26	24	3
Czech Republic	148	361	8
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	4	-	-
Democratic Republic of the Congo	1	-	-
Denmark	1,314	350	18
Dominica	2	-	-
Dominican Republic	6	-	-
Ecuador	33	-	-
Egypt	33	35	3
El Salvador	1	-	-
Estonia	35	42	1
Finland	2,079	189	15
France	7,436	3,804	241
Gabon	3	-	-
Georgia	6	7	-
Germany	18,846	5,000	584
Ghana	2	22	-
Greece	93	70	10
Guatemala	-	-	-

Origin	International applications		
	PCT	Madrid	Hague
Hungary	140	235	3
Iceland	43	45	9
India	1,329	-	-
Indonesia	13	-	-
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	1	15	-
Ireland	415	63	1
Israel	1,452	200	1
Italy	2,695	2,306	141
Jamaica	3	-	-
Japan	38,873	1,538	-
Jordan	1	-	-
Kazakhstan	19	54	-
Kenya	9	9	-
Kuwait	4	-	-
Kyrgyzstan	1	7	-
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5	-	-
Latvia	17	109	-
Lebanon	1	-	-
Liberia	1	-	-
Liechtenstein	86	103	25
Lithuania	25	113	1
Luxembourg	246	-	27
Madagascar	2	1	-
Malaysia	263	-	-
Mali	-	-	-
Malta	18	-	-
Mauritius	4	-	-
Mexico	225	-	-
Monaco	26	61	3
Mongolia	1	6	-
Montenegro	2	10	-
Morocco	20	84	4
Myanmar	-	-	-
Namibia	18	-	-
Netherlands	3,502	-	128
New Zealand	328	-	1
Nicaragua	1	-	-
Nigeria	5	-	-
Norway	698	423	47
Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market	-	5,859	-
Pakistan	1	-	-
Palau	-	-	-
Panama	10	-	-
Paraguay	1	-	-
Peru	6	-	-
Philippines	21	-	-
Poland	235	342	17
Portugal	95	175	2
Republic of Korea	10,446	489	-
Republic of Moldova	2	46	1
Romania	20	76	4
Russian Federation	946	1,652	1
Saint Kitts and Nevis	1	-	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	4	-	-
Samoa	2	-	-
San Marino	1	7	-
Saudi Arabia	147	-	-

Origin	International applications		
	PCT	Madrid	Hague
Senegal	2	-	-
Serbia	19	163	15
Seychelles	3	-	-
Sierra Leone	1	-	-
Singapore	662	227	6
Slovakia	59	105	-
Slovenia	125	183	15
South Africa	319	-	-
Spain	1,728	568	32
Sri Lanka	12	-	-
Sudan	2	-	-
Swaziland	2	-	-
Sweden	3,462	259	34
Switzerland	4,007	2,933	600
Syrian Arab Republic	5	5	-
T F Y R of Macedonia	-	24	1
Tajikistan	-	-	-
Thailand	67	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	-
Tunisia	8	-	-
Turkey	540	983	86
Uganda	2	-	-
Ukraine	141	365	7
United Arab Emirates	38	-	-
United Kingdom	4,848	1,129	29
United States of America	48,896	4,791	229
Uruguay	5	-	-
Uzbekistan	1	-	-
Vanuatu	-	-	-
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	2	-	-
Viet Nam	18	56	-
Yemen	1	-	-
Zambia	-	-	-
Zimbabwe	2	-	-
Unknown	12	-	55
Total	182,112	42,270	2,521

- = none

Not all origins listed are members of WIPO-administered systems.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

WIPO STATISTICAL COUNTRY PROFILES



For all statistical country profiles and more indicators, visit:

www.wipo.int/ipstats/en/statistics/country_profile

Please visit our new Statistical Country Profiles web pages for more statistics and longer time series for patent, utility model, trademark and industrial design data.

In addition to office data, these web pages provide statistics on the origin of applications, which are not covered in this publication.

Among the up to 15 indicators per country, you will also find information relating to grants and registrations, gross domestic product, and patents in force.

The Statistical Country Profiles are also available in French and Spanish language versions.





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

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