

Intellectual Property Institute of Canada (IPIC) Submission on Proposed Revisions to the Industrial Design Office Practice Manual (IDOP)

Submission to
Canadian Intellectual Property Office

July 9, 2018

INTRODUCTION

The Intellectual Property Institute of Canada (IPIC) is the professional association of patent agents, trade-mark agents and lawyers practicing in all areas of intellectual property law. Our membership totals over 1,700 individuals, consisting of practitioners in law firms and agencies of all sizes, sole practitioners, in-house corporate intellectual property professionals, government personnel, and academics. Our members' clients include virtually all Canadian businesses, universities and other institutions that have an interest in intellectual property (e.g. patents, trade-marks, copyright and industrial designs) in Canada or elsewhere, and also foreign companies who hold intellectual property rights in Canada.

IPIC is pleased to provide comments on the proposed revisions to the Industrial Design Office Practice Manual (IDOP) which is intended to provide more fulsome information and guidance than the current version to applicants and practitioners alike. IPIC thanks CIPO for holding a constructive pre-consultation meeting with the profession on March 29, 2018, to discuss the proposed revisions to the IDOP and to the effort by CIPO to include details on the new requirements, procedures and deadlines for national applications filed directly with CIPO, design applications received through the Hague System, and the transitional provisions detailing how CIPO will treat applications with a filing date prior to the coming into force date of the new *Act* and *Regulations* as well as designs registered under the former *Act* and *Regulations*.

IPIC's comments and recommendations are set out below. For ease of reference, IPIC provides these comments in order of the numbering in the proposed revisions to the new IDOP, and not in order of importance.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE INDUSTRIAL DESIGN OFFICE – SECTION 1

The IDOP at Section 1.01 now requires correspondence to be addressed to the “Industrial Design Office”. Many practitioners and firms place all mail to CIPO in one envelope. It is unclear whether the envelope must include the words “Industrial Design Office” or only the correspondence itself. As well, this requirement provides a procedural hurdle which may confuse applicants since, as noted in the Foreword to the IDOP, the “Industrial Design Office” is the name commonly used for the industrial design branch of CIPO, and not a legal name.

“Open to the Public”. At Section 1.02 and subsequent, the IDOP uses the phrase “open to the public” or “closed to the public”. The phrase “to the public” does not appear in the Regulations. The *Regulations* simply refer to the Office being open or closed. IPIC recommends amendment to reflect the language of the *Act* and *Regulations*.

IPIC also recommends that Section 1.06 be amended to highlight that an agent must be explicitly appointed when filing an industrial design application. At present, if an application is filed by an agent, the agent is deemed to have been appointed. The new practice that requires the express appointment of an agent should be explicitly identified here since it is a change that could cause serious issues. If an agent is not explicitly appointed, the Office will treat the application as having been filed by an authorized person and will correspond directly with the applicant. An unsophisticated applicant may not appreciate what has happened and may mishandle correspondence, resulting in a loss of rights.

Section 1.06 also uses of the pronoun “his” however, this pronoun is not found anywhere else in the document. IPIC recommends “his” and any other pronouns be drafted in gender neutral form.

Section 1.06 refers to the agent, an authorized person, the applicant and the registered proprietor. It would be helpful to applicants to have express distinction indicated here as to the difference between an agent and an authorized person since the concept of an authorized person is new and may cause confusion.

For example, if an applicant or authorized person corresponds directly with the Industrial Design Office to pay a fee or record an assignment, the Industrial Design Office will send communications only to the applicant or to that authorized person.

- Does direct correspondence by the applicant effectively result in a revocation of any previous appointment of agent, since the agent is no longer receiving correspondence? Will a previously appointed agent be informed of such a change in communication?

- Does this mean the Office will only send communications directly to the applicant/authorized person in relation to that particular correspondence, then send other correspondence to an appointed agent?

IDOP should be further amended to provide appropriate guidance on how these scenarios will be addressed.

AGENTS AND REPRESENTATION – SECTION 2

Under Section 2, there is further discussion of the term agent. Under Section 2.01.02, the last line, there is now reference to the “requestor”. IPIC assumes that this is intended to refer to the person who unsuccessfully attempted to be appointed as an agent. Who exactly the “requestor” is relative to the agent and the applicant is not clear.

In Section 2.02 there is an indication that an appointment of agent can be revoked at any time by sending a notice to the Industrial Design Office but there is no indication of who can revoke the appointment of agent. If an authorized person can revoke, how are they identified as an authorized person?

TRANSFERS – SECTION 3

Sections 3.02 (Request for recordal or registration of a transfer) and 3.03 (Evidence of a transfer) appear to be drafted in an imprecise manner. These two sections should be drafted more clearly to reflect the language in the new *Act* and *Regulations*. In particular, Section 3.03 uses the term “client” which is not used elsewhere. It is stated the Industrial Design Office will assess all evidence on a case-by-case basis and will contact “the client” if additional documentation or clarification is required. Who is considered “the client”? The preceding sentence states: “Evidence of the transfer is required when a request is submitted by the transferee.” Does “the client” mean the transferee? If yes, consider using “the transferee” for greater clarity. If not, is “the client” the appointed agent?

Section 3.04 uses the term “unauthorized”. It would be more consistent to adopt the phrase “Industrial Design Office is not authorized”.

LICENSES AND SECURITY AGREEMENTS - SECTION 4.01

A previous draft of the IDOP indicated that keeping licenses or security agreements on file does not constitute a recordal and has no legal effect. This seemed to be a helpful clarification. Why was this taken out? How does this differ from a recordal, other than not requiring a fee? An explanation of the difference is to be considered or the previous draft language adopted.

FEES – SECTION 5

In Section 5.01, the section refers to the applicant or “any person authorized by them” may pay fees. Is this intended to be “an authorized person” or a different category of persons? Clarification is required to prevent confusion and for consistency with the new *Regulations*.

CERTIFIED COPIES – SECTION 6

Section 6 has the heading “Certified Copies” but it speaks more broadly of copies of documents. IPIC believes it would be better identified as “Access to Document” since it is not limited to a discussion of certified copies. As well, Section 6.01 would be better entitled “Limitation on Access to Applications” or something similar.

APPLICATION CONTENT AND REQUIREMENTS – SECTION 8

In Section 8.01 the “Mandatory content” and “Optional content” of what is required to be filed in an application could unintentionally mislead applicants. For example, under “Optional Content” is an “Indication of Divisional Application”. Although this is not required at the time of filing a divisional application, there is a strict time limit for filing this particular information/indication and thus, it may be misleading to characterize it as “optional”. A person scanning the IDOP seeing this entry may believe that it is not necessary to specify the application is a divisional and, as such, may lose divisional status. As well, “Address of the agent” is indicated as optional. Presumably, if the agent is identified by both a name and address, the agent must be provided, since the Office must correspond with the agent if an agent is appointed. IPIC recommends simply deleting the entire section entitled “Optional Content” since it may be considered misleading.

Further, the “Optional Content section includes a “Descriptive statement” and a “Statement of limitation”. While these terms are defined in sections 8.06.01 and 8.06.03, all of the examples provided in the IDOP identify the “Finished article” and simply precede the rest of the text with “Statement”. Does the Office consider the text after “Statement” to be a “Descriptive statement” or a “Statement of limitation”? If filing online, is there a separate field for “Descriptive statement” and for “Statement of limitation”? If not, is it the intention of the Office to include this for applications filed electronically? If an application is filed with text following the term “Statement”, is it automatically/necessarily treated as either a “Descriptive statement” or a “Statement of limitation”, or does it depend on the text/language used itself?

It is interesting that the Office indicates that the Descriptive statement and Statement of limitation are wholly optional. It seems that this may be the justification for not requiring any statement regarding the use of broken lines where portions of the article or environment form no part of the design. Even for boundary lines, a description stating same is optional. (See 8.06.02.04). However, if

an Applicant wants stippled lines to form part of the design, then this must be specifically stated (8.06.02.02).

FORM REQUIREMENTS – SECTION 8.02

IPIC is pleased to note that the page orientation may be portrait or landscape. In the past the Office has rejected mixed orientations in a single application. It would be helpful if the statement could be clearer as to whether an application may include both orientations. Often, it is just much easier for certain views to have both orientations to keep a reasonable scale and for consistency with other foreign jurisdictions.

VARIANTS – SECTION 8.04.01

It appears that the Office is maintaining its practice that variants do not exist where the representations of the designs differ in respect of any matter shown in stippled lines. While it may be administratively convenient to not have to judge such variants, this hard and fast rule seems contrary to the definition of variant or the new *Regulations*. The Office should clearly document its policy in this regard in the IDOP. If the policy no longer applies, the IDOP should include examples of variants where stippled lines differ.

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR PHOTOGRAPHS AND REPRESENTATIONS - SECTION 8.05.01

This section indicates a numbering system which “should” be used. Specifying that a particular numbering system should be used will be onerous for applicants. Most applicants use a numbering system which simply numbers each figure from “1” onwards and do not use the two numbers separated by a dot “1.1”, as is done under the Hague System. *Renumbering the drawings for Canada is not a reasonable requirement and any such requirement would be very poorly received by applicants*. If the “should” here is to be interpreted as optional, then IPIC recommends rewording the section to indicate that this is the preferred numbering system, but not mandatory. As well, the last bullet in this section is inconsistent with the others since it specifies numbering from 1 without indicating two separate numbers separated by a dot.

DISPLAY SCREEN – SECTION 8.05.02 – EXAMPLE 5

Currently, the Office is objecting to “Display Screen” as a title for a finished article but this section suggests that it is now acceptable. Regardless, the figure is labeled “Figure 1.1” but the statement references it as “Fig. 1”. This is an error that would usually result in an objection and should be corrected.

The IDOP appears to be somewhat loose in its terminology vis-à-vis “representation” and “reproductions”. See, for example, Section 8.05.03.01 which speaks first about the representation and then reproductions and then images. Another example is Section 17.02.02 which provides “a reproduction (such as a photograph or reproduction)”. The IDOP should be reviewed to ensure consistent terminology is used to reduce confusion.

COMBINATION OF PHOTOGRAPHS AND REPRODUCTIONS - 8.05.04 – EXAMPLE 9 – PHOTO AND GRAPHICAL REPRODUCTION

IPIC applauds the Office’s progress in allowing both photographs and representations in a single application. In Section 8.05.04 it would be helpful to include an elaboration of what exactly is considered to be unclear in the representation. What is the different visual impression? Is it the fact that the top tapered portion of the bottle appears to have an indentation in the line drawing, but not in the photograph? Without this additional explanation, this example is of limited usefulness and does not add much more than the preceding text.

DRAWING TECHNIQUES – SECTION 8.05.05

FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS. The figure descriptions are somewhat inconsistent in the examples provided in the IDOP. For example, in Section 8.05.05.01 for shading, the description of Figure 1.1 provides a phrase “where shading is used to better illustrate the design”. This phrase appears unnecessary and the reference to “better illustration” appears subjective.

TRANSLUCENCY. The translucency example in Section 8.05.05.02 appears unclear. The text indicates that light shading throughout the translucent area indicates translucency. However, shading could also be used to indicate contrasting tones. Neither the statement nor the figure description makes any reference to translucency. As well, part of the shaded example does not include the thin diagonal lines, i.e. the base of the butter dish. Does this imply that this area is translucent or not?

INDEFINITE LENGTH. The description in Section 8.05.05.06 appears confusing. The repeating 3D features are indicated as repeating at regular intervals, however, it goes on to indicate “according to an indefinite spacing throughout the article with indefinite length”. If the features are repeating at “regular intervals”, it is not understood how they can be at “indefinite spacing”.

CROSS-SECTIONAL VIEWS. Section 8.05.05.11 indicates the method of marking cross-sectional views. IPIC believe the intention is to indicate that the cut surface can be shown with a solid black, or diagonal parallel lines, which are dotted or broken lines. However, the way it is currently written, “solid black line; parallel diagonal lines; dotted lines; or broken lines” it does not qualify the diagonal lines as dotted lines or broken lines. This could be amended to read “filled in solid black line; parallel diagonal lines; dotted parallel diagonal lines; or broken parallel diagonal lines” as it does not qualify the diagonal lines as dotted lines or broken lines.

ENLARGED FRAGMENTARY OR MAGNIFIED VIEW - 8.05.05.12

The language in this section suggests that this is the only acceptable method to illustrate a fragmentary view. The inclusion of the box in solid lines makes Fig. 1.1 and 1.2 difficult to understand, or at least more difficult than perhaps it should be with a clearer figure. The box is very distracting. A box using dotted lines would better depict this view. IPIC is concerned that the Office will require any circle or box in solid lines. In many cases that applicants file, the need for any circle or box is not even necessary to determine which portion is enlarged. One example is illustrated as 8.05.07. Here the design portion is clear, and it is enlarged in Figure 1.2, yet there is no box.

COLOUR. The example of colour in Example 28 appears somewhat confusing since it only references the pantone blue cuff. The other portion of the glove is shown in grey. Does this mean the colour grey is not claimed for the rest of the glove? As well, the present Office Practice regarding submission of colour makes reference to submitting two copies of the drawings such that one copy can be attached to the registration, to ensure the integrity of the colour in the registration. There is no reference to this option in the new IDOP. For consistency all of the 2017 Office Practice updates should be incorporated into the IDOP.

ELECTRONIC ICONS. The section regarding electronic icons, Section 8.05.07, appears confusing. It seems to imply that an electronic icon can be shown in isolation without a finished article. IPIC believes that it is the Office's intention that an electronic icon cannot be claimed as a finished article *per se*. The electronic icon can be shown in isolation in the drawings, but the finished article must be a physical article and there must be at least one drawing of the electronic icon applied to the finished article. If this is the case, then this section requires clarification.

ORNAMENT VS. ORNAMENTATION. The examples use both the word "ornamentation" and "ornament" interchangeably. Is the Office intention that these terms be used interchangeably? IPIC notes that the *Act* uses the word "ornament" and not "ornamentation". Consistent terminology should be used.

COLOURING. Example 34, which shows colouring to limit the design, still does not appear to be a particularly good example since it shows the colouring outside the article contrary to Example 7 which indicates that the colouring should not be shown outside the article. At a minimum, Example 34 should be consistent with this feature.

COLOURING TO LIMIT THE DESIGN TO PART OF THE ARTICLE - SECTION 8.06.02.03

Is it necessary to include some sort of statement relating to the use of colouring to limit the design? The absence of such a statement in Example 34 appears to suggest it is neither required nor

recommended. Is it similar to the use of contrasting tones in this regard? Use of such a statement appears limiting and the Office should reconsider its use.

BOUNDARY LINE TO LIMIT THE DESIGN TO PART OF THE ARTICLE - SECTION 8.06.02.04

IPIC questions why Example 35 includes two apparently otherwise identical figures, except that Fig. 1.1 has a red boundary line, and Fig. 1.2 has a dot-dash boundary line? Does the Industrial Design Office feel that the two figures provide a different scope of protection from each other? If yes, what is the difference? Is the use of one type of boundary line better than the other? IPIC recommends that this be clarified to prevent confusion.

USE OF BLURRING TO LIMIT THE DESIGN. Example 36 uses blurring to limit the design but there is nothing in the description to reference blurring. Is it the Office's position that such drawing techniques speak for themselves and need not be references in a statement or figure references? This appears to contrast Section 8.06.02.03.

PRIORITY – 8.07

The amended *Act* provides at Section 8.1(6)(a)(c) that the priority application be “an application for the registration of a design disclosing the same design”. Thus, the application need only disclose the same design; the Canadian application does not need to “claim” the same design as “claimed” in the priority application. For example, although the article may be the same, what is claimed in solid lines and disclaimed in dotted lines may differ without affecting the priority claim. The various places in this IDOP which paraphrase this section potentially change the meaning. For example, Section 8.07.02 says “the priority claim must be for the same design” and “[t]he design disclosed in the previously filed application must be the same design as the design the applicant is seeking to register in Canada”. There will be numerous designs which are disclosed in the previous application that might not be claimed. The intention of this amendment to the *Act* was that designs disclosed but not claimed in the previous application could be the subject for a priority claim in Canada. The paraphrased wording in the IDOP seems to be reverting to the language which speaks about the same design being registered in Canada as the design applied for in the priority application. This section, and other sections regarding priority claim in the IDOP, are less than clear and should be amended to consistently mirror the language of the *Act* to avoid unintended changes in meaning.

PRIORITY REQUEST REQUIREMENTS - 8.07.02

The following statement is awkward “When filing an application, it is recommended to include all requests for priority, regardless if they pertain to the claimed design or designs disclosed in the environment. Note that, in all cases, the priority claim must be for the same design, based on a design disclosed in a single previously regularly filed application.” It seems to contradict itself that an

Applicant can claim more than one priority, but priority must be based on a single previous application.

REQUEST FOR PRIORITY DOCUMENTS - SECTION 8.07.08

This section and particularly Section 8.07.08.01 regarding translation, does not make it clear when the translation must be filed and if the Applicant will receive a notice requesting the translation and the further three-month window within which to file the translation. For example, the last paragraph of Section 8.07.08.01, indicates that the requested translation must be provided three months after the date of the notice, but there is no reference to a notice in the translation section, the only notice is mentioned at the beginning of Section 8.07.08. If there is a separate notice to be sent in regard to the translation, it should be explicitly stated.

DIVISIONAL APPLICATIONS - 8.08

Section 8.08.03 sets out a 2-year window to file divisional applications and then the exception states the 2-year deadline does not apply if the IDO requires the applicant to limit its application to one design. Why is the applicant apparently given less time to file a divisional if an office action requires the application to be limited to one design? An applicant can delay registration in an application where there is no restriction requirement to get up to two years to file but can't do so when an office action issues to restrict to one design. What is the policy purpose? The exception makes sense if you need more than two years from the earliest application filing, for example, because prosecution in a string of applications has taken a long time. But it is too restrictive, if prosecution is quick.

WITHDRAWING AN APPLICATION – SECTION 12

Section 12.02 makes reference to the application being “made available to the public” and makes reference to “the publication date”. This difference in terminology should be resolved.

Section 12.02 (and section 20.02) is this section intended to refer throughout to “an application that is withdrawn”? For example, is the last sentence intended to refer to “if the application is withdrawn less than two months before the prescribed date”, or to refer to “if a request for the application to be withdrawn is filed less than two months before the prescribed date”?

IN A FINISHED ARTICLE – SECTION 13.02.03

Section 13.02.03, in the last line, makes reference to “modifications to be made to the finished article”. This should probably reference “modifications to be made to the representation of the finished article”, for consistency.

COMPONENT PARTS OF AN ARTICLE - SECTION 13.02.04.02

Consider amending the first sentence in the second paragraph as follows, for greater clarity: “The if the name of the finished article ~~which~~ implies that the application contains more than one design or variants, the name will not be accepted.”

EXCLUSIONS FROM PRIOR ART - 16.01.04.01

The exclusion includes excluding the applicant’s own prior disclosure within the one-year grace period. It may be helpful to understand how the IDO determines that a prior reference is from the applicant or from someone who obtained the design from them.

COMPARISON OF THE PRIOR ART WITH THE APPLIED FOR DESIGN - SECTION 16.01.05

The term “a substantial change” is used without any context or definition. (A previous version of the revised IDOP referred to differing in an unsubstantial detail, but this context has been removed.) Why is this particular term used in the current revision? What is its meaning or definition? What is the source of that meaning/definition? IPIC recommends further clarification be provided in the IDOP.

LIMITATIONS ON AMENDMENTS - SECTION 17.02.02

The phrase: “addition of a reproduction (such as photograph or reproduction)” includes a strange circular reference in which “reproduction” is used as an example of a reproduction. Consider amending the phrase to “addition of a photograph or reproduction”.

NOTICE OF POSSIBLE REFUSAL AND THE REFUSAL - SECTION 18.01

“If no request is received within three months of the Notice of Possible Refusal, the application will be considered for refusal and will be communicated to the applicant.” Exactly **what** will be communicated to the applicant? A decision regarding the possible refusal? The (automatic) refusal? IPIC recommends that this section be clarified.

REGISTRATION AND TERM OF PROTECTIONS - SECTION 19

In the title, consider replacing “term of protection” with “duration of exclusive right”, for greater consistency with the wording used in Sections 19.01 and 19.02 and Section 21.

MAINTENANCE OF EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – SECTION 21

Section 21.01.01 indicates that the right is deemed to have expired after five years, but Section 21.01.02 references a late maintenance fee. Section 21.01.01 should be cross-referenced to Section 21.01.02 to make it clear that the deemed expiration is not final until after the late payment six-month window has expired.

REFUSAL - 26.03

As practitioners having to deal with new issues relating to Section 26 and particularly refusals of a Hague application will have to adapt quickly to this new practice. IPIC finds the section related to refusals to be very brief. It gives no guidance on what is possible and how to do it or what is not possible and should be avoided. As noted below, IPIC understand that if the Office refuses a Hague application, which is already a Hague Registration, the response to a refusal from the IDO is limited to argument only. No amendment is possible. But IPIC understands that there is a way to make a Hague application a domestic application. If it is by way of divisional or otherwise, there is no description as to how to do achieve this. This seems odd for a practice manual, especially since there is no history in the Office for such practice. Are practitioners to respond to the refusal of the Hague application by asking that it be treated as a domestic application? Do practitioners file a divisional application from the Hague application? Is a Hague application already a domestic application so that if it is amended, the Office will still refuse the Hague Registration as it applies to Canada but continue to process the application for Canada? Even if there is more information in the Regulations, practitioners and applicants should not have to jump around the IDOP to figure out these practices.

It is not clear to IPIC what the procedure is to address a refusal of a Hague application when an amendment is required. It may be helpful to indicate that a response to a notification of refusal cannot include any amendment. As IPIC understands it, there is no mechanism to amend the Hague Registration as it applies to all designated territories and thus no way to amend a Hague application. To achieve this, does the Hague application have to be made domestic. Or is it that if there is an attempt to amend the Hague application it is treated as a Canadian application? Or must an applicant divide the Hague application to become a Canadian application? The procedure to make a Hague application a domestic one is not clearly set out in the IDOP. IPIC recommends that further guidance on these issues be provided in the revised IDOP.

APPLICABILITY OF THE REGULATIONS TO APPLICATIONS WITH A FILING DATE BEFORE THE COMING INTO FORCE AND DESIGNS REGISTERED ON THE BASIS OF SUCH APPLICATIONS - SECTION 37

Section 37 relates to transitional provisions and references “current Regulations” and “current Act” but also to “Regulations” and “Act” and to “former Regulations”. (e.g. Section 37.01 “In accordance with section 33 of the Act, the current Regulations apply to all applications with a filing date before

the coming into force of the current Act and all designs registered on the basis of such applications, unless the Regulations provide otherwise.”) Is “the Act” and “current Act” the same? This question also applies to “current Regulations” and “Regulations” in that sentence. Does “current” mean now, prior to the coming into force or afterward to distinguish “current Regulations” from “Regulations”? Later statements in Section 37.02.02 use all of Regulations, current regulations and former Regulations. As this IDOP is written to be effective after the coming into force, it should be rewritten to delete all reference to “current” and only use “former” when referencing the old Act or old Regulations? Alternatively, just use current consistently.

OTHER MEASURES

FORMAT

The section headings when they are indented and in the same typeface as the text, are difficult for users to locate when scanning the document. It is particularly difficult to scan for section headings in the drawing sections where other text is in bold, but the section headings are not. IPIC recommends that all the section headings be left aligned and be depicted in bold font.

Further, there is inconsistent use of capitalization for a number of terms, such as “Applicant” throughout the document which should be corrected for consistency and clarity.

IPIC recommends that the links to each of the websites should all be reviewed for accuracy and updated where required. Many of the links send the user part way to the destination but require additional “clicks” to arrive to where they should point. See, for example, sections 6.02 and 6.03 in which the [Client Services](#) goes to the “contact us” web page, the phrase “[the Extract and Certified Copies section of the](#)” is part of the hyperlink when it should not be, and link to [contact](#) the WIPO International Bureau is not to the “contact us” page.

There are minor clerical errors such as periods duplicated or missing, see for example the end of section 3.03 and section 24.01, and the section number missing from the first line of section 36.02.02.

Sections 1.08 and 8.03 both use the term “design representation” yet the term “representation of the design” is used many times throughout the IDOP. The term should be consistently used.

Typographical errors:

- 7.03: “is provided in [section](#) ~~sections~~ 25 of this manual.”
- 8.07.04: consider replacing “the priority applications” with “the priority application(s)”
- 8.07.08: consider replacing “a certified copy of priority documents” with “a certified copy of the priority document(s)”
- 13.02.01: “refer to the finished [article’s](#) ~~articles’~~...”
- 19.02.01: “The exclusive right begins on [the](#) date of registration”
- 19.04: “Particulars of a registration will be entered in the Canadian Register of Industrial [Designs](#) ~~Design~~.”
- 25.01 “as opposed to a Canadian industrial design application₂ which[[,]] must be limited”
- 25.02: “of a Hague application or [of](#) [[to]] a divisional application...”
- 36.02.01: “Register of Industrial [Designs](#) ~~Design~~”

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed revisions of the IDOP. We look forward to working with the government as the new *Act* and *Regulations* come into force on November 5, 2018. It is hoped that the dialogue between IPIC and the CIPO continues to ensure a fulsome and strong IP system in Canada.

We would welcome the opportunity to cooperate further on these and other issues.

Contact information:

Adam Kingsley, BSc., CAE
Executive Director
Intellectual Property Institute of Canada
550 – 360 Albert St.
Ottawa (ON)
K1R 7X7

Telephone: 613-234-0516 ext. 25

Email: akingsley@ipic.ca