



# World Congress Cannes, France 27-28 September 2022

## WORKSHOP SUMMARY

<b>TITLE:</b>	Summary Report on Workshop W2: THE 7-VIEW REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGN APPLICATIONS
<b>DATE:</b>	28 September 2022
<b>DRAWN UP BY:</b>	Robert S. Katz and Jürgen Buchhold (CET2)

### Executive Summary

The Workshop W2 was held on September 28, 2022 in Cannes during the World Congress 2022 and has taken a look to the formality of the 7-view requirement in some jurisdictions where “portion practice” is also permitted.

### Participants

In summary: 18 attendees

Robert S. Katz  
Jürgen Buchhold  
Andrea de Gaspari  
Editha Hechanova  
Matt Pini  
Jaqueline Holmes  
Mariano Soni

Michael Conway  
Przemyslaw Samoder  
Robert Roser  
Ronelle Goldenhuys  
Thomas Bailey  
Gabriel di Blasi  
Emanuela Branca

Chris Atichian  
Andrea Manola  
Peter Everitt  
Tarsa M. Machano  
I. Elosegle  
Britta Frommow

### The Topic

The formal requirements for the representations of a design to be registered vary around the world.



On the one hand, this results in problems with the selection of representations for a design, especially when part of an entire product is to be protected. On the other hand, problems arise with claiming priority of an already deposited design.

## The Discussion

After an introduction into the topic and a presentation of the aims of the workshop, the group discussed the topic.

A. Currently, there are basically the following restrictions on the representation of a design:

1. There is a required number of views,
2. There are required types of views, and
3. There is a maximum number of views.

These requirements are generally unnecessary for an understanding of the design for which protection is sought and usually just results in additional drafting costs for the applicant and/or the applicant being unable to show its design in the best manner.

B. With respect to the **required number of views**, many jurisdictions require, with few exceptions, seven views of a design which include six orthogonal views (i.e., top and bottom plan views, front and rear views, and left and right side views) and, in addition, one perspective or isometric view.

In many cases, this leads to applicants being required to incur drafting fees to draft drawing figures reflecting view that do not depict any part of the design for which protection is sought.

Similarly, where it is clear of the article shape from a few views, it also has to prepare views that add nothing to the understanding of the design for which protection is sought.

All this applies in particular to designs encompassing portions of articles, what is permitted in almost all jurisdictions.

Therefore, **FICPI urges** that jurisdictions to give applicants more flexibility in the specific views it chooses to best present its design for which protection is sought and should not require views that are not necessary for understanding the design for which protection is sought.



- C. With respect to the **required types of views**, the standard seven view approach (and as described above) does not always result in the best and/or most complete depiction of the design for which protection is sought.

In many cases, additional perspective views or perspective views in lieu of orthogonal views, provide a better understanding of the design.

Therefore, **FICPI urges** that jurisdictions to give applicants more flexibility in the specific views it chooses to best present its design for which protection is sought and should merely only require that these views enable an observer to understand the design for which protection is sought based on the disclosure.

- D. With respect to the **maximum number of views**, some jurisdictions have a maximum number of views.

In one prominent jurisdiction this maximum is seven (7).

However, there are many situations where more than 7 views are required or desirable to best show the design.

These reasons include:

- a. the design being movable between different states or otherwise having multiple appearances.

Products commonly have portions, or have different two or more configurations and applicants should be given the ability to best show multiple conditions/states of its design.

Some designs have unique aspects that are seen with an enlarged view or cross sections, however, for each such view added, it is forced to choose another view to delete.

Many animated graphical user interfaces (GUIs) are best shown by more than seven views.

Designs directed to sets are difficult and sometimes impossible to present in seven or less views.



Therefore, **FICPI urges** that jurisdictions to remove any requirements that limits the number of views that an applicant can submit with his application, and in the event that a limit is logistically required, that the limit be as high as possible to enable the applicant to best present its design for which the desired protection is sought.

### **The Common Conclusion of this Workshop**

The group discussion came to the conclusion that it's time urging countries to be more flexible regarding design patent drawing requirements with respect to the required number of views, the required types of views, and the any maximum number of view requirements.

The outcome of this workshop has become subject of FICPI Resolution **EXCO/FR22/RES/006**.

*[End of document]*