

26 July, 2016

Mr. Paul Maier
Director
European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights
Office for the Harmonization of the Internal Market
Avenida de Europa, 4
E-03008 Alicante, Spain
Via email: observatory@oami.europa.eu

Re: Repetition of the IP Perception study “EU citizens and intellectual property: perception, awareness and behaviour” – INTA Comments

Dear Mr. Maier,

On behalf of the International Trademark Association (INTA), we thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft questionnaire for the 2016 EU citizens and intellectual property: perception, awareness and behaviour study. We believe that it is timely to update the results of the 2013 at this time.

INTA is pleased to have participated as a stakeholder of the Observatory since its inception. Our Association benefits from being an active stakeholder in all five of the Observatory’s Working Groups. We congratulate the Observatory on its work – especially the publication of the many helpful studies that you provide.

We also support this perception study and find it useful in INTA’s advocacy work. We provide additional comments and recommendations below.

1. Question 1

INTA agrees with the proposal to delete “Performers’ rights” option, as the initial analysis revealed ambiguous results due to the fact that few regular citizens understand what performers ‘rights are.

2. Question 2

INTA agrees with the suggestion to delete the whole question Q2 as the initial analysis revealed ambiguous results due to the fact that the answers could be interpreted in various ways depending on the subjective understanding of the statement. The statements indicated in the question are unclear and allow personal interpretation, especially for persons who are not specialists in the IP field.

3. Question 3a

INTA does not agree that merging Q3a with Q3b into one Question 3 would be clear enough for the participants of the survey. Moreover, Q3 would become a very long question. If the questions

are merged, it may be easier for the consumer to prioritize the responses by numbering the answers from 1 to 8.

4. Question 5

INTA agrees with the suggestion of the re-wording of this question. Furthermore, we would recommend adding “pirated” before “artistic content” in Q5-2 and before “music or videos” in Q5-4.

5. Question III4

Bullet point 5 may be deleted since it is covered by Q6-2.

6. Question IV6

INTA agrees with the suggestion of integrating the shortened questions based on the IP and Youth Scoreboard (III4, IV5, III5 and IV6). It would make the Questionnaire more understandable for young people. Long and unclear questions could discourage young people to read them, and they could lose interest in responding.

7. General Comments

Method of Survey: Limiting the survey to be administered only over the phone would limit the types of people that will participate. Many people refuse to participate in phone surveys. This method may not capture European youths, who prefer methods of communications like texting and Internet surveys over phone solicitations. The Observatory may lose some key demographics of the European public if you only allow for the survey to be administered by phone.

Scope of Participants: INTA appreciates that 26,500 participants is large number, but looking more closely at the figure the figure covers less than 1,000 people in each Member State. We are not criticizing the number as it is quite large, but our membership would like some more explanation of how that number was decided.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. We would be happy to further discuss. Please contact INTA Europe Chief Representative Officer, Christina Sleszynska, at csleszynska@inta.org or INTA Anticounterfeiting Advisor, Maysa Razavi, at mrzavi@inta.org.

Sincerely,



Etienne Sanz de Acedo
CEO
International Trademark Association