WIPO/EC/EPO/ASEAN Sub-Regional Seminar on
Training and Teaching of Intellectual Property
July 6 to 8, 1995, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

By: Atty. IGNACIO S. SAPALO
Director
Bureau of Patents, Trademarks
and Technology Transfer

INTRODUCTION

Intellectual Property protection has lately been a concern of many countries including those in ASEAN.

The effective enforcement of intellectual property laws has become an essential element of a country's strategy to attract foreign investments. In order to bring in investors with their product ideas, innovative methods of production, and original technology that can boost expansion of strategic industries, we have to strengthen intellectual property protection.

This paper which deals with current issues on intellectual property protection and enforcement in the Philippines would be relevant to other countries of ASEAN because of the similarity in many respects of their economic, social and political conditions.

Because of time constraints and fewer occurrences of infringement cases relating to patents, I will limit my discussion to the protection and enforcement of trademarks and copyright.

TRADEMARKS

Under Republic Act 166, otherwise known as the Trademark Law, trademarks, service marks and tradenames are protected in the Philippines. Ownership of trademarks, service marks and tradenames are acquired through use thereof in trade or commerce in the Philippines.

Republic Act 166 established a system for the registration of trademarks. At least two months actual use in the Philippines is however required for trademark registration and in order for the registration to remain valid, there is a requirement of use

or justified non-use. As an exception, nationals of a country which is a member of the Paris Convention are allowed to register their trademarks in the Philippines based on a "home" foreign registration.

Under Republic Act 166, who has the better right, the first user of the trademark or the person who obtains a registration thereof? In the case of Philip Morris vs. Court of Appeals, (L-91332, July 16, 1993) the Supreme Court of the Philippines refused the grant of preliminary injunction in an action for infringement because petitioner has not used the mark in the Philippines, nothwithstanding its registration there. It ruled that petitioner's right cannot be made to rest solely on the certificate of trademark registration in the Philippines since dominion over trademarks is not acquired by the mere fact of registration alone; registration does not perfect a trademark right.

This decision illustrates that the law determines, to a large extent, effectiveness of intellectual property protection and enforcement. To avoid decisions such as that rendered the Philip Morris case, which is not deemed correct by the majority of intellectual property lawyers in the Philippines, we have sought to address their concern by way of proposing to change the basis of trademark protection in the Philippines from use to mere registration. Under the proposed law, which will be submitted with our legislature within the next few weeks, ownership of a mark is based solely on the registration thereof with the Bureau of Patents, Trademarks and Technology Transfer.

With respect to the protection of well-known marks the Philippines, having adhered to the Paris Convention, is bound to implement the provisions of Art. 6bis thereof to wit:

> Art. 6bis.
>
> (1) The countries of the Union undertake, ex officio if their legislation so permits, or at the request of an interested party, to refuse or to cancel the registration, and to prohibit the use, of a trademark which constitutes a reproduction, an imitation, or a translation, liable to create confusion, of a mark considered by the competent authority of the country of registration or use to be well-known in that country as being already the mark of a person entitled to the benefits of this Convention and used for identical or similar goods. These provisions shall also apply when the essential part of the mark constitutes a reproduction of any such well-known mark or an imitation liable to create confusion therewith.
>
> x x x

In November 20, 1980, Minister of Trade, Villafuerte, in a controversial Memorandum which is deemed by many authorities in administrative law to be an ***ultra vires*** act or in excess of jurisdiction, directed the Director of Patents to reject all pending applications involving internationally well-known marks such as Lacoste, Jordache, Gloria Vanderbilt, Sassoon, Fila, Pierre Cardin, Gucci, Christian Dior, etc.

In October 13, 1983, Minister of Trade, Roberto Ongpin, issued a Memorandum setting the criteria to determine whether the trademark is entitled to protection under Art. 6bis of the Paris Convention as a well-known mark. In essence, it refers to use in commerce internationally as the criterion to determine whether the mark is entitled to protection in the Philippines as a well-known mark. On the basis of the Ongpin Memorandum, several authorities on the law of trademarks consider that use in the Philippines is no longer a condition for the protection of a well-known mark in the Philippines.

On the other hand, the provision of our trademark law that ownership of a trademark is acquired through use in commerce in the Philippines has persuaded our courts, in several cases, to require use in the Philippines as a condition for the enforcement of well-known marks in the country, notwithstanding the Villafuerte and Ongpin's circulars. For example, in Bally vs. Mil Oro (CA-GR. No. SP. 10265, January 26, 1988), the Court of Appeals ruled that the appellee is not a fake user of the trademark "BALLY" for socks but a legitimate owner thereof. The appellant, a German corporation who obtained a registration of "BALLY" only for shoes in the Philippines never owned "BALLY" for socks,as it never adopted or used it there.

What is the solution that we are propose to this legal ambiguity? Obviously, it is by an appropriate amendment of the law. In this regard, our draft trademark law which will be filed shortly with our legislature provides as folllows:

Sec. 4. Registrability

(1) A mark cannot be registered if it:

x x x

(e) Is identical with, or cnfusingly similar to, or constitutes a translation of a mark which is considered by the competent authority of the Philippines, to be well-known in the Philippines whether or not it is registered there, as being already the mark of a person other than the applicant for registration, and used for identical or similar goods or services ***provided that*** in determining whether a mark is well-known, account shall be taken of the knowledge of the relevant sector of the public in the Philippines rather than of the public at large, including knowledge which has been obtained as a result of the promotion of the mark in the Philippines.

As earlier stated under the draft law, ownership of a trademark is acquired solely through registration. Use as a basis for acquiring trademark ownership will be abandoned. A cursory reading of the aforequoted provision would reveal that it adopts the language of Art. 16 (2) of TRIPS. The same provision refers to "promotion" instead of "use" in the Philippines to determine whether a mark is well-known.

Republic Act 166 in many respects, being based on the Lanham Act of the United States, sets high standards or norms of protection for trademarks, service marks and business names.

Regarding remedies, Republic Act 166 provides for:

(a) Civil action for infringement;

(b) Civil action for unfair competition;

(c) Civil action against false designation and origin of false description; and

(d) Prohibits importation of goods which bear infringing marks or tradenames.

The Revised Penal Code, the Philippines likewise provides for criminal sanctions against trademark, service mark and tradename infringement and also for unfair competition.

Executive Order 913, which was issued by President Marcos on October 7, 1983 provides for administrative remedies against violators of trade and industry laws which includes among others, the Trademark law, the Patent law and the Copryight law. I will refer to E.O. 913 again in the subsequent discussion on enforcement.

COPYRIGHT

The current copyright law of the Philippines is contained in Presidential Decree No. 49. Copyright is acquired automatically in a broad category of marks and materials, at the moment of their creation, without the need for formal copyright registration. This in fact complies with the no-formality rule of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works to which the Philippines acceded on August 1, 1951.

Our copyright law is outstanding in many respects. As early as 1972, when P.D. 49 came into force, when many countries have not granted explicitly statutory protection to computer programs, the Philippines unhesitatingly recognized it to be entitled to copyright. It also provided protection to the so-called reighboring rights which relates to the rights of

performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations. It also grants to authors moral rights and the ***droit de suite.***

In general, P.D. 49 provides for norms and standards of protection to literary artistic works which approximate the level of protection provided under the copyright laws of developed countries. On the other hand, it is considered by many experts as providing an unduly broad "permitted use" provision. For example, Sec. 10 of P.D. 49 provides that the author shall not be entitled to prohibit the recitation of a work or its performance if done privately or free of charge; nor may he prohibit reproduced translations and adaptations thereof destined exclusively for ***personal*** and ***private use.*** There is no provision in P.D. 49 or in the regulations which defines the scope of "personal and private use".

What is our solution to this deficiency in the law? Once again, it is by way of amendment thereof. The draft copyright law does not reproduce Sec. 10 of P.D. 49 but sets forth an enumeration of specific instances or situations which will not constitute infringement of copyright. Furthermore, these limitations on copyright "may not be interpreted in such a way as to allow its application, to be used in a manner which unreasonably prejudices the right holder's legitimate interest or conflicts with the normal exploitation of the work."

Another deficiency of P.D. 49 consists of the very low levels of penalties for infringement of copyright. In the draft copyright law, we have provided for both imprisonment and fine which is substantially higher even for the first offense than that imposed by the existing law, and is increased considerably for the second offense, and much more so for the third and subsequent offenses.

On this subject of copyright, mention must be made of P.D. No. 286, our Reprinting Law. While Pres. Marcos can be credited for the issuance of P.D. 49, authors of textbooks will put the blame on him for their current difficulties. This is because he issued P.D. No. 286. This decree grants compulsory licenses to reprint textbooks, or reference books, domestic or foreign, which are considered exhorbitantly priced. Under the current rules, a retail price of over P250. ($10.) is deemed exhorbitant. The draft copyright law expressly repeals P.D. 286.

In order to pursue the social objective of P.D. 286 which is to make textbooks affordable to our students, President Ramos has recently ratified the accession of the Philippines to the 1971 Berne Convention. This latest revision to the Berne Convention provides developing countries a means to obtain compulsory licensing for the reproduction of textbooks. Philippine accession thereto will become effective as soon as the Senate of the Philippines Congress confirms President Ramos' ratification.

ENFORCEMENT

The Role of the Department of Trade and Industry

In the Philippines, the enforcement of intellectual property laws is shared by several agencies of government. As previously discussed, a holder of an intellectual property right can avail himself of both civil and criminal action for infrringement as well as administrative remedies. The rightholder may also enforce his intellectual property right through a civil or criminal action for unfair competition.

With respect to copyright and trademarks, rightholders are provided by law with the remedy of petitioning the customs authorities to interdict the entry of counterfeit goods.

I will focus my discussion on the role of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), which is mandated to enforce intellectual property rights on the basis of the authority granted to it by Executive Order No. 913.

The Executive Order empowers the Minister of Trade and Industry, in cases involving the violation of trade and industry laws, which includes Republic Act No. 166, the Trademark Law, and P.D. No. 49, the Copyright Law, to ***motu propio*** charge the violator, and thereafter proceed with a formal investigation independent of the correspondent criminal or civil action for the said violation.

As soon as a formal charge is instituted, and even prior to the commencement of the formal investigation, for the purpose of preventing the disposition or tampering of evidence, the continuance of the acts complained of and the flight of the respondent, the Minister may order the seizure of the respondent's goods, the paraphernalia used in their manufacture and sale, the padlocking of establishments where the goods or paraphernalia are stored; the holding in port of any vessel or aircraft ferrying the goods; the prevention of respondent's departure from the country; and any other preventive measures which he deems necessary to achieve the purposes of the law.

After formal investigation, the Minister may impose one or more the following administrative penalties:

(a) the issuance of a cease and desist order;

(b) the acceptance of a voluntary assurance of compliance or discontinuance under such terms and conditions as may be imposed;

(c) the condemnation or seizure of products which are the subject of the offense;

(d) the forfeiture of the paraphernalia and all properties, real or personal, which have been used in the commission of the offense;

(e) the imposition of administrative fines in such amount as deemed reasonable by the Minister, which shall in no case be less than 500 pesos and not more than 50,000 pesos plus not more than 1,000 pesos for each day of continuing violation. The fine imposed under Section 6 shall be regardless of the limits of the criminal fine fixed in the "trade and industry law" violated;

(f) the cancellation of any permit, license, authority, or registration which may have been granted by the Minister or the suspension of the validity thereof for such period of time as the Minister may deem reasonable which shall not, however, exceed one year;

(g) the withholding of any permit, license, authority, or registration which is being secured by the respondent from the Ministry;

(h) the assessment of damages;

(i) censure;

(j) other analogous penalties or sanctions.

The DTI has fifteen regional offices (the Philippines is divided into 15 administrative regions) and 79 provincial offices.

The Bureau of Trade Regulation and Consumer Protection (BTRCP) of the DTI is the nerve center of the Department in carrying out its mandate to protect consumers against violations of trade and industry laws.

The enforcement of trade and industry laws is decentralized or delegated to the various DTI regional and provincial offices. The head office in Manila of the DTI, through BTRCP, aside from performing supervisory and monitoring functions, issues to the regional and provincial DTI offices, policies and guidelines relating to the enforcement of trade and industry laws. It was not until the 90's that DTI started to harness its nationwide network and give priority to enforcement of intellectual property rights.

The Inter-Agency Committee on Intellectual Property Right

In February of 1993, intellectual property enforcement was given a big boost by the issuance of Executive Order 60, which established the Presidential Inter-Agency Committee on Intellectual Property Rights (IAC-IPR). The IAC-IPR, which is chaired by the Secretary of Trade and Industry is composed of the Chief Presidential Legal Counsel and the top executives from the following agencies:

- Department of Trade and Industry
- Department of Justice
- Department of Finance
- National Bureau of Investigation
- Philippine National Police
- Bureau of Customs
- Videogram Regulatory Board
- National Telecommunications Commission
- Copyright Office
- Bureau of Patents, Trademarks, and Technology Transfer
- The Council to Combat Counterfeiting and Piracy of Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks (COMPACT)
- Intellectual Property Association of the Philippines (IPAP)

The Mandate of the IAC-IPR includes the following:

Coordination. Coordinate the policy-making process in the Executive Branch and with the different government agencies to effectively address the problem areas arising from infringement and counterfeiting of IPR and in enforcement of IPR laws.

Planning. Prepare and implement a fast-track anti-piracy and counterfeiting action plan and adopt appropriate strategies to improve the efficiency of anti-piracy and counterfeiting program.

Advocacy. Coordinate with government and non-governmental organizations to implement IPR information dissemination campaign and develop advocacy programs.

Policy Reform. Recommend appropriate amendments to existing IPR legislation as well as propose new IPR laws to the President and the Congress.

IAC-IPR's 1994 Accomplishment Report

In 1994, enforcement of IPR laws improved by over six (6) times compared with 1991-1993 performance. The number of establishments apprehended for IPR law violations rose to 4,100 from an annual average of 320 establishments during 1991-1993. Intensive education an information campaigns involving IPR holders, consumers and enforcers are being conducted on a continuing basis. A review of applicable laws and administrative orders and procedures has been undertaken for the purpose of updating and strengthening the same.

The latest policy guideline on buy-bust operations, which was formulated in consultation with the private sector greatly improved the enforcement performance on IPR

violations as evidenced by the increased apprehensions from an average of 12 (for the period 1990 to 1993) to 168 per month in 1994.

To effectively implement and coordinate the enforcement of IPR laws, the government has strengthened its structure by creating and strengthening existing Inter-Agency Task Forces at the regional/provincial level. To date, there are 26 Inter-Agency Task Forces operating nationwide, which are responding promptly to complaints lodged by IPR holders.

In the second semester of 1994, the PIAC-IPR adopted a Product/Industry Focus Strategy to guide the different inter-agency task forces throughout the country in their enforcement activities. For the month of July, enforcement and information drives were focused on audio and video cassette tapes. In August, suppression activities were concentrated on computer software piracy. Faked garments, accessories (watches, sunglasses, etc.) and electrical devices were the product focus for the months of September, October and November, respectively. A wide range of consumer goods/products in high demand during the Christmas season were the focus for the month of December.

A draft amendment to the Patent Law, Trademark Law and Copyright law has been completed.

The PIAC-IPR, in cooperation with the private sector, conducted tri-media, information campaigns to step-up awareness of the public on the hazards of counterfeit and pirated goods and their ill-effects on the national economy. Tripartite conferences (business-consumer-government sectors) were held regularly to promote and maintain healthy competition among business groups and the same time promote consumer welfare, effect compliance of laws using persuasion and diplomacy.

Orientation seminars and/or trainings to upgrade the skills of enforcement officers were conducted. Likewise, a Colloquium for Judges and Prosecutors was conducted to make them aware of the importance of their role in protecting IPR holders.

Furthermore, there is sufficient reason for IIPTI to be a specialized training institute because IIPTI is fully equipped with specialized books in all areas of IPR.

Besides that, it contains dormitories that can accommodate 220 persons at one time. In addition, wonderful recreation facilities are provided for the trainees.

3. Operation of training courses

The basic objectives of training

- To train personnel responsible for the effective management of IPR
- To enhance public awareness of the importance of IPR
- To improve on on-the-job skills of officials from public and private sectors in matters relating to IPR
- To encourage inventive activity
- To train foreign officials responsible for IPR matters from developing countries

Training program

IIPTI is operating its training programs in accord with the above objectives. The programs are basically classified into two programs, foreign and domestic. Domestic training programs are categorized into those for government officials and those for civilians. IIPTI is currently offering a total of 26 training courses : 11 courses for government officers, 13 courses for civilians and 2 courses for foreigners.

Courses for the public sector are professional courses aimed at heightening the standard of examinations and trial examinations as well as educating public officials' capabilities in dealing with IPR-related matters. Some courses are as follows:

- New examiner training course :
  Focuses on the training of basic capabilities and examination methods of an examiner
- Examiner supplemental training course I and II:
  Enhances understanding of specified knowledge of IPR.
- Trial examiner training course :
  Cultivates the judge's capabilities and strengthens trial performance
- Education supervision course :
  Enhances awareness of IPR and invention at all school levels

- IPR guidance officers training course :
  Training for customs officials, public prosecutors, and officials from the Ministry of Internal Affairs who are in charge of anti-counterfeiting activities.

Courses provided for in the private sector are as follows :

- Patent and utility model course :
  Teaches patent management to company staff and patent attorney staff
- R&D personnel training course :
  Teaches R&D personnel on how to catch up with patented technology and how to avoid duplicate research activities
- Corporate training course :
  Enhances awareness of company staff on the importance of IPR
- Probationary patent attorney course :
  Develops the professional capability of dealing with IPR cases

IIPTI has offered two types of training courses for trainees from other developing countries. A Training Course for Patents of Asia and the Pacific Region, and a Training Course on the Industrial Property System.

- The Training Course for Patents of Asia and the Pacific Region is the most popular course for foreigners. IIPTI holds an annual IPR seminar (training forum) jointly with WIPO to work on UNDP regional projects, which aids in developing the Asia-Pacific region with respect to IPR. The cost of this project is divided among IIPTI and WIPO. Generally, participants are patent experts from developing countries.
- The Training Course on the Industrial Property System is funded by the Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), which supports the development of developing countries. This course is designed to enhance IPR development and to teach IPR personnel from developing countries.

In addition to the above mentioned in-house training courses, IIPTI has been conducting nationwide lecture tours in order to develop human resources in industrial and technological fields.

Specifically, IIPTI's staff has visited and continues to visit education administration offices, technical high schools, colleges and vocational schools to hold seminars on inventions and IPR. Until 1994, 84,000 students and teachers have participated in this seminar.

< TRAINING PROGRAM '95 >

Courses	Period of Training	Persons	Number of Training Provided	Total Persons
Total (26 Courses)			58	3,030
1. Officials (11 courses)			14	540
-New Examiner Training Course	1 month	20	1	20
-Examiner Supplement Training Course (I)	1 week	30	1	30
-Examiner Supplement Training Course (II)	2 weeks	30	1	30
-Trial Examiner Training Course	2 weeks	30	1	30
-IPR Guidance Officer Training Course	1 week	60	3	180
-Probationary Judicial Official Training Course	1 week	30	1	30
-Training Course for KIPO Business Practice Officials	1 week	20	1	20
-IPR Manager Training Course	3 days	30	1	30
-Training Course for KIPO Civil Appeals Officials	3 days	20	1	20
-Training Course for Economic Dept. Officials	3 weeks	50	1	50
-Training Course for Mid-level Economic Dept. Officials	3 weeks	50	2	100

< TRAINING PROGRAM '95 >

Courses	Period of Training	Persons	Number of Times Training Given	Total Persons
2. Civilians (13 courses)			42	2,420
-Probationary Patent Attorney Course	6 months	30	1	30
-R&D Personnel Training Course	1 week	50	4	200
-Patent & Utility Model Training Course	1-2 weeks	30	3	90
-Corporate Training Course	3 days	50	16	800
-Patent Dispute Case Training Course	1 week	20	1	20
-IPR System Course of Other Countries	1 week	20	1	20
-Supreme Management Course	1 day	30	1	30
-Private Inventor Course	1 day	30	1	30
-University Student Course	2 days	80	1	80
-Training for the Patent Document Management Personnel	1 week	40	1	40
-Education Supervision Course	3 days	100	4	400
-Invention Guidance Teacher's Course	4 days	120	4	480
3. Foreigners (2 Courses)			2	70
-Training Course for Asia and the Pacific Region	4 days	50	1	50
-Training Course on the Industrial Property System	2 weeks	20	1	20

The duration and levels vary in each course. For example, courses for new examiners or apprentices to patent attorneys are carried out for a comparatively long-term period and at a high level. On the contrary, courses on general knowledge of IPR last only a short duration of only 3-4 days.

Selection and invitation of lecturers

At present, IIPTI has four full-time professors. There is a professor for each field in trademark and design and there are two professors covering patents. Along with lecturing the trainees, the professors are also studying IPR's theoretical areas.

Most lecturers are examiners and trial examiners of KIPO because IPR lectures emphasize more practical rather than theoretical knowledge. These examiners and trial examiners are experts in their field and an authority in examination practices.

In addition, to enhance the theoretical aspect, IIPTI invites special lecturers such as professors, patent attorneys, and lawyers to lecture when needed. On occasion, when IIPTI holds a seminar for foreigners, foreign prominent lecturers are invited.

4. Achievements

Since the opening of IIPTI in 1987, for 8 years IIPTI has trained 7,300 government officials. There were 8,300 civilians that participated in the training programs designed for researchers and employees of companies, employees of patent law firms and apprentices to patent attorneys, university students and private individuals. In addition, there were 380 foreigners from other developing countries in the Asia-Pacific, Eastern Europe, and Latin America regions who have received training at IIPTI.

< TRAINING RESULTS >

(Unit: Person)

Year / Trainees	'88	'89	'90	'91	'92	'93	'94
Officials	314	280	324	263	376	357	529
Teachers	195	268	722	825	898	837	850
Civilians	509	467	809	996	1,048	1,578	2,178
Foreigners	35	36	10	81	68	79	70
TOTAL	1,053	1,051	1,865	2,165	2,390	2,851	3,627
INCREMENTAL (%)	5.0	△0.2	87.0	16.0	10.3	19.3	27.2

To strengthen itself as an international institute, IIPTI is continuously driving towards the exchange of IPR experts and information with other foreign country's institutes. IIPTI is very interested in international cooperation activities which cooperate with International IPR Institutes such as the Franklin Pierce Law Center (FPLC) located in the United States, the Max Plank Institute (MPI) of Germany, and the International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research of IPR (ATRIP).

Through IIPTI and FPLC's concluded agreement on Joint-programs, both Offices are cooperating in matters such as the "bilateral recognition of completed training credits (points)".

FPLC is currently accepting students who have successfully completed the six-month "patent attorney apprenticeship course" at IIPTI, with the recognition of 13 credits (for one semester), which aids in the attainment of a Masters degree in Intellectual Property (MIP). Since 1992, about 2-3 students have taken part in the MIP program every year, and the joint education program has been successful.

Besides, we have been affiliated with the International Association for the Advanced of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP) as a cooperating institute and we have formed close ties with the Max Planck Institute (MPI) since last year. This will greatly facilitate the exchange of mutual information and experts in industrial property and develop curricula for trainees.

By cooperating with MPI and ATRIP, we expect that IIPTI's training program will strengthen the professionality and the enhancement of training quality.

IIPTI also keeps a close relationship with Yonsei University, one of Korea's prestigious private universities, which is the first university in Korea to open a Graduate School of Intellectual Property Law in 1993.

Other universities in Korea also have a deep interest in establishing a graduate school specializing in IPR and it is likely that a considerable number of graduate schools will be established in the near future. If and when they are established, they will have full support from the Korean Industrial Property Office (KIPO).

IIPTI has contributed a great deal towards the development of a number of training programs on IPR, upgrading the quality of industrial property members and enhancing the public's awareness on the importance of IPR.

5. Conclusion

Problems encountered in IIPTI's operation

Although IIPTI has succeeded in many areas, there is still need for improvement on its operation.

First, IIPTI is deficient in terms of research because it lacks research personnel.

Secondly, IIPTI's training facilities and materials are comparatively excellent, but its lecture methods are generally based on the theory cramming system of education. Furthermore, IIPTI provides short-term courses rather than medium-long term courses.

Thirdly, because IIPTI depends greatly on outside lecturers, IIPTI does incur difficulties in inviting lecturers to Taejon, which is relatively far from Seoul.

Future plans

Today, the role of the IPR system is increased more and more in the global competition of technology development. According to the result of a recent survey on training needs, it is inherent that trade of IPR is increasing as well as the trade of goods. This trend will likely enhance the recognition of IPR and accelerate the competitiveness of technology. Therefore, the training demand is also on an increasing trend.

In response to this demand, firstly, we are making concerted efforts to develop new training programs and to strengthen the function of research, which includes the protection of newly emerging IPR. Secondly, we are planning to continue the development of training at a more high and specialized level by acquiring more full-time lecturers.

Furthermore, I was informed that Asian countries such as Malaysia are planning to establish a Training Center similar to IIPTI.

In my opinion, it is necessary to establish a professional institute in order to educate IPR experts in every country. And, if other institutes were established, we intend to fully support the establishment and operation through our experience. I believe cooperation is necessary in terms of joint theme research for regional IPR development and in joint studies of systematic training methods with IIPTI.

IIPTI is and will continue to be equipped with contemporary facilities in order to keep up with the on-going growth of speciality training and research. IIPTI will maintain cooperation with WIPO and UNDP as well as educate experts. By contributing towards the education of experts and towards developing the Asia-Pacific region, we will focus our efforts to foster and develop our institute in order to become a professional world IPR academy.