



Andy Layton
Director of Trade Marks & Designs
Intellectual Property Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales
NP10 8QQ

27 July 2009

Ref: PP14/09

Dear Andy,

Dissolution of the Registry Practice Working Group

Thank you for your letter of 14th July announcing the dissolution of the RPWG.

The formation of the group was an innovative step, and we believe that over the years it has proven to be remarkably effective, especially in the period during which the 1996 Act was introduced. Certainly it is a facility which has been much appreciated by the Federation and its members, and widely admired and envied by our colleagues abroad. For these reasons, we shall be sorry to see it go.

However, we are quite prepared to accept that now there may be other and better ways of achieving the same - or, hopefully, an even better - result. Therefore, we look forward to continuing our dialogue with you and your colleagues through the twin approach of the on-line discussion forum and the new group, provisionally entitled the Trade Marks and Designs Policy Forum.

As to the latter, we thank you for your subsequent letter of 17th July and have the following comments re. the name and your outline terms of reference :

1. We welcome the inclusion of company names.
2. We note your laudable intention to widen the stakeholder representation but, with the exception of the Federation of Small Businesses & The Design Council, all those listed are, or are able to field, IP professionals. It may be difficult to meet the terms of reference and the expectations of the proposed constituents if you mix those engaging with IP legalities, formalities and strategic issues at a detailed level with non-IP experts for whom IP is not a subject speciality. Might an alternative be to ask the CBI IP Committee to nominate a representative?
3. As the former TMPDF (and please note we retain the name at Companies House as our registered name; IP Federation is our operating name), we would urge you to find a shorter, easier name to avoid possible confusion. Maybe Marks and Designs Group? Or BMDG (business names, trade marks & designs group), which echoes a little of the old RPWG?

FYI: When we circulated our members with your proposals these were some of the comments:

The IP Federation is the operating name of the Trade Marks, Patents and Designs Federation
Registered Office 5th floor, 63-66 Hatton Garden, London EC1N 8LE

Email: admin@ipfederation.com | Tel: 0207 2423923 | Fax: 0207 2423924 | Web: www.ipfederation.com

Limited by guarantee Registered company no: 166772



Page 2 of 2

" One practical suggestion is that they consider changing the name If they go ahead with TMDPF, there will inevitably be confusion with TMPDF. Many people involved with this will still think of TMPDF and not IP Federation."

" Can we persuade the UK IPO to drop their acronym! TMDPF is just so confusing"

" Couldn't help but chuckle when I saw TMDPF!!! I do hope that name suggestion gets canned very swiftly."

Finally, I hope I am not "telling tales" but UK-IPO staff have also noted the confusion which could be caused by the proposed name and I have even had an email referring to the new body as the TMPDF!!

We look forward to hearing from you further.

Yours sincerely,

Best wishes

Sheila Draper,
Secretary, IP Federation

The IP Federation is the operating name of the Trade Marks, Patents and Designs Federation
Registered Office 5th floor, 63-66 Hatton Garden, London EC1N 8LE

Email: admin@ipfederation.com | Tel: 0207 2423923 | Fax: 0207 2423924 | Web: www.ipfederation.com

Limited by guarantee Registered company no: 166772