



2022 CANADIAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY - REPORT

Prepared for Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

Supplier name: Environics Research Group

Contract number: U1400-222121/001/CY

Contract value: \$83,366.09

Award date: January 18, 2022

Delivery date: November 16, 2022

Registration number: POR 098-21

For more information on this report, please contact Innovation,
Science and Economic Development Canada at:

ic.publicopinionresearch-recherchesurlopinionpublique.ic@canada.ca

This publication is available online at: <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/public-opinion-research/en>.

To obtain a copy of this publication, or to receive it in an alternate format (Braille, large print, etc.), please fill out the Publication Request Form at www.ic.gc.ca/Publication-Request or contact:

Web Services Centre
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada
C.D. Howe Building
235 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H5
Canada

Telephone (toll-free in Canada): 1-800-328-6189
Telephone (international): 613-954-5031
TTY (for hearing impaired): 1-866-694-8389
Business hours: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Time)
Email: ISED@canada.ca

Permission to Reproduce

Except as otherwise specifically noted, the information in this publication may be reproduced, in part or in whole and by any means, without charge or further permission from the Department of Industry, provided that due diligence is exercised in ensuring the accuracy of the information reproduced; that the Department of Industry is identified as the source institution; and that the reproduction is not represented as an official version of the information reproduced or as having been made in affiliation with, or with the endorsement of, the Department of Industry.

For permission to reproduce the information in this publication for commercial purposes, please fill out the Application for Crown Copyright Clearance at www.ic.gc.ca/copyright-request or contact the Web Services Centre mentioned above.

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Industry, 2022.

Cat. No. Iu71-4/56-2022E-PDF
ISBN 978-0-660-46748-1

Aussi offert en français sous le titre *Office de la propriété intellectuelle du Canada Sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle 2022*.



Contents

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i
- I INTRODUCTION 1
- II DETAILED FINDINGS 3
 - A. OVERALL AND CHANNEL USE SATISFACTION 3
 - B. APPLICATION PROCESS 6
 - C. EXAMINATION 11
 - D. REGISTRATION OR GRANT 19
 - E. ADDITIONAL SERVICE ASPECTS 21
 - F. OTHER SERVICES 35
 - G. INFORMATION SERVICES 39
 - H. KEY DRIVER ANALYSIS 43
 - I. CLIENT PROFILE 46
- CONCLUSIONS 56
- APPENDIX A - METHODOLOGY 57
- APPENDIX B – QUESTIONNAIRE 62



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) Client Satisfaction Survey was developed as a standardized measure of client satisfaction. The initial baseline survey, conducted in 2017-18, established baseline measures. In 2022, CIPO contracted Environics Research to conduct the second wave of this research in order to measure to what extent recent factors have influenced client opinions on CIPO's service delivery.

The specific objectives of this research were to:

- Track a series of performance measurement metrics relating to customer satisfaction for CIPO;
- Outline client priorities for CIPO's service delivery; and,
- Collect data to support other business intelligence needs related to CIPO's clients.

Since 2018, many factors have affected CIPO's service delivery. The most notable factors are as follows:

- CIPO acceded to five (5) international treaties that introduced a dual track system (national v. international) resulting in the organization and clients having to adjust to Canada's modernized legislative framework and new business processes. The recent adherence to the treaties and the implementation of trade agreements have changed the nature and demand for Intellectual Property (IP).
- Following the implementation of the treaties, CIPO saw an unprecedented growth in IP filings which has led to record growing IP backlogs and increased turnaround times affecting clients directly.
- The COVID-19 pandemic introduced many new challenges where CIPO experienced unforeseen disruptions to its operations and services early in the pandemic and had to quickly shift into mitigating actions to minimize the impacts to service delivery and its clients. In addition, IP filings defied historical trends and remained consistent in their growth affecting CIPO's ability to recover against record levels of IP activity.
- The pace of IT modernization has amplified during the pandemic to ensure that employees remain fully productive while working from home, reducing the use of paper in CIPO's interactions with clients and operating under new virtual platforms.
- CIPO is facing a structural deficit as a result of fees that do not reflect the increased cost of service delivery over the last 17 years and which has inhibited the organization's maneuverability in facing challenges and improving client experience.

Due to the extraordinary nature of these contextual factors experienced within a relatively short period of time, it is clear that CIPO's operational landscape has changed radically since 2018. Given that clients' perceptions have been strongly influenced by many of these factors, CIPO is taking more time to better understand and contextualize the results to become more familiar with the clients they serve, their challenges and identify meaningful and relevant opportunities.



In 2022, CIPO also introduced a new client segment for this research: non-agent IP professionals. The inclusion of this segment is aligned with recent user research on CIPO clients that confirms this group is a key client segment interacting directly with CIPO services. The inclusion of IP professionals in 2022 makes the overall satisfaction score more inclusive and more reflective of the experience of all clients.

Given the shift of the operational landscape and the amendments introduced in the 2022 sampling frame, no direct comparison is being made against the 2018 survey results.

B. METHODOLOGY

The research project involved an online survey with 1,517 CIPO clients (including agents, represented and unrepresented clients and non-agent IP professionals), from April 21- June 27, 2022.

The contact lists provided by CIPO included four client groups: agents, IP professionals who are not agents (new in 2022), unrepresented clients and represented clients. The latter two groups of clients represent Canadian applicants who in the past 24 months: were granted/registered IP; had their applications refused/abandoned/withdrawn; or had an application still in progress. The agent group includes registered agents representing both national and international clients. Records without email addresses were removed and the remaining records were deduplicated. This survey represents an attempted census of all eligible clients with an available email address; since no sample was drawn, a margin of sampling error does not apply.

The final distribution of completed interviews by client type and line of business is as follows:

	Patent	ID	TD	Total	% Weighted
Agents	80	56	193	329	14%
Unrepresented clients	119	28	745	892	65%
Represented clients	5	3	12	20	9%
Mixed clients*	23	3	65	91	
Total excluding IPPRO	227	90	1,015	1,332	88%
Non-Agent IP professionals	63	40	82	185	12%
Total	290	130	1,097	1,517	100%

* Mixed clients are those who indicated that they sometimes used an agent and sometimes interacted with CIPO on their own behalf in the previous 24 months. No quota was established for this group.

When clients indicated experience with more than one line of business in the past 24 months, the survey programming selected a line of business for respondents to respond about, prioritizing those with fewer sample records (Industrial Design and Patent) to ensure these are sufficiently represented in the data.

The data were statistically weighted to match the proportions of agents, unrepresented and represented clients achieved in 2018. IP professionals were included in proportion to their actual response frequency (which is similar to the proportion of IP professional e-mails in the sample file provided by CIPO).

A more detailed description of the methodology is presented in Appendix A, and the questionnaire is included as Appendix B.

C. CONTRACT VALUE

The cost of this research was \$83,366.09 (HST included).

D. REPORT

This report begins with an executive summary outlining key findings and conclusions, followed by a detailed analysis of the survey data. Provided under separate cover is a detailed set of “banner tables” presenting the results for all quantitative survey questions by population segments as defined by client group, IP type, region and other subgroups. These tables are referenced by the survey question in the detailed analysis.

(Note: In this report, quantitative results are expressed as percentages unless otherwise noted. Results may not add to 100% due to rounding or multiple responses. Net results cited in the text may not exactly match individual results shown in the tables due to rounding.)

E. USE OF FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

The CIPO Client Satisfaction Survey is intended to be a standardized measure of client satisfaction, that is used to assess progress and trends over time.

The 2022 CIPO Client Satisfaction Survey Report has garnered valuable feedback from clients and stakeholders regarding the perceived quality of service that CIPO provides to its clients. This information will be used by CIPO to identify service quality improvements. Going forward, CIPO will continue to measure and monitor the implementation of service delivery and share results through existing mechanisms such as CIPO’s Annual Report in order to ensure that information about the organization’s continuous improvement efforts is accessible to clients and stakeholders.

F. KEY FINDINGS

The survey findings reveal that overall satisfaction with CIPO’s services is mixed. Over one-third of clients (37%) are satisfied, a similar proportion (39%) are dissatisfied, and one-quarter (24%) are neutral. This level of satisfaction is similar for both agents and unrepresented clients.

- Satisfaction is relatively *higher* with services related to filing (45% among those who filed an application in the past 24 months) and relatively *lower* for services related to examination (30%) and the quality of office actions (26%). The latter result is also reflective of a relatively high proportion of clients who could not give an opinion (36%).
- Service satisfaction is linked to successfully receiving IP protection. Overall satisfaction and satisfaction with specific service aspects is generally higher among those who have received a registration/grant in the past 24 months, which represents 74 percent of agents (who have multiple clients) but just one-quarter (23%) of unrepresented clients.

The research suggests two main areas where service expectations are not being met, that help explain mixed satisfaction levels:

- Concerns about lack of timely service: Agreement that office actions are received in a reasonable amount of time currently sits at three in ten (29%) for first office actions and one-quarter (24%) for subsequent ones. One-third of agents who successfully received an IP registration/grant (for their clients) in the past 24 months are satisfied with the length of time it

took (although satisfaction is higher among unrepresented clients at 49%). As well, clients dissatisfied with filing or examination cite the slow process as their top reason.

- Concerns about lack of information: Facing delayed service, clients appear to be looking for a contact point and/or updates from CIPO. One in three are satisfied with access to CIPO's services overall, with as many (34%) who are dissatisfied. Four in ten clients or fewer agree they were able to access CIPO staff and documents and that they were aware of the status of their IP application throughout. Agents express greater concerns about their ability to reach CIPO employees with questions, while unrepresented clients tend to focus on their inability to find out the status of their application.

The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the government service environment and increased the importance of digital channels. CIPO's website is the most widely used channel, followed by email and telephone (the latter particularly for agents and IP professionals). Not surprisingly, there was limited use of non-electronic channels to reach CIPO in the past 24 months.

- In this context, CIPO received relatively strong scores (among the highest in the survey) for its online services being easy to find (51%), online transactions being easy to complete (56%) and the website having the information they were looking for (51%).

It is important to note that these findings represent overarching levels of satisfaction across all types of intellectual property administered at CIPO. In most instances, this report shows that there are notable differences in results between patents and trademarks, with the former being more favourable than the latter with respect to overall satisfaction.

Given the multitude of service dimensions assessed, an in-depth analysis was conducted to determine which service aspects are the key "drivers" or factors influencing clients' overall satisfaction with CIPO service. The examination process is a key driver of overall satisfaction for all client types. The filing process and CIPO staff "going the extra mile" are key drivers for unrepresented clients who often need additional support navigating the IP system. Timeliness has a stronger impact on overall satisfaction for agents, who want the process to work efficiently. Thus, the extent to which CIPO can address issues/concerns in each of these areas provides the greatest opportunity to improve overall client satisfaction with its services.

Non-agent IP professionals were included in the 2022 survey for the first time. As experienced professionals in their field (six in ten have more than ten years of experience), their views on CIPO services are largely similar to agents. The exception is they tend to have more positive opinions about their ability to navigate the filing process (e.g., easily complete forms, use the searchable databases) and about the ease of use of CIPO's online services.

G. POLITICAL NEUTRALITY STATEMENT AND CONTACT INFORMATION

I hereby certify as a Vice President of Environics Research Group that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy on Communications and Federal Identity of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not contain any reference to electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leader.



Sarah Robertson
Vice President, Corporate and Public Affairs
Environics Research
sarah.roberton@environics.ca / 613.793.2229

I INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) is a special operating agency of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED). Its mandate is to deliver high quality and timely Intellectual Property (IP) services to customers and to increase awareness, knowledge and effective use of IP by Canadians.

Collecting ongoing service feedback is important to support continuous improvement and to track and report on progress as CIPO continues to modernize its service offerings.

The CIPO Client Satisfaction Survey was designed to be a standardized measure of client satisfaction. It was used to establish a baseline in 2017-18 and subsequently will be updated every three years to measure progress over time.

Since 2018, many factors have affected CIPO's service delivery. The most notable factors are as follows:

- CIPO acceded to five (5) international treaties that introduced a dual track system (national v. international) resulting in the organization and clients having to adjust to Canada's modernized legislative framework and new business processes. The recent adherence to the treaties and the implementation of trade agreements have changed the nature and demand for IP.
- Following the implementation of the treaties, CIPO saw an unprecedented growth in IP filings which has led to record growing IP backlogs and increased turnaround times affecting clients directly.
- The COVID-19 pandemic introduced many new challenges where CIPO experienced unforeseen disruptions to its operations and services early in the pandemic and had to quickly shift into mitigating actions to minimize the impacts to service delivery and its clients. In addition, IP filings defied historical trends and remained consistent in their growth affecting CIPO's ability to recover against record levels of IP activity.
- The pace of IT modernization has amplified during the pandemic to ensure that employees remain fully productive while working from home, reducing the use of paper in CIPO's interactions with clients and operating under new virtual platforms.
- CIPO is facing a structural deficit as a result of fees that do not reflect the increased cost of service delivery over the last 17 years and which has inhibited the organization's maneuverability in facing challenges and improving client experience.

This study was required to measure to what extent these recent factors have influenced client opinions on CIPO's service delivery. In addition to these factors, CIPO is about to embark on its next 5-year business strategy as well as a fee review, with plans to adjust fees for the first time since 2004. Learning more about client satisfaction in advance will support both initiatives and will help CIPO align services with the needs of clients in the aftermath of the pandemic.



B. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

CIPO sought to better understand clients' needs, prioritize its actions, and demonstrate the impact of its service initiatives. Furthermore, the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (TBS) Policy on Service and Digital emphasizes the collection of client feedback to support the delivery of client centric services.

The specific objectives of this research were to:

- Track a series of performance measurement metrics relating to customer satisfaction for CIPO;
- Outline client priorities for CIPO's service delivery; and,
- Collect data to support other business intelligence needs related to CIPO's clients.

The research involved a quantitative (online) survey with qualitative feedback collected on selected open-ended questions. The target audience was clients with at least one official transaction with CIPO's main lines of business (Patents, Trademarks and Industrial Designs) over the past 24 months. CIPO provided the client sample.

Reading this report

This report begins with an executive summary outlining key findings and conclusions, followed by detailed analysis of the survey quantitative results. A detailed set of "banner tables" is provided under separate cover; this presents results for all survey questions by segments such as client type and line of business.

In this report, quantitative results are expressed as percentages unless otherwise noted. Results may not add to 100% due to rounding or multiple responses. Net results cited in the text may not exactly match individual results shown in the charts due to rounding.

The data presented in this report are based on the total sample asked each question, and therefore includes those who did not have an opinion (e.g., who "neither agree nor disagree", but instead indicated they "cannot say"). For most questions, the proportion without an opinion is modest (less than 10 percent), but is larger for select questions,. As a result, it should be noted that some levels of agreement/satisfaction are lower as a function of a higher-than-average proportion who have no opinion of the service attribute, rather than agreement/satisfaction being inherently low.

This report does not include comparisons to the data from the 2018 study. In the near future, CIPO will conduct a holistic interpretation of these results which will be published along with a service improvement action plan.

II DETAILED FINDINGS

A. OVERALL AND CHANNEL USE SATISFACTION

1. Overall satisfaction with CIPO's services

More than one-third of CIPO's clients are satisfied with the service the organization has provided in the past 24 months, roughly equal to the proportion who are dissatisfied.

Clients from CIPO's three main client groups (agents, unrepresented, and represented clients) as well as IP professionals were asked about their overall satisfaction with CIPO services related to Intellectual Property (IP) - patents, trademarks or industrial designs (depending on the line of business used in the past 24 months). Satisfaction levels are mixed, with over one-third of clients (37%) who are satisfied, one-quarter (24%) neutral and four in ten (39%) dissatisfied.

Overall level of satisfaction with CIPO services

Level of satisfaction	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepre- -sented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)*	IP Profes- sionals (n=185)	Trade- mark (n=1097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Net: satisfied	37%	34%	35%	43%	46%	34%	44%	45%
Very satisfied	10%	5%	11%	13%	4%	10%	10%	4%
Satisfied	27%	29%	23%	30%	42%	24%	34%	41%
Neutral	24%	22%	24%	23%	26%	24%	23%	31%
Net: dissatisfied	39%	44%	41%	34%	27%	42%	33%	24%
Dissatisfied	20%	26%	20%	15%	23%	21%	19%	17%
Very dissatisfied	19%	18%	21%	19%	4%	21%	14%	7%

The base of represented clients is too low to report separately (n=20).

* Mixed clients are those who indicated that they sometimes used an agent and sometimes interacted with CIPO on their own behalf in the previous 24 months

Q.4 Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided to you by CIPO related to ____?

Overall satisfaction (very satisfied and satisfied) is higher among:

- Non-agent IP professionals (46%) compared to agents (34%) and unrepresented (35%) clients
- Clients who received service for an industrial design (45%) or patent (44%) versus a trademark (34%)

- Clients who successfully received an IP grant or registration (48%, vs. 30% who did not)
- Represented and unrepresented clients that are larger businesses (53% with 500+ employees) or have multiple IP applications (46%, vs 30% with only one).

2. Use of channels

Accessing the CIPO website via a desktop computer is the most widely used service channel; agents and non-agent IP professionals also rely on the telephone to access CIPO services. Telephone is the channel with the highest level of satisfaction.

a) Channels used in past 24 months

Clients were shown a list of channels and were asked which ones they had used to access CIPO services in the past 24 months (multiple responses were allowed). The most widely used channel is the CIPO website via desktop (88%), followed by telephone (43%) and email (37%). A small proportion access the CIPO website via mobile (12%), while live chat and chatbot were used by one percent each.

Relatively few used non-digital channels such as regular mail (14%) or fax (9%). In-person was not a significant channel due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Channels used to access CIPO products and services in past 24 months

Channel used	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unre- presented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=73)*	IP Profes- sionals (n=185)	Trade- mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
CIPO website – via desktop	88%	93%	87%	87%	95%	88%	87%	92%
Telephone	43%	68%	35%	35%	68%	38%	64%	48%
Email	37%	49%	34%	35%	41%	35%	47%	33%
Regular mail	14%	28%	12%	11%	15%	13%	20%	7%
CIPO website – via mobile device	12%	18%	13%	7%	6%	13%	12%	6%
Fax	9%	28%	2%	7%	27%	8%	13%	11%
Other (in-person, chat features)	2%	1%	2%	2%	6%	2%	3%	0%
None of the above	2%	1%	1%	5%	1%	2%	1%	3%

Q5 Which of the following channels have you used to access CIPO's products and services related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial designs] in the past 24 months? Select all that apply.

Website via desktop is the most used channel across client groups. Agents are most likely to use multiple channels including telephone (68%), email (49%) and fax (28%). IP professionals most closely resemble agents in their use of channels to access CIPO services.

Use of multiple channels including telephone, email and regular mail is more widespread among patent clients than trademark and industrial design clients.

b) Satisfaction with channels

Users of each channel were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the service provided by CIPO through that channel. A majority of channel users are satisfied with service obtained by telephone (54%), but fewer than half indicate satisfaction with other channels.

Level of satisfaction with CIPO service channels – among channel users

	Net satisfied	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Net dissatisfied
Website via desktop (n=1346)	46%	11%	36%	24%	17%	13%	29%
Telephone (n=699)	54%	22%	33%	19%	13%	14%	26%
Email (n=580)	43%	13%	30%	27%	16%	13%	29%
Regular mail (n=234)	38%	11%	27%	26%	14%	22%	36%

Q6 How satisfied are you with the service CIPO provided (by/on)...?

Net satisfaction with CIPO service by channel – among channel users, by client group and IP type

Net satisfaction (very satisfied or satisfied) by channel	2022 Total	Client group				IP type		
		Agents	Unrepresented clients	Mixed clients	IP professionals	Trade-mark	Patent	ID
Website via desktop - # of users	1346	307	773	79	175	970	256	120
Net satisfied – website via desktop	46%	49%	44%	49%	56%	45%	50%	52%
Telephone – # of users	699	223	315	32	125	443	191	65
Net satisfied – telephone	54%	51%	55%	56%	56%	54%	54%	57%
Email – # of users	580	160	307	32	75	402	137	41
Net satisfied – email	43%	44%	42%	47%	48%	46%	40%	34%
Regular mail - # of users	234	93	103	10*	27*	163	61	10*
Net satisfied – regular mail	38%	33%	41%	BTS	BTS	38%	37%	BTS

Q6 How satisfied are you with the service CIPO provided (by/on)...?

* BTS indicates base is too small to report (<30)

Satisfaction with various service channels is generally similar across client and IP types. Satisfaction with channels is linked to overall satisfaction with CIPO services in general, and for most channels is linked to having had a registration granted or approved. Satisfaction with the website via desktop increases as the number of applications filed increases.

B. APPLICATION PROCESS

1. If applied for IP in past 24 months

Over eight in ten agents and eight in ten represented clients submitted an IP application in the past 24 months.

Given that the survey covered clients in various stages of the IP process, respondents were asked if they had submitted an IP application in the past 24 months (agents and IP professionals were asked if they had filed applications on behalf of clients). The majority of all client types submitted applications within that time frame, although the proportion is lower among non-agent IP professionals (where 70% submitted on behalf of a client).

If submitted IP application [Patent/TM/ID] to CIPO in reference period

Submitted IP application in past 24 months	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)
Yes	79%	83%	80%	77%	70%
No	18%	16%	16%	21%	27%
Not sure	4%	1%	4%	2%	3%

- Q7 *REP/UNREP: In the past 24 months, did you submit an IP application for [IP TYPE: a patent(s) / a trademark(s) / an industrial design(s)] to CIPO?*
- Q7 *AGENT/IPPRO: In the past 24 months, did you submit an IP application for [IP TYPE: a patent(s) / a trademark(s) / an industrial design(s)] on behalf of a client?*

Clients responding regarding a trademark are the most likely to have submitted an application (84%), followed by industrial design clients (72%); 61 percent responding about a patent report submitting an application. Submitting an application in the past 24 months is more widespread among agents with international clients (83% vs. 62% without) and further increases with length of experience in the IP field (from 69% with ten years or less to 83% with over 20 years).

2. Overall satisfaction with filing process services

Four in ten are satisfied with CIPO's service during the filing process. Satisfaction is higher among agents and non-agent IP professionals.

Clients who filed an application in the reference period were asked about their level of satisfaction with the services CIPO provided during the filing process. More than four in ten (45%) express some level of satisfaction (12% very satisfied); around two in ten are neutral, and one-third (33%) are dissatisfied.

Overall level of satisfaction with CIPO's service during IP application among those who submitted an application in the reference period

Satisfaction	2022 Total (n=1,198)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=273)	Unrepre- sented clients (n=712)	Mixed clients (n=70)*	IP Profes- sionals (n=129)	Trade- mark (n=920)	Patent (n=185)	ID (n=93)
Net: Satisfied	45%	58%	38%	47%	64%	43%	50%	53%
Very satisfied	12%	14%	11%	20%	14%	12%	11%	10%
Satisfied	32%	44%	28%	27%	50%	30%	39%	43%
Neutral	22%	19%	22%	30%	20%	22%	21%	25%
Net: Dissatisfied	33%	23%	39%	23%	16%	35%	29%	22%
Dissatisfied	18%	13%	21%	9%	12%	18%	16%	14%
Very dissatisfied	16%	11%	19%	14%	4%	17%	13%	7%

Q8 Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided to you by CIPO during the filing process?

SUBGROUP: Submitted an IP application in the past 24 months

Satisfaction with filing process services is higher among IP professionals (64%) and agents (58%) than other clients. Satisfaction with this aspect of CIPO's service is statistically similar by type of IP and it is closely correlated to overall level of satisfaction with CIPO.

3. Reasons for dissatisfaction with filing process services

Clients dissatisfied with the filing process were asked the reasons for their dissatisfaction. The top reason is the slow registration process versus that of other countries or a long wait for an examiner to be assigned (cited by 55%). Other concerns include lack of communication in terms of status updates or confirmation of receipt (26%), the complexity of the application process (17%), slow or poor customer service (12%) and a poorly designed and slow website (7% each).

Reasons for dissatisfaction with CIPO service during IP filing process (top mentions)

Reasons for dissatisfaction	Total (n=385)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=64)	Unrepresented clients (n=281)	Mixed clients (n=16)*	IP Professionals (n=21)*	Trade-mark (n=317)	Patent (n=50)	ID (n=18)*
Slow registration process of trademark approval compared to other countries/too much wait for assigning an examiner	55%	42%	57%			60%	25%	
No communication received to update customer on application status/no confirmation of receipt	26%	9%	30%			28%	18%	
Application process is difficult/complicated/categories not properly identified	17%	14%	19%			16%	21%	
Slow/incompetent customer service/not easy to contact/not getting back to customer in time	12%	19%	11%			11%	21%	
Website is slow/frequently down/process timed out	7%	22%	3%	BTS	BTS	5%	17%	BTS
Website not well thought out/not user friendly/not easy to navigate	7%	6%	7%			7%	10%	
CIPO employees/examiners lack knowledge/not properly trained/too many mistakes	4%	3%	4%			3%	11%	
Lacking innovation/CIPO technology/forms/services are outdated	4%	9%	2%			3%	13%	
Other mentions (3% or less each for total sample)	14%	25%	14%			11%	29%	
Prefer not to say	9%	13%	8%			8%	9%	

Q9 You indicated that you are dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with the service provided by CIPO during the filing process. Could you please explain why?

SUBGROUP: Those dissatisfied with the filing process

* BTS indicates base is too small to report (<30)

4. Agreement with statements about filing process services

Clients who submitted an IP application in the past 24 months moderately agree on most statements about service during CIPO's filing services.

Those with recent application experience were shown a series of statements with respect to filing services and asked to indicate their level of agreement with each. Overall agreement (strongly agree and agree) is highest for the following items: 'CIPO's searchable database contained the information needed' (61%) and 'was easy to use' (61%). Agreement is somewhat lower, but close to six in ten, that 'application forms were easy to complete' (59%) and that 'the filing process was efficient' (57%). Half agree they 'were informed of everything they needed to do to apply for intellectual property' (52%). Agreement is lowest that "the filing process was designed with your needs in mind" (47%).

Level of agreement with statements about CIPO service during IP application among those who submitted an application in past 24 months

2022 Total (n=1,198)	Net Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net Disagree	Cannot say
CIPO's searchable database was easy to use	61%	22%	40%	19%	12%	5%	16%	3%
CIPO's searchable database contained the information you needed.	61%	20%	41%	22%	8%	5%	13%	4%
The application forms were easy to complete	59%	19%	41%	22%	11%	5%	16%	2%
The process of filing an application was efficient	57%	18%	39%	20%	11%	10%	21%	1%
You were informed of everything you had to do to apply for intellectual property protection	52%	15%	37%	23%	12%	9%	22%	3%
The filing process was designed with your needs in mind	47%	14%	33%	26%	15%	9%	24%	3%

Q10 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the service provided by CIPO during the filing process?

SUBGROUP: Submitted an IP application in past 24 months

**Net agreement with statements about CIPO service during IP application
among those who submitted an application in past 24 months – by client group and IP type**

Net Overall agreement (strongly agree + agree) with statements about filing process service	2022 Total (n=1,198)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=273)	Unrepre- sented clients (n=712)	Mixed clients (n=70)	IP Profess- ionals (n=129)	Trade- mark (n=920)	Patent (n=185)	ID (n=93)
CIPO's searchable database was easy to use	61%	59%	61%	59%	74%	63%	57%	51%
CIPO's searchable database contained the information you needed.	61%	56%	62%	59%	64%	63%	53%	53%
The application forms were easy to complete	59%	67%	57%	46%	80%	59%	55%	70%
The process of filing an application was efficient	57%	64%	54%	60%	67%	57%	56%	60%
You were informed of everything you had to do to apply for intellectual property protection	52%	56%	49%	47%	67%	52%	48%	60%
The filing process was designed with your needs in mind	47%	52%	45%	41%	57%	46%	47%	58%

Q10 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the service provided by CIPO during the filing process?

SUBGROUP: Submitted an IP application in past 24 months

Agreement is fairly consistent across client types, with the exception that non-agent IP professionals tend to be notably more positive about the ease of use of the application forms (80%) and searchable database (74%), and that they were informed of everything needed to apply for IP protection (67%).

In terms of IP type, positive opinions about the usability of CIPO's searchable database tend to skew to trademark applicants, while ID applicants give higher marks for the application forms (70%), being informed of what they needed to apply (60%) and having a filing process designed to their needs (58%).

Net agreement with the statements regarding CIPO's application process is linked to overall satisfaction with CIPO's services.

C. EXAMINATION

1. Overall satisfaction with examination process services

Three in ten are satisfied with CIPO's examination services, which is outweighed by almost four in ten who are dissatisfied.

All clients were asked about how satisfied they were with the service provided by CIPO during the process of examining their IP application. Once again, there are mixed views: three in ten (30%) are satisfied, close to four in ten (38%) are dissatisfied, while the remainder are neutral (21%) or cannot say (11%).

Overall level of satisfaction with CIPO's service during the examination process

Level of satisfaction	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group*				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepre- sented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade- mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Net: satisfied	30%	28%	30%	36%	29%	27%	38%	40%
Very satisfied	9%	5%	10%	9%	4%	9%	10%	6%
Satisfied	21%	23%	19%	27%	25%	18%	28%	33%
Neutral	21%	17%	21%	19%	25%	20%	21%	28%
Net: dissatisfied	38%	49%	40%	27%	24%	45%	21%	17%
Dissatisfied	16%	19%	17%	5%	13%	18%	9%	12%
Very dissatisfied	22%	30%	23%	22%	11%	26%	11%	5%
Cannot say	11%	6%	9%	18%	22%	8%	20%	16%

Q11 The next few questions are about the examination of IP applications. Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided to you by CIPO during the process of examining an application for [IP TYPE: a patent / a trademark / an industrial design]?

Reported satisfaction levels are similar by client type. However, agents (49%) and unrepresented clients (40%) tend to express greater *dissatisfaction* than do mixed clients (27%) and other IP professionals (24%) who, in turn, are less likely to express an opinion.

Overall satisfaction is higher among those with patent or ID experience than those dealing with trademarks, who are notably more likely to be dissatisfied with examination services (45%, vs. 21% patent and 17% ID).

Satisfaction with examination services is linked to being satisfied with CIPO overall, as well as having received a registration or grant.

2. Reasons for dissatisfaction with examination process service

Clients dissatisfied with the examination process were asked the reasons for their dissatisfaction. The top reason is the slowness of the examination process, notably when compared to that of other countries, including complaints that the delay threatened their business (cited by 61%). Two in ten indicate they did not get updates on the application status. Fewer than one in ten cite other reasons for dissatisfaction, including length of time to get replies (7%), lack of necessary training for examiners (6%) and poor customer service (6%).

Reasons for dissatisfaction with CIPO service during IP examination process (top mentions)

Reasons for dissatisfaction	Total (n=592)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=162)	Unrepresented clients (n=358)	Mixed clients (n=25)*	IP Professionals (n=45)	Trade-mark (n=511)	Patent (n=59)	ID (n=22)*
Process takes long/too slow compared to other countries/delayed examination threatens our business	61%	76%	54%	BTS	80%	65%	31%	BTS
No communication to update us on the process status	21%	5%	27%		4%	22%	15%	
Takes forever to get a reply/answer inquiries/call back	7%	12%	6%		7%	6%	14%	
CIPO examiners lack proper/legal training	6%	20%	3%		9%	5%	20%	
Customer service is poor/rude/helpless	6%	4%	6%		7%	5%	15%	
Process is complicated/confusing/not easy to go through	6%	4%	7%		0%	5%	13%	
Inconsistency in examiners' work	5%	15%	1%		13%	5%	4%	
Illogical/unfounded objections presented in regards to Goods and Services mentioned in the application	5%	11%	3%		11%	5%	8%	
Other mentions (3% or less each for total sample)	16%	20%	16%		12%	15%	26%	
Prefer not to say	9%	6%	10%		9%	8%	11%	

Q12 You indicated that you are dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with the service provided by CIPO during the process of examining an application for [IP TYPE: a patent / a trademark / an industrial design]. Could you please explain why?

SUBGROUP: Those dissatisfied with the examination process

* BTS indicates base is too small to report (<30)

The process taking too long is the most prominent concern across subgroups but is higher among agents (76%) and other IP professionals (80%), and among those dealing with registering trademarks (65%). Agents also express greater concerns about the abilities of CIPO examiners (20%) and about inconsistent (15%) and illogical (11%) decisions; in turn, unrepresented clients express more concern about lack of communications (27%).

3. Agreement with statement about examination process service

Clients are relatively more likely to agree that examiners are knowledgeable, and that both examiners and their reports are easy to understand. They are least likely to agree that decisions are consistent across examiners, which may be due in part to relatively large proportions who cannot provide an opinion.

Clients were asked their level of agreement with a series of statements about examiners and the examination process. Agreement (strongly agree or agree) levels for aspects of the examination process were as follows, that examiners were easy to understand when spoken to directly (32%), that examiners were knowledgeable (30%), that their written reports are easy to understand (29%), that examiners were easy to reach (23%), that the examination process was designed with their needs in mind (21%), and that decisions are consistent between examiners (19%). For all statements, disagreement levels are low (ranging from 5% to 13%); instead, notable proportions are neutral (ranging from 17% to 23%) or cannot give an opinion (ranging from 34% to 45%).

Level of agreement with statements about CIPO service during examination

2022 Total (n=1,517)	Net Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
When you spoke to an examiner(s), they were easy to understand	32%	11%	21%	17%	5%	5%	9%	42%
Examiners were knowledgeable	30%	11%	19%	22%	5%	5%	10%	38%
The examiners' report(s) (i.e. office actions) is/are easy to understand	29%	9%	21%	21%	8%	8%	16%	34%
Examiners were easy to reach	23%	6%	14%	23%	12%	14%	11%	30%
The examination process was designed with your needs in mind	21%	6%	14%	23%	12%	14%	26%	30%
Decisions are consistent from one examiner to the next	%	6%	13%	20%	7%	8%	16%	45%

Q13 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the service provided by CIPO during examination?

**Net agreement with statements about CIPO service during examination
– by client group and IP type**

Net agreement (strongly and agree) with statements about CIPO service during examination	Client group					IP type		
	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
When you spoke to an examiner(s), they were easy to understand	32%	57%	27%	26%	34%	31%	36%	32%
Examiners were knowledgeable	30%	41%	28%	32%	30%	28%	38%	32%
The examiners' report(s) (i.e. office actions) is/are easy to understand	29%	47%	25%	27%	n/a	26%	39%	39%
Examiners were easy to reach	23%	35%	22%	19%	20%	21%	30%	25%
The examination process was designed with your needs in mind	21%	17%	22%	24%	17%	20%	23%	23%
Decisions are consistent from one examiner to the next	19%	24%	18%	19%	n/a	18%	21%	32%

Q13 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the service provided by CIPO during examination?

Agreement with most statements is higher among agents, the exception being that the examination process was designed with their needs in mind, where their responses are similar to others. Unrepresented and mixed clients and IP professionals are less likely than agents to hold an opinion about these statements.

By type of IP, agreement about the ease of understanding examiner reports is lower for trademarks (26%); agreement about the consistency of examiner decisions is higher for industrial design (32%).

Agreement with most statements is higher among represented and unrepresented clients with three or more IP applications in the past 24 months. Agreement with these statements about examination services is also linked to being satisfied with CIPO overall and to having received a registration or grant.

4. Overall satisfaction with written reports

One-quarter of clients are satisfied with the quality of office actions; once again, many are neutral or cannot give an opinion.

Clients (excluding IP professionals) were asked about their level of satisfaction with the quality of examiners' written reports (i.e., office actions). Most respondents (56%) were either neutral (20%) or could not give an opinion (36%). One-quarter of clients (26%) were satisfied, and (17%) were

dissatisfied; however, when removing cannot says from the measure, the net satisfaction adjusts to 41%, the net dissatisfaction (27%) and neutral (32%).

Overall level of satisfaction with quality of examiners' written report(s)

Level of satisfaction	2022 Total (n=1,332)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepre- sented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Profes- sionals	Trade- mark (n=1,015)	Patent (n=227)	ID (n=90)
Net: satisfied	26%	35%	24%	30%	n/a	22%	39%	42%
Very satisfied	8%	6%	8%	10%	n/a	7%	11%	9%
Satisfied	18%	29%	15%	20%	n/a	15%	28%	33%
Neutral	20%	26%	19%	19%	n/a	20%	20%	23%
Net: dissatisfied	17%	29%	16%	10%	n/a	17%	18%	16%
Dissatisfied	8%	19%	6%	2%	n/a	8%	10%	9%
Very dissatisfied	9%	9%	10%	8%	n/a	10%	9%	8%
Cannot say	36%	10%	41%	42%	n/a	40%	23%	19%

Q14 Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of examiners' written report (s) (i.e. office actions)?

Note: This question was not asked of non-agent IP professionals.

Satisfaction with the quality of office actions is highest among agents (35%), but they are also more likely than others to be dissatisfied (29%); pluralities of unrepresented and mixed clients are unable to say, potentially indicating a lack of familiarity with the details of examination. Overall satisfaction is higher among those dealing with a patent (39%) or ID (42%) registration; four in ten (40%) of those dealing with a trademark do not have an opinion.

Satisfaction with examiners' written reports, as with other measures, is correlated to overall satisfaction with CIPO, and linked to having successfully registered IP. Satisfaction increases among represented and unrepresented clients as their volume of IP applications increases (from 21% with one up to 35% with three or more).

5. Opinions about timeliness of office actions

Agreement that office actions are received in a reasonable amount of time is outweighed by those who disagree.

CIPO clients were asked about the timeliness of first and subsequent office actions. In both cases, disagreement outweighs agreement. Three in ten (29%) agree that first office actions are received within a reasonable amount of time, while four in ten disagree (41%); the remainder are neutral or do not have an opinion. Agreement about the timeliness of subsequent office actions (24%) is also outweighed by the proportion who disagree (42%).

Level of agreement with statements about office actions

2022 Total (n=1517)	Net agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
In general first office actions are received within a reasonable amount of time	29%	8%	22%	15%	13%	28%	41%	14%
You received subsequent office actions within a reasonable amount of time	24%	6%	18%	17%	15%	27%	42%	17%

Q15 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Agreement that first office actions are timely is lower among agents (23%) and other IP professionals (21%) than among unrepresented (32%) and mixed (29%) clients. However, agents are most likely of all client groups to agree subsequent communications were timely (32%). Agreement with both statements is lower among those dealing with trademark applications.

**Net agreement with statements about office actions
– by client group and IP type**

Net agreement (strongly and agree) with statements about CIPO service during examination	Client group				IP type		
	Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
In general first office actions are received within a reasonable amount of time	23%	32%	29%	21%	28%	35%	30%
You received subsequent office actions within a reasonable amount of time	32%	22%	26%	26%	20%	37%	36%

Q15 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Agreement about the timeliness of office actions is higher among clients who are satisfied with CIPO services overall and those who have received a registration or grant.

6. Accelerated examination services

Roughly three in ten agents and non-agent IP professionals have used CIPO's accelerated examination services, in comparison to only four percent of represented and unrepresented clients ; six in ten users are satisfied with this service.

a) Use of accelerated examination service

CIPO clients were asked if they used CIPO's premium accelerated examination service in the past 24 months. One in ten clients (11%) have overall, but this group skews in favour of agents (31%), and IP professionals (28%) relative to over unrepresented (4%) and mixed (3%) clients.

Use of accelerated examination service

If used accelerated examination service	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trademark (n=317)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Yes	11%	31%	4%	3%	28%	7%	24%	16%
No	77%	60%	84%	82%	58%	80%	62%	77%
Not sure	13%	9%	13%	14%	14%	13%	14%	8%

Q16 In the past 24 months, did you use CIPO's accelerated examination service (a premium service used to fast-track the examination)?

Patent filers are more likely to have used the service (24%) than are ID (16%) or trademark (7%) filers.

Use of the accelerated service is higher among those who report receiving a registration or grant (23% vs 3%). Use is also higher among agents with international IP clients (35% vs. 9% without) and among client organizations with 100 or more employees (34%, vs. 7% with fewer).

b) Overall satisfaction with accelerated examination service

Clients who used the accelerated examination service (n=193) were asked to rate their overall level of satisfaction with it. Six in ten (61%) express satisfaction, two in ten are neutral, and another two in ten are dissatisfied.

**Satisfaction with CIPO's accelerated examination service
- among users of the service**

If used accelerated examination service	2022 (n=193)
Net: satisfied	61%
Very satisfied	17%
Satisfied	44%
Neutral	20%
Net: dissatisfied	19%
Dissatisfied	9%
Very dissatisfied	10%

Q17 Overall, how satisfied are you with CIPO's accelerated examination service?

SUBGROUP: Used CIPO's accelerated examination service

The subgroup bases for those using this service are small and further analysis is not advisable.

D. REGISTRATION OR GRANT

1. Received registered TM or ID or granted patent in past 24 months

One-third of all clients, but three-quarters of agents, have successfully received an IP registration/grant in the past 24 months.

One-third (36%) of clients successfully received a registered trademark or industrial design, or a granted patent, in the past 24 months. This skews strongly to agents (74%) and IP professionals (68%), who typically represent multiple clients.

Reported success is higher for receiving a registered ID (51%) or granted patent (41%) than a trademark registration (33%).

Received a registered TM, granted patent or registered ID in past 24 months

Received a registered TM or ID or granted patent in past 24 months	2022
Total (n=1,517)	36%
Agents (n=329)	74%
Unrepresented clients (n=892)	23%
Mixed clients (n=91)	31%
IP professionals (n=185)	68%
Trademark (n=1,097)	33%
Patent (n=290)	41%
Industrial design (n=130)	51%

Q18 In the past 24 months, did you receive [IP TYPE: a registered trademark(s) / a granted patent(s) / a registered Industrial Design(s)] [AGENTS/IPPRO: on behalf of your clients]?

The likelihood of successfully receiving IP registration/grant increases as volume of applications in process in the past two years increases (43% of those with three or more applications, vs. 19% with one and 34% with two). Application success also tends to increase with business size (22% with no employees, up to 83% with 500 or more).

Among agents and IP professionals, their success in receiving IP registration/grant in the past 24 months is linked to having a longer tenure in the IP field (79% with more than ten years in the IP field, vs. 54% with ten years or less) and having international clients who are pursuing Canadian IP (79%, vs. 42% without).

The proportion who received registered or granted IP is highest among those indicating work in the professional/scientific/technical industries (59%) and information/cultural industries (54%) and lower for those in resources/ construction/secondary (38%) and other service (42%) industries.

2. Overall satisfaction with time to receive registered/granted IP

More than four in ten who received an IP registration/grant in the past 24 months are satisfied with the length of time it took.

Among those who received IP registration or grant in the past 24 months, over four in ten (43%) are satisfied with the length of time it took, while one-third (34%) are dissatisfied and one-quarter (23%) are neutral.

Overall level of satisfaction with time it took to receive registered TM/granted patent/registered ID among those who received IP registration/grant in past 24 months

Level of satisfaction	2022 Total (n=608)	Client group			IP type		
		Agents (n=244)	Unrepresented clients (n=205)	IP Professionals (n=125)	Trade-mark (n=403)	Patent (n=133)	ID (n=72)
Net: satisfied	43%	34%	49%	44%	39%	62%	34%
Very satisfied	9%	4%	13%	4%	10%	6%	3%
Satisfied	34%	30%	36%	40%	28%	56%	32%
Neutral	23%	18%	20%	34%	19%	28%	40%
Net: dissatisfied	34%	48%	31%	22%	42%	10%	26%
Dissatisfied	15%	15%	16%	13%	18%	4%	21%
Very dissatisfied	18%	33%	15%	9%	25%	6%	4%

Q19 Overall, how satisfied are you with the time it took to receive [SELECT BASED ON IP TYPE: a registered trademark(s) / a granted patent(s) / a registered Industrial Design(s)]?

SUBGROUP: Received registered TM, granted patent or registered ID in past 24 months

Note: Sample size too small to report represented (n=6) or mixed (n=28) clients

Agents are the most likely to have successfully received IP registration (on behalf of their clients), but this group is relatively less satisfied with the amount of time it took (34%). In turn, unrepresented clients are less likely to have successfully received IP, but among those who did, satisfaction with the length of the process (49%) is higher than for agents.

Satisfaction with time to receive IP registration is highest among those reporting on patents (62%) versus trademarks (39%) or industrial design (34%). In turn, trademark clients are most likely to be dissatisfied with the length of time it took to receive their registration (42%, vs. 26% for industrial design and 10% for patents).

E. ADDITIONAL SERVICE ASPECTS

1. Perceptions about aspects of CIPO service

Minorities of clients agree with statements about access to CIPO employees and to relevant documents; just over one-third agree they got the information they needed.

Clients were asked their level of agreement with five statements about aspects of CIPO's service. Agreement (strongly agree or agree) is relatively higher that they could easily access documents pertaining to their files (40%), that CIPO provided the information they needed in the end (38%) and that they were able to get through to a CIPO employee using their preferred channel (34%).

Agreement is relatively lower that it was clear whom to contact to receive CIPO service (25%; outweighed by 40% who disagree) and that it was easy to reach the right person (23%, vs. 35% disagree).

Net agreement with most statements is generally similar by client type. However, this pattern differs for "in the end, CIPO provided you with the information you needed," where agreement is higher among agents (46%) and other IP professionals (46%) than among unrepresented (35%) and mixed (37%) clients.

Agreement with these statements is generally similar by IP type, but patent clients are more likely than others to agree they were able to get through to a CIPO employee by their preferred method (43%, vs. 32% trademark and 30% ID).

Level of agreement with statements about aspects of CIPO service

2022 Total (n=1517)	Net agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
You were easily able to access documents pertaining to your file(s)	40%	10%	29%	22%	14%	12%	26%	13%
In the end, CIPO provided you with the information you needed	38%	10%	29%	22%	13%	13%	26%	14%
You were able to get through to a CIPO employee by your preferred channel (e.g. phone, email, in-person)	34%	9%	25%	19%	12%	12%	24%	23%
It is clear who to contact within CIPO to receive service	25%	7%	18%	20%	21%	19%	40%	15%
It is easy to reach the right CIPO employee to address your problem or need	23%	6%	17%	20%	19%	17%	35%	22%

Q21 Still thinking about CIPO's service related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial designs], to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

**Net agreement with statements about aspects of CIPO service
– by client group and IP type**

Net agreement (strongly agree + agree) with statements about CIPO service	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
You were easily able to access documents pertaining to your file(s)	40%	36%	41%	38%	38%	39%	44%	36%
In the end, CIPO provided you with the information you needed	38%	46%	35%	37%	46%	36%	45%	42%
You were able to get through to a CIPO employee by your preferred channel (e.g. phone, email, in-person)	34%	35%	34%	26%	37%	32%	43%	30%
It is clear who to contact within CIPO to receive service	25%	24%	25%	20%	28%	25%	28%	20%
It is easy to reach the right CIPO employee to address your problem or need	23%	23%	23%	20%	22%	21%	28%	24%

Q21 Still thinking about CIPO's service related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial designs], to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Net agreement with these statements is linked to overall satisfaction with CIPO and to having received registered or granted IP.

2. Overall satisfaction with ease of access to service

One in three are satisfied with their ability to access CIPO's services, with a similar proportion who are dissatisfied or neutral.

Satisfaction levels with the ease of accessing CIPO's services are mixed: one-third (35%) are satisfied, another third (34%) are dissatisfied and three in ten (31%) are neutral.

Overall level of satisfaction with ease of access to CIPO's services

Level of satisfaction	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepre- sented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Profes- sionals (n=185)	Trade- mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Net: satisfied	35%	33%	35%	37%	36%	34%	41%	31%
Very satisfied	6%	3%	8%	9%	3%	7%	7%	3%
Satisfied	29%	31%	28%	29%	33%	27%	4%	28%
Neutral	31%	27%	30%	29%	38%	32%	25%	39%
Net: dissatisfied	34%	29%	35%	34%	25%	34%	34%	30%
Dissatisfied	19%	27%	17%	16%	21%	18%	18%	21%
Very dissatisfied	15%	12%	18%	18%	4%	16%	15%	9%

Q22 Overall, how satisfied were you with the ease of accessing CIPO's services?

Satisfaction is higher among those filing patents (41%) than other types of IP; satisfaction does not vary significantly by client type.

There are a few other noteworthy subgroup differences. Satisfaction with access to service is higher among those with two or more applications in the past two years (42% vs, 32% with only one) and among agents and other IP professionals with 10 years or less of experience (42%, vs. 31% with 11 or more). Satisfaction is strongly correlated to level of satisfaction with CIPO services overall and is also higher among those who received an IP registration or grant.

3. Reasons for dissatisfaction with ease of accessing CIPO's services

Clients dissatisfied with ease of access to CIPO's services were asked the reasons for their dissatisfaction. Dissatisfied clients give a range of responses, with the top two being the process of appointing the examiner takes too long (20%) and having trouble contacting CIPO staff, which some attribute to an inefficient phone system (18%). Other concerns include a confusing website to navigate (14%) and not receiving updates on the status of their application (11%). Fewer than one in ten give other individual reasons for being dissatisfied, including not knowing who to contact (8%) or difficulty logging into the new online system (5%).

Reasons for dissatisfaction with each of accessing CIPO's services (top mentions)

Reasons for dissatisfaction	Total (n=518)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=129)	Unrepresented clients (n=311)	Mixed clients (n=31)	IP Professionals (n=47)	Trade-mark (n=380)	Patent (n=99)	ID (n=39)
Too long process of appointing an examiner/need more staff	20%	12%	22%	29%	9%	24%	6%	13%
Inefficient central phone system/ phone calls are not answered/ returned in real time/ impossible to talk to an agent	18%	36%	13%	6%	34%	17%	17%	35%
Confusing website/not easy to navigate/find required information/documents	14%	8%	14%	26%	13%	14%	15%	7%
No confirmation/update of application status/ should be able to track application online	11%	6%	12%	19%	11%	12%	8%	14%
Contact information not available/don't know who to contact	8%	19%	5%	3%	6%	7%	10%	7%
New online system does not work/inaccessible/difficult to log in account	5%	11%	3%	6%	11%	4%	10%	10%
Poor service provided/no one cares to help/to provide needed information/explanation	5%	4%	5%	0%	4%	4%	7%	3%
Workers lack knowledge/efficiency/proper training	4%	12%	2%	6%	2%	3%	9%	2%
Difficult/complicated to fill out application/don't know what information goes where	4%	5%	4%	3%	2%	4%	4%	3%
Other mentions (3% or less each for total sample)	20%	25%	19%	18%	29%	17%	32%	17%
Prefer not to say	24%	24%	25%	19%	21%	25%	20%	27%

Q23 You indicated that you were [very dissatisfied/dissatisfied] regarding the ease of accessing CIPO's services, could you please explain why?

SUBGROUP: Those dissatisfied with ease of access to services

While comments are generally similar across most subgroups, agents and other IP professionals are more likely than other clients to mention issues with the central phone system and with the new online system. Agents are also the most likely to raise concerns about a lack of contact information (19%) and a lack of staff knowledge or efficiency (13%).

4. Awareness of the status of the IP application

One in three agree they were aware of the status of their IP application throughout.

Equal proportions of clients agree (36%) and disagree (36%) that they were aware of the status of the IP application(s) at all stages of the process; two in ten are neutral and six percent cannot say.

Level of agreement that you were aware of the IP application status at all stages of the process

Level of agreement	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unre- presented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Profes- sionals (n=185)	Trade- mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Net: agree	36%	42%	34%	33%	44%	35%	40%	32%
Strongly agree	8%	9%	8%	11%	7%	8%	7%	7%
Agree	28%	33%	26%	22%	37%	27%	33%	25%
Neutral	22%	22%	20%	26%	26%	21%	23%	25%
Net: disagree	36%	32%	40%	32%	22%	38%	27%	36%
Disagree	18%	22%	18%	16%	18%	18%	17%	25%
Strongly disagree	18%	11%	23%	15%	4%	21%	10%	12%
Cannot say	6%	4%	6%	9%	8%	6%	9%	6%

Q24 To what extent do you agree or disagree that: You were aware of the status of the IP application(s) at all stages of the process

Agreement that they were aware of the status of their IP application throughout the process is higher among agents (42%) and IP professionals (44%) than for unrepresented (34%) and mixed (33%) clients. Agreement is statistically similar by IP type.

Overall agreement increases along with number of applications in the past 24 months and is highest among those three or more applications (44%). Agreement also increases along with company size (from 35% with fewer than 100 employees to 49% with 500 or more). As with many other measures, agreement is linked to having received or been granted IP, and to being more satisfied with CIPO overall.

5. Opinions about CIPO staff

Less than half agree with positive statements about CIPO staff, with the exception that seven in ten agree they have been provided service in their language of choice.

Clients were asked their level of agreement about eight statements pertaining to CIPO staff. Agreement (strongly agree or agree) is strongest that they received service in their preferred official language (72%). Almost half (47%) agree CIPO staff were professional. One-third or fewer agree with other positive statements, while roughly similar proportions are not adequately familiar to provide a rating.

Agreement levels for most of these statements are generally higher among agents and other IP professionals than among unrepresented and mixed clients. However, agreement was similar across client types for two items: that “any issues that you encountered in the service process were easily resolved” and “CIPO staff went the extra mile to make sure you got what you needed.”

Agreement is also reasonably similar by IP type, although those reporting on patent applications are more likely to agree they received service in the official language of their choice (82%) and that staff take a reasonable amount of time to respond (43%).

Level of agreement with statements about CIPO service provision

2022 Total (n=1,517)	Net agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
You were provided service in the official language of your choice	72%	31%	41%	9%	1%	3%	4%	15%
CIPO staff were professional	47%	8%	17%	23%	12%	12%	7%	28%
CIPO staff understood your needs	35%	10%	26%	21%	7%	8%	15%	29%
CIPO staff (other than examiners), such as frontline and support staff, were knowledgeable	33%	10%	23%	22%	6%	6%	12%	34%
CIPO staff understand importance of their role in the IP process	32%	9%	22%	22%	7%	8%	14%	32%
CIPO staff takes a reasonable amount of time to respond to enquiries and requests	31%	9%	22%	18%	12%	16%	29%	23%
Any issues that you encountered in the service process were easily resolved	26%	7%	18%	24%	13%	11%	25%	26%
CIPO staff went the extra mile to make sure you got what you needed	25%	8%	17%	23%	12%	12%	24%	28%

Q25 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements when thinking about CIPO's service related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial designs]?

**Net agreement with statements about CIPO service provision
– by client group and IP type**

Net agreement (strongly + agree) with statements about aspects of CIPO service	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
You were provided service in the official language of your choice	72%	81%	69%	67%	82%	70%	82%	70%
CIPO staff were professional	47%	67%	40%	43%	74%	42%	63%	56%
CIPO staff understood your needs	35%	45%	31%	31%	52%	33%	42%	43%
CIPO staff (other than examiners), such as frontline and support staff, were knowledgeable	33%	42%	30%	33%	44%	31%	41%	33%
CIPO staff understand importance of their role in the IP process	32%	37%	29%	31%	43%	29%	40%	35%
CIPO staff takes a reasonable amount of time to respond to enquiries and requests	31%	36%	29%	33%	35%	28%	43%	28%
Any issues that you encountered in the service process were easily resolved	26%	29%	24%	26%	30%	24%	30%	29%
CIPO staff went the extra mile to make sure you got what you needed	25%	25%	23%	25%	34%	23%	32%	26%

Q25 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements when thinking about CIPO's service related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial designs]?

Agreement with these statements is linked to satisfaction with CIPO overall, and to having received a IP registration or grant in the previous 24 months. Agreement with all statements is also highest among the largest firms (500 or more employees).

6. Online service

In terms of CIPO's online service, agreement is highest that online transactions are easy to complete and information provided via the CIPO website will be protected.

a) Opinions about CIPO's online services and information offerings

Clients were asked their level of agreement with nine statements regarding different aspects of CIPO's online service. Just over half agree (strongly agree and agree) it is easy to complete online transactions (56%), and that they are confident personal information will be protected (54%). Similarly, half agree the web site had the information they were looking for (51%) and that online services are easy to find (51%). Fewer than half agree with other statements, with the lowest levels of agreement for the website being designed with their needs in mind (36%) and that online services are consistent across business lines (26% among those with experience with more than one type of IP). Four in ten (43%) agree with a statement that CIPO's online services are consistently available without interruption.

Level of agreement with statements about CIPO's online service

2022 Total (n=1,517)	Net agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
It is easy to complete online transactions	56%	15%	42%	20%	11%	9%	18%	5%
You are confident that personal information provided through CIPO's website is protected	54%	16%	38%	24%	3%	4%	7%	14%
CIPO's website had the information you were looking for	51%	11%	40%	25%	12%	7%	19%	4%
CIPO's online services are easy to find	51%	11%	40%	22%	13%	9%	22%	4%
CIPO's online services are consistently available without interruption.	43%	12%	31%	22%	14%	9%	23%	12%
CIPO's online services met your needs	43%	10%	34%	26%	14%	11%	26%	5%
The information you were looking for online was easy to find	43%	9%	33%	27%	16%	10%	26%	4%
CIPO's website was designed with your needs in mind	36%	8%	27%	30%	16%	12%	27%	27%
CIPO's online services are consistent across the business lines (i.e., Patent, Trademark, Industrial Design)** (n=237)	26%	2%	24%	21%	26%	16%	42%	10%

Q26 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

****SUBGROUP:** Those with multiple LOB. Note that clients only reported overlap in patent and industrial design experience; no clients responding about trademarks also reported either patent or industrial design experience. This is a function of the survey prioritization, whereby clients with patent or industrial design experience were asked about those LOB to ensure sufficient representation.

**Net agreement with statements about CIPO's online service
– by client group and IP type**

Net agreement (strongly agree and agree) with statements about CIPO's online service	Client group					IP type		
	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
It is easy to complete online transactions	56%	56%	57%	43%	66%	58%	51%	53%
You are confident that personal information provided through CIPO's website is protected	54%	50%	55%	45%	61%	54%	59%	47%
CIPO's website had the information you were looking for	51%	47%	53%	44%	52%	51%	52%	45%
CIPO's online services are easy to find	51%	53%	50%	45%	59%	52%	48%	48%
CIPO's online services are consistently available without interruption.	43%	33%	49%	43%	22%	46%	35%	28%
CIPO's online services met your needs	43%	43%	44%	35%	46%	44%	39%	43%
The information you were looking for online was easy to find	43%	40%	43%	38%	46%	44%	40%	33%
CIPO's website was designed with your needs in mind	36%	31%	38%	29%	31%	37%	32%	27%
CIPO's online services are consistent across the business lines (i.e., Patent, Trademark, Industrial Design)**	n=237** 26%	n=98** 24%	n=51** 41%	n=12* BTS	n=69** 16%	-	n=120** 31%	n=117** 21%

Q26 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

* BTS indicates base is too small to report (<30)

**SUBGROUP: Those with multiple LOB. Note that clients only reported overlap in patent and industrial design experience; no clients responding about trademarks also reported either patent or industrial design experience. This is a function of the survey prioritization, whereby clients with patent or industrial design experience were asked about those LOB to ensure sufficient representation.

Agreement is reasonably similar for agents and unrepresented clients; mixed clients are somewhat less likely to agree and more likely to not be able to say. IP professionals are more likely than other client types to agree it is easy to complete online transactions (66%) and least likely to agree that CIPO's online services are consistently available without interruption (22%). The latter statement is highest among trademark clients (46%); otherwise, agreement about CIPO's online services is generally similar by IP type.

Agreement is similar by region, industry and business size, but as for other measures, is higher for most statements among clients who have received an IP registration/grant and those who are satisfied with CIPO overall.

b) Why online services have not met needs

Clients who say their needs are not being met by CIPO’s online services (27% of total sample) were asked to elaborate further (open-ended, without selecting from pre-defined response options).

The main concerns are the time it takes to complete each step of the process (17%) and the website is not user friendly or easy to navigate, and perceptions of being poorly designed and outdated (17%). Other concerns relate to not knowing the status of the application, including not receiving feedback or follow-up on their application (12%), not being able to communicate with personnel/slow response (12%), the complexity of the process (9%) and problems accessing the file history (9%).

Why CIPO’s online services have not met needs-top mentions

Reasons for not having needs met	2022 (n=395)
Takes too long time to complete each step of the process/similar processes is done much faster in the US	17%
Website is not user friendly/not easy to navigate/poorly designed/outdated	17%
No feedback/follow up on application/not knowing the status of my filing	12%
Unable to communicate with personnel/slow to respond to my requests/questions	12%
Very complex/too difficult to understand process	9%
Problem finding/accessing CIPO file history for reviewing/records are split into multiple tabs rather than one	9%
Trademarks database is not user friendly/requires too many clicks to get to application basic information	6%
CIPO employees not helpful/little effort on their part to assist	5%
Compared to other systems (ex. USPTO) CIPO online services are lacking	4%
No clear instructions to what to do/steps to follow	4%
Payment related issues (can't pay online, can't print a payment receipt)	3%
Prefer not to say	21%

Q27 You indicated that CIPO’s online services have not met your needs. In what ways were your needs not met?

SUBGROUP: Those who disagreed that CIPO’s online service met their needs

There are minimal differences in response by client type and IP type. Unrepresented clients are the most likely to say they got no feedback or follow-up on their application (15%, vs. 7% of agents and 5% of other IP professionals), and are also more likely to say the process took too long (21%, vs. 13% of agents and 11% of other IP professionals). Concerns about the length of the process are also more widespread among those filing trademark applications (20%, vs. 10% for patents and 8% for ID).

7. Opinions about payment process

There is widespread agreement that the electronic payment process is easy to use. Four in ten agree payment questions are answered in a timely manner.

Clients agree CIPO's payment process is easy to use (73%); few clients disagree with this statement (7%); the remainder are neutral (15%) or cannot say (6%).

Four in ten (40%) agree that questions about payment status are answered promptly. In this case, a sizeable proportion cannot say (32%; presumably because they did not need to ask any questions) or are neutral (19%); few disagree (9%).

Level of agreement with statements about CIPO's payment process

2022 Total (n=1,517)	Net agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
CIPO's electronic payment process is easy to use	73%	24%	48%	15%	3%	4%	7%	6%
Questions regarding payment status are answered in a timely manner	40%	12%	27%	19%	4%	5%	9%	32%

Q28 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Net agreement with statements about CIPO's payment process – by client group and IP type

Net agreement (strongly + agree) with statements about payments	Client group					IP type		
	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
CIPO's electronic payment process is easy to use	73%	73%	73%	59%	85%	76%	59%	69%
Questions regarding payment status are answered in a timely manner	40%	38%	41%	37%	34%	41%	37%	31%

Q28 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Agreement that the payment system is easy to use is the dominant response across client types but is higher among IP professionals (85%) and lowest among mixed clients (59%). Agreement with this is also lower among those who filed patents (59%, with 18% who disagree).

Agreement with both statements is higher among those who are satisfied with CIPO overall, and those who received an IP registration or grant.

8. Opinions about consistency and error management

Over one-third of clients agree they received a consistent level of service during their interactions with CIPO; fewer indicate CIPO does not make mistakes or that it is easy to have errors corrected, in part due to the number who cannot give an opinion.

Clients were asked to indicate their level of agreement with three statements pertaining to CIPO's consistency and error management. Agreement (strongly agree or agree) is highest for consistency in level of service received by CIPO during all interactions, with just over one-third of clients agreeing (37%). One in four (24%) agree CIPO does not make mistakes/errors when providing services, on par with the proportion (26%) who disagree, with sizeable proportions who provide either a neutral response (23%) or no response at all (28%).

Similarly, when asked whether it is easy to have errors corrected by CIPO, many clients appear not to have encountered this issue and, as a result, most provide a neutral response (25%) or are unable to answer (38%). Two in ten of all clients agree (20%) and a similar proportion disagrees (19%).

There are few notable differences in agreement by client group. Non-agent IP professionals are the most likely to agree they received a consistent level of service during all interactions (45%). Agents and IP professionals are less likely than others to say CIPO does not make mistakes (18% and 16% respectively), but relatively more likely to agree it is easy to have errors corrected (25% and 24%, respectively).

Level of agreement with statements about consistency and error management

2022 Total (n=1,517)	Net agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Net disagree	Cannot say
Overall, you received a consistent level of service during all interactions with CIPO	37%	9%	28%	25%	12%	9%	21%	17%
Overall, CIPO does not make mistakes/errors when providing services	24%	6%	17%	23%	15%	11%	26%	28%
It is easy to have errors corrected by CIPO	20%	5%	15%	25%	10%	9%	19%	36%

Q29 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

**Net agreement with statements about consistency and error management
– by client group and IP type**

Net agreement (strongly agree and agree) with statements about consistency and error management	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Overall, you received a consistent level of service during all interactions with CIPO	37%	36%	36%	36%	45%	35%	45%	36%
Overall, CIPO does not make mistakes/errors when providing services	24%	18%	26%	25%	16%	24%	24%	18%
It is easy to have errors corrected by CIPO	20%	25%	18%	15%	24%	18%	25%	19%

Q29 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Agreement is generally similar by IP type, and is higher among those with three or more IP applications, agents and IP professionals with 10 or fewer years of experience, those who received an IP registration or grant, and those satisfied with CIPO overall.

9. Opinions about service cost

Close to four in ten clients agree the products and services CIPO provides are worth the cost.

There are mixed views about whether CIPO products & services are worth the cost: under four in ten (37%) agree compared to one-quarter (24%) who disagree, with the remainder who are neutral (29%) or cannot say (9%).

Level of agreement that CIPO products and services are worth the cost

Level of agreement	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Client group				IP type		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP Professionals (n=185)	Trade-mark (n=1,097)	Patent (n=290)	ID (n=130)
Net: agree	37%	43%	36%	44%	34%	36%	43%	32%
Strongly agree	8%	9%	8%	13%	4%	9%	6%	5%
Agree	29%	34%	28%	31%	29%	27%	37%	26%
Neutral	29%	31%	27%	24%	39%	29%	26%	37%
Net: disagree	24%	23%	27%	24%	12%	25%	21%	22%
Disagree	12%	12%	12%	12%	8%	12%	9%	10%
Strongly disagree	13%	11%	15%	12%	4%	13%	12%	12%
Cannot say	9%	3%	10%	8%	15%	10%	9%	10%

Q30 To what extent do you agree or disagree that: Products and/or services that CIPO provides are worth the cost

Agreement is higher among those registering a patent (43%) than those dealing with trademarks (36%) or industrial design (32%); it is also higher among agents (43%) compared to unrepresented clients (36%) and IP professionals (34%). Agreement increases as number of applications increases (from 32% with one, up to 55% with three or more).

Level of agreement that CIPO products/services are worth the cost is strongly correlated with level of satisfaction with CIPO services overall, and is also higher among those who have received a registration or grant.



F. OTHER SERVICES

1. Opposition/summary cancellation proceedings

Over one in ten clients – including half of agents - were involved in opposition or summary cancellation proceedings in the past 24 months. Half are satisfied with the service received from CIPO related to the proceedings; those who are dissatisfied mainly say it took too long.

a) *Involvement in opposition/summary cancellation proceedings*

Clients who have had experience with trademarks over the past 24 months were asked whether they have been involved in any opposition/summary cancellation proceedings during that time. Overall, more than one in ten (14%) have. Involvement skews heavily to agents (51%) over unrepresented (5%) and mixed (9%) clients. As well, one-third of non-agent IP professionals had experience with opposition/summary cancellation proceedings in the past two years.

Involvement in opposition/summary cancellation proceedings in past 24 months among those with trademark experience

Involved in opposition/ summary cancellation proceedings	2022
Total (n=1,268)	14%
Agents (n=265)	51%
Unrepresented clients (n=794)	5%
Mixed clients (n=77)	9%
IP professionals (n=114)	33%

Q31 *In the past 24 months, were you involved in any opposition proceedings or summary cancellation proceedings?*

SUBGROUP: Experience with trademarks in past 24 months

Involvement in these types of proceedings is more widespread among more experienced agents and non-agent IP professionals and those with international IP clients.

b) Overall satisfaction with CIPO service during opposition or summary cancellation proceeding(s)

Half (53%) of clients who have been involved in opposition/summary cancellation proceedings in the past 24 months are satisfied with the service provided by CIPO during this process. The remainder are almost equally divided between those who are neutral (26%) or dissatisfied (21%) with their experience. The subsample size is too small to examine results by subgroup.

Overall level of satisfaction with CIPO service during opposition or summary cancellation proceeding(s) among those with experience in past 24 months

Level of satisfaction	2022 (n=223)
Net: satisfied	53%
Very satisfied	9%
Satisfied	43%
Neutral	26%
Net: dissatisfied	21%
Dissatisfied	13%
Very dissatisfied	9%

Q32 Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by CIPO during your experience with an opposition proceeding(s) or a summary cancellation proceeding(s)? Please note: we are interested in your degree of satisfaction with the service you received, rather than with any decision that was made as a result of the proceedings.

SUBGROUP: Experience with opposition or summary cancellation proceedings in past 24 months

c) Reasons for dissatisfaction with CIPO service during opposition or summary cancellation proceeding(s)

Among the small number (n=44) involved in opposition/summary cancellation proceedings in the past 24 months and dissatisfied with CIPO’s service related to this, the main reason for being unhappy is the length of time of the proceeding (29%). One in ten mention they did not receive a callback, and a similar proportion (8%) say too many mistakes were made by CIPO staff. Other reasons include not having money refunded, staff not being knowledgeable, and the opposition board appearing to bend the rules.

Why dissatisfied with CIPO’s during opposition or summary cancellation proceeding(s)

Reasons for not having needs met	2022 (n=44*)
The time these proceedings take is too long	29%
No call back received	11%
Too many mistakes made by CIPO staff	8%
My money was not refunded after cancelling my application	7%
Workers are inconsistent in their decisions/lack knowledge and training	6%
Was not informed about the status of my application	6%
Opposition board bends the rules to how they prefer	5%
Other mentions (3% or less each for total sample)	10%
Prefer not to say	32%

Q33. You indicated that you are (dissatisfied/very dissatisfied) with the service provided by CIPO during your experience with opposition proceeding(s) or a summary cancellation proceeding. Could you please explain why?

*Note: Small base (<50); caution is advised in interpreting results.

2. Experience with Patent Appeal Board

Few clients have recent experience with the Patent Appeal Board, and this skews to agents.

Overall, few clients (7%) had experience with the Patent Appeal Board in the past 24 months. Since dealing with the Board is a more complex undertaking, agents (13%) are more likely to have done so than the other client groups.

Of the small number who had experience with the Board (n=31), more than half (56%) are satisfied, one in five (18%) are neutral and one-quarter (26%) are dissatisfied.

Experience with Patent Appeal Board in past 24 months

Experience with Patent Appeal Board	2022
Total (n=408)	7%
Agents (n=135)	13%
Unrepresented clients (n=141)	5%
IP professionals (n=100)	6%

Q34 *In the past 24 months, have you had experience with the Patent Appeal Board?*

SUBGROUP: Experience with patents/ID in past 24 months

Q35 *Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by CIPO during your experience with the Patent Appeal Board?
Please note: we are interested in your degree of satisfaction with the service you received, rather than with any decision that was made by the Patent Appeal Board.*

SUBGROUP: Experience with Patent Appeal Board (n=31) NOTE: SMALL BASE SIZE.

G. INFORMATION SERVICES

1. CIPO IP Educational Services

a) Awareness of CIPO educational services

There is limited awareness of CIPO's IP education services among represented and unrepresented clients.

Agents, represented and unrepresented clients were asked if they knew about the educational services CIPO offers. One-quarter (25%) are aware CIPO offers services to raise the awareness of and educate Canadians about IP. This is heavily skewed to agents (74%).

If aware of CIPO IP educational services

Aware of CIPO IP educational services	2022 Total excl IPPRO (n=1,332)	Agents (n=329)	Unrep/rep/mixed clients (n=1,003)
Yes	25%	74%	15%
No	65%	20%	74%
Not sure	10%	6%	11%

Note: this question was not asked of non-agent IP professionals

Q36 Before today, were you aware that CIPO offers services to raise awareness of and educate Canadians about Intellectual Property? These services include a range of informational material about IP, seminars and events, as well as access to CIPO staff who can help you better understand the value of IP and discuss your IP strategy.

Awareness of CIPO's IP education services is higher among mixed clients (25%) than among unrepresented clients (14%); the subsample size of represented clients is too small to report.

b) Usefulness of IP Educational Services

Six in ten represented and unrepresented clients agree CIPO's IP educational services are useful to businesses/individuals.

Regardless of their level of awareness of CIPO's IP education services, represented and unrepresented clients were also asked how useful they believe such services are to businesses like theirs. Overall, six in ten (60%) either strongly agree or agree that these services are useful, compared to around one in ten (8%) who disagree. The remainder are neutral (22%) or have no opinion (9%).

Level of agreement that IP educational services are useful to businesses/individuals

Level of agreement	Unrep/rep/mixed clients (n=1,003)
Net: agree	60%
Strongly agree	26%
Agree	34%
Neutral	22%
Net: disagree	8%
Disagree	4%
Strongly disagree	4%
Cannot say	9%

Note: this question was not asked of agents nor non-agent IP professionals

Q37 To what extent do you agree or disagree that these types of IP services are useful to businesses like yours or individuals like you?

SUBGROUP: Unrepresented, represented and mixed clients

Agreement about the usefulness of these educational services is statistically similar across client and IP type.

Those who are not satisfied overall with CIPO and those who did not receive an IP grant or registration are less likely to believe that these educational services would be of use to them.

c) Suggestions for IP educational products

Agents aware of CIPO’s IP education services (n=242) were asked what IP information products CIPO should be producing to better prepare Canadians and Canadian businesses seeking IP protection. Most of this group did not provide suggestions, and the most mentioned comment, by one in ten, was to focus resources on timely processing rather than on public education. Other comments indicate agents feel Canadians and Canadian businesses seeking IP protection are best served by referring them to professionals like themselves.

Suggestions for IP information products

Suggestions	Agents 2022 (n=242)
Better focus on timely processing of applications than spending time and resources on educating public about IP	9%
Real world practitioners/professionals to assist in information sessions to provide practical advice and viewpoint	6%
Better to refer them to professionals	5%
Better documentation of procedures for dealing with CIPO/making them easy to access online	3%
CIPO should improve their knowledge/organizational expertise to guide/educate Canadian businesses on importance of IP protection	2%
Improving service quality	2%
CIPO's Patent Database should have complete electronic file wrapper for each patent and patent application	2%
Improve website	2%
Make information about your backlog more transparent to people	2%
More advisors/patent and trademark agents	2%
Other mentions (1% or less each)	10%
Nothing/no comment	65%

Q38. *Based on your experiences with clients, what IP information products do you think CIPO should be producing to better prepare Canadians and Canadian businesses seeking IP protection?*

2. Comments and suggestions

The most commonly mentioned feedback for CIPO is to reduce the length of time between filing and examination.

At the end of the survey, clients were asked if they had any additional feedback, positive or negative, about CIPO's recent efforts to improve services and products (open-ended, without providing response options). One-third of respondents provided comments about aspects needing improvement, most commonly about the need to have faster service (16%). Under one in ten (7%) said something positive. Six in ten (59%) did not provide a comment.

Additional feedback

Feedback comments	2022 (n=1,517)
Faster service/speed up process or set up a fixed date	16%
Improve communication with applicants/update them on progress of their application/should provide contact information of examiner	7%
More explicit guidance to help applicants in their application process/make it easier for those who can't afford a lawyer	5%
Poor website (too slow, often down, bugged,...)	4%
Switch from mail to email correspondence and improve email system to make sure we receive all notices	2%
Poor customer service/client's requests are ignored/no helpful service is provided	2%
Improve knowledge/professionalism of service/more training for staff to maintain consistency	2%
Other mentions (1% or less each)	15%
Positive comments (net) (thank you, helpful staff etc.)	7%
Nothing/no comment	59%

Q39 Do you have any additional feedback, positive or negative, about CIPO's recent efforts to improve services and products?

H. KEY DRIVER ANALYSIS

One of the key objectives of the research was to determine what service aspects influence or “drive” overall satisfaction with CIPO’s services, and particularly those aspects over which CIPO can exert some control (e.g., it is possible for CIPO to improve the timeliness of its responses but it cannot change how many IP applications a client submits nor their views about the federal government’s IP policies).

This analysis was undertaken in three stages:

1. **Factor analysis** – A factor analysis identifies groups of survey questions that respondents think about in the same way and to which they provide similar responses.
2. **Key driver analysis** – A multivariate statistical technique referred to as “key driver analysis” identifies significant drivers of overall client satisfaction.
3. **Performance analysis** – A performance analysis identifies where to focus attention to maximize client satisfaction, by analyzing CIPO’s performance on the key drivers of satisfaction.

1. KEY DRIVER ANALYSIS

The key driver analysis identified four statistically significant drivers of how satisfied clients are with CIPO’s services overall, which account for half (41%) of the results, or “variance” in clients’ overall satisfaction with CIPO.

- **Filing** – satisfaction with the service provided *at the filing stage*, including that the process was efficient and customized to their needs, forms were easy to complete, and it was clear what was required of them.
- **Examination** – the extent to which clients are satisfied with the quality and clarity of written and verbal communications, the knowledge of examiners, and the consistency of decisions *at the examination stage*.
- **Extra mile** – perception that CIPO staff go the extra mile to fulfill client needs.
- **Timeliness of decisions** – first and subsequent office actions, as well as the IP registration/grants themselves, are received in a reasonable amount of time.

The table below presents the “beta weight” for each factor, which is a statistical measure of its relative importance in predicting the outcome measure (in this case, overall client satisfaction) - the higher the value, the stronger the influence. The value of the beta weight is in direct proportion to the factor’s predictive power. For instance, a beta weight of .20 means that factor is more than twice as powerful in predicting overall client satisfaction as a factor with a beta weight of .10.

In 2022, the impact of the four factors is quite similar, with filing and examination having slightly more influence than extra mile and timeliness.

Service factors driving client satisfaction with CIPO overall (beta weights)

Service factors	2022 Total (n=1,517)
Filing	.24
Process of filing was efficient	
Application forms were easy to complete	
Filing process designed with your needs in mind	
Informed of everything you had to do to apply for IP protection	
Overall satisfaction with services provided during filing	
Examination	.22
Overall satisfaction with quality of written reports	
Examiners were knowledgeable	
Examiners' reports are easy to understand	
Decisions are consistent from one examiner to the next	
When spoke to an examiner, they were easy to understand	
Examination process designed with your needs in mind	
Overall satisfaction with services provided during examination	
Extra mile	.20
CIPO staff went extra mile to make sure you got what you needed	
Timeliness	.18
Overall satisfaction with time to receive registration/grant	
Received first office action in reasonable amount of time	
Received second office action in reasonable amount of time	

Examination is a common driver of satisfaction for both agents and unrepresented clients (the base is too small to comment on drivers for represented clients).

Filing and extra mile are unique drivers of overall satisfaction for unrepresented clients, reflecting the challenges these clients face (and their need for additional support) when navigating the IP system on their own. In turn, timeliness has a stronger impact on overall satisfaction for agents, who simply want the process to work efficiently.

2. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

The purpose of this part of the analysis is to identify the service attributes with lower performance ratings within each factor that is a significant driver of overall satisfaction. This points to areas where efforts by CIPO to improve performance are most likely to lead to a boost in client satisfaction. Mean scores under 3.00 are shown in bold below, reflecting service attributes that are strong possibilities for improvement.

Overall, this analysis indicates that efforts to improve the timeliness of first and subsequent office actions, as well as the overall length of time to receive IP registration/grant, are changes that would subsequently influence overall satisfaction scores (the latter particularly for agents). The other strong possibility for improvement includes adjusting examination processes/services with user needs in mind and, for agents, addressing perceptions of consistency of decisions between examiners.

Performance scores are also relatively low for CIPO staff going the extra mile for both agents and unrepresented clients. However, efforts to improve these perceptions should focus on unrepresented clients, for whom this is a driving factor of overall satisfaction.

Performance (mean scores) on survey questions that load on each factor

Service factors	2022 Total (n=1,517)	Agents (n=329)	Unrep clients (n=892)	IP professionals (n=185)
Filing				
Overall satisfaction with services provided during filing	3.08	3.37	2.90	3.57
Filing process designed with your needs in mind	3.28	3.41	3.21	3.59
Informed of everything you had to do to apply for IP protection	3.38	3.62	3.26	3.85
Process of filing was efficient	3.45	3.62	3.37	3.72
Application forms were easy to complete	3.58	3.78	3.50	4.00
Examination				
Overall satisfaction with services provided during examination	2.76	2.50	3.10	n/a
Examination process designed with your needs in mind	2.82	2.60	2.85	2.90
Decisions are consistent from one examiner to the next	3.02	2.67	3.13	n/a
Overall satisfaction with quality of written reports	3.12	3.04	3.10	n/a
Examiners' reports are easy to understand	3.21	3.36	3.14	n/a
Examiners were knowledgeable	3.41	3.31	3.42	3.47
When spoke to an examiner, they were easy to understand	3.50	3.71	3.40	3.59
Extra mile				
CIPO staff went extra mile to make sure you got what you needed	2.96	2.89	2.91	3.22
Timeliness				
Received second office action in reasonable amount of time	2.54	2.67	2.43	2.84
Received first office action in reasonable amount of time	2.63	2.19	2.75	2.44
Overall satisfaction with time to receive registration/grant	3.00	2.57	3.17	3.18

I. CLIENT PROFILE

1. Type of IP by client group

Agents and other IP professionals are more likely than clients to have recent experience with Patents or Industrial Design.

Of the three lines of business, all client groups are most likely to have experience with trademark services. Experience with patent services is most widely reported by non-agent IP professionals (56%) and agents (36%), and least common among unrepresented clients (14%). IP professionals (34%) and agents (26%) are also more likely than unrepresented and mixed clients to have experience with industrial design services.

LOB in past 24 months

LOB in past 24 months	Total (n=1,517)	Client group			
		Agents (n=329)	Unrepre- sented clients (n=892)	Mixed clients (n=91)	IP profes- sionals (n=185)
Trademark	84%	81%	89%	85%	62%
Patent	24%	36%	14%	27%	56%
Industrial design	11%	26%	3%	4%	34%

Q3 Which of the following types of Intellectual Property (IP) have you had experience with in the past 24 months?

2. Client characteristics

Over four in ten CIPO clients are located in Ontario; they tend to be small businesses (less than 100 employees) that represent a wide range of sectors. IP clients are most likely to be male.

The largest proportion of CIPO's client respondents is based in Ontario (45%), with substantial proportions in Quebec (17%), BC (17%) and Alberta (11%). Agents and IP professionals are more likely than represented and unrepresented clients to be Ontario-based (54% vs. 42%, respectively); in turn, represented and unrepresented clients are more likely to be based in BC (36% vs. 19% of agents and 16% of IP professionals).

Location (total sample)

Province/territory	Total (n=1,517)	Client group		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrep/rep/mixed clients (n=1,003)	IP professionals (n=185)
NET: West	31%	19%	36%	16%
British Columbia	17%	10%	20%	6%
Alberta	11%	7%	12%	8%
Saskatchewan	2%	0%	2%	1%
Manitoba	2%	2%	3%	1%
Ontario	45%	54%	42%	54%
Quebec	17%	21%	15%	25%
NET: Atlantic	3%	2%	4%	1%
NET: North	<1%	0%	<1%	0%

Q48 In what province or territory do you live?

CIPO's client respondents represent a wide range of industry sectors. The most common are retail trade (27%) and manufacturing (21%). All industry sectors are more widely reported by agents and IP professionals, because they act on behalf of clients across multiple industries.

Industry sectors represented by IP clients (total sample)

Number of employees	Total (n=1,517)	Client group		
		Agents (n=329)	Rep/unrep clients (n=1,003)	IP professionals (n=185)
NET: Resource/Constr/Secondary	52%	65%	51%	41%
Retail Trade	27%	41%	25%	21%
Manufacturing	21%	44%	16%	26%
Wholesale Trade	13%	22%	11%	15%
Agriculture/Fishing/Hunting/Forestry	8%	19%	5%	16%
Construction	7%	20%	4%	12%
Oil/Gas/Mining	7%	21%	2%	19%
Transportation and Warehousing	6%	16%	2%	16%
Utilities	4%	12%	1%	11%
Net: Other Service	31%	45%	28%	33%
Art, Entertainment, Recreation	15%	22%	13%	15%
Health care and social assistance	10%	25%	6%	19%
Educational Services	8%	17%	6%	13%
Accommodation and Food Services	8%	23%	4%	16%
Finance and Insurance	6%	21%	1%	15%
Real Estate and Rental/Leasing	4%	17%	1%	9%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	16%	40%	9%	27%
Information and Cultural Industries	7%	20%	4%	10%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	4%	13%	2%	9%
Administrative and Support, Waste Management, Remediation Services	3%	10%	1%	10%
Public Administration	2%	7%	<1%	4%
IT/Computers/Telecommunications/Software	2%	2%	2%	1%
Other industries (1% or less each)	14%	9%	12%	8%
Prefer not to say	12%	16%	6%	38%

Q45 IF AGENT/IPPRO: What industry sector(s) do you represent most often when acting on behalf of IP clients?

IF REP/UNREP: What industry sector does your IP relate to?

Consistent with the general profile of Canadian companies, most clients (79%) can be categorized as small businesses (i.e., fewer than 100 employees), including three in ten (31%) who are self-employed. Represented and unrepresented clients were relatively smaller in size (39% with no employees and 34% with only 1-4 employees). Larger organizations with 100 or more employees are most common among agents (32%) and IP professionals (55%).

**Number of employees (agents, IP professionals and clients
indicating at least some IP was for a company)**

Number of employees	Total (n=1,517)	Client group		
		Agents (n=329)	Unrep/rep/mixed clients (n=1,003)	IP professionals (n=185)
No employees (you are self-employed)	31%	16%	39%	8%
1-4 employees	27%	19%	34%	5%
5-49 employees	18%	21%	18%	14%
50-99 employees	3%	6%	1%	8%
100-499 employees	10%	19%	2%	38%
500+ employees	5%	12%	<1%	17%

Q44 How many employees work for your company across all locations in Canada? By this, we mean both full-time and part-time staff but not contract staff. Please include part-time staff as the number of full-time equivalents.

NOTE: Seven percent of clients preferred not to answer the question.

Clients are notably more likely to be male (57%) than female (35%), and a small proportion (8%) choose not to say. The gender ratio is more evenly divided among agents (47% male/39% female) than represented and unrepresented clients (64% male). Non-agent IP professionals were mostly female (68%).

Gender (total sample)

Gender	Total (n=1,517)	Client group		
		Agents (n=329)	Rep/unrep clients (n=1,003)	IP professionals (n=185)
Male	57%	47%	64%	21%
Female	35%	39%	29%	68%
Gender diverse	1%	<1%	<1%	1%
Prefer not to say	8%	13%	6%	11%

Q49 How do you identify yourself?

Under two in ten clients identify as being in an equity-deserving group (16%); this is somewhat lower among agents (10%) than represented or unrepresented clients (17%) or other IP professionals (15%).

Equity group identification (total sample)

Equity groups	Total (n=1,517)	Client group		
		Agents (n=329)	Rep/unrep clients (n=1,003)	IP professionals (n=185)
Racialized person	9%	6%	9%	8%
Person living with a disability	4%	3%	4%	3%
LGBTQ2+	4%	3%	4%	5%
Indigenous	1%	1%	1%	1%
None of the above	65%	67%	65%	61%
Prefer not to say	20%	22%	18%	24%

Q50 Do you identify as any of the following?

3. Agents and other IP professionals

Almost half of agents have been working in the IP field for over 20 years; non-agent IP professionals tend to have less experience, but still, six in ten have over ten years of experience. Around three-quarters of agents and IP professionals have worked with an international client seeking Canadian IP services in the past 24 months.

Agents are highly experienced with IP. Three-quarters (75%) have been working in the IP field for more than ten years, including close to half (46%) who have more than 20 years of experience. Six in ten (62%) other IP professionals have over ten years of experience.

Experience in IP in years

Years of experience in IP	Client group	
	Agents (n=329)	IP professionals (n=185)
Net: 10 years or less	25%	38%
<6 years	15%	21%
6-10 years	10%	18%
Net: 11-20 years	29%	35%
11-15 years	13%	17%
16-20 years	16%	18%
21+ years	46%	26%

Q46 How many years have you been working in the IP field?

Subgroup: Agents and non-agent IP professionals

Most agents (76%) have worked with international clients requiring Canadian IP services in the past 24 months, drawing primarily from the U.S. (69%) followed by Europe (62%) and Asia (53%). Other IP professionals report similar proportions of international clients seeking Canadian IP in that time period (77% any).

Have international clients requiring Canadian IP services

Location of international IP clients	Client group	
	Agents (n=329)	IP professionals (n=185)
The United States	69%	72%
Europe	62%	69%
Asia	53%	62%
Australia/Oceania	6%	4%
South America	5%	2%
Other	5%	6%
None of the above	17%	11%
Prefer not to say	7%	12%

Q47 In the past 24 months, have you, yourself, worked with any of the following international clients requiring Canadian IP services?

Subgroup: Agents and non-agent IP professionals

4. Represented and unrepresented clients

The majority of represented and unrepresented clients tend to have only one application underway with CIPO, for IP that is associated with their company. One in five patent and ID clients, and one in ten trademark clients, report using an international filing system.

Over six in ten (64%) represented and unrepresented clients say their IP is associated with their company. It is less common for the IP to be associated solely with the client personally (23%). The remaining 13 percent say that some of their IP is associated with them personally and some with their company.

Represented/unrepresented client use of IP

How IP is used	Total (n=1,003)	Client group		
		Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Represented clients (n=20)*	Mixed clients (n=91)
Associated with your company	64%	63%	BTS	69%
Associated with you personally	24%	24%		18%
Some associated with you personally and some with your company	13%	12%		13%

Q40 Which of the following best describes you? The Intellectual Property that you have applied for and/or had registered/granted is...?

SUBGROUP: Unrepresented, represented, and mixed clients

* BTS indicates base is too small to report (<30)

The majority of represented and unrepresented clients (66%) have had one application in process with CIPO in the past 24 months, while one-quarter (27%) have two or more applications in process (the remaining seven percent are unsure about the number of applications in process). Unrepresented clients are most likely to have only one application in process (68%, vs. 52% of mixed clients).

**Number of different IP applications in past 24 months
- represented/unrepresented clients**

Number of IP applications	Total (n=1,003)	Client group		
		Unrepresented clients (n=892)	Represented clients (n=20)*	Mixed clients (n=73)
1	66%	68%	BTS	52%
2	15%	15%		18%
3	5%	5%		11%
4	3%	3%		3%
5+	4%	3%		11%
Not sure	7%	7%		5%

Q41 Over the past 24 months, how many different [IP TYPE: patent / trademark / industrial design] applications do you have in process with CIPO?

SUBGROUP: Unrepresented, represented, and mixed clients

Unrepresented, represented, and mixed clients were asked if they used international filing systems for their Trademark, Patent and Industrial Design filing in Canada. About two in ten patent and ID clients used the Patent Cooperation Treaty (23%) and WIPOs Hague International Design (21%) systems, respectively, while one in ten trademark clients (12%) used the Madrid e-filing system. In all three cases, but particularly for trademarks, substantial proportions are unsure whether they had used the international systems.

Filing systems used - represented/unrepresented clients

Used filing system	Client group		
	Trademark/Madrid e-filing (n=822)	Patent/Patent Cooperation Treaty (n=147)	ID/WIPOs Hague International Design (n=34)
Yes	12%	23%	21%
No	29%	44%	50%
Not sure	59%	33%	30%

Q42 UNREP AND REP/MIXED ONLY: Thinking about the [IP TYPE: patent(s)/trademark(s)/industrial design(s)] you had in process with CIPO over the past 24 months, did you use [patents: the Patent Cooperation Treaty / trademarks: the Madrid e-Filing / industrial designs: WIPOs Hague International Design] system to file in Canada?

SUBGROUP: Unrepresented, represented, and mixed clients asked about Trademark, Patent and Industrial Design IP

The small number of clients who reported using an international filing system (n=140) were asked why they did so. The most common single reason given was efficiency (12%), with the same proportion who mentioned the advantage of filing in more than one country (several countries 9%; the US 3%).

Reasons for using an IP filing system - represented/unrepresented clients using a system

Reasons for using s filing system	Represented/unrepresented clients using a filing system (n=140)
Ease of use/efficient	12%
To have my registration valid in several countries for international protection	9%
Only option	3%
Was granted a patent in US/wanted to have Trademark registered in Canada & US	3%
Other (less than 3% each)	14%
Prefer not to say	60%

Q43 UNREP AND REP/MIXED IF Q42=01: Could you elaborate on why you chose to use [patents: the Patent Cooperation Treaty / trademarks: the Madrid e-Filing / industrial designs: WIPOs Hague International Design] system to file your IP in Canada?

CONCLUSIONS

CIPO offers exacting and complex Intellectual Property services to some of the most knowledgeable and sophisticated clients in Canada in their respective fields, including lawyers (both agents and in-house legal counsel) and companies that recognize the value of IP for their business. Among its specialized clientele, CIPO has achieved a mixed level of satisfaction, both overall and with specific aspects of the service it provides. The results indicate the service aspects that clients would most like to see addressed and are most likely to lead to improvements in overall satisfaction include: for agents, timeliness; for unrepresented clients, the filing process and CIPO staff “going the extra mile”; and for all clients, the examination process.

APPENDIX A - METHODOLOGY

The research results are based on an online survey with 1,517 CIPO clients, including agents, represented and unrepresented clients and non-agent IP professionals, from April 21-June 27, 2022. The margin of error for the total sample of 1,517 is +/- 2.5 percentage points, at the 95% confidence level (margin of error is greater for subgroups).

The report provides tracking information for the group of respondents comparable to the 2018 study (agents, unrepresented and represented clients); the margin of error for this sample of 1,332 is +/- 2.7 percentage points.

Background and purpose

The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) Client Satisfaction Survey was developed as a standardized measure of client satisfaction. The initial baseline survey, conducted in 2017-18, established baseline measures. In 2022 CIPO again contracted with Environics Research to conduct the second wave of this research, in order to measure to what extent recent factors have influenced client opinions on CIPO's service delivery.

The specific objectives of this research were to:

- Track a series of performance measurement metrics relating to customer satisfaction for CIPO;
- Outline client priorities for CIPO's service delivery; and,
- Collect data to support other business intelligence needs related to CIPO's clients.

Target audience

CIPO provided lists of agents, non-agent IP professionals and represented and unrepresented clients, which were pulled based on the following criteria:

Transaction phase or outcome	Line of business	Source & Selection criteria
Granted or registered for represented and unrepresented clients	Trademarks Industrial Design Patents	Granted or registered anytime in 24 month period from December 1st 2019 to November 31st 2021
Refused/Abandoned/Withdrawn for represented and unrepresented clients	Trademarks Industrial Design Patents	Refused, Abandoned or Withdrawn in 24 month period from December 1st 2019 to November 31st 2021
Applied and still in progress for represented and unrepresented clients	Trademarks Industrial Design Patents	IP is laid open within the 24 month period from December 1st 2019 to November 31st 2021 period and still active.
Agents	Trademark Agents and Patent Agents as found on Agent lists	All agents currently listed as active with CIPO.
Non Agent IP Professionals	Trademarks Industrial Design Patents	IP clerks and administrators registered with CIPO's online services portal

Environics compiled the lists, de-duplicated the records, and filtered to those with e-mail addresses. The following table provides the distribution of unduplicated records with e-mail addresses available for the survey:

	Patent	ID	TD	Total
Agents	2%	0%	5%	7%
Unrepresented clients	3%	0.4%	73%	76%
Represented and mixed (rep and unrep) clients	0.3%	0.1%	6%	7%
Non agent IP professionals	4%	0.1%	6%	10%
Total	9%	1%	90%	100%

In addition, Environics conducted telephone lookups with agents and represented and unrepresented clients for whom the lists did not contain email addresses. This generated 71 additional email addresses for agents and 307 for represented and unrepresented clients.

The survey screened for clients who had had interactions with CIPO in the past 24 months. When clients indicated experience with more than one line of business in the past 24 months, the survey programming selected a line of business for respondents to respond about, prioritizing those with fewer sample records (Industrial Design and Patent) to ensure these are sufficiently represented in the data.

The final distribution of completed interviews by client type and line of business is as follows:

	Patent	ID	TD	Total	% Weighted
Agents	80	56	193	329	14%
Unrepresented clients	119	28	745	892	65%
Represented clients	5	3	12	20	9%
Mixed clients*	23	3	65	91	
Total excluding IPPRO	227	90	1,015	1,332	88%
Non-Agent IP professionals	63	40	82	185	12%
Total	290	130	1,097	1,517	100%

* Mixed clients are those who indicated that they sometimes used an agent and sometimes interacted with CIPO on their own behalf in the previous 24 months. No quota was established for this group.

The data were statistically weighted to match the proportions of agents, unrepresented and represented clients achieved in 2018 to allow for accurate comparisons over time (i.e., if responses change, it is not due to a change in sample composition). IP professionals were included in proportion to their actual response frequency (which is similar to the proportion of IP professional e-mails in the sample file provided by CIPO).

This survey represents an attempted census of all eligible clients with an available email address. Because the entire target population with an email address was invited to participate (and no sample was drawn), a margin of sampling error does not apply. While there may be impact of non-sampling error due to non-response from those who chose not to participate or by excluding those without email addresses, there is no existing data on the CIPO client universe on which to base a potential non-response bias analysis.

Questionnaire design

The questionnaire was designed by Environics and CIPO to address the objectives of the research, drawing heavily on the 2018 questionnaire. Upon CIPO's approval, Environics translated the questionnaire into French.

Data collection

Environics programmed the English and French versions of the questionnaire into its online survey software. The programming was checked by Environics and CIPO staff. The initial soft launch was broadcast April 20th and 33 completed interviews were achieved (23 English, 10 French). No questionnaire changes were required following the soft launch.

The full launch took place on April 25 and field closed on June 27. An extended field period and several reminder emails were used to generate the desired number of interviews.

All research work was conducted according to federal government and industry standards, including the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Online Surveys, as well as applicable federal legislation (Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, or PIPEDA). Environics is a founding member of the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC) and registered the survey with CRIC's Research Verification System, as is done as a matter of policy for all Environics surveys.

Response rate

The initial survey invitation was broadcast to 31,365 contacts. 1,517 responses were received, for a calculated response rate of 6% overall. The response rate is shown below.

Email disposition	Total (N)
Total number invited to participate	31,365
UNRESOLVED (U)	28,330
Did not respond	28,330
IN SCOPE NON-RESPONDING (IS)	1,144
Qualified respondent break-off	1,144
IN SCOPE RESPONDING (R)	1,890
Disqualified	373
Quota filled	0
Completed	1,517
CONTACT RATE $[(R+IS) / (U + IS + R)] - \%$	9.68%
RESPONSE RATE $[R / (U + IS + R)] - \%$	6.03%

Weighted sample profile

The table below presents the weighted sample profile for agents, IP professionals and represented/unrepresented/mixed clients by key characteristics. For this table the weighting is based on the full sample including IP professionals.

Profile categories	Agents (n=329)	Unrep/rep/ mixed clients (n=1,003)	IPPro (n=185)
LOB experience in past 18 months			
Trademark	81%	89%	62%
Patent	36%	16%	56%
Industrial design	26%	4%	34%
Location			
Atlantic provinces	2%	4%	1%
Quebec	21%	15%	25%
Ontario	54%	42%	54%
West	19%	36%	16%
Gender			
Male	47%	64%	21%
Female	39%	29%	68%
Gender diverse	<1%	<1%	1%
Prefer not to say	13%	6%	11%
Years of experience in IP field (agents and IP professionals)			
5 years or less	15%	n/a	21%
6-10 years	10%		18%
11-15 years	13%		17%
16-20 years	16%		18%
21+ years	46%		26%
Equity-deserving groups			
Any equity-deserving group	10%	17%	15%
Racialized person	6%	9%	8%
Person living with a disability	3%	4%	3%
A LGBTQ2+ person	3%	4%	5%
An Indigenous person	1%	1%	1%
None of the above	67%	65%	61%
Prefer not to say	22%	18%	24%
Location of clients of agents and IP professionals			
Domestic IP clients only	17%	n/a	11%
Any international IP clients (net)	76%		77%
US	69%		72%
Europe	62%		69%
Asia	53%		62%
Other	16%		12%
Prefer not to say	7%		12%
IP associated with... (rep/unrep clients)			
Your company	n/a	64%	n/a

Profile categories	Agents (n=329)	Unrep/rep/ mixed clients (n=1,003)	IPPro (n=185)
You personally		24%	
Some with company/some you personally		13%	
Number of IP applications in process in past 18 months (rep/unrep clients)			
One	n/a	66%	n/a
Two		15%	
Three or more		12%	
Not sure		7%	



APPENDIX B – QUESTIONNAIRE



**Canadian Intellectual Property Office
2022 Client Satisfaction Survey
FINAL Questionnaire**

20-minute average length

E-MAIL INVITATION

Subject line: Canadian Intellectual Property Office Satisfaction Survey

Bonjour/Hello

The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), an agency of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, is the federal authority responsible for registering or granting intellectual property (IP) rights including trademarks, patents and industrial designs. As a client of CIPO, we are inviting you to participate in an online survey about your use of and satisfaction with their services.

CIPO has retained Environics Research, an independent research firm, to conduct the survey. The purpose is to learn more about what clients think about CIPO and what their experiences have been. Your feedback is vital and will help CIPO improve the services it provides.

The survey will take approximately 15 – 20 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and confidential, and your responses will be anonymous. Your decision on whether to participate will not affect any dealings you may have with CIPO or with any other part of the Government of Canada.

If you don't have time to complete the survey in one sitting, you can return to it by clicking on the link above again.

If you have any questions or concerns, or if you encounter technical difficulties while filling out this survey, please email ciposurvey@environics.ca. Should you have questions about the purpose of the survey, please call CIPO at 1-866-997-1936.

This study has been registered with the Canadian Research Insights Council's (CRIC's) Research Verification Service so that you may validate its authenticity. If you would like to enquire about the details of this research, you can visit CRIC's website: www.canadianresearchinsightscouncil.ca. If you choose to verify the authenticity of this research, you can reference project code 20220421-EN066.

We appreciate your support and thank you for your valuable opinions.

LANDING PAGE

Please select your preferred language for completing the survey / Veuillez choisir la langue dans laquelle vous préférez répondre au sondage.

01–English / Anglais

02–Français / French

Background information

Welcome to the **Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) Client Satisfaction Survey**. This survey is designed to give us a better understanding of clients' service experiences with CIPO. It should take approximately 15- 20 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and confidential, and your responses will be anonymous. Please do not submit business confidential information.

EnviroNics Research is conducting this survey on behalf of CIPO, an agency of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

< PROGRAMMING NOTE: All questions are mandatory.>

Eligibility

NOTE TO READERS: Headings will not be shown on-screen to respondents. They are simply to organize the content for the research team.

1. The first few questions are to identify the main way you have interacted with CIPO in the past 24 months.

Are you a licensed Intellectual Property (IP) agent who interacts with CIPO on behalf of clients?

01 – Yes

AGENT – SKIP TO Q.3

02 – No

ASK Q.2

2. Which of the following best describes your interactions with CIPO in the past 24 months?

Select one only

01 -	A licensed IP agent interacts with CIPO on your behalf	REP
02 -	You sometimes use an IP agent and sometimes interact with CIPO on your own	MIXED
03 -	You interact with CIPO on your own on all matters concerning your Intellectual Property.	UNREP
04 -	You are an IP professional other than a licensed IP agent (e.g., IP clerk, IP manager, IP searcher, IP lawyer, etc). [NEW]	IPPRO
05 -	None of the above	THANK AND END SURVEY: This survey is for clients who have handled at least one IP application in the past 24 months

3. Which of the following types of Intellectual Property (IP) have you had experience with in the past 24 months?

Select all that apply.

01 – Patent

02 – Trademark

03 – Industrial design

04 – None of the above

THANK AND END SURVEY: This survey is for clients who have had experience with any of these three IP types in the past 24 months.

NOTE TO READERS: The focus for remaining questions will be on one type of IP with which they have had experience in the past 24 months.

Priority as follows: (1) Industrial design, (2) Patent and (3) Trademark. Priority reflects the relative availability of sample/emails (to ensure we have enough responses for each LOB).

IP TYPE SELECTION

For the remainder of the survey (unless otherwise indicated), please answer the questions thinking about your CIPO service experience in the past 24 months with respect to [PATENTS / TRADEMARKS / INDUSTRIAL DESIGN].

PRIORITY AS FOLLOWS:

- INDUSTRIAL DESIGN (Q3=03)
- PATENT (Q3=01)
- TRADEMARK (Q3=02)

IF REP/MIXED: If you are unable to answer a question because that aspect of your IP application was managed by your agent, please choose the “not applicable/cannot say” option.

IF IPPRO: If you are unable to answer a question because that aspect of the IP application was managed by a licensed IP agent, please choose the “not applicable/cannot say” option.

Overall satisfaction and channel use/satisfaction

4. Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided to you by CIPO related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial design]?

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral

04 – Satisfied

05 – Very satisfied

5. Which of the following channels have you used to access CIPO's products and services related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial design] in the past 24 months?

Select all that apply.

- 01 – Telephone
- 02 – CIPO website - accessed from desktop
- 03 – CIPO website – accessed from a mobile device
- 04 – In-person visit
- 05 – Email
- 06 – Chatbot (Virtual assistant tool)
- 07 – Livechat (Online messenger with a CIPO client service officer)
- 08 – Regular mail
- 09 – Fax
- 99 – None of the above [SINGLE PUNCH]

NEW ITEMS f, g

6. How satisfied are you with the service CIPO provided...?

Select one response for each item

ONLY SHOW ITEMS SELECTED AT Q5

- a. By telephone
- b. On its website – accessed from a desktop
- c. On its website – accessed from a mobile device
- d. During your in-person visit(s)
- e. By email
- f. Chatbot (Virtual assistant tool)
- g. Livechat (Online messenger with a CIPO client service officer)
- i. By regular mail
- j. By fax

- 01 – Very dissatisfied
- 02 – Dissatisfied
- 03 – Neutral
- 04 – Satisfied
- 05 – Very satisfied

IP application

The next few questions are about the process of filing an IP application.

7. **REP/UNREP/MIXED: In the past 24 months, did you submit an IP application for [IP TYPE: a patent(s) / a trademark(s) / an industrial design(s)] to CIPO?**

AGENT/IPPRO: In the past 24 months, did you submit an IP application for [IP TYPE: a patent(s) / a trademark(s) / an industrial design(s)] on behalf of a client?

01 – Yes

02 – No

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

03 – Not sure

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

8. **Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided to you by CIPO during the filing process?**

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral

[SKIP TO Q10]

04 – Satisfied

[SKIP TO Q10]

05 – Very satisfied

[SKIP TO Q10]

NEW

9. **You indicated that you are [PIPE Q8 8ANSWER: very dissatisfied/dissatisfied] with the service provided by CIPO during the filing process. Could you please explain why?**

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

99 – Prefer not to say

10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the service provided by CIPO during the filing process?

Select one response for each item

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. You were informed of everything you had to do to apply for intellectual property protection [Q17A1]
- b. The application forms were easy to complete
- c. CIPO's searchable [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial design] database was easy to use
- d. CIPO's searchable [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial design] database contained the information you needed.
- e. The process of filing an application was efficient
- f. The filing process was designed with your needs in mind

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

Examination

ASK SECTION OF TOTAL SAMPLE

11. The next few questions are about the examination of IP applications. Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided to you by CIPO during the process of examining an application for [IP TYPE: a patent / a trademark / an industrial design]?

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral [SKIP TO Q13]

04 – Satisfied [SKIP TO Q13]

05 – Very satisfied [SKIP TO Q13]

99 – Cannot say [SKIP TO Q13]

NEW

12. You indicated that you are [PIPE Q11 ANSWER: very dissatisfied/dissatisfied] with the service provided by CIPO during the process of examining an application for [IP TYPE: a patent / a trademark / an industrial design]. Could you please explain why?

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

99 – Prefer not to say

13. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the service provided by CIPO during examination?

Select one response for each item

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. Examiners were knowledgeable
- b. Examiners were easy to reach
- c. When you spoke to an examiner(s), they were easy to understand
- d. [DO NOT ASK IPPRO] The examiners' report(s) (i.e. office actions) is/are easy to understand [Q54A8]
- e. [DO NOT ASK IPPRO] Decisions are consistent from one examiner to the next
- f. The examination process was designed with your needs in mind

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

14. [DO NOT ASK IPPRO] Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of examiners' written report (s) (i.e. office actions)? [Q55]

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral

04 – Satisfied

05 – Very satisfied

99 – Cannot say

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Select one response for each item

GRID – SHOW IN ORDER

- a. In general first office actions are received within a reasonable amount of time (“First office action” refers to the first official written communication received from CIPO on the merits of your application) [Q23A1]
- b. You received subsequent office actions within a reasonable amount of time.

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

EXPANDED TO INCLUDE TM

16. In the past 24 months, did you use CIPO’s accelerated examination service (a premium service used to fast-track the examination)?

01 – Yes

02 – No

99 – Not sure

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

EXPANDED TO INCLUDE TM

17. Overall, how satisfied are you with CIPO’s accelerated examination service?

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral

04 – Satisfied

05 – Very satisfied

Registration or grant

18. In the past 24 months, did you receive [IP TYPE: a registered trademark(s) / a granted patent(s) / a registered Industrial Design(s)] [AGENTS/IPPRO: on behalf of your clients]?

01 – Yes

02 – No

99 – Not sure

SKIP TO Q21

SKIP TO Q21

19. Overall, how satisfied are you with the time it took to receive [SELECT BASED ON IP TYPE: a registered trademark(s) / a granted patent(s) / a registered Industrial Design]?

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral

04 – Satisfied

05 – Very satisfied

ITEM b EXPANDED TO PATENT

20. UNREP/REP/MIXED ONLY: In the past 24 months, did you experience any of the following scenarios?

a) Your [IP TYPE: patent / trademark / industrial design] application was abandoned

b) Your [IP TYPE: patent / trademark / industrial design] application was [AUTOFILL: PATENT= refused / TD/ID= denied]

01 – Yes

02 – No

99 – Not sure

Additional service aspects

ASK SECTION OF TOTAL SAMPLE

21. Still thinking about CIPO’s service related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial design], to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Select one response for each item

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. It is clear who to contact within CIPO to receive service [Q12A1]
- b. It is easy to reach the right CIPO employee to address your problem or need [Q12A3]
- c. In the end, CIPO provided you with the information you needed [Q12A4]
- d. You were able to get through to a CIPO employee by your preferred channel (e.g. phone, email, in-person)
- e. You were easily able to access documents pertaining to your file(s)

- 01 – Strongly disagree
- 02 – Disagree
- 03 – Neutral
- 04 – Agree
- 05 – Strongly agree
- 99 – Cannot say

22. Overall, how satisfied were you with the ease of accessing CIPO’s services?

- 01 – Very dissatisfied
- 02 – Dissatisfied
- 03 – Neutral [SKIP TO Q24]
- 04 – Satisfied [SKIP TO Q24]
- 05 – Very satisfied [SKIP TO Q24]

NEW

23. You indicated that you were [PIPE Q22 ANSWER: very dissatisfied/dissatisfied] regarding the ease of accessing CIPO’s services, could you please explain why?

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

- 99 – Prefer not to say

24. To what extent do you agree or disagree that:

You were aware of the status of the IP application(s) at all stages of the process

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

25. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements when thinking about CIPO's service related to [IP TYPE: patents / trademarks / industrial design]?

Select one response for each item.

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. CIPO staff were professional
- b. CIPO staff (other than examiners), such as frontline and support staff, were knowledgeable
- c. CIPO staff understood your needs
- d. CIPO staff understand the importance of their role in the IP process
- e. Any issues that you encountered in the service process were easily resolved
- f. You were provided service in the official language of your choice
- g. CIPO staff went the extra mile to make sure you got what you needed
- h. CIPO staff takes a reasonable amount of time to respond to enquiries and requests [Q23A3 – REVISED WORDING]

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

26. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Select one response for each item.

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. CIPO's online services met your needs
- b. CIPO's website had the information you were looking for [REVISED]
- c. CIPO's online services are easy to find
- d. It is easy to complete online transactions
- e. You are confident that personal information provided through CIPO's website is protected
- f. The information you were looking for online was easy to find
- g. CIPO's website was designed with your needs in mind
- h. CIPO's online services are consistently available without interruption. [NEW]
- i. ASK IF MULTIPLE MENTIONS AT Q3: CIPO's online services are consistent across the business lines (i.e., Patent, Trademark, Industrial Design)

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

27. IF CODE 1-2 AT Q26a: You indicated that CIPO's online services have not met your needs. In what ways were your needs not met?

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

99 – Prefer not to say

28. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Select one response for each item.

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. CIPO's electronic payment process is easy to use
- b. Questions regarding payment status are answered in a timely manner [Q28A3]

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

29. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Select one response for each item.

GRID - RANDOMIZE

- a. It is easy to have errors corrected by CIPO
- b. Overall, CIPO does not make mistakes/errors when providing services
- c. Overall, you received a consistent level of service during all interactions with CIPO

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

30. To what extent do you agree or disagree that:

Products and/or services that CIPO provides are worth the cost [Q31/2008 revised wording]

01 – Strongly disagree

02 – Disagree

03 – Neutral

04 – Agree

05 – Strongly agree

99 – Cannot say

Other services

Please answer the next questions thinking about your CIPO service experience in general.

- 31. ASK IF ANY EXPERIENCE WITH TRADEMARKS (IF Q3=2): In the past 24 months, were you involved in any opposition proceedings or summary cancellation proceedings?**

01 – Yes

02 – No

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

03 – Not sure

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

- 32. IF Q31=01: Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by CIPO during your experience with an opposition proceeding(s) or a summary cancellation proceeding(s)?**

Please note: we are interested in your degree of satisfaction with the service you received, rather than with any decision that was made as a result of the proceedings.

01 – Very dissatisfied

02 – Dissatisfied

03 – Neutral

[SKIP TO Q34]

04 – Satisfied

[SKIP TO Q34]

05 – Very satisfied

[SKIP TO Q34]

NEW

- 33. You indicated that you are [PIPE Q32 ANSWER: very dissatisfied/dissatisfied] with the service provided by CIPO during your experience with opposition proceeding(s) or a summary cancellation proceeding. Could you please explain why?**

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

99 – Prefer not to say

- 34. ASK IF ANY EXPERIENCE WITH PATENT OR ID (IF Q3=1 OR 3) In the past 24 months, have you had experience with the Patent Appeal Board?**

01 – Yes

02 – No

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

03 – Not sure

SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

35. **IF Q34=01: Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by CIPO during your experience with the Patent Appeal Board?**

Please note: we are interested in your degree of satisfaction with the service you received, rather than with any decision that was made by the Patent Appeal Board.

- 01 – Very dissatisfied
- 02 – Dissatisfied
- 03 – Neutral
- 04 – Satisfied
- 05 – Very satisfied

Information Services

IF IPPRO, SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

36. **[ASK UNREP/REP/MIXED/AGENT] Before today, were you aware that CIPO offers services to raise awareness of and educate Canadians about Intellectual Property? These services include a range of informational material about IP, seminars and events, as well as access to CIPO staff who can help Canadians better understand the value of IP and discuss their IP strategy.**

- 01 – Yes, aware
- 02 – No, not aware
- 99 – Not sure

37. **[ASK UNREP/REP/MIXED] To what extent do you agree or disagree that these types of IP services are useful to businesses like yours or individuals like you?**

- 01 – Strongly disagree
- 02 – Disagree
- 03 – Neutral
- 04 – Agree
- 05 – Strongly agree
- 99 – Cannot say

NEW

38. **[ASK AGENTS ONLY IF Q36=01] Based on your experiences with clients, what IP information products do you think CIPO should be producing to better prepare Canadians and Canadian businesses seeking IP protection?**

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

- 99 – No comment

Wrap-up

NEW

- 39. Do you have any additional feedback, positive or negative, about CIPO's recent efforts to improve services and products?**

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

99 – No comment

Respondent Profile

Now just a few last questions that will help us to classify your responses for analysis purposes only.

- 40. UNREP AND REP/MIXED ONLY: Which of the following best describes you? The Intellectual Property that you have applied for and/or had registered/granted is...?**

Select one only.

01 – Associated with you personally

02 – Associated with your company

03 – Some associated with you personally and some with your company

- 41. UNREP AND REP/MIXED ONLY: Over the past 24 months, how many different [IP TYPE: patent / trademark / industrial design] applications do you have in process with CIPO?**

01 – 1

02 – 2

03 – 3

04 – 4

05 – 5+

99 – Not sure

NEW

- 42. UNREP AND REP/MIXED ONLY: Thinking about the [IP TYPE: patent(s)/trademark(s)/industrial design(s)] you had in process with CIPO over the past 24 months, did you use [patents: the Patent Cooperation Treaty / trademarks: the Madrid e-Filing / industrial designs: WIPOs Hague International Design] system to file in Canada?**

01 – Yes

02 – No

[SKIP TO Q44]

99 - Not sure

[SKIP TO Q44]

NEW

- 43. UNREP AND REP/MIXED IF Q42=01: Could you elaborate on why you chose to use [patents: the Patent Cooperation Treaty / trademarks: the Madrid e-Filing / industrial designs: WIPOs Hague International Design] system to file your IP in Canada?**

OPEN-ENDED TEXT BOX

99 – Prefer not to say

- 44. IF AGENT/IPPRO OR (Q40=02-03 FOR REP/UNREP/MIXED): How many employees work for your company across all locations in Canada? By this, we mean both full-time and part-time staff but not contract staff. Please include part-time staff as the number of full-time equivalents.**

07 – No employees (you are self-employed)

01 – 1-4 employees

02 - 5-49 employees

03 - 50-99 employees

04 - 100-199 employees

05 – 200-499 employees

06 – 500 or more employees

99 – Prefer not to say

45. **IF AGENT/IPPRO: What industry sector(s) do you represent most often when acting on behalf of IP clients?** *Check all that apply*

IF REP/UNREP/MIXED: What industry sector does your IP relate to?

Check all that apply.

01 - Agriculture/Fishing/Hunting/Forestry

02 - Oil/Gas/Mining

03 - Utilities

04- Construction

05 - Manufacturing

06 - Wholesale Trade

07 - Retail Trade

08 - Transportation and Warehousing

09 - Information and Cultural Industries

10 - Finance and Insurance

11 - Real Estate and Rental/Leasing

12 - Professional, Scientific and Technical Services

13 - Management of Companies and Enterprises

14 - Administrative and Support, Waste Management, Remediation Services

15 - Educational Services

16 - Health care and social assistance

17 - Art, Entertainment, Recreation

18 - Accommodation and Food Services

19 - Public Administration

97 - Other (SPECIFY) _____

99 – Prefer not to say

46. **AGENTS/IPPRO ONLY: How many years have you been working in the IP field?**

01 – 0-5 years

02 – 6-10 years

03 – 11-15 years

04 – 16-20 years

05 – 21+ years

47. AGENTS/IPPRO ONLY: In the past 24 months, have you, yourself, worked with any of the following international clients requiring Canadian IP services?

Select all that apply

- 01 – Clients in the United States
- 02 – Clients in Europe
- 03 – Clients in Asia
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
- 98 – None of the above [SINGLE PUNCH]
- 99 – Prefer not to say

48. In what province or territory do you live?

Select one only.

- 01 – British Columbia
- 02 – Alberta
- 03 – Saskatchewan
- 04 – Manitoba
- 05 – Ontario
- 06 – Quebec
- 07 – New Brunswick
- 08 – Nova Scotia
- 09 – Prince Edward Island
- 10 – Newfoundland and Labrador
- 11 – Yukon
- 12 – Northwest Territories
- 13 – Nunavut
- 14 – Other

49. How do you identify yourself?

Select one only.

- 01 – Female
- 02 – Male
- 03 – Gender Diverse
- 99 – Prefer not to say

