

### Top 10 filers of CTM applications in Italy\*

(April 1 2006 to March 31 2007)

Position	Representative Name	CTM filings
1	Jacobacci & Partners SpA	399
2	Perani Mezzanotte & Partners	288
3	Bugnion SpA	244
4	Barzanò & Zanardo	232
5	Modiano	212
6	Dott Proff Franco Cicogna	209
7	Società Italiana Brevetti SpA	190
8	Giambrocono & C SpA	184
9	Signus SAS Di Zanetti Giancarlo & C	135
10	Studio Torta Srl	129

### Top 10 filers of CTM applications in Italy\*

#### Top 30 filers of CTM applications\*

(April 1 2006 to March 31 2007)

Position	Representative name	Representative country of origin	CTM filings
1	Bureau Gevers	Belgium	971
2	Marks & Clerk	United Kingdom	785
3	Novagraaf	Netherlands	657
4	Elzaburu	Spain	542
5	Ungria Patentes y Marcas SA	Spain	528
6	Field Fisher Waterhouse LLP	United Kingdom	499
7	Murgitroyd & Company	United Kingdom	443
8	Clarke Modet y Cia SL	Spain	409
9	Withers & Rogers LLP	United Kingdom	407
10	Jacobacci & Partners SpA	Italy	399
11	Lovells	United Kingdom	397
12	Pons Patentes y Marcas Internacional SL	Spain	390
13	Udapi & Asociados	Spain	385
14	Jeffrey Parker & Co	United Kingdom	378
15	FR Kelly & Co	Ireland	377

16	Barker Brettell	United Kingdom	355
17	Herrero & Asociados	Spain	350
18	Boult Wade Tennant	United Kingdom	336
19	RGC Jenkins & Co	United Kingdom	298
20	Perani Mezzanotte & Partners	Italy	288
21	Grünecker Kinkeldey Stockmair & Schwanhäusser	Germany	286
22	Frank B Dehn & Co	United Kingdom	285
23	Kilburn & Strode	United Kingdom	279
24	D Young & Co	United Kingdom	263
25	Cabinet Germain & Maureau	France	259
26	Mitscherlich & Partner	Germany	251
26	Bureau DA Casalonga-Josse	France	251
28	Page White & Farrer	United Kingdom	246
29	Boehmert & Boehmert	Germany	245
30	Bugnion SpA	Italy	244

OHIM had performed better than, the same as or worse than in the previous year. The results were largely positive for OHIM, with 35% of agents stating that the functioning of OHIM had improved in the past year, against 7% who believed that it had worsened. The figures relating to trademark proprietors show a similar trend: 16% felt that things had improved, while only 3% thought the opposite.

Although the 2007 user satisfaction survey indicates an overall improvement in performance in many areas, it also demonstrates that a number of issues remain. It highlights:

- increases in the number of complaints against OHIM in terms of delays and errors;
- a decline in the level of consistency at examination level;
- difficulties in contacting the relevant OHIM staff member;
- high levels of dissatisfaction with the information systems (eg, clarity of information, problems in obtaining the correct information and reliability of the e-filing system); and
- lack of awareness on the part of agents and mark owners as to the changes brought in following the previous survey.

OHIM says it takes the results of these surveys very seriously and intends to continue asking its users for feedback in future years. In response to the weaknesses highlighted, OHIM has organized a working group which has put forward an action plan. This identifies three key