

June 24, 2013

C. PCT 1385

Madam,
Sir,

PCT Office Feedback Survey 2012

This Circular is addressed to your Office in its capacity as a receiving Office, International Searching Authority, International Preliminary Examining Authority and/or designated or elected Office under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). The Circular concerns the "PCT Office Feedback Survey 2012".

This Survey was conducted in early 2013, using an on-line questionnaire, to determine the level of satisfaction among Offices with the services provided by the International Bureau under the PCT in 2012. A report analyzing the findings of the Survey has been prepared by
./. the International Bureau and is attached for your information.

The report is also available on WIPO's web-site, accessible via the "PCT Resources" page, at: http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/pct/en/activity/pct_office_survey_2012.pdf

./. The Survey has been conducted for three consecutive years and charts, attached in the "Quick Summary 2010 - 2012", have been created to show the year on year progress.

I would like to express my gratitude to Offices for their participation in this Survey and confirm that the International Bureau is using the information collected to ensure that the PCT services provided to Offices continue to address their needs. Please note that the Survey will be conducted in one year's time when Offices will be requested to give satisfaction ratings and make comments regarding PCT services provided by the International Bureau in 2013.

Should you have any further questions or comments regarding the Survey results please contact Mr. Takashi Yamashita, Director, PCT International Cooperation Division, e-mail: pctica@wipo.int, fax: (+4122) 338 7160.

Yours sincerely,



James Pooley
Deputy Director General

PCT Office Feedback Survey

Quick Summary

2010 - 2012

Summary


- 66 Offices replied to the survey for PCT services in 2012
- Overall satisfaction ratings
5 point scale 1(low) →5(high)

	Cooperative activities	IT Tools	Meetings	Operations	Document availability	Translation
2012	3.8	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.8
2011	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.6
2010	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7

Changes from 2011 Survey


- Eligible offices for survey is increased by 2 (because of accession)
- The question related for 'PCT-COR' has been changed to 'PADOS'
- Two new questions were added for 'ePCT Applicant' and 'ePCT Office'
- For 2011 the 2010 survey structure was simplified for International Cooperation

2010 - 2012 satisfaction ratings




5 point scale (totally=5, highly = 4, satisfied= 3, partially = 2, dissatisfied = 1)

2010 - 2012 Satisfied Office percentage




Note: this chart excludes 'Not applicable' results

2010 - 2012 satisfied count



The actual count of satisfied responses
(total responses 2010-65, 2011-69, 2012-66)

2010 - 2012 'Not applicable' percentage



Note: the questionnaire for cooperative activities was modified after 2010 survey, which is reflected in the change (the first four points) in the chart.



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
DATE: JUNE 5, 2013

PCT Office Feedback Survey 2012

Report of results

Written by	P. Waring
Reviewed by	T. Yamashita, R. Hernandez

INDEX

PCT Office Feedback Survey 2012	1
I. Introduction	3
II. Summary	4
III. Respondents	6
IV. 2012 results	7
IV.(i) PCT International Cooperation:	8
Questions.....	8
Satisfaction ratings.....	8
Comments regarding “Dissatisfied” ratings.....	10
PCT International cooperation comments.....	10
General comments and suggestions regarding PCT cooperative activities	10
IV.(ii) IT tools	11
Questions.....	11
Satisfaction Ratings.....	11
Comments regarding “Dissatisfied” ratings.....	13
PCT IT tools comments	13
ePCT Portal	13
PCT-SAFE Electronic filing	13
PADOS	13
PATENTSCOPE	13
IV.(iii) PCT administrative bodies meeting organization	14
Questions.....	14
Satisfaction Ratings.....	14
PCT administrative bodies meeting organization comments.....	16
IV.(iv) Operational processing	17
Questions.....	17
Satisfaction Ratings.....	17
PCT operational processing comments.....	18
IV.(v) Document availability	20
Questions.....	20
Satisfaction Ratings.....	20
Documents Service Coverage	21
Document availability comments.....	22
IV.(vi) Translation	23
Questions.....	23
Satisfaction Ratings.....	23
Operational translation service comments	24
IV.(vii) General End of Survey comments	25
V. Conclusions and next steps	25
Annex I – Survey Questions	
Annex II - Satisfaction by Geographic Region	

I. Introduction

Aiming to assess the level of satisfaction with the PCT services provided by the International Bureau during 2012, the PCT Office Feedback Survey 2012, hereafter “the Survey”, was addressed to 151 Offices in their capacities as receiving Office, International Searching Authority, International Preliminary Examining Authority and/or designated or elected Office under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), inviting their participation in the Survey regarding services provided to Offices by the International Bureau¹.

This report reflects the results of the third running of the survey which is in the main unchanged from 2011, with the exception of a revision of the questions related to PCT IT tools where two questions have been added related to ePCT.

The Survey consisted of an on-line questionnaire² in the 6 UN languages, regarding 6 areas of PCT services provided by the International Bureau:

- PCT international cooperative activities;
- Organization of the meetings of PCT administrative bodies;
- PCT IT tools;
- PCT international applications processing service;
- PCT document availability; and,
- PCT translation service.

A copy of the entire questionnaire (PDF printable version, in English only, attached as Annex IV to this document) was furnished with the Survey to help Offices understand the questionnaire structure and facilitate internal coordination prior to an individual submitting the response.

The responses have been analyzed to assess the Office perception, in the form of satisfaction ratings, of PCT services and to provide valuable input for improving the services. Part of the Survey results has been utilized as a performance indicator in the Program Performance Report for 2012. It is the International Bureau’s intention to repeat the Survey in a year’s time so as to monitor progress and identify further improvement priorities.

¹ C.PCT 1365

² The Opinio software hosted by the WIPO Information and Communication Technology Department’s Internet Services Section was used to present the questionnaire on-line.

II. Summary

Overall, of a possible maximum 151 Offices, 66 responded to the Survey (44% of the total, 3 less Offices responded than for 2011). To provide a general summary, the responses to the “Overall satisfaction” question regarding each of the 6 areas are shown in the following table (the rating average excludes the “Not applicable” (N/A) responses):

Table 1

Overall satisfaction:	Totally (5)	Highly (4)	Satisfied (3)	Partially satisfied (2)	Dissatisfied (1)	N/A	Rating average
Cooperative activities	17	19	20	3	0	7	3.8
IT Tools	11	19	29	1	1	5	3.6
Meetings	19	23	19	0	0	5	4.0
Operations	18	25	21	0	0	2	4.0
Document availability	15	31	16	2	0	2	3.9
Translation	12	16	23	1	0	14	3.8

The table above shows slight improvements from the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2011.

In all areas the “Overall satisfaction” rating averages are between “Satisfied” and “Highly satisfied”. The general satisfaction in each of the 6 areas can also be assessed using the percentage of satisfied responses (“Totally satisfied”, “Highly satisfied” and “Satisfied”) from the entire set of responses:

Table 2

Service area	Satisfaction percentage (excluding N/A)	Satisfaction percentage (including N/A)
Cooperative activities	95	85
IT Tools	97	89
Meetings	100	92
Operations	100	97
Document availability	97	94
Translation	98	77

The “Not applicable” responses provide valuable information as these can be interpreted as meaning that a service is not used; similarly satisfaction and dissatisfaction ratings can imply that a service is used by an Office.

The table above shows no significant changes from the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2011, with the exception that the “Not Applicable” rating for all areas activities is lower, leading to higher overall, including “Not Applicable” satisfaction percentages.

A set of comments have been received relating to all areas of service. As in 2011, the comments received suggest the following should be reviewed for possible actions:

- the provision of additional Training and Seminars;
- the automation, formatting and media for PCT documents;
- the making available of translated meeting documents in additional languages
- the range of PCT tools for the filing and processing of international applications, made available to Offices and applicants; and,
- international application document availability in additional languages.

A review of the results considering geographic region is presented in Annex II.

III. Respondents

The chart below shows the responding Offices by geographic region:




Figure 1

The 66 respondents represent, globally, a broad distribution of Offices.

IV. 2012 results

The overall set of satisfaction results³ is represented in the chart below:




Figure 2

The chart shows that respondents gave services provided by the International Bureau mostly ratings of “Totally satisfied”, “Highly satisfied” and “Satisfied”, or “Not applicable”; there were few ratings of “Partially satisfied” or “Dissatisfied”.

In comparison with 2011 and 2010 results these results show slight improvements in satisfaction for the majority of the individual questions and a better distribution of the areas of “Not applicable” responses which is becoming more consistent with actual usage of the relevant services.

The following sections of this document review the results following the structure of the questions, organized by PCT service area. For each area of service within the PCT the levels of satisfaction are presented, the level of coverage/applicability and the descriptive comments are reviewed.

³ A summary of the survey questions is provided as Annex I, and, a review of the results considering geographic regions is presented in Annex II.

IV.(i) PCT International Cooperation:

Questions

The following questions were asked relating to PCT international cooperation:

Table 3

Question No.	Question text
1	Please rate your satisfaction with PCT cooperation activities such as training and seminars, legal assistance and technical (IT) cooperation:
	Overall:
	Please rate your satisfaction with PCT training and seminars organized by, or co-organized by, the International Bureau:
	Please rate your satisfaction with PCT legal assistance provided by the International Bureau:
	Please rate your satisfaction with PCT technical (IT) cooperation with the International Bureau:
2	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding PCT training and seminars, legal assistance and technical (IT) cooperation:
2a	Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding PCT training and seminars, legal assistance and technical (IT) cooperation:

Satisfaction ratings

The results, including the “Not applicable” responses, are shown on the following chart:




Figure 3

The following chart shows the results with the “Not applicable” responses removed:




Figure 4

The following table shows the PCT international cooperation response data:

Table 4

Question	Overall Cooperation	Training and Seminars	Legal Assistance	IT Cooperation
Totally satisfied	17	14	18	9
Highly satisfied	19	20	21	18
Satisfied	20	13	16	23
Partially satisfied	3	4	1	3
Dissatisfied	0	0	0	1
Not applicable	7	15	10	12
TOTAL RESPONSES	66	66	66	66
Not applicable percentage	9	22	14	18
Satisfaction rating (1-5)	3.8	3.9	4	3.6

The responses to the satisfaction questions above show a good level of satisfaction (Figure 5 and table 4).

Comments regarding “Dissatisfied” ratings

The one “Dissatisfied” rating was given with a comment that electronic filing at the relevant Office had not yet been planned and implemented.

PCT International cooperation comments

General comments and suggestions regarding PCT cooperative activities

The comments received generally reflect a good perception of PCT cooperative activities, and particularly recognizing the value of training and seminars provided by WIPO.

There were a number of comments from Offices that expressed requests for increased provision of training and seminars.

There was one comment indicating that an increase in technical support regarding IT tools is required at that Office, and in comments regarding PCT IT tools there were several comments requesting additional levels of assistance in the implementation of PCT IT tools.

IV.(ii) IT tools

Questions

The following questions were asked relating to PCT operation IT tools:

Table 5

Question No.	Question text
3	Please rate your satisfaction with the PCT operational processing IT tools:
	Overall:
	ePCT Applicant:
	ePCT Office:
	PCT-SAFE:
	PCT-ROAD:
	PCT-EDI:
	PADOS (replaced PCT-COR 2012):
	PATENTSCOPE web site:
	PATENTSCOPE XML web services:
4	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding PCT operational processing IT tools:
4a	Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction with PCT operational processing IT tools:

Satisfaction Ratings

The results, including the “Not applicable” responses, are shown on the following chart:




Figure 5

The following chart shows the results with the “Not applicable” responses removed:




Figure 6

The following table shows the response data regarding PCT IT tools:

Table 6

Question	Overall IT Tools	ePCT Applicant	ePCT Office	PCT-SAFE	PCT-ROAD	PCT-EDI	PADOS	PATENT SCOPE Web site	PATENT SCOPE Web services
Totally satisfied	11	4	5	9	3	8	1	17	8
Highly satisfied	19	5	7	9	2	6	1	27	8
Satisfied	29	4	8	18	4	15	5	20	16
Partially satisfied	1	1	5	2	0	3	0	0	0
Dissatisfied	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0
Not applicable	5	51	40	27	54	33	58	2	34
TOTAL RESPONSES	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
Not applicable percentage	8	77	60	42	82	49	88	3	51
Satisfaction rating (1-5)	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.5	3.1	4.0	3.8

Table 6 shows that, in comparison with the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2010 and 2011, the overall satisfaction ratings have remained at a similar level. The “Dissatisfied” ratings for ePCT (applicant and Office) came from one Office that is currently not using the system.

The satisfaction data shows a higher level of satisfaction with the PATENTSCOPE Web site and the Web services⁴ compared to other IT tools. Looking at the “Not applicable” response rates for the various questions, it appears that Offices may have improved in their understanding of the questions in that this response rate appears more appropriate for the known usage levels of the various IT tools that are provided.

Comments regarding “Dissatisfied” ratings

There were several “Dissatisfied” ratings regarding PCT-IT tools. These ratings were accompanied with comment related to several aspects of using IT tools: the need for information and assistance in their deployment the performance/behaviour of the systems in locations remote from Geneva and the desire to have additional functionality and document availability.

PCT IT tools comments

As for 2011, while there is a group of Offices happy with some of the IT tools, there appear to be a group of Offices that commented that they either did not have enough information or any facility to implement some of the PCT IT automation tools available. Apart from this more general comment the majority of the comments reflect individual requests for improvements that need to be addressed by IT tools.

ePCT Portal

The comments regarding the ePCT portal primarily requested further evolution of the ePCT Office portal, including to the extent of enabling a small/medium Office to use the Office Portal as its primary administrative tool for PCT applications as a receiving Office. In other cases the ePCT comments were reflecting a need for additional support to get started with ePCT.

PCT-SAFE Electronic filing

The comments received regarding the PCT-SAFE GUI from 2011 were repeated, requesting that the GUI be improved. Additionally it was commented that the PCT-SAFE tools available for the receiving office did not provide good troubleshooting messages.

PADOS

There were no comments regarding PADOS itself, but one office requested a facility for the download of documents for early national phase entry International Applications, pre-publication. The implementation of such a service has been discussed, but as yet is not planned.

PATENTSCOPE

The comments regarding PATENTSCOPE confirm its wide usage and the heavy reliance on the system that Offices have for obtaining documents for International Applications. There was a comment requesting the making available of translations of application documents, in addition to titles and abstracts, in the case where the language of filing is not English. There was also a comment regarding the occasional unavailability of the system and a comment praising the current implementation of the user interface.

⁴ PATENTSCOPE Web site is a portal site to provide search service for free, whereas PATENTSCOPE Web service is an API. facility for organizations to write corresponding software to access the PATENTSCOPE database (<http://www.wipo.int/patentscope/en/data/products.html>).

IV.(iii) PCT administrative bodies meeting organization

Questions

The following questions were asked relating to PCT administrative bodies meeting organization:

Table 7

Question No.	Question text
5	Please rate your satisfaction with the organization (such as logistics and preparatory work) of the meetings of PCT administrative bodies:
	Overall:
	PCT Assembly:
	PCT Working Group:
	PCT Meeting of International Authorities:
6	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding the organization of PCT administrative bodies:
6a	Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction with the organization of PCT administrative bodies:

Satisfaction Ratings

The results, including the “Not applicable” responses, are shown on the following chart:




Figure 7

The following chart shows the results with the “Not applicable” responses removed:




Figure 8

The following table shows the response data for PCT administrative bodies meeting organization:

Table 8

Question	Overall PCT Admin. Bodies	PCT Assembly	PCT Working Group	PCT MIA
Totally satisfied	19	17	19	10
Highly satisfied	23	21	24	13
Satisfied	19	17	13	10
Partially satisfied	0	0	0	0
Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	5	11	10	33
TOTAL RESPONSES	66	66	66	66
Not applicable percentage	8	17	15	49
Satisfaction rating (1-5)	4.0	4.0	4.1	4

Table 8 shows that, in comparison with the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2011, the overall satisfaction ratings have improved with notably all responses indicating a rating of Satisfied or better.

The percentage of Offices responding either “Partly satisfied”, or “Dissatisfied” is now zero regarding the three annual meetings (see Figure 9), indicating that the administrative bodies are being run in a consistent manner with a good level of satisfaction.

PCT administrative bodies meeting organization comments

In general the comments expressed three main points:

- Offices were satisfied with the meetings and noted improvements in the timeliness of the availability of meeting documents;
- The making available of meeting documents in Spanish and Chinese was suggested; and,
- where possible papers for the meetings should be prepared as early in advance of the meetings as possible.

IV.(iv) Operational processing

Questions

The following questions were asked relating to the PCT operational processing service:

Table 9

Question No.	Question text
7	Please rate your satisfaction regarding the service provided by the PCT processing team at the International Bureau handling international applications:
	Overall:
	Facilities for contacting the processing team:
	Availability of staff:
	Timeliness of answering questions:
	Quality of follow up:
	Experience/expertise of staff:
8	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding the PCT processing team service:
8a	Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding the PCT processing team service:

Satisfaction Ratings

The results, including the “Not applicable” responses, are shown on the following chart:




Figure 9

The following chart shows the results with the “Not applicable” responses removed:




Figure 10

The following table shows the response data relating to the PCT operational processing service:

Table 10

Question	Overall Processing	PT contact facilities	Staff availability	Timeliness answering questions	Quality of follow up	Staff experience/expertise
Totally satisfied	18	16	18	18	14	20
Highly satisfied	25	23	22	28	28	23
Satisfied	21	24	24	19	20	20
Partially satisfied	0	2	1	1	0	0
Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	2	1	1	0	4	3
TOTAL RESPONSES	66	66	66	66	66	66
Not applicable percentage	3	2	2	0	6	5
Satisfaction rating (1-5)	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0

Table 10 shows that, in comparison with the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2011, the overall satisfaction ratings have improved with a small reduction in the already low number of “Dissatisfied” or “Partially satisfied” ratings.

PCT operational processing comments

There were a number of comments expressing satisfaction with the good working relationships between the processing team staff at the International Bureau and the corresponding Office staff.

Included in the comments were a number of suggestions for possible improvements of the operational processing of international applications:

- improved availability of processing team contact information;

- a suggestion that IB would accept double sided copies of documents to reduce paper usage; and,
- a suggestion that the RO guidelines and the administrative instructions for ISAs could be improved.

IV.(v) Document availability

Questions

The following questions were asked relating to the PCT operations document service:

Table 11

Question No.	Question text
9	Please rate your satisfaction regarding the International Bureau’s service that makes documents (such as PCT publications, priority documents, or PCT forms) available for PCT international applications:
	Overall:
	Timeliness of document availability:
	Accuracy of documents:
	Timeliness of answering questions:
	Ease of document access via PATENTSCOPE:
	Rule 87 / Article 20 DVD:
10	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding PCT document availability:
10a	Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding PCT document availability from the International Bureau for international applications:

Satisfaction Ratings

The results, including the “Not applicable” responses, are shown on the following chart:




Figure 11

The following chart shows the results with the “Not applicable” responses removed:




Figure 12

The following table shows the response data relating to the PCT operations document service:

Table 12

Question	Overall Documents	Timeliness of availability	Accuracy	Timeliness responding to questions	Ease of access	Rule 87 / Article 20 DVD
Totally satisfied	15	14	14	16	20	7
Highly satisfied	31	28	26	24	19	7
Satisfied	16	19	21	17	22	14
Partially satisfied	2	2	1	1	1	2
Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	2	3	4	8	4	36
TOTAL RESPONSES	66	66	66	66	66	66
Not applicable percentage	3	5	6	12	5	54
Satisfaction rating (1-5)	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.6

Table 12 shows that, in comparison with the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2011, the overall satisfaction ratings have increased slightly with a similar low number of “Dissatisfied” or “Partially Satisfied” ratings.

Documents Service Coverage

The Rule 87 and Article 20 DVD bulk data products are not interesting for many Offices, (the IB is encouraging Offices to discontinue the reception of the Article 20 DVDs) and their use is gradually diminishing, being replaced by on-line data transfer mechanisms as appropriate.

Document availability comments

There were a number of comments expressing satisfaction with the ease of access to documents via PATENTSCOPE, and requesting that more documents be delivered via electronic transmission and requesting the support of documents in Microsoft Word format; there was one comment regarding the perception that the PATENTSCOPE web site has not been available or slow at times.

Included in the comments were a number of suggestions for possible improvements of the operational processing of International applications:

- a suggestion that drawings should be scanned in a different format to improve their readability;
- a request for the making available of translations of application descriptions in English
- a request to update the Portuguese version of PCT/RO/101 to reflect the adjustments in force since 16 September 2012. (the Portuguese version is still from January 2010); and,
- The better identification of ST.25 sequence listings for the purposes of search.

IV.(vi) Translation

Questions


The following questions were asked relating to the PCT operational translation service:

Table 13

Question No.	Question text
11	Please rate your satisfaction concerning translations provided, under the Regulations, by the International Bureau, related to PCT international applications (titles, abstracts, international search reports, written opinions and international preliminary examination reports):
	Overall:
	Quality of translations:
	Timeliness of translation availability:
12	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding the PCT translation service:
12a	Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding the PCT translation service:

Satisfaction Ratings

The results, including the “Not applicable” responses, are shown on the following chart:

**Figure 13**

The following chart shows the results with the “Not applicable” responses removed:




Figure 14

The following table shows the response data relating to the PCT operational translation service:

Table 14

Question	Overall Translation	Translation quality	Translation timeliness
Totally satisfied	12	11	10
Highly satisfied	16	15	17
Satisfied	23	22	21
Partially satisfied	1	2	2
Dissatisfied	0	0	0
Not applicable	14	16	16
TOTAL RESPONSES	66	66	66
Not applicable percentage	20	23	23
Satisfaction rating (1-5)	3.8	3.7	3.7

Table 14 shows that, in comparison with the table presented for the PCT Office feedback survey 2010, the overall satisfaction ratings have increased slightly, and the numbers “Not applicable” responses has reduced, but there is a small increase in the low number of “Dissatisfied” or “Partially Satisfied” ratings.

Operational translation service comments

There were a small number of comments regarding the quality of translation, and that in respect of Japanese – English translation there are cases where the translation quality might be improved on.

IV.(vii) General End of Survey comments

At the conclusion of the questionnaire, a general question was asked to Offices seeking additional suggestions that had not already been prompted by the more directed questions earlier in the questionnaire.

A small number of comments were received concentrating on, and thanking the International Bureau for, continued cooperation and requested further information sharing and, in particular requested further training and seminars related to the provision of PCT information.

V. Conclusions and next steps

In general, the response data indicates that, with regards to questions asking for satisfaction ratings, Offices expressed a certain degree of satisfaction with the PCT services provided by the International Bureau.

The comments provided by Offices suggest that the following areas should be reviewed for possible actions:

- the provision of additional Training and Seminars;
- the range of PCT tools for the filing and processing of international applications, made available to Offices and applicants; and,
- international application document availability in additional languages.

Regarding the survey procedure, the use of the Opinio on-line survey tool can be viewed as a success, noting that few of the Offices had any difficulty in using the tool and no negative feedback was received.

[Annex I follows]

Annex I – Survey Questions

The complete set of survey questions in tabular form:

Question No.	Question text
1	Please rate your satisfaction with PCT cooperation activities such as training and seminars, legal assistance and technical (IT) cooperation: Overall:
2	Please rate your satisfaction with PCT training and seminars organized by, or co-organized by, the International Bureau: Please rate your satisfaction with PCT legal assistance provided by the International Bureau: Please rate your satisfaction with PCT technical (IT) cooperation with the International Bureau:
2a	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding PCT training and seminars, legal assistance and technical (IT) cooperation: Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding PCT training and seminars, legal assistance and technical (IT) cooperation:
3	Please rate your satisfaction with the PCT operational processing IT tools: Overall:
4	ePCT Applicant ePCT Office PCT-SAFE: PCT-ROAD: PCT-EDI: PADOS (replaced PCT-COR in 2012): PATENTSCOPE web site: PATENTSCOPE XML web services:
4a	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding PCT operational processing IT tools: Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction with PCT operational processing IT tools:
5	Please rate your satisfaction with the organization (such as logistics and preparatory work) of the meetings of PCT administrative bodies: Overall:
6	PCT Assembly: PCT Working Group: PCT Meeting of International Authorities:
6a	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding the organization of PCT administrative bodies: Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction with the organization of PCT administrative bodies:
7	Please rate your satisfaction regarding the service provided by the PCT processing team at the International Bureau handling international applications: Overall:
8	Facilities for contacting the processing team: Availability of staff: Timeliness of answering questions: Quality of follow up: Experience/expertise of staff:
8a	Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding the PCT processing team service: Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding the PCT processing team service:

Question No.	Question text
9 10 10a	Please rate your satisfaction regarding the International Bureau's service that makes documents (such as PCT publications, priority documents, or PCT forms) available for PCT international applications: Overall: Timeliness of document availability: Accuracy of documents: Timeliness of answering questions: Ease of document access via PATENTSCOPE: Rule 87 / Article 20 DVD: Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding PCT document availability: Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding PCT document availability from the International Bureau for international applications:
11 12 12a	Please rate your satisfaction concerning translations provided, under the Regulations, by the International Bureau, related to PCT international applications (titles, abstracts, international search reports, written opinions and international preliminary examination reports): Overall: Quality of translations: Timeliness of translation availability: Please provide your thoughts and suggestions regarding the PCT translation service: Please specify the cause of dissatisfaction regarding the PCT translation service:
13	Please share any additional comments, information or requests:

[End of Annex I, Annex II follows]

Annex II – Satisfaction by Geographic Region




Figure 15

The chart above shows satisfaction by geographic region. It appears that there is a lower perception of satisfaction at Offices in the Asian region, in comparison with other regions, almost across the entire set of services provided by the PCT (unchanged from 2010). While this could be expected in the area of IT due to differing levels of development of IT services, it should be noted (in the context of the “language to English” translation service at the International Bureau) that this perception also applies to the translation service⁵. The satisfaction by geographic region chart is quite similar to the charts presented for 2010 and 2011; this could also indicate that the perception of variations by region is related to differing levels of expectation.

[End of Annex II and document]

⁵ Possibly because the service affects applicants from these countries when English speaking countries are the “Office of second filing”