

Interagency Cooperation at National and
International Level:
An assessment of good practices for
improving IPR enforcement



INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVEL: AN ASSESSMENT OF GOOD PRACTICES FOR IMPROVING IPR ENFORCEMENT

ISBN 978-92-9156-293-0 doi: 10.2814/713152 TB-02-21-562-EN-N

© European Union Intellectual Property Office

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Executive Summary	4
1 Introduction and background	6
2 Findings	6
2.1 Existence of interagency cooperation, framework or structures	6
2.2 Single or multiple structures	7
2.3 Scope of activities	8
2.4 Judicial involvement	8
2.5 Role of private stakeholders	9
2.6 Cross-border activity	9
2.7 Website presence	10
3 Good practices	10
3.1 Leading entity for interagency cooperation	10
3.2 Multiple structure based on different type of intellectual property rights	11
3.3 Involvement of judicial authorities	11
3.4 Involvement of private stakeholders	11
3.5 Cross-border activity	12
3.6 Activities	12
4 Conclusions	13
5 Annexes	14
5.1 Annex I - Questionnaire for Member States	14
5.2 Annex II - Summary of the responses	15
5.2.1 Entities and legal form	15
5.2.2 Cross border, website and principal activities	32

Executive Summary

Interagency cooperation has been identified as a possible source of best practices in the field of enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR), since it facilitates synergies and resource optimisation, improves communication between the relevant parties, avoids overlaps in activities, and fosters coherence in the messages conveyed.

On 29 July 2014 the European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights (the Observatory) published a report on 'Inter-Agency Cooperation at National and International Level'. Since several years have passed and there have been a number of developments at national level, the Observatory has decided to update the report to reflect such developments. The updated report has been prepared on the basis of data provided by the Observatory public sector stakeholder representatives.

The report includes information about: the existence of interagency cooperation in the area of IPR enforcement, its nature, the involvement of different stakeholders and authorities, and the type of activities carried out in this framework.

The updated version of the report presents and compares the information provided in 2014 with the information obtained in 2020. From the information provided to the Observatory, there have been some developments between 2014 and 2020 as regards the status of interagency cooperation in European Union (EU) Member States.

- While all the Member States that answered the questionnaire have some form of interagency cooperation, it is still the case that not all Member States have frameworks or structures for such cooperation. Where there are structures, it is still the case that some are informal and others are more **formalised**, often based on national legislation.

- **Single structures**¹ taking the lead in the cooperation effort continue to be less common than **multiple structures**², with no formal entity leading the cooperation.
- There has been an increase in the involvement of the judiciary in interagency cooperation.
- **Private sector stakeholders**' involvement in the interagency structures remains constant. Such participation takes place via formalised entities representing intellectual property stakeholders and consumer associations.
- The **range of activities** undertaken through interagency activity is still wide. In both the 2014 and 2020 questionnaires the scope includes activities ranging from educational initiatives and awareness-raising to legal enforcement and data analysis.
- **Cross-border cooperation** continues to be carried out either within the framework of international organisation or through bilateral agreements, and information on it is only provided by half of the countries that replied to the questionnaire.

¹ In this report single structure refers to the case when a specific body is set up to coordinate the cooperation of different entities in the field of enforcement of intellectual property rights. The specific body is usually the national industrial property office, a Ministry dealing with IPR or a specific structure created for this purpose.

² In this report multiple structures refer to the cases where interagency cooperation takes place between different entities that collaborate with each other in the field of enforcement of intellectual property rights, with none of them taking the lead, or via informal set ups.

1 Introduction and background

The first report from 2014 was produced with input from an external provider, the Legal and International Working Group (LIWG³) of the Observatory and the EU Member States' public sector stakeholder representatives in the Observatory network. The 2020 version is based on updated data received from the public sector stakeholder representatives.

Both in 2014 and 2020, the public sector stakeholder representatives were sent a questionnaire. In 2014 the responses covered a total of 25⁴ of 28 Member States, while in 2020 the information used covered 26⁵ of the current 27 Member States. While this does not constitute complete coverage of the EU it provides enough information for a general picture of national interagency cooperation in the field of IPR enforcement to be drawn and for some good practices in this field to be identified.

2 Findings

Interagency cooperation in IPR enforcement can produce a number of benefits, for instance it can contribute to saving resources and creating synergies, thus avoiding overlaps in activities. It can also improve communication between agencies and help build a team spirit that makes their activities more effective. Efficient cooperation also has the potential to facilitate easier identification of gaps in enforcement programmes and activities.

On the other hand, the creation or continued existence of interagency cooperation is not a magic wand: it does not solve all problems. From the responses to the questionnaire and the known differences between the legal and administrative culture in the various Member States, it is also clear that there is no one-size-fits-all formula for interagency cooperation. The situation in the various Member States is diverse.

2.1 Existence of interagency cooperation, framework or structures

There has been an increase in the number of countries that have interagency cooperation, as compared to the data provided for the 2014 report, since all Member States that provided information for the 2020 questionnaire now have some form of IP interagency cooperation, whether it is a single

³ This working group is no longer in place.

⁴ All EU Member States (including the United Kingdom) except Greece, Lithuania and the Netherlands.

⁵ All 27 EU Member States except the Netherlands. The information used for Bulgaria is from the data provided in 2014.

or a multiple structure. Even within these subdivisions there remains a range of approaches. In Cyprus, although there is no dedicated IP interagency cooperation, all national agencies cooperate with each other. They often organise joint actions together with the police and exchange information to assist each other in combating violations of IPR.

As for Luxembourg, there is an informal structure without an administrative status, whereas in Malta the coordination is based on a written memorandum of understanding between police and customs.

Within the variety of formalised structures, some are based on legislation, such as the Italian CNALCIS⁶ (a specific body that works through its general Secretariat DGTPI-UIBM), with a statutory basis on the Industrial Property Code Legislative Decree⁷, or the Greek Interagency for Market Control (DIMEA), set up to coordinate actions of enforcement authorities at national level to combat illicit trade and safeguard consumers pursuant to Law no. 4712/2020, while others do not have a statutory basis, such as the French CNAC. In some cases, the structures were initially based on administrative measures and later covered by legislation (e.g. Hungary).

2.2 Single or multiple structures

Comparing the data provided in 2014 and that from 2020, there has been an increase among the countries that have a single structure and a decrease in those having multiple ones. Member States embarking on the establishment of an interagency structure have a wide choice in the type of model they might adopt, respecting the different administrative and legislative cultures that exist between Member States.

Almost half of the Member States that provided information in the 2020 questionnaire have a single structure that takes the lead of the interagency cooperation, often based in national legislation⁸. In many cases the lead is the national industrial property office (e.g. Denmark, France, Croatia and Sweden) or a Ministry dealing with IPR. For instance, the latter is the case in the Czech Republic, where such coordination is managed by the Czech Ministry of Industry and Trade. Italy (CNALCIS),

⁶ National Council for the fight against counterfeiting and Italian Sounding.

⁷ February 10th 2005, n. 30, and subsequent amendments and additions: www.normattiva.it/uri-res/N2Ls?urn:nir:stato:decreto.legislativo:2005-02-10;30!vig=.

⁸ The following MS have a single structure based in national legislation: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Italy, Hungary, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia.

Greece (DIMEA) and Sweden (PRV) have at present a single structure leading interagency cooperation at national level. Poland used to have a leading agency in 2014 (for counteracting infringements of copyright and related rights), but this no longer seems to be the case.

Slightly over half of the Member States that provided information in the 2020 questionnaire have in place multiple structures dealing with interagency cooperation. In some countries there are two main entities, as is the case of Spain, while in others, for example Belgium, there are various bodies involved: the NANAC, the Foundation against Counterfeit, is a cooperation between the International Chamber of Commerce and the Federal Public Service Finance, with involvement of the Federal Public Service Economy.

2.3 Scope of activities

The scope of activities covered by interagency IPR enforcement cooperation, viewed across all the Member States, is diverse. The following activities are among the most commonly undertaken⁹:

- Awareness raising,
- Data collection,
- Coordination of actions and activities,
- Information sharing,
- Provision of advice on legislation and policy,
- Training,
- Assisting the implementation of IPR enforcement projects.

2.4 Judicial involvement

Involvement of the judiciary has increased between 2014 and 2020. Courts have a role in both civil and criminal enforcement of IPR. Furthermore, where prosecution authorities are part of the judiciary, they also have a role in the enforcement of IPR. While in 2014 there were only five countries where the judicial bodies (including prosecutors) took part in interagency cooperation (i.e. Bulgaria, Germany, Croatia, Latvia and Romania), by 2020 this number had doubled¹⁰, since Spain, France, Italy, Lithuania and Sweden have also involved such bodies in the interagency activities.

⁹ The list is by no means exhaustive.

¹⁰ If we can consider that the situation in BL is the same in 2020.

2.5 Role of private stakeholders

There has been an increase in the Member States regarding the involvement of the private stakeholders. Private sector stakeholders' participation varies from an arranged participation in the structures (Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Hungary, Poland and Romania), to a less formal or ad hoc involvement (Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, Portugal, Greece and Finland). Private stakeholders can be invited to take part in some seminars and conferences. This is the case in Sweden, for instance.

Possible constraints on private stakeholder involvement, particularly with respect to operational matters, should be considered when devising the means of involving private stakeholders in interagency structures.

2.6 Cross-border activity

As compared to 2014, there is one Member State which has indicated that there are no longer cross-border activities taking place in the framework of interagency cooperation. Information on cross-border activities is only provided by half of the countries that replied to the questionnaire. Among those Member States engaged in cross-border IPR enforcement activity, there are several ways in which such action takes place. In some cases this is done through existing EU or international organisations, such as Directorate-General for Taxation and Customs Union (Malta), Europol (Belgium, Ireland and Italy) or Interpol (Italy), the World Customs Organization (Ireland and Italy), the World Health Organization (Italy) or the Council of Europe (Estonia and Italy). While this is a possibility, there may be gaps that can be filled in via cooperation between interagency structures of different Member States.

Some Member States organise specific cross-border activities or have concluded agreements with other countries (within the EU and with third countries). For example, Denmark carries out the cross-border activities via three different recurring international enforcement actions. France (via CNAC) is periodically signing conventions with similar structures outside of Europe (e.g. Brazil and China). And cooperation with Cyprus and Albania has also been reported by Greece.

In Germany, police and customs regularly make use of the instruments available for cross-border legal assistance in the EU and with non-EU countries. In Portugal, the Anti-Counterfeiting Group (ACG) is involved in a cooperation action with the Chinese Delegation and with other EU countries.

Romania has set up a cooperation partnership with authorities and antipiracy and anti-counterfeiting associations in the Balkan area.

2.7 Website presence

From the information provided in the questionnaires, website presence has increased between 2014 and 2020. For most cases, where a structure for interagency cooperation exists, a dedicated website is frequently available in relation to its activities. Even in the absence of a dedicated website, information is often provided on the website of one of the participating agencies, for instance the national intellectual property office. In some countries there is a website under construction, this is the case for Greece.

3 Good practices

The Observatory has identified the following good practices from the information provided from the Member States.

3.1 Leading entity for interagency cooperation

Even if the independence for the administrative and legislative diversity among the Member States should be respected, having a leading agency in each Member State facilitates the work of networks at EU level. Furthermore, this allows the centralisation of the activities and enables a single contact point for any exchanges. The choice of which entity is most suitable should be determined by the circumstances of each Member State. In Hungary, for instance, interagency cooperation exists mainly within National Board Against Counterfeiting (NBAC). This body was set up in 2008 and it deals with the whole range of IPR protection and enforcement as a public-private partnership. To enhance cooperation in some specific fields, the NBAC has signed several cooperation agreements with some of its members.

Another example is the case of Italy, where the National Council for the fight against counterfeiting and Italian Sounding Ministry of Economic Development (CNALCIS) is a specific body that works through its general Secretariat, the Directorate General for the Protection of Industrial Property – Italian Patent and Trade Mark Office (DGTPI-UIBM). This body was set up with a statutory basis to direct, promote and coordinate strategic actions with all the administrations involved in the fight against counterfeiting. In Belgium there is the Inter-ministerial Commission for the fight against

counterfeiting and piracy, which has its legal basis in the Belgian Code of Economic Law and whose concrete implementation is regulated by a Royal Decree.

3.2 Multiple structure based on different type of intellectual property rights

An alternative to a single structure can be the existence of two different entities dealing with interagency cooperation with a separate focus on industrial property rights on the one hand and copyright and related rights on the other. The separation between the two fields of activity allows different approaches considering the specificities of the different IPRs, such as for the need for registration (industrial property rights) or the identification of the relevant target audience for training. This is the case in Spain where the Spanish Patent and Trade Mark Office leads the Inter-sectorial Commission for action against activities that infringe industrial property rights and the Ministry of Culture and Sports leads the Inter-sectorial Commission for the action against copyright infringements.

3.3 Involvement of judicial authorities

Involvement of judicial authorities can provide a positive contribution to effective interagency cooperation. As an example, in Croatia competent authorities including representatives from the Ministry of Justice are involved in the work of the group for cooperation with IPR holders. This group is a forum for the exchange of information and experiences. The activities of this body are coordinated by the State Intellectual Property Office. Another example is Italy, where interagency cooperation takes place via the CNALCIS, which coordinates strategic actions with all of the administrations involved in the fight against counterfeiting, including the Ministry of Justice.

Nonetheless, judicial participation remains a sensitive issue for a number of countries as it might give rise to concerns such as separation of powers and the independent role of the judiciary.

3.4 Involvement of private stakeholders

Private stakeholders, in particular rights-holders and consumers, are the ones who suffer the most immediate impact of IPR infringement. Consequently, their involvement in interagency structures is valued. Such participation can take different forms. For instance, in Latvia private stakeholders take part in the Intellectual Property Rights Expert Group and have the same rights as other members from ministries and agencies.

In Ireland, while there is no formal platform for cooperation in the field of IPR enforcement, private stakeholders cooperate with the Revenue agency in a number of areas. This cooperation includes the submission of Applications for Action by right holders to Revenue, as well as the provision of information and training to customs officers.

And in Greece, DIMEA is in close cooperation with IPR holders' representatives, the Chambers of Commerce, the Confederation of Trade and Entrepreneurship and the General Confederation of Professional Craft Traders, which support DIMEA's operational actions.

3.5 Cross-border activity

The establishment of bilateral agreements with countries and the organisation of specific cross-border activities seem an effective complement for the cross-border IPR enforcement actions done through existing EU or international organisations. This is, for example, the case in Germany, Portugal and Romania. In France, the CNAC periodically signs conventions with similar structures out of Europe (e.g. in Brazil and China).

3.6 Activities

The creation of a structured plan for activities proposed within the framework of interagency cooperation over a period of time could be useful for the effective coordination and implementation of the activities, as well as the creation of synergies. This is the case in Italy, for example, which proposes a two-year structured anti-counterfeiting plan, approved by the CNALCIS, defining a shared and integrated national anti-counterfeiting policy. The plan is the sole national document on anti-counterfeiting planning and it is intended to provide a tool for the consistent and integrated management of all the activities involved in the fight against counterfeiting.

4 Conclusions

The experience of those Member States that have an interagency cooperation structure is positive despite the diversity of models in place. Interagency cooperation in IPR enforcement can contribute mainly to:

- creating synergies and optimising resources,
- improving communication between agencies and helping build a team spirit which makes their activities more effective and efficient,
- avoiding overlaps in activities and conveying diverging messages to the same audience,
- identifying gaps in enforcement programmes and activities.

The greater the number of Member States with a leading interagency structure in the field of IPRs, the more likely this will facilitate the work of networks at EU level. For this reason, the possibility of there being only one body or agency to lead the national cooperation effort should be considered.

Even if judicial participation might give rise to concerns about sensitive issues such as separation of powers and the independent role of the judiciary, interagency cooperation structures should explore how to involve the judiciary.

While interagency cooperation has the activities and programmes of public sector organisations at its core, there is room for synergies between public and private interests, such as in awareness-raising campaigns, compilation of statistics and education activities. Consequently, private-public cooperation in this field could help to create synergies to avoid duplicating actions and conveying contradictory messages.

The possibility of cross-border cooperation⁵ should be part of Member States' interagency cooperation¹¹. The Observatory could assist, through its own activities, in such a development.

¹¹ This is in addition to any cooperation that takes place through the Observatory.

5 Annexes

5.1 Annex I - Questionnaire for Member States

1. What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement in your Member State? (Please list all enforcement ministries/agencies involved)
2. Does your country have any form of interagency cooperation in the enforcement of IPR?
3. If so, what form does such interagency cooperation take? (e.g. via a specific body set up to coordinate work, via cooperation agreements between agencies, or via formal or informal taskforces, platforms or other informal set ups that link all these actors together)
4. Is there one agency that takes the lead? Which one?
5. Is there a specific body set up to coordinate work? If so, does it have a statutory basis (is it based on national legislation)? How is the body funded?
6. Are private stakeholders involved in the work of the body/platform/agency in charge of interagency cooperation? If so please describe the extent to which such participation takes place and provide a list of the stakeholders in question.
7. Is the interagency cooperation body/platform/agency involved in cross-border activity (i.e. does it cooperate with other Member States)?
8. Is there a dedicated website?
9. Please summarise its principal activities, and most recent actions, reports, studies and recommendations (if any).
10. Please provide the details of a contact person.

5.2 Annex II - Summary of the responses

5.2.1 Entities and legal form

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
Austria	Police and Customs	Restricted to intelligence	Case by case
Belgium	Federal Public Service Economy (economic inspection); Federal Public Service Finance (customs)	Yes	(a) The Inter-ministerial Commission for the fight against counterfeiting and piracy (b) The Foundation against Counterfeit (NANAC).
Bulgaria (Data from 2014)	Prosecution authorities, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Culture, Customs Agency, Bulgarian Patent Office	Yes	The Council for Protection of Intellectual Rights is responsible for the cooperation on political level. On operation level there is ad hoc cooperation based on statutory requirements. It is based on procedural rules requiring joint actions by the competent authorities in the prosecution of IP-related crimes and administrative offences.

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
Croatia	Office of the State Attorney, Ministry of Justice (courts competent for cases in the field of intellectual property), Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Finance – Central Office of Customs Administration, Ministry of Health (Directorate for Sanitary Inspection and Health protection Directorate), Ministry of Agriculture, Croatian Food Agency, Agency for Medicinal Products and Medical Devices of Croatia, State Intellectual Property Office.	Yes. In the Republic of Croatia the coordination mechanism for performance of the tasks and activities related to the enforcement of intellectual property rights was established in 2010. Coordination mechanism is operating on several levels through standing coordinating bodies, coordinating sub-groups and working groups.	The coordination mechanism was established in accordance with National Strategy for the Development of Intellectual Property System of the Republic of Croatia for the period from 2010 to 2012 and includes the following permanent bodies: I. Steering Committee for the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights is composed of high officials from the competent state administration bodies and it is a management (strategic) level of coordination. It carries out supervision over the enforcement of intellectual

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
			<p>property rights in the Republic of Croatia.</p> <p>II. Coordination Board for the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights</p> <p>III. Operational Group for the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights</p> <p>IV. Group for the Cooperation with the Holders of Intellectual Property Rights</p> <p>V. Working groups</p>
Cyprus	Customs & Excise Departments responsible for any goods imported or transferred into the Republic of Cyprus.	No	N/A

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	Cyprus Police and the Ministry of Energy, Commerce, Industry and Tourism responsible for any goods that are manufactured in Cyprus		
Czech Republic	Customs, National Police, Trade Inspection, Agriculture and Food Inspection	Yes	The Interministerial Commission for Combating illegal actions against intellectual property rights was set up to coordinate work between its members. Its work consists mainly in the coordination and stimulation of its members.
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danish Patent- and Trademark Office • State Prosecutor for Serious Economic and International Crime • The Danish Customs Agency 	Yes	Danish Ministerial Network against IPR Infringements

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Culture Denmark • Danish National police • Danish Medicines Agency • Danish Veterinary and Food Administration • Danish Safety Technology Authority • Danish Competition and Consumer Authority/ European Consumer Centre Denmark • Danish Business Authority • Danish Export Council • Danish Agricultural Agency 		
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Estonian Tax and Customs Board - Police and Border Guard Board 	No formal structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Informal meetings of customs and police take place periodically. - Intelligence sharing and cooperation between customs

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
			and police on case-by-case basis.
Finland	Customs, Ministry of Employment and the Economy, the Copyright Information and Anti- Piracy Centre, Finnish Anti-Counterfeiting Group, Police and Customs	<p>MoU between Customs and the Copyright Information and Anti-Piracy Centre and The Anti- Counterfeiting Group</p> <p>The Act on Cooperation between the Police, Customs and the Border Guard sets out a general framework for cooperation between the PCB authorities . Strategies of PCB authorities are jointly implemented so that the tasks laid down for these authorities and individual measures that are connected with the prevention, detection and investigation of crimes (combating of crime), control and monitoring and related international cooperation, are carried out in an</p>	<p>Exchanging information according to the memorandum of understanding</p> <p>Co-operations, information sharing and consultation when needed on a case by case basis.</p>

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
		appropriate, efficient and cost-effective manner.	
France	INPI, Customs, Police, Gendarmerie, Justice, DGE	Yes, CNAC	An informal structure without administrative status, led by a parliamentarian
Germany	Ministries of Justice and Consumer Protection, Finance, Food and Agriculture, Interior at federal and state level; civil courts and bailiffs, police, customs, prosecution services, local market supervision authorities.	Yes	The character and basis of the inter-agency cooperation varies depending on its subject.
Greece	Interagency for Market Control (DIMEA), Ministry of Development and Investments Police Customs, Ministry of Finance	Yes	Via the Interagency for Market Control (DIMEA)

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	Special Secretariat for Financial and Economic Crime Unit (SDOE), Ministry of Finance Coast Guard, Ministry of Shipping and Island Policy Municipal Police		
Hungary	National Tax and Customs Authority, Police, Market surveillance authorities, National Food Chain Safety Office, district and county level authorities, prosecutors	Yes	National Board Against Counterfeiting (NBAC)
Ireland	Revenue Commissioners, Garda Síochána (police)	Yes	It is an informal arrangement. Revenue has responsibility for IPR enforcement at EU borders, while An Garda Síochána has responsibility for enforcement of controls relating to goods in free circulation.

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
			<p>The Irish Medicines Board (IMB), with whom both agencies work closely, has an indirect involvement in that it has responsibilities in relation to all illegal medicines, medical devices, and cosmetics, which may include IPR infringing products.</p> <p>Similarly, The Food Safety Authority of Ireland (FSAI) has responsibilities in relation to food products which could include IPR infringing goods. However, neither of these agencies is empowered to act in relation to the specific area of IPR infringements.</p>

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
Italy	Information and Publishing Department of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers; Department for European Policies at the Presidency of the Council of Ministers; Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ministry of the Interior; Ministry of Justice; Ministry of Economy and Finance; Ministry of Economic Development; Ministry of Agricultural and Forestry Policies; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism; Italian Tax Police (Guardia di Finanza); Italian Customs and Monopolies Agency; Carabinieri Command for the Protection of Health; Carabinieri Command for Agricultural and Food Policy; National Anti-Mafia Directorate (DNA); AGCM (Autorità Garante della Concorrenza e	Yes it does, at a national level: CNALCIS –National Council for the fight against counterfeiting and Italian Sounding (ex CNAC National Anti-counterfeiting Council): an inter-ministerial body under the Ministry of Economic Development. Besides CNALCIS’s Members involvement of law enforcement agencies as well as business and consumers associations is also granted through two Permanent Consultative Committees. Ministry of Economic Development: the Directorate General for the Protection of Industrial Property– Italian Patent and Trademark Office (DGTPI-UIBM), also as CNALCIS’ General Secretariat.	The inter-agency cooperation, at a strategic level, takes place via the CNALCIS (a specific body that work through its general Secretariat DGTPI-UIBM) set up to direct, promote and coordinate strategic actions with all of the administrations involved in the fight against counterfeiting (12 ministries – Economic Development, Finance, Economy, Education, Justice, Interior, Defence, Agricultural Policies, Cultural Heritage, Social Policy, Foreign Affairs, Health and Public Administration – and the Association of Italian Municipalities). The

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	<p>del Mercato); AGCOM – Communications Regulatory Authority; AIFA – Italian Medicines Agency; CNALCIS –National Council for the fight against counterfeiting and Italian Sounding (ex CNAC National Anti-counterfeiting Council); ITA – Italian Trade Agency; ISS (Istituto Superiore della Sanità); SIAE – Italian Society of Authors and Publishers.</p>	<p>At a local level: Prefectures (Ministry of the Interior), through the Provincial Permanent Conferences for order and safety that coordinate the activities to prevent and combat counterfeiting, among the other tasks.</p>	<p>anticounterfeiting actions planned in synergy by CNALCIS members, together with LEAs and business/consumers associations flow into “The anticounterfeiting national strategic Plan” (biennial).</p> <p>For specific matters and territories, different cooperation agreements between agencies, and -or via informal or formal - taskforces are in place: thanks to these agreements, all enforcement local agencies regularly meet to coordinate activities, in the framework ensured by the Prefectures.</p>

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
Latvia	Ministries of Justice (Patents Office), Culture, Agriculture, Interior, Economics, Finance, Education and Science, Foreign Affairs, Transport, Environmental Protection and Regional Development, Prosecutors' Office, Courts	Yes	There are two bodies: the Cooperation and Coordination Working Group (enforcement authorities' level) and the National Strategic Council for Research and Innovation (national level).
Lithuania	Chancellery of the Government; Ministry of Culture; Ministry of Justice; State Patent Bureau; Ministry of Economy; Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sport; Agency for Science, Innovation and Technology; Customs Department under the Ministry of Finance; The State Plant Service under the Ministry of Agriculture; Lithuanian Criminal Police Bureau; Food inspections; Courts	Yes	The Commission on Intellectual Property Protection and Co-ordination was established by the Order of the Lithuanian Government.

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
Luxembourg	Ministry of the Economy Prosecution authorities Customs & Excise Administration Police authorities	Yes	Informal structure without administrative status
Malta	Customs (Ministry of Finance), Police (Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security).	No specific structure.	There is a memorandum of understanding between customs and police.
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA
Poland	Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Administration and Digitisation, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, Chancellery of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Science and Higher Education, Ministry of Economy, Customs Service,	Yes, the Team for Counteracting Infringements of Copyright and Related Rights	Minister of Culture and Heritage

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	<p>Border Guards, Police, The Patent Office, Prosecution General, National Broadcasting Council, Office for Competition and Consumer Protection, Office of Electronic Communication, Inspector General for the Protection of Personal Data, Human Rights Defender (ombudsman).</p>		
Portugal	<p>ASAE (Authority for Food and Economic Safety - mainland), IRAE (Regional Authority for Food and Economic Safety – isles of Azores) and ARAE (Authority for Food and Economic Safety – isles of Madeira), which are under the Ministry of Economy ; GNR (Republican National Guard) and PSP (Public Security Police), which are under the Ministry of Internal Administration; PJ (Judiciary</p>	<p>Yes, the ACG (Anti-Counterfeiting Group)</p>	<p>The ACG is an inter-ministerial group that congregates the multidisciplinary expertise in fight against counterfeiting of the six organizations already mentioned.</p> <p>The fundamental competence of this Group is to develop joint actions to prevent and repress counterfeiting activities, with full</p>

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	<p>Police), which is under the Ministry of Justice; INPI (National Institute of Industrial Property), PGR (Attorney's General Office), IP Court (Intellectual Property Court) and other Courts dealing with IP issues, which are under the Ministry of Justice; AT (Customs), which is under the Ministry of Finance and IGAC (General Inspection for Cultural Activities), which is under the Ministry of Culture.</p>		<p>respect to the jurisdiction of each entity. The Group was officially created through the Ordinance No. 882, September 10, 2010.</p>
Romania	<p>Public Ministry, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Culture, Copyright Office (ORDA), State Office for Patents and Trademarks (OSIM), General Inspectorate of the Romanian Police (Fraud Investigation Division), General Inspectorate of Border Police, National</p>	<p>Yes, the Service for the coordination of the Public Ministry activity in IPR field (IPR Unit)</p>	<p>Inter institutional cooperation is set up through a Government Decision in 2005 followed by a Minister of Justice order in 2006 when the IPR Unit has been settled within the GPO s.</p>

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
	Inspectorate of Gendarmerie, National Customs Authority, Financial Guard, National Authority for Consumers Protection, General Inspectorate of Communications and Information Technology, National Institute of Magistracy		The IPR WG is set up by a Memorandum of Understanding and the public – private cooperation is settled between 40 signatories, with the Public Ministry as coordinator.
Slovakia	Ministry of Finance (Customs), Ministry of Justice (Courts), Ministry of Interior (Police), Trade Inspection (Ministry of Economy).	Yes, the National Inter-Ministerial Commission for the coordination of cooperation against counterfeiting and piracy (Commission)	The Commission operates based on (Rules of Procedures) and the activities are in line with adopted Action Plan – part of the National Anti-counterfeiting Strategy.
Slovenia	Slovenian Intellectual Property Office, Market Inspectorate of the Republic of Slovenia, Financial Administration of the Republic of Slovenia, Police – General Police Directorate.	Yes, the Permanent Coordination Group on Combating Piracy and Counterfeiting.	The coordination group was officially set up in 2018 with the signature of Memorandum of Joint Cooperation.

Country	What agencies are involved in IPR enforcement?	Is there any form of interagency cooperation?	What form does it take?
Spain	Ministries of Industry, Energy and Tourism, (including the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (SPTO)), Education, Culture and Sports, Justice, Interior and the Police and the Civil Guard, Foreign Affairs, Health and Consumers, Customs Department, the Federation of Municipalities and Provinces.	Yes, there is an Inter-sectoral Commission for action against activities that infringe industrial property rights (Ministry of Industry, Energy and Tourism) and an Inter-sectoral Commission for action against intellectual property rights (Ministry of Culture and Sport).	Both of them are specific bodies to coordinate work and initiatives among representatives of the public sector (at a local, regional and national level) and private stakeholders.
Sweden	Police, Customs Office, International Prosecutor's Chambers, Courts for civil and penal prosecution.	Yes, involving six agencies	The six agencies meet regularly, normally 6 – 8 times per year.

5.2.2 Cross border, website and principal activities

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
Austria	No	No	N/A
Belgium	Federal Public Service Economy (economic inspection); Federal Public Service Finance (customs)	Yes www.nanac.be	(a) Inter-ministerial Commission for the fight against counterfeiting and piracy (b) The Foundation against Counterfeit (NANAC).
Bulgaria (Data from 2014)	Prosecution authorities, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Culture, Customs Agency, Bulgarian Patent Office	Yes	The Council for Protection of Intellectual Rights is responsible for the cooperation on political level. On operation level there is ad hoc cooperation based on statutory requirements. It is based on procedural rules requiring joint actions by the competent authorities in the prosecution of IP-related crimes and administrative offences.

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
Croatia	Not at present	Yes	Meetings of coordinating bodies and working groups, twice yearly reports, collection of statistics, awareness raising, education
Cyprus	N/A	N/A	N/A
Czech Republic	No	No	The operational programme covers processing data, deepening cooperation, training, consumer education.
Denmark	Yes – e.g. participation in international enforcement actions	www.jegvaelgeraegte.dk (an English version of the website is available)	Coordination and knowledge sharing. Cooperation on enforcement actions. Cooperation on awareness raising.
Estonia	No	No	N/A
Finland	No	No	N/A
France	Yes, through the Observatory and with bodies outside Europe. France for 10 INPI IP <i>attaché</i> around the world	Yes	Charters to fight counterfeiting, public awareness activities, diplomatic intervention to help right owners solve IPR infringement problems abroad.

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
Germany	Yes. In criminal enforcement, the prosecution services, police and customs regularly make use of the instruments available for cross- border legal assistance in the EU and with non-EU countries.	No. The respective authorities involved in enforcement provide information on IP on their websites.	N/A
Greece	DIMEA cooperates with Cypriot Enforcement Authorities (customs) and a MoU with Albanian State Inspectorate for Market Surveillance (SIMS) is in preparation.	Under construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • combat illicit trade, including illegal e-commerce via controls and audits as well as coordinated actions • secure smooth market operation
Hungary	No	Yes	The NBAC strategy is separated into three areas: first reducing supply, secondly reducing demand and thirdly pinning down the economic impact.
Ireland	Yes, with Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)	No	Exchange of information, awareness raising, training
Italy	Italian authorities are engaged at different level in bilateral and multilateral	www.uibm.gov.it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication, education and training Enforcement at local level

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
	international cooperation activities and fora, also with respect to issues related to the protection and enforcement of IPRs.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fight against online counterfeiting and piracy • SME training on IP management
Latvia	No	Yes, here is the link: http://viltotarealitate.lv/	The main task of the Cooperation and Coordination Working Group is to address topical issues of IPR infringements. The National Strategic Council for Research and Innovation coordinates and implements effective research, technology development and innovation policy.
Lithuania	No	No	The main activity of the Commission on Intellectual Property Protection and Co-ordination is to co-ordinate activities of state institutions and organisations in regard of the protection of the intellectual property.
Luxembourg	No	No	N/A
Malta	Through EU structures and events	Malta Customs website	Law enforcement

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA
Poland	No	No	The tasks of the Team include the preparation of applications and proposals concerning the improvement of coordination of actions taken by the governmental administration bodies within the scope of an effective combating of the infringements of copyright and related rights.
Portugal	The ACG is involved in a cooperation action with the Chinese Delegation in several areas, namely in the defense of IP rights and awareness campaigns to the value of IP to be developed near SME's of both countries; the Delegation of Cape Vert with whom was sign a MoU which entailed, amongst other points, the possibility of giving technical help in the establishment of an Anti-	Yes, the anti-counterfeiting Portal, that was created as a result of the work carried out by the Anti-Counterfeiting Group: https://anti-contrafacao.gov.pt/	The principal activities of the ACG are: Management of the Anti-Counterfeiting Portal and Online Complaint; Information Exchange; Statistics Harmonization; Cross training between ACG entities; Best Practices Identification; Cooperation with Private Sector; Propose law changes; Cooperation with the European Observatory.

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
	<p>Counterfeiting Group in that Country; with the French Comité National Anti-Contrefaçon (CNAC) and the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (OEPM). The ACG also cooperates in all the activities proposed by the European Observatory.</p>		
Romania	<p>A cooperation framework was set up with other 6 European anti-counterfeiting coordination agencies – following the French CNAC initiative. Under Phare project 2007 – 2008 a partnership with DKPTO was established.</p> <p>The IPR WG through its members has been developed cooperation partnerships with authorities and antipiracy and anti-counterfeiting associations in the Balkan area.</p>	Yes	<p>Continuous training of the designated IPR personnel from the authorities Improvement of the IPR legislation Increase IPR enforcement Public awareness Most recent actions Training seminar on the investigation of IPR infringements on the internet, followed by a Guideline for the use of police and prosecutors; Training seminars on new methods for combating software piracy (virtual machines) and on investigating cases</p>

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
			<p>regarding counterfeiting of a trademark;</p> <p>Updating the Guideline for the investigation of software piracy (version II);</p> <p>National and European jurisprudence relevant in IPR cases (on going activity) published on the website.</p>
Slovakia	No	No, but information can be found on the IPO site http://www.upv.sk/?medzirezortna-komisia-pre-koordinaciu-spoluprace	<p>Development of the National Anticounterfeiting Strategy.</p> <p>The Commission`s activities are focused primarily on public awareness raising activities and education/training of main players (Police, Customs).</p>
Slovenia	No	Yes, www.originalen.si	Meetings of coordination group members, exchange of information, awareness raising.
Spain	The inter-sectorial Commission has no competence in cross border activities	The action against activities that infringe industrial property rights	<p>For both Commissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To stablish the guidelines and

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
	<p>directly, but it is related to prosecution services, police and customs.</p>	<p>has a dedicated website and citizens can ask their doubts through it.</p>	<p>take measures to fight against IPR infringement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To promote agreements among public and private organizations, national and international, that have among their goals the protection of industrial property rights as well as to monitor and report about the relationship with other States and international organizations competent in this matter when it is required. <p>To promote advertising campaigns and a widespread knowledge of copyrights to raise public awareness about the need of protecting these rights, and to promote training activities for enforcement authorities.</p>

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To propose legislative and regulatory initiatives for an effective protection of industrial property rights. • To know the annual statistics about the actions taken against the infringement of the industrial property rights. <p>To propose that measures be adopted in order to raise the awareness of the general public and organizations such as trade unions about this issue. These measures should put forward means of ensuring ongoing collaboration with them.</p> <p>The Inter-sectorial Commission for the action against copyright infringements' main activities are:</p>

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To advice in the fight against the violation of intellectual property rights through the Internet. importance of respecting copyright. • To coordinate public administrations and private organizations dedicated to the protection of copyright, as well as other organisations representing social interests, for the study, proposal and implementation of actions that develop the Plan of the Government for the reduction and elimination of activities infringing copyright.

Country	Is there cross border activity?	Is there a dedicated website?	Principal activities
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To promote advertising campaigns and a widespread knowledge of copyrights to raise public awareness about the need of protect these rights.
Sweden	No	No	The group has “toured” with a display stand that is best described as a “fake shop”. The “fake shop” has been in various airports and public places.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVEL: AN ASSESSMENT OF GOOD

ISBN 978-92-9156-293-0 doi: 10.2814/713152 TB-02-21-562-EN-N

© European Union Intellectual Property Office

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged