Effectiveness Of Quality Management System (Qms) In An Efforts To Improve The Performance Of Trademark Examiners At The Office Of The Directorate General Of Intellectual Property (A Comparative Qualitative Study)

Yustina Linasari[1*], Denok Sunarsi[2], Mukhlis Catio3
Universitas Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan, Banten, Indonesia
E-mail: violetina154@gmail.com;

ABSTRACT

This research is a qualitative comparative study aimed at analyzing the differences in quality control systems affecting the performance of Trademark Examiners before and after the implementation of the QMS at the Directorate of Trademarks and Geographical Indications, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP). The background of this research stems from the need to establish a consistent, accountable, standardized, and solution-oriented substantive examination process in response to applicant complaints. The main issue examined is the comparative analysis of the quality control system for Trademark Examiners' performance before and after QMS implementation and the extent to which QMS impacts the improvement of examination quality and accountability. This study applies an empirical juridical approach with qualitative descriptive analysis techniques. Data were collected through document review and interviews with Trademark Examiners and relevant officials. The results indicate that prior to QMS implementation, quality control was informal and subjective, lacking standard performance indicators. After QMS implementation, quality control becomes more systematic through the use of quality documents, examination evaluation forms, and regular internal audits. However, the effectiveness of QMS still faces challenges such as heavy workloads, limited human resources, resistance to strict evaluation mechanisms, and the absence of an integrated computerized quality monitoring system aligned with the internal systems used by Trademark Examiners in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. The study concludes that QMS implementation has proven effective in contributing significantly to the development of a more structured, objective, and transparent quality control system. Nonetheless, the sustained effectiveness of QMS requires the strengthening of a quality-focused culture within the organization, regular advanced training, and the integration of quality assessment tools with the internal systems used by Trademark Examiners. It is recommended that DGIP continues to develop and enhance a technology-based quality policy that is inclusive and participatory for all examiners.

Keywords: Quality Control System, Trademark Examiner Performance, QMS Implementation

INTRODUCTION

In the digital era, human resource (HR) development is a strategic factor determining the competitiveness of organizations, both in the public and private sectors. Technological advancements and digitalization require HR to possess more adaptive competencies, ranging from mastery of information systems and analytical skills to accurate decision-making. In the context of public organizations, such as

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

intellectual property service institutions, the quality of HR significantly influences the level of public trust and satisfaction with the services provided. To ensure service quality, the Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DJIP) obtained ISO 9001:2015 certification as a form of commitment to quality management.

The Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DJKI) is a state institution with a strategic role in managing intellectual property in Indonesia. One of DJKI's primary functions is trademark registration, with substantive examinations conducted by civil servants with the functional position of Trademark Examiner. Substantive examinations conducted by Trademark Examiners require high precision, speed, and accuracy because they directly relate to the exclusive rights of applicants.

Before the implementation of the Quality Management System (QMS), quality control of substantive audit results was carried out through a mentoring system. This system operated based on job levels, but had several weaknesses. The lack of written guidelines, evaluation standards, or systematic documentation resulted in the mentoring process being inconsistent, subjective, and difficult to evaluate for effectiveness. Monitoring and validation also relied heavily on individual work groups without integration across groups, resulting in group-centric outcomes.

In response to the weaknesses of the mentoring system and to support the implementation of ISO 9001:2015 at the Directorate General of Trademarks and Geographical Indications (DGKI), the Director of Trademarks and Geographical Indications established a QMS Working Team tasked with developing QMS Technical Instructions and overseeing their implementation. The QMS is designed to regulate validation, quality control, and supervision processes in a comprehensive and documented manner. The QMS prioritizes transparency, objectivity, and clear indicator-based performance measurement. Throughout the process, the QMS is supported by technology, including the potential integration of artificial intelligence (AI) to increase efficiency.

The QMS will be piloted in 2024 and fully implemented in early 2025. However, the extent to which this system can improve the performance of Trademark Examiners compared to the previous mentoring system is not yet known with certainty. Therefore, this study was conducted to analyze the effectiveness of QMS implementation in improving the performance of Trademark Examiners, as well as assess the alignment of this system with the DJPI's vision and mission within the ISO 9001:2015-based quality management framework.

Formulation of the problem

Based on the problem identification above, the researcher provides the following problem formulation:

1. What is the condition of quality control in the performance of Trademark Examiners before the implementation of the Quality Management System (QMS) at the Office of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property?
2. How is the implementation of the Quality Management System (QMS) on the performance of Trademark Examiners at the Office of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property?

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

3. How effective is the implementation of the Quality Management System (QMS) in efforts to improve the performance of trademark examiners at the Office of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property?

Research methods

The research employed a descriptive qualitative approach with ethnographic methods and comparative elements. This approach was chosen because it focused on in-depth understanding of the behavior and interactions of Brand Inspectors within the context of QMS implementation. The researcher acted as the primary instrument, and data was collected through interviews, observations, and documentation, then analyzed inductively to discover meaning and understand the naturally occurring phenomena.

According to Sidik and Denok (2021), qualitative research aims to understand the meaning behind data, explore social issues in depth, and interpret phenomena based on participant narratives, not numbers. Descriptive qualitative research is used to systematically describe a phenomenon based on factual data, not opinions. An ethnographic approach is used to explore the interactions of Brand Examiner groups regarding QMS implementation. Comparative elements are used to compare performance conditions before and after QMS implementation to assess the extent to which QMS implementation is effective in improving Brand Examiner performance compared to a mentoring system.

In the research design, the researcher has guidelines in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the collected data and then making conclusions. The research design begins with a preliminary study on how quality control is carried out by the Brand Inspector before the implementation of the QMS, namely the mentoring system, what are the shortcomings and weaknesses of the implementation of the mentoring system. The researcher also observes how the QMS is implemented, what are the shortcomings and weaknesses of the implementation of the QMS. After finding problems from the performance conditions of the Brand Inspector in each period of quality control implementation, then focusing on these problems, then determining the problem formulation by comparing the two and ending in a conclusion whether the QMS implementation is effective or not.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Quality Control of Mentoring System

Trademark Examiners are divided into seven groups based on the class of goods and services in the trademark registration application. These classes consist of 34 classes of goods (classes 1–34) and 11 classes of services (classes 35–45), in accordance with the classification in the Nice Agreement, which Indonesia has ratified through Presidential Decree No. 10 of 2023. Each group is coordinated by a Group Chair who serves as the Principal Expert Trademark Examiner.

This grouping aims to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of Trademark Examiners' performance in a structured and standardized manner. This performance is implemented and monitored through a managerial system involving four levels of technical functional positions (JFT) within the Trademark Examiner structure.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

Quality Control of QMS Implementation

Changes to the quality control system through the implementation of a QMS were implemented in response to various weaknesses in the mentoring system. The goal of these changes is to create a more objective, transparent, and accountable decision-making process for trademark registration.

*QMS*designed by the Brand Inspection Team under the direction of the Director of Brands and Geographical Indications, with reference to official guidelines such as operational guidelines, technical guidelines, and applicable laws and regulations and developed by considering QMS practices from other countries and local conditions in Indonesia.

*QMS*The QMS guidelines are designed taking into account the number and level of Trademark Examiner positions, their competencies, and similar systems in other countries. The QMS technical guidelines are tailored to internal needs and Indonesian cultural values as implementation guidelines.

A significant change in the implementation of the QMS is the regrouping of Trademark Examiners into 10 groups, each comprising a balanced composition of job levels, without distinction based on the class of goods or services. Each group examines all classes to address differences in the number of applications and avoid workloads that could potentially lead to violations of legal provisions. The QMS is supported by the formation of a QMS Working Team and a Quality Control Team. The QMS Team is tasked with overseeing the system's implementation and formulating training based on needs. The Quality Control Team validates the decisions of the trademark examiners based on the provisions of the technical guidelines, to ensure the quality and consistency of the examination results.

QMS Quality Control Conditions

Changes to the quality control system were implemented in response to various weaknesses in the previous mentoring system. Evaluations showed that the mentoring system was unable to provide objective and consistent assurance of decision quality. Therefore, a QMS was created as a more structured, objective, and accountable approach.

The establishment of QMS was carried out with the aim of creating a system that can monitor, assess and direct the performance of Brand Examiners based on clear benchmarks, not just personal perception or experience.

*QMS*considering the distribution of job levels, competencies, and the legal character of trademarks in Indonesia. Based on in-depth studies and practical needs, the QMS Technical Guidelines were developed as a basis for implementation. One of the main changes is the regrouping of Trademark Examiners. Previously, grouping was based on the type of goods/services. In the QMS, Trademark Examiners are grouped into 10 groups with an even composition of job levels: 2 Main Experts, 3 Middle Experts, 2 Junior Experts, and 2 First Experts. One of the Main Experts is appointed as the Group/Sub-Division Head.

Each group examines all trademark classes (both goods and services), no longer limited to one type. This aims to address the imbalance in the number of trademark applications across classes, which leads to an imbalanced workload and potential backlog.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

In addition to regrouping Trademark Examiners, two support teams were also formed during the QMS implementation: the QMS Working Team and the Quality Control (QC) Team. The QMS Team is tasked with ensuring the system's implementation complies with the technical guidelines, designing training and developing the Examiners' competencies based on the QC Team's evaluation results. The QC Team consists of a Principal Expert Examiner and a Head of the Trademark Examining Working Team, who are tasked with validating the decisions of Trademark Examiners at all levels with the sampling percentages specified in the technical guidelines.

With QMS, it is hoped that the quality of substantive examination decisions of Trademark Examiners will improve measurably and sustainably, with a decision-making process that is more transparent, accountable, and in accordance with national and international standards.

Effectiveness of QMS implementation in efforts to improve the performance of Brand Inspectors

Comparative: Form and Implementation

The transition from a mentoring system to a Quality Management System (QMS) in the quality control of Trademark Inspectors' performance represents a strategic change with far-reaching implications, not only in terms of management but also in organizational structure and work mechanisms. The mentoring system relied on informal relationships between levels of office, with Associate Expert Inspectors mentoring lower levels in a decentralized and flexible manner, but without systematic coordination. In contrast, the QMS adopts a more standardized, homogenous structure across groups, with a more balanced division of labor thanks to classification based on the number of applications, rather than the class of goods/services.

In terms of quality validation, the mentoring system lacks a standard mechanism and relies heavily on personal initiative, resulting in limited oversight. The QMS introduces a multi-layered validation system conducted by the QC Team and Group Leaders, with proportional sampling coverage based on level and risk level, ranging from 30% to 100% of inspection results, for both proposed listings and rejections. This ensures collective oversight and closes gaps for undetected errors.

While the mentoring system lacks traceable documentation, the QMS requires the use of standard forms (such as Forms A–D, H, and T) in the review process. These forms serve not only as work tools but also as traceable evaluative documents for objectively assessing individual performance.

In terms of transparency and accountability, mentoring does not provide real-time management reporting. In contrast, a QMS provides auditors, team leaders, and directors with access to validation and performance evaluation results, which serve as the basis for monitoring and tailoring training to each individual's actual needs.

Regarding competency development, the mentoring system is individualized, with no guarantee of equal capacity among auditors. The QMS integrates periodic evaluations with data-driven training cycles, designed by the QMS Team based on the QC Team's findings. This ensures that each auditor receives relevant and appropriate coaching.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

To address the complexities and dynamics of trademark examination law, the QMS provides a peer review mechanism and discussion forum among Principal Expert Examiners to minimize individual dominance. This ensures that complex or potentially disputed matters can be discussed collectively and resolved by a panel, without compromising the professional independence of the Trademark Examiners.

Comparative: Managerial and Performance Improvement

The differences in quality control systems, between mentoring systems and QMS, have a significant impact on the management and performance improvement of Brand Inspectors. In mentoring systems, quality control relies more on personal experience, manual procedures, and a lack of standardization, making inspector performance subjective and difficult to monitor systematically. In contrast, QMS offers a more structured and documented approach through process mapping, internal audits, and ongoing training, thus enabling objective performance monitoring. From a managerial perspective, QMS strengthens the role of the Director as top management in evaluating data-based performance, providing targeted feedback, and designing competency development as needed. This system also improves the effectiveness of process monitoring and control through internal audits and better inter-unit coordination.

In human resource management, QMS provides a formal mechanism for competency-based evaluation, customized training, and planned job rotation, which ultimately impacts short-term performance improvement and long-term capacity development. In terms of work processes, QMS overcomes the weaknesses of undocumented mentoring systems by establishing clear work procedures and standards, so that audit results are more consistent and easier to monitor. QMS also builds a more structured and transparent work culture, increasing Auditor satisfaction and motivation due to clarity of roles, expectations, and an objective assessment system.

In its implementation structure, the QMS involves three main entities: the Head of the Inspection Team, the Head of the QMS Team, and the Director of Trademarks and Geographical Indications. The Head of the Inspection Team acts as a technical supervisor and direct supervisor of the performance of the Examiners, with the authority to formulate training recommendations based on validation reports. The Head of the QMS Team is tasked with designing and controlling the QMS system, compiling technical instructions, managing evaluation data, and aligning technical needs with institutional strategies. Meanwhile, the Director plays a strategic role in decision-making, ensuring service accountability, and directing the implementation of the QMS in accordance with institutional policies. These three roles work in an integrated manner, making the QMS not only a quality control system, but also a means of renewing work culture, increasing professionalism, and strengthening public services at the Directorate of Trademarks and Geographical Indications.

Comparative: Perspectives of Management Theory and Quality Management.

The mentoring system currently in place is not fully aligned with the basic principles of classical management or modern quality management. Based on Henry Fayol's framework, which encompasses planning, organizing, directing, and

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

monitoring, the mentoring system has not optimally implemented these four functions. Planning is not carried out systematically because there are no clear quality objectives or achievement indicators, and there is no standard time limit for the First Expert Trademark Examiner to handle independent examinations. Organization is also weak due to the lack of a formal mentoring structure or standard procedures to serve as a reference. The directing function is limited because mentoring is informal and not supported by systemic supervision from management. Meanwhile, the monitoring function is also not effective because there is no formal reporting or documentation of mentoring results that can serve as a basis for evaluation. From a quality management perspective, the mentoring system also does not fully implement the PDCA (Plan–Do–Check–Act) cycle, thus not supporting the principle of continuous quality improvement.

In contrast, the implementation of a QMS demonstrates a more structured coaching and supervision effort based on modern management principles. In its planning function, the QMS includes standard procedures and technical guidelines compiled based on competency requirements, complete with daily targets and feasibility indicators. In terms of organization, the QMS forms balanced work groups based on job levels, rather than on the type of goods/services class, resulting in a more equitable workload and a more efficient work structure. The directive function is strengthened through the active role of the Head of the Inspection Team and the Head of the QMS Team in providing policy direction and capacity development. Supervision has also become more systematic through periodic validation, performance evaluation, and reporting of results by the QC Team which serves as the basis for training recommendations.

Furthermore, the QMS implements the complete PDCA cycle, starting from the development of systems and policies (Plan), conducting inspections and filling out forms (Do), validating and reporting evaluation results (Check), to providing training recommendations and revising procedures if non-conformities are found (Act). With this approach, the QMS becomes not only an administrative system, but also a documented, systematic instrument for continuous quality improvement, as recommended by modern quality management principles and reinforced by Aslami's (2020) opinion.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Mentoring System and QMS: Form and Implementation

Aspect	Mentoring System	QMS
Group Structure	Based on classification of goods/services	Based on distribution of positions across levels
Composition of Examiner	Not uniform across groups	Uniform: 2 Senior Experts, 3 Mid-level Experts, 2 Junior Experts, 2 Entry-level Experts
Mentor	Senior Expert designated but not fixed	Validator (QC Team) systematic and consistent

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

Validation Flow	Not scheduled, ad-hoc	Structured, validated, and includes total check sampling
Documentation	Minimal documentation, no standard forms	Forms A-D, Form H, Form T, thoroughly documented
Organizational Structure	Flexible, informal across levels	Structured, formal across levels
Validation of Results	Ad-hoc, depends on initiative of senior examiner	Mandatory validation, proportional and reasoned
Document Aspects	Lack of systematic documentation	Standardized forms A-D, H, T
Supervision & Oversight	Supervision is inconsistent	Validates across groups + cross-checks across groups
Standardization of Processes	No standardized mentoring	There are standardized QMS guidelines

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Mentoring System and QMS: Managerial and Improvement of Brand Examiner Performance

Aspect	**Mentoring System**	**QMS**
System Development	Informal and flexible, not standardized	Formal, structured, and uniform across groups
Evaluation Parameters	Not uniform and subjective	Uniform, performance indicators-based, and measurable reports
Access to Performance Data	Not documented and not accessible	Accessible by Examiner, Supervisor, and Director
Evaluation and Feedback	No ongoing system for feedback	Routine evaluations, data-driven improvements
Competency Development	Individual initiative, not uniform	Collective, based on performance evaluation results
Workload Fairness	Uneven across classes of requests	Even, all groups handle all class requests
Impact on Decision Accuracy	Susceptible to different interpretations, subjective	Consistent and diversified through peer reviews, across levels
System Orientation	Responsive, bottom-up, not yet strategic	Preventive, top-down, focused on quality and institutional aspects
Accountability	Difficult to evaluate, subjective	Transparent and well-documented
Performance Reports	No formal reports	Periodic reports based on data

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

Response to Problematic Issues	Not systematic, personal relationships-based	Systemic evaluation mechanisms and regular updates
Evaluation Transparency	Not open, only group discussions	Transparent, accessible to management and individuals

Table 3: Comparative Analysis of Mentoring System and QMS: Perspectives of Management Theory and Quality Management

Aspect	Mentoring System	QMS
Planning	No standard timeframe or quality indicators	Planning based on guidelines, SOPs, and KPIs. Systematic performance targets and evaluations
Organizing	Grouped based on type of goods/services. Informal mentor assignment	Grouped based on balance of job positions. Structured and standardized tasks
Directing	Instructions are not uniform, dependent on the group and mentor	Training, leadership, and communication across all levels
Controlling	No reports or validation, irregular oversight	Systematic validation (100%, 50%, 30%), periodic reports, and audits by the QC team
Managerial Approach	Bottom-up, informal, subjective	Top-down, structured, data-based
PDCA - Plan	No formal planning	Preparation based on guidelines, indicators, and reporting systems
PDCA - Do	Informal mentoring from Senior Expert to Junior	Evaluation based on SOP, mentoring according to Forms A-D, H, T
PDCA - Check	No systemic evaluation or documentation	Regular sampling and performance evaluations
PDCA - Act	No data-driven improvement system	Recommendations for training and developing SOPs based on evaluation

Effectiveness of QMS implementation in efforts to improve the performance of Brand Inspectors

Based on the analysis in Tables 1, 2, and 3, it can be concluded that a QMS has proven to be a more effective, objective, and sustainable quality control approach than traditional mentoring systems. Mentoring systems tend to be reactive, personal, and undocumented, thus failing to guarantee consistent quality. In contrast, a QMS offers a more standardized structure, a transparent validation system, and data-driven performance monitoring and improvement. With an adaptive managerial design and the implementation of a professional work culture, a QMS not only improves the quality of substantive audits but also strengthens internal accountability and

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

encourages continuous improvement, ultimately contributing directly to improving the quality of public services in the field of trademark registration.

There are several key reasons why a QMS is considered more effective in improving the performance of Trademark Examiners. First, a QMS provides process standardization and much more structured documentation. In a mentoring system, workflows rely on individual experience and interpretation without reference to standard written standards, thus opening up the potential for inconsistencies in results. Meanwhile, a QMS ensures measurable written guidelines and procedures that can be followed by all Examiners, resulting in a uniform process and more objective performance evaluation.

Second, a QMS allows for more objective performance monitoring and control. Mentoring systems lack structured evaluation mechanisms or specific performance indicators. Instead, a QMS uses concrete metrics such as speed of completion, error rates, and adherence to procedures to assess performance. Internal audits and regular evaluations enable leaders to detect problems early and provide more targeted feedback or interventions.

Third, a QMS increases the engagement and job satisfaction of Brand Examiners. It provides transparency in the evaluation and career development process, and provides opportunities for Examiners to obtain constructive feedback and develop their own capacities. This positively impacts their motivation and the quality of their work.

Fourth, a QMS supports continuous improvement and adaptation to change. The QMS team has mechanisms in place to regularly review procedures, update standards as needed, and respond more quickly and effectively to regulatory dynamics and market demands. This makes the QMS an adaptive and resilient system in the face of change.

Fifth, QMS implementation has been proven to increase efficiency and productivity. With well-documented procedures, the inspection process is faster, error-free, and more organized. Inspectors can also more easily identify areas requiring attention or improvement, resulting in more focused and efficient work processes.

Sixth, a QMS offers greater system sustainability and reliability. The mentoring system's reliance on a personal approach and subjective evaluations makes it unstable, especially when personnel changes occur. A QMS ensures quality control through a documented and reliable system. Standards can be maintained even when changes occur in organizational structure or human resources.

With these various advantages, QMS has proven to be a system that not only improves individual performance, but also creates a work ecosystem that is professional, accountable, and oriented towards sustainable service quality.

Room for improvement in QMS

The implementation of a QMS in the quality control of Brand Inspector performance has had a positive impact, particularly in standardizing the inspection process and improving performance. However, several aspects remain that could be improved to make the QMS more efficient and adaptable to evolving operational needs.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

One area that needs improvement is the validation and performance assessment system, which is still carried out manually. Using physical forms in this process is time-consuming and labor-intensive, and carries the risk of data input errors. Therefore, digitization through an app-based system is considered essential to speed up the process, increase accuracy, and reduce the administrative burden.

Furthermore, current performance indicators still rely on qualitative evaluations. More objective and measurable indicators (KPIs) need to be formulated, such as the number of decisions, validation level, compliance with regulations, and completion time. This will help create a fair and transparent evaluation system that can serve as a basis for incentives and coaching.

Improvement efforts can also be made through rotation between groups and assigning tasks with more diverse content. This step not only prevents burnout but also broadens the perspectives and increases the flexibility of examiners. Furthermore, strengthening the capacity of the QC Team and the Examination Team is crucial, especially in dealing with the increasing complexity of cases and the increasing volume of requests.

Finally, the ideal work system is decentralized yet systematic. This system allows for adaptation at the workgroup level while maintaining consistency through standardized procedures. With this combination, the Directorate General of Public Works and Public Housing (DJPI) can create a more professional, efficient work environment, and one that is oriented toward improving the quality of public services.

CONCLUSION

1. Quality control conditions on Brand Inspector performance before QMS implementationThe mentoring system has not been implemented regularly, in a focused, and systematic manner. The coaching and supervision processes remain individual and informal, work procedures are unclear and inconsistent, performance indicators are not measurable, and there is a lack of documentation supporting the process. This results in inconsistent audit quality and makes it difficult to evaluate objectively.
2. QMS implementation providesChanges to the Trademark Examiner's work mechanism include standardization of work procedures, the use of standard examination forms, the implementation of a regular and periodic validation system, and more open and objective performance evaluations. These changes have resulted in a more structured, transparent, documented, and accountable work process for Trademark Examiners. Supervision and coaching are also oriented toward continuous improvement.
3. QMS implementation is more effective in improving the performance of Trademark Inspectors. The effectiveness of QMS implementation can be seen from the improvements intechnical and administrative aspects. QMS plays a role in creating a more disciplined, responsible, objective, and quality-focused work culture. Overall, QMS implementation not only improves the procedural performance of Trademark Examiners but also strengthens their shared commitment as a professional group that has quality standards in the implementation of trademark examination activities.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

Suggestion

1. To improve competence and quality consistency, it is essential for Trademark Examiners to undergo ongoing training. This training focuses not only on understanding examination procedures but also on implementing high quality standards to ensure that substantive trademark examinations are conducted appropriately and in accordance with applicable regulations.
2. Implementation*QMS*A balance between quantity and quality must be maintained. While the quality of audit results must remain a top priority, quantitative performance in the number of applications processed is also crucial, as there is a timeline that must be maintained consistently. Therefore, performance evaluation in a QMS should not only measure the accuracy and precision of each audit but also productivity.
3. The success of a QMS implementation depends heavily on management support and commitment. Strengthening management's role in providing clear direction, providing adequate resources, and creating a supportive environment will significantly impact the smooth and effective implementation of this system within the Trademark Examiner working group.
4. The use of applications within a QMS system can improve efficiency by reducing wasted time and simplifying data management. Integrated applications streamline administrative processes, reduce the likelihood of human error, and expedite inspections, thus supporting a more effective and efficient QMS implementation.

REFERENCES

Afandi, 2018, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori, Konsep dan Indikator),* Nusa Media, Yogyakarta.

Agus Siswanto, dkk, 2023, *Analysis of Determinant Factors Employee Performance of Directorate General of Intellectual Property Rights Republic of Indonesia,* JEMSI (Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Akuntansi, E-ISSN: 2579-5635, P-ISSN: 2460-5891 Volume 9 (6) Desember Tahun 2023, Hal 2493-2498. DOI:10.35870/jemsi.v9i6.1659

Aslami, 2020, *Sistem Manajemen Mutu*, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Islam, Universitas Islam Negeri, Sumatra Utara.

DJKI, Susunan Organisasi Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual, https://www.dgip.go.id/tentang-djki/struktur-organisasi/direktorat-jenderal-kekayaan-intelektual, diakses tanggal 16 Februari 2025

DJKI, Susunan Organisasi Direktorat Merek dan Indikasi Geografis (https://www.dgip.go.id/tentang-djki/struktur-organisasi/direktorat-merek-dan-indikasi-geografis), diakses tanggal 16 Februari 2025

DeGrazia, Pairolero, Giczy, 2023, *Procrastination or Incomplete Data? An Analysis of USPTO Examiner Search Activity (WITHDRAWN)*, Academy of Management, https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2023.16886

Deming, W. E, 1950, *Elementary Principles of The Statistical Control of Quality JUSE, Japanese Union of Scientists and Engineers.*

Fahmi, Irham, 2016, *Pengantar Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Konsep dam Kinerja.* Mitra Wacana Media: Jakarta

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

Febriyanti, Kusumo Bintoro, 2023, *Analisis Critical Success Factors Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual (DJKI) Dalam Layanan Paten*, Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia, p–ISSN: 2541-0849 e ISSN: 2548-1398 Vol. 8, No. 3, Maret 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v8i3.11531

G. R. Terry, 2018, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia.* Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara

Gawang Sudrajat dkk, 2023. *The Effect of Motivation and Competence Factors for Improving Patent Examiner Employee Performance,* JABM, Vol. 9 No. 1, DOI: https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.9.1.115.

Hasibuan, M, 2018, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia:Pengertian Dasar, Pengertian, dan Masalah.* PT. Toko Gunung Agung, Jakarta.

Ifah, Zulhawat, 2020, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Campuran,* PUSTAKA PELAJAR, Yogyakarta.

Kasmir, 2016, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori dan Praktik)*. Depok: PT Rajagrafindo Persada

Koontz, Harold Cyril O'Donnel, 2018, *Management*, Edition VII. Tokyo: Mc Graw-Hill Kogakusha, Ltd.

Mangkunegara, A.P, 2017, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia.* PT Remaja Pasda Karya, Bandung.

Marinu Waruwu, 2023, *Pendekatan Penelitian Pendidikan: Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mixed Method)*, Magister Administrasi Pendidikan, Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana, Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, Volume 7 Nomor 1 Tahun 2023

Mathis, dan Jackson, 2017, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* Edisi 9, dialihbahasakan oleh Jimmy Sadeli dan Bayu Prawira Hie, Salemba Empat, Jakarta.

Michael, Melissa, 2020, *Are there as many trademark offices as Trademark Examiners?* Duke Law Journals, DLJ Vol. 69 No. 8, https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/dlj/vol69/iss8/5

Oksana V, 2020, *The risk-based approach in organization quality management systems,* Revista Galega de Economía, 29 (3), 6538 ISSN-e 2255-5951. DOI:10.15304/rge.29.3.6538

Radu, Aurel, 2024, *An Analysis of the Implementation of a Quality Management System in Intellectual Property Organization*, MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS REVIEW 9(1): 204-213 (DOI: 10.24818/mer/2024.01-13)

Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2016 Tentang Merek dan Indikasi Geografis.

Republik Indonesia, Peraturan Menteri Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi Republik Indonesia Nomor 34 Tahun 2013 Tentang Jabatan Fungsional Pemeriksa Merek Dan Angka Kreditnya.

Republik Indonesia, Peraturan Menteri Hukum dan HAM Nomor 67 Tahun 2016 Tentang Pendaftaran Merek.

Republik Indonesia, Permenkumham Nomor 12 Tahun 2021 Tentang Perubahan atas Permenkumham Nomor 67 Tahun 2016 Tentang Pendaftaran Merek.

Republik Indonesia, Permenkum Nomor 1 Tahun 2024, Tentang Organisasi dan tata Kerja Kementerian Hukum

Sadili, 2017, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia.* Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32493/iijoms.v1i2.53527

Sedarmayanti, 2017, *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Meningkatkan Kompetensi, Kinerja dan Produktivitas Kerja*, Refika Aditama, Bandung.

Sella, 2020, Manajemen Mutu. linovhr.com. diakses pada 9 Agustus 2023 dalam https://nasonline.id/apa-itu-sistem-manajemen-mutu/, diakses pada 29 Januari 2025

Sidik dan Denok, 2021, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif.* Pascal Books.

Singodimedjo, Markum, 2000, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia.* Surabaya: SMMAS.

S. Sean Tu, 2022, *Effectiveness of Examiner Interviews. Landslide*, The WVU Law Research Paper, SSRN: http://ssrn.com/link/W-Virginia-U-LEG.html

Sugiyono, 2020, *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif,* Alfadeta, Bandung.

Veithzal, 2015, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan*, RAJAGRAFINDO, Depok.

Wibowo, 2017, *Manajemen Kinerja*, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta