

Submission on consultation document: *Implementation of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Intellectual Property Chapter*

Your name and organisation

Name	David Pannett (Senior Manager, Planning, Performance and Stakeholder Relations)
Organisation	Creative New Zealand (Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa)

Responses to consultation document questions

1	Have the overarching objectives been framed correctly for this policy process? If not, what would be more appropriate objectives?
Technological protection measures	
2	Do you agree with the exceptions or limitations proposed for TPMs? What would be the impacts of not providing these exceptions? Please be specific in your answers.
3	Do you agree that the exceptions proposed for TPMs should apply to both prohibitions (i.e. circumventing a TPM and the provision of devices or services that enable circumvention)? Why / why not?
4	Do you agree that, if our proposals are implemented, the current exception allowing a qualified person to circumvent a TPM that protects against copyright infringement to exercise a permitted act under Part 3 would no longer be required? Why / why not?
5	Are there any other exceptions or limitations to the TPM prohibitions that should be included in the Copyright Act? Please explain why any additional exceptions would be necessary.
6	Would there be a likely adverse impact on non-infringing uses in general if the exception for any other purpose that does not infringe copyright was not provided for? Please be specific in your answers.
7	Should there be a regulation-making power to enable the exception for any other purpose that does not infringe copyright to be clarified, and if so, what criteria should be considered?

Patent term extension for delays in patent grant

8 Do you agree with the proposals for patent term extensions for unreasonable grant delays? Why / why not?

9 Do you think that there should be a limit on the maximum length of extension available for grant delays? If so, what should it be?

10 Do you consider that third parties should be able to oppose decisions to extend patents on the ground of unreasonable delays in grant?

Patent term extension for pharmaceuticals

11 Do you agree with the proposed definition of “unreasonable curtailment” for pharmaceutical patent term extensions? If not, what other definition should be used?

12 Do you agree that the definition of “unreasonable curtailment” should apply different time periods for small molecule pharmaceuticals and biologics? If so, what could these time periods be? If you consider that only one time period should apply to both, what should this be?

13 Do you agree with the proposed method of calculating the length of extensions for pharmaceutical patents?

14 The proposed method of calculating extensions for pharmaceutical patents includes a maximum extension of two years. Do you agree with this? If not, what do you think the maximum extension should be?

15 Do you agree or disagree that only patents for pharmaceutical substances *per se* and for biologics should be eligible for extension? Why?

16 Do you think the Australian definition of “pharmaceutical substance” should be adopted? Why / why not?

17	Do you agree that patent rights during the extended term should be limited in the manner proposed?
18	Do you agree that third parties should be able to oppose decisions to extend patents for pharmaceuticals through the Commissioner of Patents? Why / why not?

Performers' rights

19	Do you agree that a performer's moral rights should apply to both the aural and visual aspects of their live performance and of any communication of the live performance to the public? Why / why not?
	<p>Yes, we agree with the extension of a performer's moral rights to both aural and visual aspects of their live performance, and any communication of the live performance to the public.</p> <p>We were however perplexed why paragraph 112 of the consultation document chose to use 20th century technologies of radio and television as the example platforms where these rights might apply. Far more current (and potentially problematic) would be the practical application of these rights in 21st century platforms such as YouTube, Facebook, etc. We would encourage you to traverse these issues further.</p>
20	Should performers' moral rights apply to the communication or distribution of any recording (i.e. both sound recordings and films) made from their performances, rather than just sound recordings as required by WPPT? Why / why not?
	Yes. We believe that performers' moral rights should apply to communication and distribution for both sound recordings and films. We cannot see any public policy rationale for acknowledging those rights in sound recordings and, at the same time, denying those rights in film.
21	Do you agree or disagree with any of the exceptions or limitations proposed for a performer's right to be identified? Why?
	We agree with the exceptions or limitations proposed, as these follow existing industry custom and practice.
22	Are there any other exceptions or limitations to a performer's right to be identified that should be included in the Copyright Act? If so, can you please explain why they would be necessary.
	–
23	Do you agree or disagree with providing for any of the exceptions or limitations proposed for a performer's right to object to derogatory treatment? Why?
	Production and distribution methods have seen significant change over the last decade. In such an environment, editorial and production practice has fewer and fewer norms. This makes the second bullet point in paragraph 121 (modifications made which are consistent with normal editorial or production practice) unduly permissive and undefined.

24	Are there any other exceptions or limitations to a performer's right to object to derogatory treatment that should be included in the Copyright Act? If so, please explain why they would be necessary.
	–
25	Should the new property rights for performers be extended to apply to the recording of visual performances in films? Why / why not? (Please set out the likely impacts on performers and producers, and any others involved in the creation, use or consumption of films.)
	<p>As noted under question 19, we believe it is to time to align performers' moral and property rights across both aural and visual media and agree with the extension of performer's property rights in this manner.</p> <p>In addition, we ask if any proposal to limit performers' property rights to sound recordings (and not to include the visual performances in film) will see an actual withdrawal or reduction of existing performers' rights in film?</p>
26	Do you agree or disagree with any of the exceptions or limitations proposed above? Why?
	–
27	Are there any other exceptions or limitations to the new performers' property rights that should be included in the Copyright Act? If so, can you please explain why they would be necessary.
	–
28	Do you agree or disagree with any of the proposals above? Why?
	–
29	Are there any other amendments that need to be made to the Copyright Act, and in particular to Part 9, to clarify the new performers' property rights? If so, can you please explain why they would be necessary.
	–
Border protection measures	
30	Do agree that Article 4 of European Union Council Regulation (EC) No 3295/94 is an appropriate model for implementing <i>ex officio</i> powers into the border protection measures set out in the Copyright Act 1994 and Trade Marks Act 2001? If not, please explain why not and outline an alternative approach to implementing <i>ex officio</i> powers.
31	Do you agree that the detention period of three business days following notification to the rights holder is appropriate? Can you outline the impact on both the right holders and any importer/exporter where you consider the period should be shorter or longer than three business days?

Other comments

-