

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

## Your name and organisation

<b>Name</b>	Karen Neill
<b>Organisation</b>	Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision

## Responses to consultation document questions

1	<p>Have the overarching objectives been framed correctly for this policy process? If not, what would be more appropriate objectives?</p>
<b>Technological protection measures</b>	
2	<p>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.</p> <p><b>Ngā Taonga agrees with the exceptions proposed. In particular, TPMs should be able to be circumvented, and TPM circumvention devices and services supplied, to enable the exercise of a permitted act under Part 3 of the Copyright Act (para 47). Otherwise, Nga Taonga and other archives would be unable to carry out its functions, even though the acts concerned are permitted acts under Part 3.</b></p>
3	<p>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?</p>
4	<p>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?</p>
5	<p>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.</p>
6	<p>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.</p>

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?
<b>Performers' rights</b>	
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?
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?
21	Do you agree or disagree with any of the exceptions or limitations proposed for a performer's right to be identified? Why?
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?
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.)
	<b>Ngā Taonga considers that the new property rights for performers should not extend to</b>

	<p>apply to the recording of visual performances in films. That would go beyond what is required by the WPPT and mean NZ had a more stringent, and different, rights regime to other countries (such as the UK). This would make the rights clearance process more complex.</p>
26	<p>Do you agree or disagree with any of the exceptions or limitations proposed above? Why?</p>
27	<p>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.</p>
28	<p><b>Ngā Taonga's view is that there should be a future date stated at which performer's rights will come into effect – in other words, that such rights should not be deemed to have retrospective effect, as again, that would make the rights clearance process far too onerous.</b></p> <p>Do you agree or disagree with any of the proposals above? Why?</p>
29	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Border protection measures</b></p>	
30	<p>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.</p>
31	<p>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?</p>

## Other comments