

#41

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Page 2: A bit about you and your submission

Q1 Your name

Earl Gray

Q2 Your email address

Q3 Please briefly tell us why copyright law interests you

I am a barrister, and previously a solicitor, and have practised in copyright and other intellectual property issues for almost 30 years. I write substantial sections of the LexisNexis looseleaf Copyright & Design.

Q4 For the purpose of MBIE publishing the information you provide in this submission, do you wish to remain anonymous? **No**

Q5 Do you object to your submission being published (anonymously if you have requested that) in whole or in part by MBIE on its website? Note: if you answer Yes to this question, when you reach the end of this survey, you will be asked to specify which parts of your submission (or all of it) you do not wish MBIE to publish and help us understand your concerns so that we can consider them in the event of a request under the Official Information Act. **No**

Page 3: Question navigation

Q6 Which of the following subjects in the Issues Paper do you wish to answer questions on?

Part 4 (Rights) Section 1 - what does copyright protect and who gets the rights?

,

Part 5, (Exceptions and Limitations) Section 4 - exceptions relating to the use of particular categories of works

Page 4: Objectives

Q7 Q1 Are the above objectives the right ones for New Zealand's copyright regime? How well do you think the copyright system is achieving these objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q8 Q2 Are there other objectives that we should be aiming to achieve? For example, do you think adaptability or resilience to future technological change should be included as an objective and, if so, do you think that would be achievable without reducing certainty and clarity? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q9 Q3 Should sub-objectives or different objectives for any parts of the Act be considered (eg for moral rights or performers' rights)? Please be specific in your answer. **Respondent skipped this question**

Q10 Q4 What weighting (if any) should be given to each objective? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 5: Rights: What does copyright protect and who gets the rights?

Q11 Q5 What are the problems (or advantages) with the way the Copyright Act categorises works? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q12 Q6 Is it clear what 'skill, judgement and labour' means as a test as to whether a work is protected by copyright? Does this test make copyright protection apply too widely? If it does, what are the implications, and what changes should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q13 Q7 Are there any problems with (or benefits arising from) the treatment of data and compilations in the Copyright Act? What changes (if any) should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q14 Q8 What are the problems (or benefits) with the way the default rules for copyright ownership work? What changes (if any) should we consider? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q15 Q9 What problems (or benefits) are there with the current rules related to computer-generated works, particularly in light of the development and application of new technologies like artificial intelligence to general works? What changes, if any, should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q16 Q10 What are the problems (or benefits) with the rights the Copyright Act gives visual artists (including painting, drawings, prints, sculptures etc.)? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Submission by Earl Gray, Sangro Chambers, Auckland in relation to certain issues affecting visual artists

1. This submission addresses two issues raised in the Copyright Act Review Issues Paper:

(a) The exception for artistic works on public display in section 73 of the Copyright Act 1994 (Act) (paras 400-409 and question 57 in the Issues Paper); and

(b) The possibility of an artist resale royalty right for visual artists (paras 153-155 and question 10 in the Issues Paper).

2. As a lawyer specialising in intellectual property and related fields, I have represented many artists and users of artistic works over the years, and have had many other discussions about these issues with artists and those representing artists. I also acted for artist, John Radford, in the High Court appeal discussed in paragraphs 404, 405 and 407 of the Issues Paper.

Artist Resale Royalty Right

3. As noted in paragraph 155 of the Issues Paper, the Copyright Artists' Resale Right Amendment Bill was introduced to Parliament in 2008 but did not proceed. The Bill followed a 2007 discussion paper "A Resale Royalty Right for Visual Artists: Options for its possible application to New Zealand", on which 202 submissions were received from artists and art groups, art collectors, art dealers and galleries, and others. A summary of the submissions was published by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage- <https://mch.govt.nz/files/resale-royalty-submission-analysis.pdf> .

4. Generally, although not exclusively, works by visual artists are unique, and therefore the artist sells them once and does not have the opportunity to participate in ongoing exploitation of the work. This differs from, for example, music and written works such as novels, where the return to the author of a popular work is often from repeated and mass reproduction of the work.

5. When artists' works are re-sold by dealers and auction houses, copies of the work are often reproduced in catalogues, on websites and in other marketing. While this may be an actionable copyright infringement where the artist remains the copyright owner, most artists do not have the financial resources to take action. The likely damages award would make taking action uneconomic and artists may not necessarily know about the reproductions in any event.

6. For those and similar reasons to those set out in the Explanatory Note to the 2008 Bill, this submission supports introduction of an artist resale royalty right of 5% as proposed in the Bill, with a collecting society tasked with collection and distribution of the royalties.

7. While some submitters in 2007 raised possible issues with an artist resale royalty right or possible alternatives, those are all clearly and fully addressed in the Explanatory Note to the Bill. Artist resale rights or "droit de suite" are recognised in the founding international copyright treaty, the Berne Convention, to which New Zealand is a party, although implementation is optional. I understand that approximately 80 countries have implemented artist resale rights. As far as I am aware, they operate well in jurisdictions that have adopted such rights, such as France and the EU, the UK (in the Artist's Resale Right Regulations 2006) and Australia (in the Resale Royalty Right for Visual Artists Act 2009).

8. One issue requiring deeper consideration is whether resale rights will apply to all successive sales and transfers, whether private or through dealers and auction houses. While on a practical level some private sales may not be detected, it is submitted that this is not in itself a justification for limiting the re-sale right to dealer or auction house sales.

Q17 Q11What are the problems creators and authors, who have previously transferred their copyright in a work to another person, experience in seeking to have the copyright in that work reassigned back to them? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q18 Q12What are the problems (or benefits) with how Crown copyright operates? What alternatives (if any) do you think should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q19 Q13Are there any problems (or benefits) in providing a copyright term for communication works that is longer than the minimum required by New Zealand's international obligations?

Respondent skipped this question

Q20 Q14Are there any problems (or benefits) in providing an indefinite copyright term for the type of works referred to in section 117?

Respondent skipped this question

Q21 Any other comments on Rights: what does copyright protect and who gets the rights?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Rights: What actions does copyright reserve for copyright owners?

Q22 Q15Do you think there are any problems with (or benefits arising from) the exclusive rights or how they are expressed? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q23 Q16Are there any problems (or benefits) with the secondary liability provisions? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q24 Q17What are the problems (or advantages) with the way authorisation liability currently operates? What changes (if any) do you think should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q25 Any other comments on Rights: what actions does copyright reserve for copyright owners?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Rights: Specific issues with the current rights

Q26 Q18What are the problems (or advantages) with the way the right of communication to the public operates? What changes, if any, might be needed?

Respondent skipped this question

Q27 Q19What problems (or benefits) are there with communication works as a category of copyright work? What alternatives (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q28 Q20What are the problems (or benefits) with using 'object' in the Copyright Act? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q29 Q21Do you have any concerns about the implications of the Supreme Court's decision in Dixon v R? Please explain.

Respondent skipped this question

Q30 Q22What are the problems (or benefits) with how the Copyright Act applies to user-generated content? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q31 Q23What are the advantages and disadvantages of not being able to renounce copyright? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q32 Q24Do you have any other concerns with the scope of the exclusive rights and how they can be infringed? Please describe.

Respondent skipped this question

Q33 Any other comments on Rights: specific issues with the current rights

Respondent skipped this question

Page 8: Rights: Moral rights, performers' rights and technological protection measures

Q34 Q25What are the problems (or benefits) with the way the moral rights are formulated under the Copyright Act? What changes to the rights (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q35 Q26What are the problems (or benefits) with providing performers with greater rights over the sound aspects of their performances than the visual aspects?

Respondent skipped this question

Q36 Q27Will there be other problems (or benefits) with the performers' rights regime once the CPTPP changes come into effect? What changes to the performers' rights regime (if any) should be considered after those changes come into effect?

Respondent skipped this question

Q37 Q28What are the problems (or benefits) with the TPMs protections? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q38 Q29Is it clear what the TPMs regime allows and what it does not allow? Why/why not?

Respondent skipped this question

Q39 Any other comments on Rights: moral rights, performers' rights and technological protection measures

Respondent skipped this question

Page 9: Exceptions and Limitations: Exceptions that facilitate particular desirable uses

Q40 Q30Do you have examples of activities or uses that have been impeded by the current framing and interpretation of the exceptions for criticism, review, news reporting and research or study? Is it because of a lack of certainty? How do you assess any risk relating to the use? Have you ever been threatened with, or involved in, legal action? Are there any other barriers?

Respondent skipped this question

Q41 Q31What are the problems (or benefits) with how any of the criticism, review, news reporting and research or study exceptions operate in practice? Under what circumstances, if any, should someone be able to use these exceptions for a commercial outcome? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q42 Q32What are the problems (or benefits) with photographs being excluded from the exception for news reporting? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q43 Q33What other problems (or benefits), if any, have you experienced with the exception for reporting current events? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q44 Q34What are the problems (or benefits) with the exception for incidental copying of copyright works? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q45 Q35What are the problems (or benefits) with the exception transient reproduction of works? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q46 Q36 What are the problems (or benefits) with the way the copyright exceptions apply to cloud computing? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q47 Q37 Are there any other current or emerging technological processes we should be considering for the purposes of the review?

Respondent skipped this question

Q48 Q38 What problems (or benefits) are there with copying of works for non-expressive uses like data-mining. What changes, if any, should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q49 Q39 What do problems (or benefits) arising from the Copyright Act not having an express exception for parody and satire? What about the absence of an exception for caricature and pastiche?

Respondent skipped this question

Q50 Q40 What problems (or benefit) are there with the use of quotations or extracts taken from copyright works? What changes, if any, should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q51 Any other comments on Exceptions and Limitations: exceptions that facilitate particular desirable uses

Respondent skipped this question

Page 10: Exceptions and limitations: Exceptions for libraries and archives

Q52 Q41 Do you have any specific examples of where the uncertainty about the exceptions for libraries and archives has resulted in undesirable outcomes? Please be specific about the situation, why this caused a problem and who it caused a problem for.

Respondent skipped this question

Q53 Q42 Does the Copyright Act provide enough flexibility for libraries and archives to copy, archive and make available to the public digital content published over the internet? What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) this flexibility or lack of flexibility? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q54 Q43 Does the Copyright Act provide enough flexibility for libraries and archives to facilitate mass digitisation projects and make copies of physical works in digital format more widely available to the public? What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) this flexibility or lack of flexibility? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q55 Q44 Does the Copyright Act provide enough flexibility for libraries and archives to make copies of copyright works within their collections for collection management and administration without the copyright holder's permission? What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) this flexibility or lack of flexibility? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q56 Q45 What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) the flexibility given to libraries and archives to copy and make available content published online? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q57 Q46 What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) excluding museums and galleries from the libraries and archives exceptions? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q58 Any other comments on Exceptions and Limitations: exceptions for libraries and archives

Respondent skipped this question

Page 11: Exceptions and limitations: Exceptions for education

Q59 Q47 Does the Copyright Act provide enough flexibility to enable teachers, pupils and educational institutions to benefit from new technologies? What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) this flexibility or lack of flexibility? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q60 Q48 Are the education exceptions too wide? What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) this? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q61 Q49 Are the education exceptions too narrow? What are the problems with (or benefits arising from) this? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q62 Q50 Is copyright well understood in the education sector? What problems does this create (if any)?

Respondent skipped this question

Q63 Any other comments on Exceptions and Limitations: exceptions for education

Respondent skipped this question

Page 12: Exceptions and limitations: Exceptions relating to the use of particular categories of works

Q64 Q51 What are the problems (or advantages) with the free public playing exceptions in sections 81, 87 and 87 A of the Copyright Act? What changes (if any) should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q65 Q52 What are the problems (or advantages) with the way the format shifting exception currently operates? What changes (if any) should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q66 Q53 What are the problems (or advantages) with the way the time shifting exception operates? What changes (if any) should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q67 Q54 What are the problems (or advantages) with the reception and retransmission exception? What alternatives (if any) should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q68 Q55 What are the problems (or advantages) with the other exceptions that relate to communication works? What changes (if any) should be considered? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q69 Q56 Are the exceptions relating to computer programmes working effectively in practice? Are any other specific exceptions required to facilitate desirable uses of computer programs? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q70 Q57 Do you think that section 73 should be amended to make it clear that the exception applies to the works underlying the works specified in section 73(1)? And should the exception be limited to copies made for personal and private use, with copies made for commercial gain being excluded? Why?

Submission by Earl Gray, Sangro Chambers, Auckland in relation to certain issues affecting visual artists

1. This submission addresses two issues raised in the Copyright Act Review Issues Paper:

(a) The exception for artistic works on public display in section 73 of the Copyright Act 1994 (Act) (paras 400-409 and question 57 in the Issues Paper); and

(b) The possibility of an artist resale royalty right for visual artists (paras 153-155 and question 10 in the Issues Paper).

2. As a lawyer specialising in intellectual property and related fields, I have represented many artists and users of artistic works over the years, and have had many other discussions about these issues with artists and those representing artists. I also acted for artist, John Radford, in the High Court appeal discussed in paragraphs 404, 405 and 407 of the Issues Paper.

Artistic Works on Public Display

3. Section 73 of the Act provides an exception to copyright infringement for two dimensional or film or video reproduction of artistic works on permanent public display, being buildings, sculptures, models for buildings and works of artistic craftsmanship.

Copyright Act 1994 Review: Issues Paper - Online submission

4. The original policy objective of this exception was to allow students and tourists to sketch or photograph public buildings and artworks, and later for similar acts by video and film. As focus on buildings or sculptures in film and other works would not fall within the exception for incidental copying in section 41 of the Act, this exception needed to extend to reproductions included in films and communication to the public such as internet posts. This genesis is reflected in the title to the section – “Representation of certain artistic works on public display”.

5. *Radford v Hallensteins Bros Ltd* [2007] NZHC 1654 confirmed that the exception, as s73(3) is currently worded, extends to commercial exploitation of such works on public display in two dimensions, although not in three dimensions. That is a consequence of s73(3) extending the exception to the issue to the public of copies of anything made under the exception.

6. As a result, commercial operators can, without permission from the artist or copyright owner, mass commercialise copies of a sculpture or building situated in a public space by including the copy on, for example, clothing, tea-towels, prints, post-cards. There is however no right to commercialise three dimensional models of the work.

7. As noted at paragraph 4 above, such mass merchandise use was not the original purpose of the section. It singles out those whose works are on permanent public display to deny them a return from exploitation of their work. That is the case even if the work was not originally on public display but is later installed in a permanent public place. Self-evidently, many visual artists would not in any case be aware of the extent of exploitation that section 73 has been held to allow. It is also unrealistic in New Zealand to suggest that artists have an economic choice to refuse commissions for public works if they want to avoid commercialisation of their works.

8. Moreover, in the modern day, the distinction between three dimensional and two dimensional exploitation has no obvious justification. Both can be mass-produced and are forms of exploitation that can provide a return for the valuable copyright owned by a visual artist.

9. I therefore submit that section 73 should be returned to its original purpose, and sale of or otherwise dealing in copies of such a work on public display should be expressly excluded from the exception.

10. If section 73 is appropriately limited in this way:

(a) The right to include copies of the works as part of the setting for a wider work such as a film can be preserved; and

(b) The section can be revised to expressly provide that the exception includes reproduction of the underlying works that were used to make the three-dimensional artistic work.

11. This submission is focused on the section 73 exception as it applies to sculptures and works of artistic craftsmanship, because that is where we have encountered issues with section 73 in my practice. Tentatively, however, we express the view that the proposed amendments to section 73 should cover all the artistic works covered by the section.

12. This recommendation to exclude commercial exploitation from the section 73 exception aligns with the limited nature of such rights in most other jurisdictions other than the UK, such as European jurisdictions, where the right is known as the right of panorama. In the United States, the parallel exception applies to buildings only, not sculptures. The parallel provision of the Australian Copyright Act 1968, section 65(2), does not include an equivalent to section 73(3).

Q71 Any other comments on Exceptions and limitations: exceptions relating to the use of particular categories of works **Respondent skipped this question**

Q72 Q58What problems (or benefits) are there in allowing copyright owners to limit or modify a person's ability to use the existing exceptions through contract? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 14: Exceptions and limitations: Internet service provider liability

Q73 Q59What are problems (or benefits) with the ISP definition? What changes, if any should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q74 Q60Are there any problems (or benefit) with the absence of an explicit exception for linking to copyright material and not having a safe harbour for providers of search tools (eg search engines)? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q75 Q61Do the safe harbour provisions in the Copyright Act affect the commercial relationship between online platforms and copyright owners? Please be specific about who is, and how they are, affected.

Respondent skipped this question

Q76 Q62What other problems (or benefits) are there with the safe harbour regime for internet service providers? What changes, if any, should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 15: Transactions

Q77 Q63Is there a sufficient number and variety of CMOs in New Zealand? If not, which type copyright works do you think would benefit from the formation of CMOs in New Zealand?

Respondent skipped this question

Q78 Q64If you are a member of a CMO, have you experienced problems with the way they operate in New Zealand? Please give examples of any problems experienced.

Respondent skipped this question

Q79 Q65If you are a user of copyright works, have you experienced problems trying to obtain a licence from a CMO? Please give examples of any problems experienced.

Respondent skipped this question

Q80 Q66 What are the problems (or advantages) with the way the Copyright Tribunal operates? Why do you think so few applications are being made to the Copyright Tribunal? What changes (if any) to the way the Copyright Tribunal regime should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q81 Q67 Which CMOs offer an alternative dispute resolution service? How frequently are they used? What are the benefits (or disadvantages) with these services when compared to the Copyright Tribunal?

Respondent skipped this question

Q82 Q68 Has a social media platform or other communication tool that you have used to upload, modify or create content undermined your ability to monetise that content? Please provide details.

Respondent skipped this question

Q83 Q69 What are the advantages of social media platforms or other communication tools to disseminate and monetise their works? What are the disadvantages? What changes to the Copyright Act (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q84 Q70 Do the transactions provisions of the Copyright Act support the development of new technologies like blockchain technology and other technologies that could provide new ways to disseminate and monetise copyright works? If not, in what way do the provisions hinder the development and use of new technologies?

Respondent skipped this question

Q85 Q71 Have you ever been impeded using, preserving or making available copies of old works because you could not identify or contact the copyright? Please provide as much detail as you can about what the problem was and its impact.

Respondent skipped this question

Q86 Q72 How do you or your organisation deal with orphan works (general approaches, specific policies etc.)? And can you describe the time and resources you routinely spend on identifying and contacting the copyright owners of orphan works?

Respondent skipped this question

Q87 Q73 Has a copyright owner of an orphan work ever come forward to claim copyright after it had been used without authorisation? If so, what was the outcome?

Respondent skipped this question

Q88 Q74 What were the problems or benefits of the system of using an overseas regime for orphan works?

Respondent skipped this question

Q89 Q75 What problems do you or your organisation face when using open data released under an attribution only Creative Commons Licences? What changes to the Copyright Act should be considered? Respondent skipped this question

Q90 Any other comments on Transactions Respondent skipped this question

Page 16: Enforcement of Copyright

Q91 Q76 How difficult is it for copyright owners to establish before the courts that copyright exists in a work and they are the copyright owners? What changes (if any) should be considered to help copyright owners take legal action to enforce their copyright? Respondent skipped this question

Q92 Q77 What are the problems (or advantages) with reserving legal action to copyright owners and their exclusive licensees? What changes (if any) should be considered? Respondent skipped this question

Q93 Q78 Should CMOs be able to take legal action to enforce copyright? If so, under what circumstances? Respondent skipped this question

Q94 Q79 Does the cost of enforcement have an impact on copyright owners' enforcement decisions? Please be specific about how decisions are affected and the impact of those decisions. What changes (if any) should be considered? Respondent skipped this question

Q95 Q80 Are groundless threats of legal action for infringing copyright being made in New Zealand by copyright owners? If so, how wide spread do you think the practice is and what impact is the practice having on recipients of such threats? Respondent skipped this question

Q96 Q81 Is the requirement to pay the \$5,000 bond to Customs deterring right holders from using the border protection measures to prevent the importation of infringing works? Are there any issues with the border protection measures that should be addressed? Please describe these issues and their impact. Respondent skipped this question

Q97 Q82 Are peer-to-peer filing sharing technologies being used to infringe copyright? What is the scale, breadth and impact of this infringement? Respondent skipped this question

Q98 Q83 Why do you think the infringing file sharing regime is not being used to address copyright infringements that occur over peer-to-peer file sharing technologies?

Respondent skipped this question

Q99 Q84 What are the problems (or advantages) with the infringing file sharing regime? What changes or alternatives to the infringing file sharing regime (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q100 Q85 What are the problems (or advantages) with the existing measures copyright owners have to address online infringements? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q101 Q86 Should ISPs be required to assist copyright owners enforce their rights? Why / why not?

Respondent skipped this question

Q102 Q87 Who should be required to pay ISPs' costs if they assist copyright owners to take action to prevent online infringements?

Respondent skipped this question

Q103 Q88 Are there any problems with the types of criminal offences or the size of the penalties available under the Copyright Act? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q104 Any other comments on Enforcement of copyright

Respondent skipped this question

Page 17: Other Issues: Relationship between copyright and registered design protection

Q105 Q89 Do you think there are any problems with (or benefits from) having an overlap between copyright and industrial design protection? What changes (if any) should be considered?

Respondent skipped this question

Q106 Q90 Have you experienced any problems when seeking protection for an industrial design, especially overseas?

Respondent skipped this question

Q107 Q91 We are interested in further information on the use of digital 3-D printer files to distribute industrial designs. For those that produce such files, how do you protect your designs? Have you faced any issues with the current provisions of the Copyright Act?

Respondent skipped this question

Q108 Q92 Do you think there are any problems with (or benefits from) New Zealand not being a member of the Hague Agreement? Respondent skipped this question

Q109 Any other comments on Other Issues: Relationship between copyright and registered design protection Respondent skipped this question

Page 18: Other issues: Copyright and the Wai 262 inquiry

Q110 Q93 Have we accurately characterised the Waitangi Tribunal's analysis of the problems with the current protections provided for taonga works and mātauranga Māori? If not, please explain the inaccuracies. Respondent skipped this question

Q111 Q94 Do you agree with the Waitangi Tribunal's use of the concepts 'taonga works' and 'taonga-derived works'? If not, why not? Respondent skipped this question

Q112 Q95 The Waitangi Tribunal did not recommend any changes to the copyright regime, and instead recommended a new legal regime for taonga works and mātauranga Māori. Are there ways in which the copyright regime might conflict with any new protection of taonga works and mātauranga Māori? Respondent skipped this question

Q113 Q96 Do you agree with our proposed process to launch a new work stream on taonga works alongside the Copyright Act review? Are there any other Treaty of Waitangi considerations we should be aware of in the Copyright Act review? Respondent skipped this question

Q114 Q97 How should MBIE engage with Treaty partners and the broader community on the proposed work stream on taonga works? Respondent skipped this question

Q115 Any other comments on Other Issues: copyright and the Wai 262 inquiry Respondent skipped this question

Page 20: Information you've provided that should not be publicly available

Q116 Please specify (by question number) which of your answers you object to being published by MBIE Respondent skipped this question

Q117 Please specify (by question number) which of your answers contain information that MBIE should consider withholding if requested under the Official Information Act. For each question number, please tell us which information in your answer you believe would need to be withheld and why (preferably by referring to the relevant ground in the Official Information Act).

Respondent skipped this question
