

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

Your name and organisation

Name	Courtney Johnston
Organisation	The Dowse Art Museum, Hutt City Council

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>
Technological protection measures	
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>I strongly support exceptions relating to libraries and other non-profit entities; the impact of not providing these exceptions is the reduction of public access to information and material that is important to the quality of their life and their civic empowerment.</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> <p>I agree that the exceptions relating to libraries and other non-profit entities for TPMs should relate to both prohibitions. The impact of not providing these exceptions is the reduction of public access to information and material that is important to the quality of their life and their civic empowerment.</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> <p>The same exceptions that are afforded to libraries and archives should be extended to all cultural organisations that provide free public access to resources. This would correct an anomaly where organisations with the same missions and roles do not share the same status in the legislation.</p>
6	<p>Would there be a likely adverse impact on non-infringing uses in general if the exception for</p>

any other purpose that does not infringe copyright was not provided for? Please be specific in your answers.

Public institutions (libraries, archives, museums, galleries etc) that exist to provide the public with free access to information and material that is important to the quality of their life and their civic empowerment should be supported with an exception, to ensure equity and affordability of access for all New Zealanders.

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?

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.)

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.

Sound and performance recordings are maintained by collecting institutions of all types, not just libraries and archives. The exceptions applied to libraries and archives should be extended to all public cultural organisations (especially galleries and museums) that make information and material relating to our history and culture available. This would correct an anomaly where organisations with the same missions and roles do not share the same status in the legislation.

Exceptions should also be made to allow for 'format shifting' and other preservation activities that will ensure recordings remain available as technology is superseded.

Exceptions should be made for copying for administrative purposes, including cataloguing a collection, communicating a collection to the public and preservation of a collection. An "administrative purposes" extension is included in Australian copyright law with respect to museums. These uses seldom curtail the commercial exploitation of works by copyright holders, especially compared to the public benefit that museums perform in providing care and awareness of collections.

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 you agree that Article 4 of European Union Council Regulation (EC) No 3295/94 is an appropriate model for implementing *ex officio* 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 *ex officio* 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

Museums, galleries, libraries and archives (and in the future community-based cultural centres) collect, preserve, research and make accessible the intellectual and material heritage of Aotearoa New Zealand, and the cultures that intersect with us.

As a sector, we take the need to follow the terms of the Copyright Act, and to support the copyright holders of material we work with and care for, extremely seriously. Extension of the copyright term to 70 years is not helpful to the work of museums, libraries, galleries or archives, but I accept that this is an inevitable measure to align New Zealand legislation with international standards.

The extension will increase the likelihood of orphan works held in museum collections being left unused due to our inability to trace copyright holders. This may in turn affect institutions willingness to take in items for safekeeping on behalf of the public, if they cannot be exhibited or published.

The extension will also increase the workload for institutions seeking permissions and clearances for a range of uses, including public access and reuse. This will impact the speed at which research can be published and collections can be digitised and made available online: it will also narrow the amount of our history and culture that is available for public discovery.

I understand that this will be addressed through the Creative Sector Survey (paragraph 18) but wished to note this fact in the feedback here as well.