

---

## Brief Submissions received from 05/05/2016 to 9/08/2016

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
1	Michael Webb, LFormation Pty Ltd	<p>This submission is in relation to Draft Recommendation 8.1 of the draft report.</p> <p>We have invested considerable funds in developing LFormation and Dealer Drive, two software products that significantly benefit the automotive industry by streamlining automotive dealership operations and improving communication with manufacturers. Our software solution has eliminated considerable paperwork for dealerships by automating the test drive process as well as automating the use of valid forms that are required by law to be current and clearly displayed on all dealership vehicles for sale.</p> <p>Whilst we understand copyright may protect any copying of the software code, it will not stop a competitor seeing how our product operates and then replicating the inventive and commercially valuable features of our product.</p> <p>The only way we can hope to stop that occurring is by relying on patent protection.</p> <p>Without the availability of patent protection for the inventive features of our software, we simply could not commit the considerable capital to develop our product and our business. Our business as it grows will employ more Australians and benefit the country, and we need patent protection for our software to help us achieve that and protect our investment.</p> <p>We believe software patents are extremely important in encouraging new and valuable innovation.</p>
2	George Ivanoff, Individual	<p>I am an author. I make a living from my writing. It's a tough gig. Writers don't get paid all that much compared with other occupations. But with a lot of hard work, it is possible to earn a reasonable income. The proposed changes to copyright, PIR and "fair dealing" are going to make it so much more difficult to earn a living. It also makes it likely that I will have to depend on a pension in my old age instead of continued earnings from the works that I have created. Of course, I am not the only one affected. Other authors, publishers, booksellers and the book-buying public will also be adversely affected. The draft report shows a deep lack of understanding of the publishing industry. It NEEDS to be reconsidered.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
3	Tonya Ward, Individual	<p>I am opposed to removing the rules about parallel imports and introducing US-style 'fair use' system.</p> <p>The fact is, it would mean: fewer Australian writers, fewer Australian editors, fewer book designers, less marketing people, fewer sales staff, fewer administration etc. In other words, job losses.</p> <p>Far fewer Australian stories will be told, making future generations more homogenized, calling 911 in emergency not 000.</p> <p>As a writer, I find it offensive to be given so little support. Already we work for below minimum wage. People think this is okay because we 'like' our work. I know plenty of investment bankers who 'like' their work. But because they provide the country with money, rather than the joy, pleasure and education that writers provide, they are rewarded and supported. But we're not asking for more we're just asking please don't make it even harder than it is to get by.</p> <p>The current system works.</p> <p>New Zealand and Canada have both been negatively impacted by similar systems being put into place.</p> <p>Please give our community a chance to compete in the global marketplace. We hope our voices are valued.</p>
4	Madelaine Wallace, Individual	<p>Expanding copyright will kill local industry.</p> <p>It is already possible to obtain foreign books, music, and materials from online sources. Cutting copyright and the funding that goes to vulnerable people such as writers and musicians will cripple the Arts in Australia. More than the 60 businesses already shut in 2016. We need arts in Australia and not just from overseas markets! Australian art by Australian people!</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
5	Claire Saxby, Individual	<p>I have been working as a children's author for the past 20 years. My income as an author comes from multiple sources both locally and internationally. My local income is greater than that earned overseas, because current PIRs protect both my intellectual property rights and my ability to produce works that have relevance and resonance in my local market. Many of these works subsequently are produced in international markets where they succeed because they reflect that which is unique about Australia, whether in content or style. Changes such as those suggested to protections for Australian creators would result not only decreases in creator incomes, but also the loss of the uniqueness of Australian literature. Australian creators have worked relentlessly to build a local industry, a local voice that can proudly hold its place in world literature. To lose this local voice would be to rob our readers young and old of their own stories.</p> <p>Many Australian publishers are now part of multinational companies, but to now have continued to enable local voices to be heard. Removing PIRs and altering copyright protections will make it more difficult for them to maintain local lists and support local creators.</p> <p>Please don't reduce my ability to earn a (modest) living creating books which celebrate Australia in either content or language and which contribute to the body of work that educate and inform our young people. Please continue to protect our local book industry by maintaining PIRs and please continue to protect my intellectual rights.</p>
6	Judy Nunn, Individual	<p>Allowing parallel imports will threaten the entire sphere of Australian publishing, from all those employed in the industry itself, in the production, marketing and distribution of Australian books to those who create the books themselves.</p> <p>To do away with parallel importation restrictions will be an invitation to disaster economically and culturally. Not only will the job losses in our industry be huge, we will eventually lose our Australian stories altogether, the very voices that speak to our people.</p> <p>Along with territorial copyright, the term of personal copyright is of equally vast importance. If creative works are available for general publication in a relatively short period, authors will not be able to keep up with the demand for material. Books will be electronically churned out and downloaded, and we'll be left with a cultural desert, a denuded forest, no more Australian stories.</p> <p>Everything the Government is proposing is a backward step for our country and its people.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
7	Sue Lawson, Individual	<p>The current round of Intellectual Property Recommendations will decimate a publishing industry that is punching well above its weight.</p> <p>Any changes to intellectual property laws will damage the distinctive Australian voice and style of books created for our children and teenagers. Changes will also damage the livelihood of creators and sound the death knell for an already struggling publishing industry.</p> <p>In a country with high illiteracy numbers, high-quality Australian children's literature is more important than ever, and these changes will silence not only our Australian authors, but our stories. Our world is continually shrinking thanks to advances in technology, and with that comes the real possibility that our unique Australian voice and culture will be swallowed, turning us into a generic society.</p> <p>Australian publishers, particularly independent publishers, which I am proud to be published by, produce quality Australian books that allow our children to learn about and understand our culture, our people and our unique place in the world. Surely that is to be valued and protected.</p> <p>I implore you to protect our unique and wonderful culture and our children's future. Allow our children to see themselves, hear their voice and discover their place in the world through Australian literature. Protect Australian authors and illustrators, for the sake of our culture.</p> <p>As Winston Churchill reportedly said, if we aren't fighting for art, what are we fighting for?</p>
8	Jacqui Halpin, Individual	<p>I would ask the commission not to remove the parallel importation restrictions on books. The reasoning is that it will makes books cheaper. This has not been the case since it was done in New Zealand and Canada. In fact, their book prices have increased and their publishing industries have been decimated. We cannot allowed that to happen here. Not only will it have a negative financial impact on our publishing, writing and illustrating industries, with a suspected loss of one in four jobs, it will lead to the erosion of our cultural identity as Australian stories reproduced overseas (particularly in America) and imported for sale here will be stripped of all our cultural references and language. Please protect our Aussie books and book industry. It is of paramount importance to the future of our nation and our identity. Thank you.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
9	John Barwick, Individual	<p>I am concerned about proposals put forward in the draft report on Intellectual Property Arrangements, particularly as it relates to 'fair use' As an educational writer of learning materials for Australian schools, implementing 'fair use' will affect both my ability to earn a living from writing, and, more broadly, the quality and relevance of educational resources available to our children.</p> <p>For example, I am currently writing a series of Geography text books which support the Australian Curriculum. Should 'fair use' exceptions come into force, my work would be extensively photocopied in schools, but I would receive nothing in return. My only income would be from initial book sales. Cost-free photocopying would mean schools would buy just one copy rather than buying class sets.</p> <p>It is, patently, financially unsustainable for me to devote 10 months working virtually full time on a project for which I will receive very little payment.</p> <p>The effect of this would be that I would stop writing text books. If all Australian educational writers did this, schools would simply not have the resources to support the Australian Curriculum. Overseas producers will not fill the void, as they have neither the motivation nor current expertise to produce work that supports the Australian Curriculum.</p> <p>Without adequate compensation for photocopying, Australian content in Australian schools will disappear. I urge you to reconsider these proposals.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
10	Yvonne Mes, Individual	<p>As a recently published author of two picture books (fiction and non-fiction ) and a reader of books, I am horrified at the proposed changes that will unsettle and damage the Australian book publishing industry with disastrous results for publishers, authors, creators and readers in negatively impacting Australia's culture, identity and intelligence and in short its productivity as a vibrant, active and economically viable industry.</p> <p>I would like to add my voice to those of Dee White, Pamela Freeman, Deborah Abela, Sophie Masson and many other children's and YA authors who have made their submissions.</p> <p>I would like to refer to the Summary of Pamela Freeman's submission as follows:</p> <p>The removal of parallel importation restrictions will destroy the Australian publishing industry, as it has done to New Zealand publishing. In particular, it will reduce the incentives for publishers to publish new Australian work.</p> <p>The removal of PIR will significantly reduce the income of Australian writers, and therefore their incentive ' and financial ability 'to write</p> <p>The reduction of the copyright term to 15 or 25 years is immoral as well as misguided. It will seriously reduce the incentive for fiction writers, and transfer profits from creators to publishers. Combined with the removal of PIRs, most profits from Australian writing ' especially fiction writing will move off shore.</p> <p>The reduction in term is also likely to disincentivise the publication of new Australian work, and to lead to the republication of popular, relatively recent out of copyright work, predominantly from overseas, with disastrous cultural effects.</p>
11	Margaret Warner, Individual	<p>As a writer, I would ask you respect the rights of Australian creators and reject a change to US-style copyright exceptions which will damage Australian creators. The proposal to change the territorial copyright laws and abolish parallel import rules and possibly change the current terms of copyright will be detrimental to Australian creators and therefore the Australian community.</p> <p>Australian creators expect affirmation from the government for the important creative work they produce. Please respect our rights.</p>
12	Kym Houghton, Individual	<p>I think we need to open up Australia's literary field to much broader participation. at present, it is dominated by "literary heavyweights" at the expense of wider community participation. Australia Council grants and other activities are not concerned with the grass roots of writing in Australia.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
13	Susanne Gervay, Society of Children's Book Illustrators & Writers SCBWI	<p>The Society of Children's Book Writers &amp; Illustrators SCBWI Australia represents more than 1000 professional authors and illustrators and is part of the largest organisation of children's book writers/illustrators in the world. We are dependent on a vibrant Australian Publishing Industry to invest in Australian creators. Territorial rights are essential for publisher investment in new as well as established authors. It safeguards our Australian industry and is the barrier to dumping of books by international markets. In UK, Canada and HK who have implemented PI, their publishing industries are in serious decline.</p> <p>The implementation of Fair use (USA model) instead of fair dealing attacks educational publishing here. The litigation is huge in the USA with this model disempowering creators. The current system in Australia is fair to creators and consumers. It works. The USA fails.</p> <p>Innovation must include the Arts. The creative industry in Australia represents \$2 billion in revenue alone and this is growing as the arts undertake more innovation.</p> <p>It will take a few years for the negative impact of parallel importing and "fair use" to hit our economy but like New Zealand and Canada it will bring our publishing down with all that loss of revenue, jobs, Australian books and authors and our voice.</p> <p>Parallel importation, free use, copyright for creators "the arts" feeds Google, Apple, Facebook etc with their insatiable need for free content.</p> <p>The argument that this is about CHEAP Books for Australians is curious books are so cheap now with supermarkets, discount shops, even the post office - and individuals can get them online at the lowest prices anyway.</p> <p>The PC should be a champion of Australian books and authors/creators and growing this industry to benefit all Australians. SCBWI would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further.</p>
14	Lian Tanner, Individual	<p>I write children's novels, and support myself purely through my published writing. But if the Parallel Importation Rules (PIRs) that currently protect Australian territorial copyright are removed, that situation will undoubtedly change. Going by the experience of New Zealand and Canada, removing PIRs will allow overseas editions to flood our market, with substantially lower royalties for authors, and with sales revenues going overseas, rather than to Australian publishers. The local industry will contract and the range of Australian books will be reduced.</p> <p>The current system has created a viable and successful Australian publishing industry, while still allowing individual readers to order a book from anywhere in the world. Why would anyone want to undercut such a successful industry?</p> <p>And why handicap our authors and publishers? As Peter Carey, Richard Flanagan and Tom Keneally put it, this is a question of fairness. We are not asking for money, or for a subsidy. We are asking for the same rules and intellectual property rights that prevail for writers and book publishing in the USA, in Britain, in Europe.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
15	Jeremy Eccles, Individual	<p>As a journalist/writer of 33 years practice, I am always delighted when made aware that someone has read/heard/watched my work and been sufficiently interested to respond. But if that response takes the form of mass copying, then I do expect recompense for the sharing of my copyright. That's only fair - but what the Productivity Commission is proposing is not fair, and, indeed, US and Canadian experience has clearly shown that an individual writer such as myself will be severely disadvantaged in terms of protecting my copyright and continuing to earn a small return from it; I will also be forced to the law courts far more often than makes sense to anyone other than a lawyer.</p> <p>I also believe that my copyright should continue to be protected throughout my life and into my inheritance. Whether that should be 10, 20 or 70 years is uncertain in my mind. But to suggest 15 years only after my writing has come into being is just ludicrous - toppling international conventions on the matter and raising serious doubts about the seriousness of the Commission's other proposals.</p>
16	Karen Tyrrell, Digital Future Press	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing as a person both involved in the creation and production of books in Australia, as a reader of books and as an educator with a passion for Australian creativity and literacy. I am an award winning author who has worked hard and will continue to do so in order to develop my craft and to make an income from what I do. I need this income to be able to continue in this career as I, like everyone else, has to pay a mortgage or rent, run a vehicle, feed a family and pay my bills.</p> <p>Despite my success in this industry, I cannot yet claim to make a living out of it. Currently it provides a small income boost to my household and it covers most of my overheads, with my required materials and equipment consuming any potential profit. If I were to earn less than I currently do in my role as author/illustrator, I will be forced to seek other employment and that would not enable me to continue with what I am passionate about. This would certainly be the case if parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors. It would not only affect my career but the careers of all other creators.</p> <p>The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
17	Michel Deverall, Individual	<p>To whom it may concern, I am writing as a person both involved in the creation of books in Australia, as a reader of books and as an educator with a passion for Australian creativity and literacy. I am a newly established author who has worked hard and will continue to do so in order to develop my craft and to make an income from what I do. I need this income to be able to continue in this career as I, like everyone else, has to pay a mortgage or rent, run a vehicle, feed a family and pay my bills.</p> <p>Despite my success in this industry, I cannot yet claim to make a living out of it. Currently it provides a small income boost to my household and it covers most of my overheads, with my required materials and equipment consuming any potential profit. If I were to earn less than I currently do in my role as author/illustrator, I will be forced to seek other employment and that would not enable me to continue with what I am passionate about. This would certainly be the case if parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors. It would not only affect my career but the careers of all other creators.</p> <p>The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p> <p>Please STOP parallel importation of Australian BOOKS!!</p>
18	Lindy Jones, Individual	<p>As a bookseller I am concerned that repeal of PIR will negatively impact the nurturing and promoting of Australian literature and culture at large, destroy a thriving and non-subsidised publishing and bookseller industry employing thousands of people; and have a detrimental impact on Australian creativity and diversity, with little or no change to book prices and availability of product to the Australian reader. There is no evidence that prices will be cheaper. There is evidence (look at NZ) that repeal will mean that local publishing and thus Australian voices will be lessened due to loss of territorial rights.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
19	Deborah Abela , Individual	<p>I am a children's author of over 20 novels and have been part of the legion of Australian creators who have been speaking to kids in schools and at writer's festivals for many years. I have seen first-hand how reading books and meeting their creators can change and enrich children's lives.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the Productivity Commission's proposal to change the rules surrounding our Industry, which suggest allowing parallel imports, reducing the term of copyright and replacing the current 'fair dealing' laws with US-style 'fair use'.</p> <p>I believe these changes will have a hugely damaging effect on our Australian publishing industry, making it almost impossible for authors to earn a living and for Australian publishing companies to continue.</p>
20	Megan Higginson, Individual	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing as a person both involved in the creation of books in Australia, as a reader of books, and as an educator with a passion for Australian creativity and literacy. I am an emerging children's book author. I am working hard in order to develop my craft and to make an income from what I do. I need this income to be able to continue in this career as I, like everyone else, has to pay a mortgage or rent, run a vehicle, feed a family and pay my bills.</p> <p>I cannot yet claim to make a living out of it. The idea that, as an author, I would earn hardly anything from all the hard work that I put into my stories, it would affect my career right at the beginning, is just appalling. I believe that it would also discourage new talent from even bothering to try and start in this industry. What a disgrace! Why is it, that our contribution to society is not even valued anymore?</p> <p>If parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors this would most certainly be the case. It would not only affect my career but the careers of all other creators.</p> <p>The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral, but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p> <p>Please STOP parallel importation of Australian BOOKS!</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
21	Sue-Ellen Pashley, Individual	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing as an Australian author and as a passionate consumer of Australian books. As a new author, I am working hard in order to develop my craft and increase the number of books available to readers, thereby trying to make an income from what I do. I need this income to be able to continue in this career as I, like everyone else, has to pay a mortgage or rent, run a vehicle, feed a family and pay my bills.</p> <p>I cannot yet claim to make a living out of it. But the idea that, as an author, I would earn hardly anything from all the hard work that I put into my stories after such a short period of time, and that it would affect my career right at the beginning, is just appalling. I believe that it would also discourage new talent from even bothering to try and start in this industry. What a disgrace! Why is it, that our contribution to society is not valued anymore?</p> <p>If parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors this would most certainly be the case. It would not only affect my career but the careers of all other creators.</p> <p>The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral, but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p> <p>Please STOP parallel importation of Australian BOOKS!</p>
22	Vanessa Radnidge, Individual	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the recommendations made in the draft report on Intellectual Property Arrangements, which was released on 29 April 2016.</p> <p>I believe the proposed changes to Australia's parallel importation rules would greatly impact on the viability of the Australian publishing industry and see UK and US publishers and their books given an advantage over Australian-produced books and an incentive to dump books into our market.</p> <p>Territorial copyright helps publishers manage risk and supports the creation of new Australian stories. As a publisher, without these rules, the vibrant Australian publishing industry would contract and I and many others would lose our jobs.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that these changes will affect my ability to earn a living, support my family and will also impact heavily on the incomes and opportunities for Australian writers. I respectfully ask that you reconsider your position.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
23	Karen Hendriks, Individual	<p data-bbox="689 351 986 387">To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p data-bbox="689 421 1342 674">I am writing as a person both involved in the creation of books in Australia, as a reader of books, and as an educator with a passion for Australian creativity and literacy. I am an emerging children’s book author. I am working hard in order to develop my craft and to make an income from what I do. I need this income to be able to continue in this career as I, like everyone else, has to pay a mortgage or rent, run a vehicle, feed a family and pay my bills.</p> <p data-bbox="689 674 1342 875">I cannot yet claim to make a living out of it. The idea that, as an author, I would earn hardly anything from all the hard work that I put into my stories, it would affect my career right at the beginning, is just appalling. I believe that it would also discourage new talent from even bothering to try and start in this industry. What a disgrace! Why is it, that our contribution to society is not even valued anymore?</p> <p data-bbox="689 875 1342 987">If parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors this would most certainly be the case. It would not only affect my career but the careers of all other creators.</p> <p data-bbox="689 987 1342 1240">The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral, but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p> <p data-bbox="689 1240 1302 1279">Please STOP parallel importation of Australian BOOKS!</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
24	Helen Stubbs, Writers Activation	<p>Nurturing Australian writers, stories, publishers and booksellers is key in increasing productivity within Australian literature, when productivity is measured in terms of quality, diversity and cultural relevance -- important key indicators in arts industries.</p> <p>Long term copyright and protection of Australia's book industry is incredibly important for increasing the quality of Australian writing.</p> <p>It is nonsensical to measure the productivity of the arts in terms of the number of works reaching consumers. Cheap books are waste. A reader can read a limited amount. Every download or paper book purchase creates environmental waste compromising productivity.</p> <p>Far more important are the production queries of:</p> <p>Is the work home grown?</p> <p>Does it explore contemporary or emerging conditions?</p> <p>Does the artist (writer) excel in their form? Are they emerging and still learning their craft? What new developments does this work show?</p> <p>Is the artist or does the work engage with less visible groups such as refugees, indigenous people, people with disabilities?</p> <p>Is the work breaking new ground? Is it cutting edge?</p> <p>Is it world class?</p> <p>Is it extending writers networks and abilities?</p> <p>Australian writers and publishers already struggle to pursue their craft, and we do it with commitment and often for little financial reward. To further erode our financial position by shortening copyright and destroying our local publishers and independent bookstores is abominable.</p> <p>Another factor that's hard to measure is the influence the arts have on happiness. The right stories provide our lives with the meaning we need to cope with life. They also entertain us and bring us joy. Participation in the arts can relieve anxiety and depression -- both huge problems in Australia. A lively and engaging arts sector in which our people could follow their artistic dreams with some chance of success may have far reaching positive outcomes on productivity.</p>
25	Anthony Baker, Individual	<p>I have not invested my time and money into my practice for my intellectual property to be obtain by anybody without my permission.</p> <p>There are far more implications for the collective than my personal concerns.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
26	Dr Shirley Patton, Individual	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am an Australian author and a passionate reader of books.</p> <p>I am a member of literary focused organisations, and have been on the board of the Tasmanian Writers Centre. The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import has the potential to make authors' careers unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain.</p> <p>It would risk undercutting local production of books in Australia as we do not have the population numbers to support the printing of large volumes of books as they do overseas, making print runs more expensive. Mass market print editions from overseas would sit in book stores alongside the Australian produced copy and the Australian books would not be purchased.</p> <p>As demonstrated in New Zealand, we also risk ending up with non Australian content in our books.</p> <p>If copyright terms are reduced and parallel imports introduced writers' livelihoods risk being destroyed. Without Australian creators we have no Australian books, without Australian books our Australian culture is not adequately represented to Australian (and international) readers.</p> <p>Please refrain from undermining Australian culture, and from taking our creative and literary heritage for granted.</p>
27	Suzannah Arnot , Zanni Louise Author	<p>Dear Productivity Commission</p> <p>I am a young and emerging children's author. To date, I've received two advances for picture books, and I hope to receive royalties any day now. Needless to say, I am not making a 'living' from children's literature. But since I am at the very beginning of my career, and am only 32, I very much hope I will one day make a partial income from being an author. As I am published by Australian publishers however, I am very concerned that my future here is fragile. If authors such as Mem Fox and Jackie French are at risk of losing ownership of their copyright, what hope have I? And on a far less selfish note, I know how hard Australian publishers work to bring books into the hearts and minds of children. If these recommendations go ahead, many of these publishers will be severely disadvantaged and will not have the means to foster home grown authorship. Having grown up on books like Possum Magic and Allison Lester's wonderful books, I feel immensely sad for our future children if they are not given the same right to be raised on Australian literature. Please look at the effects of proposed changes in New Zealand and other places, and please remember back to the books that helped make you. I'm sure many came from our own soil.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
28	Cassandra Webb, Individual	<p data-bbox="766 358 1404 425">This is my submission. Just Reword it in your OWN words To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p data-bbox="766 459 1404 705">I am writing as a person both involved in the creation of books in Australia, as a reader of books and as an educator with a passion for Australian creativity and literacy. I am an award winning author who has worked hard and will continue to do so in order to develop my craft and to make an income from what I do. I need this income to be able to continue in this career as I, like everyone else, has to pay a mortgage or rent, run a vehicle, feed a family and pay my bills.</p> <p data-bbox="766 716 1404 1041">Despite my success in this industry, I cannot yet claim to make a living out of it. Currently it provides a small income boost to my household and it covers most of my overheads, with my required materials and equipment consuming any potential profit. If I were to earn less than I currently do in my role as author/illustrator, I will be forced to seek other employment and that would not enable me to continue with what I am passionate about. This would certainly be the case if parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors. It would not only affect my career but the careers of all other creators.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1052 1404 1288">The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1299 1404 1332">Please STOP parallel importation of Australian BOOKS!!</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
29	Libby Hathorn, Individual	<p>Productivity Draft Report</p> <p>Submission by children’s author Libby Hathorn</p> <p>As a writer for children and young adults, I am appalled at the stance taken on moves to weaken Australian copyright. Copy (not right) says it all. This will see the diminishing of Australian culture as all the arts are involved and we writers shall (once again) see Australia as the dumping ground for left over books, and our work being co-opted by third parties without payment to the creator, if this legislation takes place. The Australian Copyright Council says, though faced before, there is a new ideological stance from an independent agency whose draft report is a mish-mash of previous reviews unsupported by new evidence. The report even alludes to creators in inverted commas as though writing is not a full profession. “Fair use” in the US has sent creators to the wall their only recourse to go to litigation and most writers here whose average income is about \$13,000 per annum for their writing and have second and third jobs, cannot afford such a step. In both Canada and New Zealand it has not resulted in cheaper books as cited but has sent local publishers to the wall and thus fewer and fewer works that reflect those particular cultures. In fact the cost of books has been reduced by some 30% in Australia on the past few years, and anyone can see just walking into a local Post Office, Target, Coles and Woolworths, that cheaply available Australian books are in demand and are bought. It will see fewer Australian books reflecting our own culture and must not go ahead..</p>
30	Gindi Wauchope, Individual	<p>Regarding the copyright portions of the draft report.</p> <p>I agree that the life of the author plus 70 years is too long, however the proposed 15-20 years is clearly too short. I know a few authors and if you are writing novels you have to have a long tail in order to make a living. It can take 20 years to become known at which point you need all of your back catalogue available for sale and generating royalties.</p> <p>I suggest that the recommended copyright period be the life of the author or 20 years whichever is longer. This would still be in line with copyright arrangements worldwide, therefore fitting into existing business models and allowing writers to make a living. It would also free the copyright control of material where the authors are long dead.</p>
31	Andree Magnusson, Language International Bookshop	<p>As the manager of a specialist bookshop I urge the government to make no changes to current intellectual property rules and to maintain the status quo with regard to Parallel Importation Rules. A healthy book industry needs editors and local publishers to maintain standards and uphold Australia's unique voice. I am also concerned about the ramifications for the printing industry. Manufacturing has taken enough hits already.</p> <p><a href="https://www.languageint.com.au/">https://www.languageint.com.au/</a></p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
32	Kirsty-Lee Workman, Penguin Random House	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a reader of Australian stories -- written by Australian writers and produced in Australia by Australian workers -- and as someone who has worked in the Australian book industry for a number of years now, I am deeply disturbed at the moves by the Australian Federal Government to change the copyright and parallel importation restriction rules that have worked to protect the Australian book industry for so long.</p> <p>As has been pointed out by a number of sources, the data that the productivity commission report, and the Federal Government, are relying on to make their case is outdated and in some cases plain irrelevant. Most importantly, it does take into account the crucial cultural component that is such a part of the Australian book industry.</p> <p>For a number of reasons, including economic and cultural reasons, the Australian book industry should remain protected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 2014-15 the Australian book industry generated \$7.1 billion in revenue</li> <li>- The publication print services sector alone generated \$2 billion and employs over 3,600 people</li> <li>- If PIRs are removed the demand for the services of a domestic publication print industry will be reduced beyond the point of sustainability</li> <li>- Employment will be threatened in some already vulnerable regional communities</li> <li>- Australia will lose specialised skills</li> <li>- Australia will lose its stories.</li> </ul> <p>I would like to voice my strong support for both copyright and PIRs to be maintained, in order that the culturally and economically critical Australian book industry be protected against international competitive advantage.</p>
33	Debra Coombs, Individual	<p>I lend my voice to other book creators about the potential damaging effect of the Productivity Commission's proposed changes to intellectual property laws particularly on the children's book industry and on the psyche of Australian children who need to see themselves represented in literature.</p> <p>Creativity is the driver of innovation and if we stifle our creative industries, we stifle the very thing the Productivity Commission claims to encourage ie. "creativity, investment and new innovation by individuals". I urge the Government to carefully consider the counterproductive impacts that the Commission's recommendations could have on Australian Society.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
34	Garry Evans, Harbour Publishing House	<p>I write for you to note my disagreement to the proposed changes to the Australian intellectual arrangements. We are a new small regional publisher capturing the voice of everyday Australians for today &amp; future generations. Your proposals will enviably shift profits offshore to large global players &amp; destroy the small independent bookseller market in this country. Look to dumping of cheap generic book content globally today and see the outcomes from that practice. These small stores are the champions of small press and between both help largely to record and voice authentic Australian content.</p>
35	Lucienne Noontil, Sunrise Reflections	<p>Dear Minister Plibersek,</p> <p>I am an Australian children's author and share my stories with kids in schools and kinders. I know how reading books and meeting their creators can change and enrich children's lives.</p> <p>The Productivity Commission's proposal to change the rules surrounding our Industry, which suggest allowing parallel imports, reducing the term of copyright and replacing the current "fair dealing" laws with US-style 'fair use' is not fair.</p> <p>I believe these changes will have a hugely damaging effect on our Australian publishing industry, making it almost impossible for authors to earn a living and for Australian publishing companies to continue. We have a strong, creative authenticity in Australia and these changes will certainly undermine this.</p> <p>Please think carefully about this issue. Many existing and emerging authors are relying on your decisions so they can forge ahead and have stability in their writing careers.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
36	Coral Tulloch, Individual	<p>As an award winning Author and Illustrator, working within this industry for over thirty years, there has always been constant battles over recognition and copyright, let alone payments and intellectual property rights. People in this industry come to it because of their passion and commitment and it has always been a struggle. But they stay because of their incredible dedication, despite the often hard and creativity insecure life. I am flawed and disgusted by the enormous money that have recently been offered to sport whilst at the same time an axe of cultural ignorance slashes Arts funding, let alone what is intended here! The struggle for our intellectual property should never exist! It is more than an insult to our importance in our culture, but it is a clear message that we are perceived to have no value at all, therefore we have no worth to our culture's contemporary life let alone its future. How much more do we have to fight for our rightful worth. So it seems our future lies in only valuing bread and circuses, painting everything that garish yellow and green. The message we will bring up our children with is that we have devalued our literary and visual narratives, our thinkers and creators, our intellectual future and honour and revere those who can run around a sports field. I'm disgusted by our country that we even have to justify ourselves in writing these submissions. Sit back and watch what happens when such an important voice of a culture, as ours is so devalued.</p>
37	Lesley Gibbes, Individual	<p>I concur with Margaret Hamilton, Dee White, Wendy Or and Sophie Masson in my concerns about the proposed changes to Intellectual Property arrangements.</p>
38	Jen Franklin, Museum of Australian Democracy, Old Parliament House	<p>Intellectual Property Arrangements</p> <p>Comments on Productivity Commission Draft Report</p> <p>J Franklin 26/05/2016</p> <p>Requests for further information:</p> <p>5.2, 16.1, 16.2</p> <p>- Suggest administration of copyright be included in IP Australia remit; all IP, both policy and regulation, should sit in one place. This would reduce fragmentation and improve the coherent policy development, in turn making it clearer and easier for users.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>- Agree that perpetual copyright protection of unpublished works should be removed.</p> <p>- Agree that the Copyright Act should permit use of orphaned works.</p> <p>- Agree that the fair dealing exceptions could be made more broad and flexible.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
39	John Coetzee, Individual	I urge you to take seriously the objections to the parallel importation of books raised by Australian publishers, booksellers and writers. These objections are well founded. There are genuine and substantial grounds for fearing that implementing the proposals of the Productivity Commission will cause serious damage to the Australian publishing industry and - even more seriously - weaken our national literary culture.
40	Paula Tierney, Individual	The proposed changes in copyright and parallel importation threatens my livelihood and the very industry that supports me. I invest in my future one sentence at a time, and I strongly oppose the changes in copyright that will limit the earning period for this investment. The removal of PIRs would dismantle territorial copyright for Australian authors and publishers and lead to much reduced print runs, investment and returns for Australian authors and publishers.
41	Nicola Tierney, Individual	I am VERY disturbed that this government is considering changing the copyright to 15 years for my writing. I have spent 9 years writing, large sums of money getting illustrations done, will spend more money marketing my book and for what so I can lose the right to my own work after 15 years! There is also changing the availability of books within 14 days of their overseas publication date, or legally making them available simultaneously. Also removing parallel importation restrictions will result in the swamping of the Australian market with overseas product. The Australian government should be PROUD of the work that Australian writers produce instead all they seem to be intent on doing is destroying the publication industry just as soo many other industries have been destroyed. I do not expect to make huge sums of money from my book but I wanted to own it longer than 15 years! I object to this proposed action!
42	David Lucas, Individual	Copyright should be limited to 15 years, with a Fair Use exception limited to 300 words if the quoted work is properly identified. This helps the original author exploit their work. A further 15 years can then be added if the Author establishes an easy-to-obtain permission process [not the labyrinth that now exists], with the Fair Use exemption remaining and a sliding scale of reasonable charges to be paid. So, for example, 500 words would attract a fee of AUS\$3 per word [including the 300 Fair Use words] and if the original author has sold more than 1m copies, double that amount. This allows the author to exploit their work if they are diligent in protecting and exploiting it, and also allows homage to be paid to their work, and opens it up to possible new audiences.

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
43	Andrew Tune, Individual	To suggest as per the Productivity Commission Draft Report that the level of innovation supported by software patents is any different that supported by other patents (such as, for example, electronic hardware or a process carried out by a human being) betrays a failure to understand an issue of fundamental importance: there is no clear dividing line between what can be done in software, computer (or other) hardware, or as a manual (perhaps paper-based) process by a human being: the same process can be implemented equivalently (in terms of function) in each manner. To exclude software-based systems from patentability is to create an artificial distinction not reflective of the real world. It will reduce innovation.
44	Lex Hirst, Individual	The removal of PIRs and the movement towards a fair use system of copyright would be dangerously destructive for Australia's long and short term future as a nation of innovative artists. I truly believe this submission would see the investment in Australian writers and artists of all kinds falter in favour of international companies, and stunt our growth as a nation. Copyright is one of the few ways artists from across the spectrum can earn a living wage from their work. Many artists do not earn super for their years of working and their copyright is their financial security. This money currently filters through Australian industries but if we open up our copyright system to a fair use agreement we are saying these artists and the companies that currently invest in their work have no real value to us as a nation. The arts already struggles to survive in Australia and yet does a huge amount with a small amount of capital and constant financial risk. Removing PIRs would open our nation up to a flood of low cost international books whose profits never trickle down to our own industries, all for the sake of some slightly cheaper books in the short term. The only other major English-speaking country that has similarly removed these barriers in recent years is New Zealand, and the cost of books there has lowered slower than in Australia. Other, much larger nations like the UK and US have never risked their artistic industries by reducing copyright in this way or opening up their market to cheap international titles. Don't make Australia a guinea pig for the sake of short term goals.
45	Elizabeth Bor, Individual	Many educational authors are motivated by conviction rather than by the hope of remuneration. However, royalties and the CAL payment are welcome because they help to pay for professional editing and design. Sales are limited by the practice in primary schools of buying a single copy of a resource in the expectation that teachers will photocopy the pages they want to use. Consequently, a reduction in compensation may further disadvantage educational authors while potentially increasing the use of imported educational materials not created to meet the needs of Australian students.

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
46	Ilan McLean, Individual	<p>As an up and coming, ever-hopeful, commercial author and illustrator of children's books, and a professional reviewer of same, it distresses me greatly when I hear of the Government's intentions to repeal Parallel Importation Laws. It seems to me that doing so will have a huge, negative impact on the Australian publishing industry and, in turn, on the Australian culture.</p> <p>I cannot imagine how local publishers, bookshops, authors, illustrators and designers are expected to fare, let alone continue to make a decent living, if overseas companies have such unfair advantages.</p> <p>Supposed changes to Australian copyright are just as chilling. Will the Australian book industry survive? I cannot see how.</p>
47	Sarah Taylor, South Seas Books	<p>I am an independent bookseller in South Australia and as such part of the successful Australian bookselling industry in Australia.</p> <p>As an Australian bookseller we support and promote both established and emerging Australian writers and believe that this is essential to have a thriving Australian culture of writers. We both read, sell and introduce these authors and their books to the communities in which we live.</p> <p>The bookselling and publishing communities employ thousands of people and contribute to both the cultural and economic life of our local communities. We receive no subsidies and should the suggested changes be implemented changes this would impact adversely on both jobs, the creativity of writing in Australia and the larger community this benefits.</p> <p>Should these recommendations be introduced Australian publishers will be unable to afford to invest in established and emerging writers as they do now and the rich Australian cultural life we are privileged to participate in will be decimated.</p> <p>The removal of PIRs does not mean cheaper prices and greater availability.</p> <p>In New Zealand where this has occurred prices have in fact risen and there is significantly less local content published with publisher's capital reduced or withdrawn.</p> <p>As a small independent business owner who employs staff and supports the local community in which we live we are concerned about the future should these proposals be implemented.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
48	Andrew Dalgleish, Gusto Clothing and Design PTY LTD	<p>My name is Andrew Dalgleish I own a business called Gusto Clothing and Design Pty Ltd. We are importers/distributors of European clothing for 20 years.</p> <p>I have been working on an idea over the past 10 years called CLASS/colorDNA. It's based on a computer algorithm which I received an Australian Patent for in Sept 2015 Number [XXXXXXXXXXXXX]. Details attached.</p> <p>I have also acquired the R&amp;D Tax Incentive from the Aust Gov for R&amp;D activities on the ColorDNA business Registration Number [XXXXXXXXXXXXX]. Details attached.</p> <p>Furthermore I put forward a submission in 2011 to the Productivity Comm for the, NATIONAL INQUIRY INTO ECONOMIC STRUCTURE AND PERFORMANCE OF THE AUSTRALIAN RETAIL INDUSTRY.</p> <p>Attached is transcript from that inquiry, I mention on a couple of occasions, the technology I was working on.</p> <p>I have spent almost \$150,000.00 on Aust and Int patents and over \$1,000,000.00 on the bus. to date. Attached are tables which detail spend.</p> <p>We are currently working on a GO TO MARKET STRATEGY and will be negotiating seed capital in Aug for a Soft Launch in Nov. A global Hard Launch is planned for the second half of 2017.</p> <p>I think my patent is safe, even if you change the criteria for acquiring a patent on computer BM&amp;S algorithms. Given it does produce a "physical effect" which does lead to a useful product as well as an implementation scheme.</p> <p>The European patent office has not ruled on my Patent app, like many cases they are not sure where to categorize it.</p> <p>The Americans are similar to Euro, we think are down to the last challenge.</p> <p>My patent, algorithm and system, creates something online that was always thought to be only possible in person - hence the physical effect.</p> <p>If my system full fills its potential, it would be the basis of the worldwide shopping net.</p> <p>If a company with endless resources is able to copy it, Australia will lose what could be an endless source of income and employment.</p>
49	Gwen Haritonidis, Individual	<p>This US Trade deal and the possibility that the Productivity Commission will sign away the copyright ownership of Australians under the "fair use" condition is a real concern.</p> <p>Who will it benefit?-certainly not the common person, who has used their creativity to produce some wonderful work.</p> <p>How will a small person be able to stand up to the large corporations who will possibly be able to use their work willy nilly without any real threat of legal action by the creator?</p> <p>Why change the protected term from 70 years to 15 years? With internet being so pervasive in our technological driven world, someone's creativity can be copied ad nauseum without any comeback. It seems to me that it goes against all our Prime Minister says, to be innovative and productive- why, when you will not be rewarded for your efforts.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
50	Sharon McLeod, Individual	<p>I am an artist and this new copyright change of laws will affect my livelihood . I sell original artwork but retain my copyrights so i can then print from the original and continue to make money from the image even after sale, and even the publishing companies i work for and receive royalties i still own my own art work but these new laws will seriously put my handwork at risk. Copyright longevity changes</p> <p>Reducing the length of copyright to a length of 15-25 years (total) counters the intention of the report to boost innovation. It does the exact opposite. It stifles innovation and boosts the copying and distribution of original created works at the expense of the creators. Excellent for search engines, web hosts, social media and other advertising platforms that require free content for their business model, but of no value to creators and consumers.</p> <p>I strongly oppose these changes and suggest you lengthen the copyright time to 150 years after death so families can continue to benefit after death</p>
51	Chenoa Fawn, Individual	<p>I have received royalties from works I have created which were, are, and should continue to be covered by copyright for the term of my life. I would like to voice my concern and disagreement with any reduction of the term of copyright below internationally agreed standards. It is important to support Australian perspectives, critical thinking and stories being published. Australian artists should be able to earn a reasonable income from works created earlier in their careers.</p> <p>Copyright legislation includes many other forms of creation other than fiction and non-fiction such as illustration and song. Limiting copyright to less than the lifetime of the creator will discourage creators from creating. They will be forced into other forms of work (if they can get it) and our future generations will be deprived of their cultural inheritance. For those who can relocate overseas, we will not only lose the goodwill, pro bono work and pride injected into the local communities of those artists but they are unlikely to have an Australian focus once they relocate as they will have to “sell” to their overseas audience.</p> <p>Who benefits from a reduction in the term of copyright? Not the creator and not their Australian audience.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
52	Shona Martyn, Individual	<p>I am the Publishing Director of the General Books Division of HarperCollins Australia and also have oversight of our New Zealand publishing program. I have worked in the Australian book publishing industry since 1996 and in my role have direct financial responsibility for managing local and international lists, making offers to authors based on profitability and sales of their books as well as realising the creative vision of their work. As publishers of Australian books, we are committed to telling Australian stories and allowing talented Australian authors a route to readers. Ours is a highly collaborative industry that honours the author as creator and invests the considerable time, energy, thought and effort in the publishing, editorial, marketing, publicity and selling that can make a book a bestseller.</p> <p>I can vouch first hand for the impact that Parallel Importation has had in New Zealand - most notably piles of cheap remaindered books which steal sales from their authors (who are paid significantly less on remainders). It is certainly true that a reduction in revenue from falling sales - publishers are businesses after all! - means there is less money to invest in new and existing authors. Over the last decade, publishing in New Zealand has diminished as companies have cutback staff and publishing lists in the face of competition from these overseas imports. It is inevitable that if Parallel Importation is introduced here, the same will happen.</p> <p>As a mother, I am particularly concerned about the effect on children's books. Those of us who grew up in the 1960s will recall the English skew of our storybooks. Badgers. Swallows and Amazons. Mice in Frilly Frocks living in thatched cottages. How lucky we have been over the last two decades to see the expansion of Australian children's books featuring wombats and possums and a diversity of authors from Andy Griffiths - with his uniquely Australian humour - and Anh Do connecting way beyond the migrant market.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
53	Jo Vabolis, Individual	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am a South Australian writer and editor, working in educational publishing as well as the arts (reviewing and script editing). I'm also a book lover, with a particular passion for exploring new Australian literature and poetry.</p> <p>Our writers deserve to make an income from the works they create. Writers, along with everyone else in this country, must pay bills, feed themselves and their families, and make what little they currently earn stretch a very long way.</p> <p>The current proposal to introduce parallel importation and reduce the term of copyright will force writers to further supplement already low earnings with employment that detracts from essential creative time.</p> <p>Writers must write, and should be fairly remunerated for their efforts. A flood of foreign editions will ruin the Australian market resulting in less opportunities for publication. This, in addition to extended limitations on copyright, presents a bleak future for writers both new and established.</p> <p>I believe our laws should preserve our cultural heritage and support the ongoing development and success of Australian writers, and this is why I oppose the proposed changes.</p>
54	Kian Lon Wong, Individual	<p>The draft report only foster more confusion in its decision of whether a software/business method is patentable or not. Sadly, this report has no recommended outcome. Even if there was one, it is insinuated and generally does not look encouraging, nor does it say much.</p> <p>If ever there is a decision, it has to be clear cut how this is going to be done.</p> <p>The very existence of a blurring distinction as to whether something is patentable or not, is a waste of monetary, energy and knowledge resources.</p> <p>The whole idea should be on the promotion of bright ideas, that will contribute to progress in a country, and as a nation, to compete in the world stage.</p> <p>What it is, is stifling and counterproductive. Australia has lost a lot of talents. Australia will continue to lose its sons and daughters to the world at large with the continued presence and institution of restrictive policies, this patent issue included.</p> <p>In an ever competitive world, we will lose out eventually. The decision is now onto you, the policy makers. You shape Australia, for good or for bad.</p> <p>The clock is ticking and my personal opinion and recommendation is that the policies set forth should be definitive and concrete in nature. If there is any element of doubt or the inability to come to a definitive conclusion, then the benefit of allowing patent filings based on software or business method should be encouraged rather than to "err on the side of caution" and stifle any growth.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
55	Stephen Luby, Individual	<p>As a film and television producer who has specialized in adapting Australian literary works for the screen (most recently Kate Grenville's 'The Secret River' as an ABC mini-series), and as a result has come to understand the publishing and bookselling industry in Australia ( not to mention establishing relationships with numerous working writers), I strongly object to Government proposals to make changes to territorial copyright regulations, and to Parallel Import Restrictions.</p> <p>These changes will adversely affect the access of authors to local publishing deals which are their major opportunity for making a reasonable living from their creative efforts. By denying Australian publishers the right to an exclusive window in their home territory, the changes will make it less financially viable for them to support Australian authors It will also reduce the incentive for Australian booksellers to give priority to Australian-published books.</p> <p>This is a triple threat which will have a negative impact on Australian cultural sovereignty, as well as on the livelihoods of many sectors of the Australian book industry.</p>
56	Robert Brown, Individual	<p>I strongly object to the proposed changes to the copyright and parallel importation rules. There are many in my immediate family who are engaged in "creative industries" and will be severely and adversely affected. If the proposed fair use copyright policy is implemented, they will be disincentivised from producing original work.</p> <p>I enjoy reading, listening to music and watching video material, but strongly believe that the original author of the work should retain copyright and therefore royalties for considerably longer than the proposed 15 years. I do not want to have my literary choices clouded by "Americanised remainders" that will be dumped on Australia and kill off our local publishing industries.</p>
57	Mary Knox, Individual	<p>I disagree with the plans to repeal Parallel Importation Laws as they will have a negative impact on the Australian publishing industry, and thus on the Australian culture. Creativity should be encouraged and rewarded not the opposite.</p>
58	Helene Magisson, Individual	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am an Australian illustrator coming from overseas. When I settled down here in Australia a few years ago, I was strongly seduced by the very specific Australian books. They are very strongly representative from Australian culture and soul. They are just unique.</p> <p>Unfortunately I believe that the proposal to reduce the term of copyright and allow the introduction of parallel import will kill our local publications and consequently will kill this very specific Australian industry.</p> <p>Please help us to preserve it.</p>
59	Jacqui Barton, Individual	<p>I have a masters in Australian literature , I believe in our history , respect and value our authors and publishers and would hate to think that we'd look back in years to come and see that we are under British or American literature</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
60	Wayne Macauley, Individual	<p>As an Australian mid-list author with five books published, I wish to register my concern with the Productivity Commission's recommendations regarding the limitation of author copyright and the lifting of the book industry's parallel import restrictions. The idea that we could sacrifice a currently dynamic publishing industry to a one-size-fits-all economic ideology is narrow-minded to say the least. These recommendations will leave an Australian author such as myself in a more precarious position than now and will likely result in less Australian stories being written and published. Meanwhile, our market will be opened up for large multinationals to dump cheap overseas titles into it - and, once the local industry has been decimated, presumably then gouge the Australian customer with price increases on these titles. These recommendations have no merit. They are shallow-minded and ill-conceived and take no account of the realities on the ground for writers, publishers and booksellers. Books are an essential part of the cultural fabric of this country, they are not simply an economic unit and should never be treated as such. I urge you to reconsider these recommendations.</p>
61	Jane Fraser, Fremantle Press	<p>Fremantle Press unites with literary and publishing organisations across Australia in the Books Create Australia campaign to voice our grave concern for the recommendations proposed in the Productivity Commission report. In particular we condemn the Government's plan to abolish international standards of the book publishing industry, a move that will seriously threaten the future of Australia's literary culture.</p> <p>To propose removing parallel importation rules and territorial copyright is not only based on out of date price data but it pays no regard to the effects of such a move. It will seriously threaten the future of independent publishers of quality Australian literature like Fremantle Press as well as the creative future of our Australian authors, all who contribute to keeping Australia's literary heritage vibrant and relevant. Territorial copyright and PIR protects our author's livelihoods by mitigating what would amount to extra, external downward pressure on already baseline author income through reduced royalties. By controlling overseas book imports PIR keeps Australian publishers competitive and readers supplied with local stories brimming with wonderful Australian ideas, histories and culture.</p> <p>Since 2013 the federal funding of the arts has been reduced by \$300 million and has resulted in the destabilisation of an under-resourced sector whose contribution to the national economy equals that of the healthcare sector and outperforms that of the retail and agricultural industries (ABS, 2008-09). Literature forms a significant part of this nation's arts sector and to force Australian writers and publishers to have to struggle even more than we do is simply unbelievable.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
62	Katie Stackhouse, Individual	As a reader I support retaining PIR to protect Australian copyright and give Australian writers and publishers the same rights that the US and UK industries enjoy. Don't give away Australian territorial rights to foreign interests - abandoning PIR benefits only big corporations and overseas interests, not Australian book buyers.
63	Ester de Boer, Ester de Boer Illustration	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am a children's book illustrator, artist and writer. These must be some of the hardest areas to make a living from already!</p> <p>If parallel imports were approved and the copyright laws changed for Australian authors, well... I guess you really could call them starving artists, huh? Or maybe just shout them an order: "More coffee please"! because it's going to make it even tougher on the toughest areas of self-employment.</p> <p>This does kiss the arse of mega-business, while kicking the creators of original works in the same proverbial rear! (my novel has taken ten years, and a single ink drawing up to eight months- it's not like I just buy it from some wholesaler!)</p> <p>The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral, but would make my and other authors' and illustrators' careers as creators unsustainable. Our books would be involved in an unfair competition with copies of foreign editions coming into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain and the market would kill the chances of local publications having any success in the flooded market.</p>
64	Jason Nahrung, Individual	<p>A new book is not like a new car. It may not be a bestseller immediately on release. It may only sell well when one of those following, perhaps decades later, establishes an audience. Each book drives sales of the preceding volumes. Reducing the period of copyright endangers the writer's return from this long tail.</p> <p>It's already hard enough to make a dollar as a published author. Reducing the earning potential by reducing the copyright period will not encourage a literary industry.</p> <p>There is an onerous aspect, in the creative use of other's work in small amounts, e.g., quotation of lines in a work or as an epigraph, that restricts interaction between texts, but the 'free for all' of 'fair use' proposed by the report appears to be just another way to limit income for producers.</p> <p>The threat to the domestic industry posed by cancellation of the PIR has been voiced by publishers, writers and their organisations, and my fears on this score have not abated since the last time the commission looked into this issue. We should be encouraging a local literary industry in all its varied modes, for economic and cultural wellbeing of the nation, in much the way that other nations preserve theirs.</p> <p>I agree with this quote from the report: "Accessible and competitively priced online content is the best deterrent to copyright infringement".</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
65	John Ogden, Cyclops Press	<p>I am a freelance photographer and cinematographer and have been since graduating from film school in 1979. Following an injury to one of my eyes in 1998 I started a small publishing company dedicated to producing books that promote reconciliation. This is a small but important operation with small print run books. As a one man band, I research, write, photograph, design and oversee the printing. Then I have to do the marketing and oversee the distribution and bookkeeping. For all this I hardly raise enough income to survive in Sydney. Any lessening of the copyright regulation will make it impossible to continue to make these important cultural books.</p>
66	Sue Cartledge, Individual	<p>I am an author, and an avid reader of books. While I am as yet unpublished, other than in literary journals, I have submitted my latest book to publishers. Like all authors, I have worked hard to develop my craft and hope to make an income from what I do. Like many authors, I am distressed at the changes to the Intellectual Property Arrangements. If you reduce our copyright terms and introduce parallel imports, you destroy the livelihood, minimal as it is, of our creators. No Australian creators means no Australian books, no Australian books means no Australian culture represented to our children, youth or adult readers.</p> <p>For regulations to be changed knowing that it will result in the destruction of an industry that is alive and well and supports our heritage and unique culture is short sighted and highly immoral. Please reconsider, and abandon these changes, so that Australia's vibrant literary culture can continue and grow.</p>
67	Andrew Varney, nxSpark	<p>I agree that software patents hinder innovation rather than promote it. As a software start-up founder and in the early days of getting my software ready for market, I see the risk of patent trolls litigating me for an infringement (even though I believe my software to be innovative, unique, and original ) far outweighs the benefits of investing in my own patents that may or may not give me protection due to the nature of software. I did invest \$10,000 in perusing a patent but gave up before we submitted it. So yes, I think software patents should be abolished, like in NZ.</p>
68	Kelli Bradicich, Individual	<p>After spending 25 years honing my craft and finally being on the cusp of publication, the idea of one day losing rights to my creative work is soul destroying. I am not writing for riches. But I am also not writing to hand it all over to someone else. Creativity needs to be valued. It is one of the surest ways of reaching the hearts and minds of people and initiating growth and change in our society. It is a field that needs to be invested in, promoted and valued.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
69	Linda Parkinson, Individual	<p>This is ludicrous. You want to encourage creativity by reducing copyright protection to 15 years. It's an oxymoron. You want to encourage people to create, but not have ongoing royalties from the books, artworks and songs that they create and sell.</p> <p>Frank Lowy has used his skills as a businessman to amass a fortune. Is there a time limit on how long he is able to benefit from this? No, of course not. Nor should there be. No doubt, he will pass his properties and the financial benefits he has amassed to his family when he dies. Bryce Courtney died in 2012. I'm sure that he assumed that ongoing royalties from his books sold after that time would pass to his wife and son and not expire in 2027. Both men have used their abilities in their chosen spheres and been successful. Both have left a legacy, it would appear that Mr Lowy's is more acceptable to the Productivity Commission. There are numerous successful authors, artists and performers in Australia such as Jackie French, Mem Fox, Graham Base, Markus Zusak, Guy Sebastian etc. Should their works not remain under copyright protection? Are their endeavours less valid than someone like Mr Lowy?</p> <p>This is an ill-conceived idea and needs to be reconsidered. Otherwise what incentives are there for many gifted, innovative Australians to pursue their creative dreams? Intellectual property needs to be protected.</p>
70	Caroline Tuohey, Individual	<p>I am a writer. I create. My creations are stories and poems. I write them to share with others, but I proudly acknowledge they are mine. My thoughts, my placing of words in different combinations, my creativity. A librarian recently said to me 'I love your stories. They make me happy.' So even though my stories are shared with hundreds, perhaps thousands of readers, that librarian knows they're mine and affords me the respect of acknowledgment. Other writers know they are mine. Readers know they are mine. And that's important. Have you not noticed when discussing books, people automatically have the title of the book inextricably linked to the writer? For example: "Have you read Possum Magic by Mem Fox?" "Have you seen the new Andy Griffiths tree house book?" I hope I live to be an old, old lady. I hope that in that part of my life, I am still sharing my stories. Stories that still belong to me because I am the creator. Even if they were created a lifetime ago. That is important. Why on earth does the government think it isn't?</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
71	Robyn Annear, Individual	<p>My concern is that what is proposed will put Australia's book industry at a disadvantage. By "book industry", I mean not just writers, publishers and booksellers, but also readers. While other leading book-producing countries - chiefly the US and UK - maintain parallel import protections, it seems foolhardy to expose our market in the manner proposed. Other countries that have dropped parallel import regulations have seen their book industries diminish as a result. A reduction in publishing activity and the number of booksellers seems a likely outcome, and it's hard to see how that could promote the telling of Australian stories.</p> <p>Australian readers and book-buyers have ready access to the international book market as it is, and competition from offshore retailers online has already driven down local book prices. It seems to me that we stand to lose a local industry that is more important than economic measures can tell.</p> <p>Besides being a published writer of very modest income, I have worked for years in public libraries, observing how readers read. And I know that, even in the digital age, a thriving network of local publishers and independent booksellers is vital to Australia's creative character - that is, the Australia of readers' imaginations.</p>
72	Georgina Ballantine, Possum Books	<p>I've spent a number of hours reading and considering the findings of the Productivity Commission and for me it comes to several key points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The suggested copyright reduction is illegal and is therefore a non-issue. However, I am stunned that as little as 15 years could be considered a fair and viable outcome for content creators. Authors can spend years writing, honing and perfecting a book. Given how little authors earn in royalties from traditional publishing, it seems fair for them to receive long-term income.</li> <li>2. Parallel importation. Over the last 60 years Australians have built a wonderful, diverse and vibrant publishing industry that supports many wonderful authors. Removing parallel importation restrictions focuses only on the consumer. People want cheaper books because they want cheaper everything, which is why some already use Book Depository, Amazon and other overseas websites to buy, already undercutting Australian bookshops and publishers. Removing restrictions will only increase the pressure on bookshops and publishers to survive. Isn't the purpose of having a Productivity Commission to find ways to increase productivity, not destroy it? Given that people already have access to cheap books online, why risk the viability of Australian publishing?</li> </ol>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
73	Catherine Cavanagh, Individual	<p>I am the non-fiction writing mother of an emerging illustrator.</p> <p>Any change to copyright laws that reduces their power bothers me.</p> <p>A young person flipping burgers for McDonalds can earn \$15-\$20 dollars an hour.</p> <p>An artist-illustrator spends hours learning drawing, watercolour and computer skills. Then several hours producing a purchase worthy image and might clear 15 cents profit out of a greeting card sold in a shop for \$2, as well as the time taken to set up websites, and other marketing work.</p> <p>Why isn't the effort to produce artwork or write a blog/column valued as highly as flipping burgers and filing documents?</p> <p>It is really hard for creatives to make a living. Please make sure any legislative changes to copyright don't make it harder.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
74	John Carr, Individual	<p>The report makes no mention of the dangers to children and young people represented by many piracy web sites. Research has shown such sites not only to be full of malware of various kinds but also it is not unusual to find a "free" download of a children's movie surrounded by ads for or links to pornography, including child pornography, prostitution and drugs. Often the sites are kept afloat financially by ad revenues, not uncommonly linked to highly reputable brands. The advertising industry and the brands themselves need to vigorously pursue this matter to cut off these funds. There also needs to be a more energetic enforcement regime to shut these sites down, linked to an awareness raising campaign to ensure, parents, teachers and children are aware of the dangers and real nature of these "Robin Hood" environments.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
75	Keith Stevenson, Individual	<p>The draft recommendation to limit the length of copyright protection for authors to 15 to 25 years after publication is not supported by current and robust evidence. The arguments in this section fail to acknowledge the effect of ebooks. The reports cited date from 2002 and 2007. Both reports are too outdated to be of use in drawing a supportable conclusion. Consequently the quality of the recommendation is severely compromised.</p> <p>The report states:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Excessive periods of copyright mean the price of material is kept artificially high. This fails to acknowledge ebooks, where material is often available for \$3 or less, particularly material that is a few years old.</li> <li>2. Older material still under copyright is removed from sale and no longer available to the public. Not true. With ebooks, material VERY RARELY becomes unavailable, and in fact a lot of out of print books are now available again as ebooks.</li> <li>3. Literary works only provide a financial return between 1 and 5 years on average. The 'on average' is important here and weakens the argument. This point also fails to consider trilogies and other multi-book series developed over a number of years.</li> <li>4. Three-quarters of original titles are retired after a year, and by 2 years 90% of titles are out of print. This is actually rubbish (see point 2).</li> <li>5 A 2002 study argues that a term of around 25 years allows rights holders to earn revenue comparable to what they would receive in perpetuity. This is too out of date to be relevant in today's royalty landscape.</li> <li>6. The 2002 study notes the estimate of 25 years was based on a low discount rate and that a higher rate would mean the term should be longer. Prevailing heavy discounting (especially on ebooks) and lower royalties for authors, prove on that reasoning that 25 years is NOT enough.</li> <li>7. A 2007 study notes more creative works would be produced if the copyright period was lowered to 15 years. This is presented with no supporting evidence.</li> </ol>
76	Yasmin Bridges, Individual	<p>As an emerging visual artist who has recently been commissioned for artwork, I have been researching Australian copyright and licensing laws. I was pleasantly surprised to discover how strong our current laws are about the use of an artist's work. I felt comfortable presenting my terms under which my work could be used knowing our laws value appropriate use/credit/payment for art (as it should, as it is work just like any other). I am very concerned about the proposed changes to these current laws to a "fair use" system. There is a huge potential for loss of income for artists which is scary for an industry that is already known to be wrought with expectations for artists to work for "exposure" or "experience". We all have living costs and need to be paid for our work just like any other worker. Please do not change our current copyright laws.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
77	Catherine Kingsford, ImpediMed Limited	<p>This submission is in relation to Intellectual Property Arrangements - Draft Recommendation 8.1 of the draft report.</p> <p>As an Australian medical device company we have invested considerable funds in developing our impedance measuring systems, which include significant software features.</p> <p>Whilst we understand copyright may protect any copying of the software code, it will not stop a competitor seeing how our product operates and then replicating the inventive and commercially valuable features of our product.</p> <p>The only way we can hope to stop that occurring is by relying on patent protection.</p> <p>Without the availability of patent protection for the inventive features of our software we simply could not commit the considerable capital to develop our product and our business. As our business grows we will employ more Australians and benefit the country, and we need patent protection for our software to help us achieve that and protect our investment.</p> <p>We believe software patents are extremely important in encouraging new and valuable innovation.</p>
78	Jimmy Barnes, Individual	<p>As a musician who experienced the impact of parallel imports in the Australian music industry during the late 1990's I am steadfastly opposed to similar changes in book publishing. Similar changes in the music industry saw profits shifted from Australian content producers to overseas "free-riders" because local mass merchants could buy wholesale from low price/low royalty jurisdictions (eg: Indonesia, Brazil). According to economic theory the music industries in these poorer countries were notionally demonstrating "world's best practice" because their prices were so low. In reality though their low prices were caused by having to compete with rampant piracy. The consequent slim margins of record companies in these troubled territories lead to them investing relatively little in recording and marketing music locally. Instead they focused mainly on selling cheap versions of overseas hits. This situation exposed the fiction at the core of this economic theory ... "world's cheapest practice" does not always mean "world's best practice".</p> <p>Removing parallel import restrictions forces our local producers to compete with those in poorer countries and as a result our industry will inevitably end up LOOKING more like that theirs ie: it will have very low levels of local investment and very high levels of overseas content. This has serious negative economic and cultural consequences for all Australians.</p> <p>Also CD prices actually did not drop significantly in Australia over the years immediately after parallel imports were introduced as mass merchants used imports to help drive down wholesale prices but did not pass most of those savings on to consumers. Furthermore local book retailers now compete heavily with overseas retailers like Amazon so book prices have already fallen significantly over recent years. Therefore the supposed consumer benefits from parallel importation of books are likely to be significantly less than have been touted.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
79	Richard Glover, Individual	<p>I'm an author whose last seven books have been published by HarperCollins. Alas, only the most recent has been a big bestseller. As such, I think my example might prove an instructive case study about the problems of removing the parallel importation rules.</p> <p>The success of that most recent book - <i>Flesh Wounds</i> - comes at the end of 16 years investment in me by the publisher: books edited, advice given, book tours paid for. One of the books sold as few as 4000, leaving the publisher deeply in the red.</p> <p>Finally, after all these years, the publisher is receiving a solid return on this latest book: a chance to recoup earlier losses.</p> <p>And yet, because the book has been successful here, it's now under active consideration at about ten American publishing houses. If one of them chooses to go ahead, they will be able to publish my book without any of the editing costs, and with much reduced risk: they know that this book is one that has "worked".</p> <p>A change to the parallel importation rules would then allow that US publisher to undercut the local people who have invested so much in me. The book need only be 20 cents cheaper and a bookseller would sensibly prefer the imported edition.</p> <p>The difference would mean little to the consumer, but a lot to the publisher, whose efforts over the years would now go unrewarded.</p> <p>Naturally, when the next first-time Australia author comes along, that long-term investment simply would not make commercial sense.</p> <p>I hope my experience shows the dangers that lie ahead if the current system is dismantled.</p>
80	Debra Oswald, Individual	<p>I urge the Australian government not to make any changes that would weaken the viability of the local publishing industry. I'm a screenwriter and author (9 published children's titles, an adult novel, 8 published play scripts). None of us - writers, publishers, booksellers - is owed a living, but the Australian people are owed a vibrant storytelling culture. If we want to offer our kids Australian stories and textbooks, if we want to keep local voices strong in fiction, non-fiction and theatre-writing, then government policy must support our publishing industry in a realistic way.</p>
81	Sarah, Muggeridge Coyle, Individual	<p>I believe the changes will severely damage the ability for Australian publishers to invest in Australian authors</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
82	Nick Rennie, Individual	<p>As an Australian based product designer specialising in furniture/lighting/home wares, I have a large number of issues with the current and suggested laws relating to protection of designs. Unfortunately I have been the target of “copy” design both internationally and locally. As one of the leading designers in Australia working almost exclusively with international clients I can tell you that we are the laughing stock of world design when it comes to protection. I have been forced to work internationally due to the limited chances available locally, and one of my biggest issues is the lack of recognition of Australian IP laws by other contours. The UK for example. Then there is also the cost of registering designs here as well. If I design 40 concepts a year, that means before legal costs I am up for over \$10,000 dollars in fees. It is absurd that i as a designer do not have the same rights to protect my work as an artist or jeweller does through copyright. And to think that someone can legally use my name and brand to promote and sell a copy design is mind blowing. This isn't just about production designs or sales, but rather protecting the integrity of my profession. Without protection in design there will be no innovation..!!! As a result of Australian IP laws, I now do not show my work in Australia, rather only in countries who's laws protect and respect that of the designer. The irony here is that they can't be copied in Europe, but are fine to be copied and sold legally in Australia. For me the IP laws should be all about protecting the integrity of design. I will work on a project for anything up to three years or longer, spending thousands of hours and dollars developing the design to be presented to a manufacturer. If it is successful and goes in to production, I still will not see any royalties for possible two years. So that's potentially five years of work before I can get paid. But legally someone can profit from copying my designs here</p>
83	Garry Disher, Individual	<p>Although the author of 50 books, with a growing readership, my income has steadily declined to the point where I barely make a living. I fear that the proposed changes will further erode my income. I fear that this will happen to all Australian authors and publishers.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
84	Christopher Warren, Hamlet Research	<p>I am writing in connection with your draft report recommending software be specifically excluded from patentability. This would be disastrous legislation because as a small business I would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loose seven years of my own investment time and energy</li> <li>- Not be able to offer a helpful service to other businesses which saves them money and makes them more sustainable</li> <li>- Not be able to raise capital to help develop a innovative service from Australia and build export earnings</li> <li>- I would not have sufficient motivation to evolve the software (due to the above reasons) and thus stay competitive</li> <li>- There would be no practical way for me to develop an exit strategy and therefore help the company expand</li> </ul> <p>I feel that this recommendation has been made without sufficient consultation with small business and provides no certainty for my future in this sector.</p>
85	Danielle Okeefe, The house that dan built	<p>I urge the Australian government not to make any changes that would weaken the viability of the local publishing industry. I am a director who believes the Australian people are owed a vibrant storytelling culture. If we want to offer our young people Australian stories and textbooks, we need to protect our publishing industry. if we want to keep local voices strong in fiction, non-fiction and theatre-writing, then government policy must support our publishing industry in a realistic way</p>
86	Caleb Lewis, Individual	<p>As a working professional playwright who manages to survive on commissions and royalties for my work, I urge the Australian government to respectfully resist making any changes to weaken the local publishing industry.</p> <p>This decision comes down to what kind of country we want to live in and more importantly what kind of country we want our children to grow up in. Is ours a nation that respects culture or not? Without hyperbole, it's really simple. We are talking about our national voice. And while Australian writers aren't owed a living they deserve the meagre income most of them survive on. To take that away is to diminish our voice on the international stage. I would dearly hate for that to happen.</p> <p>I respectfully submit that government policy must support our publishing industry in a realistic way and hold back from any changes that will damage this fragile sector. Our culture is so important. Please don't throw it away.</p>
87	May King, Individual	<p>PLEASE protect Australian publishers &amp; authors. This issue is really important to our book industry. Thank you .</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
88	Lee Coulson, Academic Printing and Publishing	<p>Academic Printing and Publishing is an Australian owned, small independent academic publisher in its 42nd year of operation.</p> <p>In our view two critical issues in the PIRs debate, doubtless mentioned in other submissions, are access and benefit.</p> <p>1. The Productivity Commission's conflation of Open Access and "free access" implies a fundamental misunderstanding of our industry and how we choose to market our publications. Informed deliberation on this matter requires an appreciation of how our industry actually works.</p> <p>2. Conjecture on the possible outcomes of the proposed changes to Australian PIRs can argue for various scenarios. However, there is hard evidence of the consequences from jurisdictions that have removed PIRs. For instance, in New Zealand the local publishing industry is significantly impacted causing job losses, and the range of books available has contracted by 34.5%. Significantly, the reduction in book prices has been less than in Australia during the comparable period. Similar evidence is available from Canada. We also note the costly and protracted litigation that afflicts "fair use" jurisdictions.</p> <p>With respect, the question the Productivity Commission needs to address is quite simple - cui bono? Evidence suggests that the economic and social benefits from eliminating PIRs are minimal, whereas the potential harm is extensive. Removing PIRs is likely to result in job losses, public revenue loss as profits are transferred overseas, and a brutal reduction in the range of Australian books publishers will be able to publish. Australia will become, as it was in the 1960s, a dumping ground for American and English books, and we will risk becoming , as we once were " a colony of the minds of others" (Peter Carey, Thomas Keneally, Richard Flanagan).</p> <p>Risking Australia's proud publishing tradition, 1,000 Australian businesses employing more than 4,000 people (20,000+ ancillary employees) is not in Australia's best or productive interest.</p>
89	Darcy Delany, Individual	<p>As a writer I consider the proposal to reduce the copyright period for work created in Australia will degrade the value and quality of Australian writing. Authors spend years perfecting their work, and many cannot earn a sufficient income from royalties to make writing a full time income. They currently can rest assured they will benefit solely from their hard work during their lifetime, and their beneficial in beyond their passing. They will have less time to earn royalties under the proposed changes, which may discourage writers from expending the significant time and energy required to produce quality work.</p> <p>This proposal sends a very clear signal to Australian writers that creativity is not valued in this country. If Australia is to be innovative, surely that requires protection of the creative process? Please encourage creativity in this country rather than discouraging it, and do not reduce the copyright period for Australian works.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
90	Bradley Wynne, Individual	<p>If the commission's recommendations are implemented, I assume I will be at liberty to claim as my own that McCubbin painting at the AGNSW of which I am so fond (and remove it from the gallery's walls to place above my own fireplace). Or that catchy AC/DC tune -- it'll be okay to use it on a movie soundtrack without cost. Fantastic! And it means I can start a publishing company and reprint books sourced from near and far (and possibly claim ownership of this intellectual property for myself because I have repurposed it, right?) What a breathtaking new world that opens to us with those recommendations -- with a withering of the domestic publishing industry, we will have access to that cornucopia of cheap imports (local voices will be a casualty, but hey, it's for the greater good, right?) Well done, PC. Not sure if all this chatter about ideology-driven agendas is correct, but it sure seems as though you're out to fix a car what ain't broke -- in need of fine-tuning, sure, but certainly not this total replacement of the publishing machinery with a jalopy dressed up as next-year's model.</p>
91	Jessica Everingham, Individual	<p>I wish to state my opposition to the productivity commission's recommendation to shorten the length of copyright on author's works.</p> <p>I am an aspiring author. Writing is an extremely hard thing to do, and it already offers little financial reward. You are now saying that only 20 years after my work is published, it could be in the public domain. I am a young writer, so when I am only in my 40s I could lose the rights to my own backlist that I poured blood, sweat and tears into.</p> <p>It is so hard to write a book, it takes years. It takes more years to get published. So in a writers mind, two decades is not much time. The thought of losing something I worked so hard on is very upsetting.</p> <p>Please don't take away the rights of some of Australia's hardest working creative.</p>
92	Diana Simmonds, Stagenoise.com	<p>I urge the Australian government not to make any changes that would weaken the viability of the local publishing industry. I'm a journalist and author of more than 30 years productive work. None of us - writers, publishers, booksellers - is owed a living, but the Australian people are owed a vibrant storytelling culture. If we want to offer our kids Australian stories and textbooks, if we want to keep local voices strong in fiction, non-fiction and theatre- and screen-writing, then government policy must support our publishing industry in a realistic way.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
93	Charlotte Wood, Individual	<p>I urge the Australian government to keep our publishing industry viable by making no change to parallel importation legislation. I am the author of five novels and two books of non-fiction, and editor of one anthology of Australian short fiction. I am deeply concerned that proposed changes to territorial copyright will not only reduce my ability to make a living from selling my books in different territories (the Productivity Commission's solution that writers turn to governments for funding support is laughable in the current climate of ongoing cuts to arts funding), but will also put the local independent publishing and bookselling scenes in an extremely precarious position. Small local publishers need to be able to buy international books to sell here, which then enables them to foster new talent and take risks on new voices on the Australian scene. Our independent bookselling industry is the envy of many developed countries, but it is under threat if territorial copyright provisions make it easier for global giants such as Amazon to set up warehouses here. Please don't destroy a vibrant and very energetic self-sustaining book industry for the sake of a questionable and self-sabotaging experiment on pricing.</p> <p>In decades past our publishing industry was dictated to by British and American publishers. Changes to parallel importation rules will send us back there once more, too timid and ashamed to protect and promote our own intellectual and creative life, and our culture will be poorer for it.</p>
94	Peter Stanley, Individual	<p>The proposed changes made to copyright arrangements are not in the interests of Australian writers, publishers or, indeed, the Australian people. The entire report is predicated on an Philistine view of creative work and publishing that fundamentally misunderstands or misrepresents the need for and nature of literary creativity and its commercial manifestations. The proposed changes - they are not 'reforms'; reforms make things better - would actively denude the established rights of authors and creators and would in no way assist or support future creativity. These changes would be absolutely contrary to both the economic and creative interests of Australian authors and publishers and the creative self-respect of Australia as a nation with a distinctive culture. The so-called 'productivity Commission' appears to either not understand publishing as a viable industry or seems intent on destroying it by allowing a change - based on US practice - which will take away authors' rights to their own work. It fails to explain why this change is necessary or desirable, and fails to justify an attack on authors' fundamental rights. The proposal should be abandoned.</p>
95	Jeffrey Leask, Individual	<p>Only two small publishers in Australia have bravely published comprehensive music education in Australia. Large publishers will not make enough profit. If financial support by copyright fees does not help this mode of publishing, schools, teachers and children will see no such publishing and those employed to publish will severely effected.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
96	Tanya, Tintner, Individual	<p>I am a self-employed Australian author living in Canada. I published a non-fiction book in Australia in 2011 and Canada in 2013. As I am not eligible for university or other grants I paid for all research costs: about \$40,000 including travel over 10 years. My income from the book has been less than \$3000. One of the few minuscule amounts I receive from the book was from copyright payments - and now those have all but dried up since Canada switched to "Fair use", system. This has been a complete disaster for all creative persons. We live on little enough as it is - why should we give away our work to anyone who wants to use it, for free, when they (e.g., universities) are perfectly able to pay for it (and did, in the past)? PLEASE don't switch to this system in Australia! Already in Australia there is no Public Lending payments if your book isn't in 50+ libraries - Fair Use is really the nail in the coffin.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
97	Peter Lewis, Lewis Eye-Opening Art	<p>Creators provide content in the same way that farmers provide food and, like farmers, they are the lowest paid component in the chain from provider to consumer. Corporations, which by their nature are avaricious, are allowed to dominate these processes and take most of the profits. Now they want an arrangement where they won't have to pay creators anything at all. This is outrageous but not surprising since corporations have no country or conscience. Unacceptable.</p>
98	Rowan McAuley, Individual	<p>As a children's writer, my income is substantially based on PLR and ELR payments, so I am in no doubt that Australian creativity relies on artists being recompensed for the use of their material. If copyright laws in this country are watered down so that material is used for free, then not only is the work's status as a real good, really made by a real person, undermined, but the artist will be less able to continue in future work. Australian culture means we must protect our artists' capacity to keep telling our stories, reflecting our images, speaking with our voices.</p>
99	Chris Oaten, Individual	<p>Having reviewed the issues paper, it appears to me that the overarching purpose of reviewing current arrangements regarding Intellectual Property are firmly seated in the interests of those who would choose to exploit the creators of works.</p> <p>Current copyright law in Australia provides a well-established basis upon which creators of, and consumers of, creative works can negotiate terms of use that are reasonable and give the creators leverage to negotiate an exchange of valuable consideration.</p> <p>It's not broke. It doesn't need fixing. Creatives in this nation already struggle to earn a fair income for the product of their intellect. Any changes that make it any harder for them to attain fair remuneration amount to an egregious abuse of their gifts.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
100	Julia Lawrinson, Individual	I implore the Productivity Commission to reassess the basis on which it has made its draft recommendations, and to take into consideration the devastating effect such changes would have on authors and the book industry generally. As one example, in relation to copyright, my most successful book, published ten years ago, still brings royalties in as it is on the curriculum in many states. Successes like these are rare in publishing, but to have my ability to earn money from the investment I have made in the novel and my career stopped after ten or fifteen years is grossly unfair. In relation to parallel importation, there are enough safety nets in the existing system to render such changes unnecessary for consumers: changes would devastate our publishing industry. Australia should be looking to Ireland, which supports its writers through tax breaks and income support grants, not devastating its literary culture for unproven and unlikely consumer benefits.
101	Ron Savage, Individual	I'm totally opposed to adopting American copyright provisions because they are far too heavily weighed in favour of protecting American copyrighted material and have nowhere near enough protection for non-American authors.
102	Chris Oaten, Individual	<p>Having reviewed the issues paper, it appears to me that the overarching purpose of reviewing current arrangements regarding Intellectual Property are firmly seated in the interests of those who would choose to exploit the creators of works.</p> <p>Current copyright law in Australia provides a well-established basis upon which creators of, and consumers of, creative works can negotiate terms of use that are reasonable and give the creators leverage to negotiate an exchange of valuable consideration.</p> <p>It's not broke. It doesn't need fixing. Creatives in this nation already struggle to earn a fair income for the product of their intellect. Any changes that make it any harder for them to attain fair remuneration amount to an egregious abuse of their gifts.</p>
103	John Newton, Individual	Fair use is only fair for America and big corporations.. Writers, artists, musicians do not want these changes. Only corporations

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
104	David Metzenthén, Individual	<p>As an author of fifty books for children and teenagers, I am incensed by the Productivity Commission's recommendation to adopt a Fair Use policy for copyrighted work. Intellectual property is exactly that; it is the property of the creator and it cannot be appropriated by anybody unless permission has been sought and/or paid for. To give access to my work, on which I rely for income, is an affront to me, my profession, and my family. I will never support this idea that will effectively condone the illegal use of work; and thus, is tantamount to stealing.</p> <p>No organisation willingly grants free access to what it has spent years and years creating. Why should writers and their work be seen in any way different from other professions or industries?</p> <p>I see farmers being propped up by the government, I hear about the smart country, the age of entitlement - and then I see the Fair Use Act designed to take income from people on the say-so of a committee. Australia is not a communist state; intellectual property does not belong to all. It belongs to the creator and I will only ever support a government that supports the rights of an individual to profit from their labor.</p> <p>Get rid of this idea of Fair Use or you will see creators accessing Centre Link rather than earning and paying tax. The idea of Fair Use destroys the culture of professional creativity; no industry or practitioner in their right mind would support it.</p> <p>It is morally offensive, culturally bankrupt, and financially indefensible.</p>
105	Penny Morrison, Individual	<p>I am a children's author and also an avid reader. I buy books for myself and my three children as well as gifts for friends and relatives.</p> <p>I believe the proposed changes in IP would not be in the interests of most Australians. It is true that we may be able to buy international titles more easily, but the Australian book industry would be destroyed. Apart from affecting the income of Australian authors and publishers, there would be drastic results for all of Australia. These changes would mean that Australian titles would not be able to compete with international titles. Authors and publishers wouldn't be able to produce books in our small market, and we would no longer have the option of buying Australian books.</p> <p>As a buyer of books, I am prepared to pay a little more for books from overseas if it means I will still have the option of buying books created in my own country from my own culture. I believe this would be best for all Australians.</p>
106	Dawn Meredith, Individual	<p>As an author and illustrator I work extremely hard to get anywhere in this competitive market. I resent organisations being able to use my material without proper reparation being made to me as the creator. It's disrespectful and harms my career as well as my income. I rely upon my government to protect me from big business who have no interest in protecting the rights of citizens, particularly of other countries.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
107	Colin Schumacher, Making Meaning On Screen Pty Ltd	<p>As an Australian writer and publisher I am against any changes to the current and pre-existing Intellectual Property Arrangements. Any changes to Intellectual Property Arrangements for me and my company would jeopardised our IP.</p> <p>Please protect our Australian IP and maximise our income as writers, artists and educators.</p>
108	Lauren O'Brien, Teachers 4 Teachers Publications	<p>Dear Productivity Commission,</p> <p>I am submitting this form as a request you do not follow in the footsteps of America's extremely unsuccessful fair use reform.</p> <p>As an educational publisher and author I can guarantee you would put myself and our company out of business if you were to take this heinous path. I can also guarantee all Australian publishers would cease to produce Australian Curriculum specific content for students to use in schools. Teachers will be forced to seek extremely low-quality, free content found via American or other foreign websites. Our school standards have already dropped significantly over recent years, this fair use model would be absolutely devastating to our nation's educational system.</p> <p>If you were to walk into a shoe shop to get a pair of shoes would you expect to pay money for them? Of course you would. The shop, designers, manufacturers and sales assistants all need to be paid from the sale of the shoes. Why would I spend another twelve months of my life creating beautiful educational resources for children if you want to give them away for free? What is the point of continuing in business? How do we get paid?</p> <p>Think of the businesses, their employees and their right to earn money through the creation of original intellectual property. You will put a lot of honest Australians out of business and employment if you continue of this road that, quite frankly, most people do not want you to go down.</p>
109	Yuchun Zhong, Worldzhong Pty Ltd.	<p>We prefer the Australian Copyright traditional system rather the U.S. one for it is much beneficial for the author and writer and better for the production of intellectual properties in many fields.</p>
110	Daan Spijer, Individual	<p>I am a published author of mainly short stories, poetry and essays. Over the years I have been receiving small payments for copies made of articles I have had published in journals. It is not a large sum, but it is some recompense for the time and effort I have put into writing. That these articles are being copied by schools and universities for study purposes, indicating they have value to other people. I do not write for these relatively small payments, but they help to support a balance between 'day job' and writing time that allows me to do the writing. 'Fair use' would mean these payments will likely stop.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
111	Darryl Parsons, Individual	As the co-author of a textbook, I spent hundreds of hours writing and redrafting. I object to anyone, schools and libraries included, using my work without paying me some form of compensation for my time. If I wanted my work to be available for free, I would have published it on the web. Allowing creative works to be used for free denies authors the opportunity (and option) to earn extra money for the time involved. Granted that I have published some things for free use, but some I want payment for!
112	Donald Gilbert, Australian Lease & Property Consultants Pty Ltd	<p>Dear Productivity Commission.</p> <p>Are you sane? Are you on this planet or off it?</p> <p>How did Microsoft evolve? How did Hewlett Packard evolve?</p> <p>How do we I-Phones, how do we have 1,000 upon 1,000 upon 1,000 of software products worldwide? What about Android products, etc. etc?</p> <p>Are you smoking some serious Green Stuff in Canberra to take away people's incentives to develop software that lead to medical break-thoughts, child learning material, forecasting and financial analysis? Developing bionic limbs via software?</p> <p>Are you seriously trying to stop INNOVATION dead in its tracks?</p> <p>These are the next fields of endeavour.</p> <p>I simply cannot believe it!</p> <p>This is now the most foolish idiotic inward-looking negative insular thought-process that only a Government Institution would dream up; to defeat its own objective. To counter the taxed dollars that are being put up for innovation</p> <p>As for ASIC's software programming for the last two years/maybe three I have not been able to log in to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change my Company addresses;</li> <li>2. Receive and download my accounts;</li> <li>3. And neither have ASIC staff been able to assist.</li> </ol> <p>Maybe just maybe if there was some innovation and incentive to fix this bloody mess; the time I have wasted trying to get some fo the most elementary things done for my Company's Administration would have saved up to two weeks of my time.</p> <p>PS Your own bloody software is so archaic it says my email address is not a valid Email address.</p> <p>Would you kindly create some incentives via Intellectual Property Rights so that software can be built to fix your own software?</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
113	Alan Hayes, Individual	<p>I wish to object to the changes in intellectual property protection. As an author of 27 best-selling books and the copyright owner of a huge amount of published material, to even consider such a move destroys the very fabric of our rights in protecting it from what other people wish to steal. Why should there be a “free ride”, for companies, who are wishing to do no more than become the parasites of our society by using some body's hard work and intelligence to fill their coffers to achieve a healthy bottom line. It puts them, and all those others who would support such a regime, in the category of nothing more than “scurrilous scumbags”, - part of the parasitic blight than is increasingly infecting our society today.</p> <p>This commission should not even exist in the first place to consider such an outrageous proposition. It takes away the incentive, and lack of recognition, for people to create for the benefit of others and at the same time earn a reasonable living from it. It takes away the legacy that should be passed down through the family.</p> <p>YOU SHOULD ALL HANG YOUR HEADS IN SHAME!!!!</p>
114	John Wenitong, The Kurdaitcha Mob	<p>Dear sirs; as an indigenous author and Australian citizen, I believe following the US system of copyright laws will cost each and every author dearly in our country. I find it very strange that our Government can legislate for their/our 'coffers' but not for one of the smallest and most difficult areas of small business. Please reconsider this proposal for your writers'-authors' of fiction and non-fiction in our wonderful country...</p>
115	John Mancy, Individual	<p>As an Australian writer (formerly barrister and professional journalist and legal writer &amp; publisher) I have lived and supported myself and family by my various creations for more than 50 years.</p> <p>Now, in retirement, I am hoping to be able to continue supporting myself by my various writings. However, I am currently on the aged pension; should I succeed in earning sufficient money to either reduce or end this dependency, the benefit to the economy is surely obvious.</p> <p>Aspects of the Productivity Commission's draft report threaten to handicap me and all similarly placed Australian writers from earning a reasonable income from the sale of their books and the reasonably paid use of their content through copying and repurposing. As the Australian Society of Authors (ASA) has noted: “If an increased amount of that usage became permissible and free, as the Commission is recommending, the effects on the vibrant and successful Australian book ecosystem would be profound and deadly”. The Canadian widening of their “fair dealing” provisions to exempt educational use and the resultant loss of income to authors is of course well documented.” requirement, with its meaning settled by Courts on a continuing basis, be retained and the proposed “fair use” test rejected.</p> <p>With genuinely fair pay Australia's authors will not be restricted from telling our stories and creating our culture.</p>

---

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
116	Nicole Hayes, Individual	<p>Australian authors struggle to make a live able income. Most don't. We live frugally and work constantly at our writing but also teach writing, do public engagements, visit schools, and/or editing – and even then, most of us earn about the same as the dole. The idea that even the opportunity to sell rights to overseas publishers might be under threat is appalling. Worse than this, Australian stories with exclusively Australian content will not be published in a world where local publishers aren't afforded the same independence and support as publishers of other English language texts, like the USA and UK. As a YA author, my readers are mostly teens, and my stories are very Australian. My first novel was the first about AFL that featured a girl who loved footy. It's on school lists and read and borrowed widely because so many girls felt their story hadn't been told before. It has never sold overseas. It will never sell overseas. AFL books don't. Readers and fans have cried telling me how much this story meant to them. Yet it would never have been published without a local publisher taking on that risk. Nor sold without the local knowledge of my Australian publisher, local booksellers, schools and libraries. My second novel deals with Victorian politics, and a young person's experience of being the daughter of a female premier following public scandal. Australian politics does not play overseas. Why would it? This novel won the Australian Children's Peace Literature Prize in 2015. Yet, it wouldn't have a life without a local publisher. My third book is a collection of AFL stories featuring Australian writers with unusual stories. Again, no foreign sales, no foreign publisher. Local stories for local readers published by a local publisher. Without an Australian publisher, I would not be a published author, and the stories I've written that would never have made it out of my bottom drawer. Australian publishers deserve the same support publishers get in the US and UK</p>

---



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
117	Coral Vass, Individual	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing as a reader, author and educator of Australian literature.</p> <p>I cannot claim to make a living out of writing. It is a labour of love. However the current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel import is not only immoral but would make my and other authors careers as creators unsustainable.</p> <p>Australian books written by Australian authors with Australian content, is something to be proud of in this great country of ours. The current proposal would put our books and the Australian book industry at risk. In an unfair competition of foreign editions into the Australian market at greater volume than our Australian publishing houses could sustain, our Australian publishing industry, as demonstrated in New Zealand, would ultimately be destroyed, resulting in non- Australian content in our books.</p> <p>The Productivity Commission has failed to substantiate any of its claims. Books are NOT always cheaper overseas.</p> <p>Do we want the next generation of Australian young people missing out on the richness of our Australian culture expressed through Australian literature?</p> <p>For the future of Australia - economically, culturally - and for our children, who deserve books written about their land, by Australians, in order that they know who they are, please reconsider your proposal.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p> <p>Coral Vass</p>
118	Kris Cole, Individual	<p>As an Australian author of 7 'Here's How' type trade books, 3 academic text books, one of which is in its 6th edition, and a major contributor to 9 collated academic texts, I am deeply concerned about adopting the US-style 'fair use' copyright doctrine. I earn my living from my texts and I believe my PLR and CLR royalties will be significantly reduced. It's already difficult enough for creators of intellectual property to earn a living from their work. This will make it more difficult, perhaps to the point that Australians won't bother. Do we really want our kids reading 'Australianised' US text books, with Chuck changed to Bruce and Joan to Shiela? I certainly don't.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
119	Michelle De Stefano, Individual	<p>I am a Deaf visual artist and have started to make a big name for myself. I never ever sell art for free and I am not happy at the prospect of giving art for 'free' while other countries have laws that allow artists to be paid for their art being used! Do not steal our right away to be paid for our artwork being used in any form! This not only undermines the work we do. We work for many hours in our studio, hours that we deserve to be paid for the same way workers at any other job are paid for doing. People invest in our artworks - art is not just art, every art work has a purpose to fulfil to the populous. Also, if art is forced to be used for free, this is not going to do the economy any favours either, because if the artwork is seen around the world and people know that the art was used for free, THEN this means they will NOT value the artwork at all, therefore, no money will come into our country because of the "free" imposed on our art in a magazine or printed form of some kind.</p>
120	Diana Rigg, PLD Literacy and Learning	<p>PLD is a small Western Australian publisher, but has a significant impact on local primary schools. In 2015 PLD was recognised within Professor Louden's research from UWA, 'High performing primary schools, what do they have in common?' PLD's synthetic phonic programs were idle tied across all high performing schools.</p> <p>PLD relies on the CAL royalty to create and also continue to adapt and improve existing programs. The proposed changes could likely cripple PLD and render it non profitable. In today's current climate, publishing is already a challenging area to be operating in without these proposed additional changes.</p> <p>I strongly appeal that the industry does not go down this road. It will have a devastating impact on local Publishers and creators of publishing content.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
121	Duncan Carling-Rodgers, Individual	<p>The concept of making copyright only 20 years is absurd. Here are examples why.</p> <p>My stepfather was a blind music teacher. He published 2 books of tunes to help him teach students &amp; generate extra income. His royalties were tiny but welcome to my mother after he died. The few dollars every month were worth a lot to a struggling widow with a child. Without those royalties, we'd have struggled even more.</p> <p>My wife is a fulltime employee. After work &amp; at weekends, she writes &amp; has published several books. Her royalties, declared as extra income to the ATO, are as little as \$30 a month. They are recompense for many hours she spends writing each book &amp; promoting them. She is becoming more known &amp; hopes to be successful enough for her royalties to augment her retirement. Without those royalties to look forward to, it becomes difficult to justify the massive investment of her leisure hours today.</p> <p>I am an editor. I often work on books written by people like my wife who spend many hours writing stories on a laptop at the dining table. Considering many make less than \$500 a year from their writing, one wonders how many will declare the income to the ATO now when their copyright will be cut off in 20 years anyway? The internet lets people self-publish books &amp; a thriving cottage industry has emerged to service them with editing and design. If people don't write because there's no lasting money in it, that cottage industry ends &amp; stops generating income on which it pays tax.</p> <p>These aren't pop stars, top authors &amp; global publishers. They are ordinary people who write novels or songs &amp; release them as eBooks and digital downloads on the web for small amounts of money in royalties each month. They have created their own assets. They should be able to continue earning from them until they die &amp; leave them as assets to their children.</p> <p>There is no difference between intellectual property &amp; physical property. Taking away copyright is the same as taking away property. It's called theft.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
122	Alan Mcseveny, Individual	<p>To the Australian Government Productivity Commission,</p> <p>I have written and/or published over 100 mathematics text books for Australian schools and one teaching/learning website (<a href="http://www.mathsbuilder.com.au">www.mathsbuilder.com.au</a>).</p> <p>At least 50% of my income comes from photocopying revenue. If a USA, 'Fair Use' style system were introduced, my income would be reduced significantly as would my willingness to continue to produce world class material.</p> <p>Over the last 30 years Australia has been a respected leader in mathematics education. A move like this will effectively reverse this situation and retard the production of world class texts in Australia.</p> <p>This move is like deciding that you will pay significantly less for a product that you have purchased in the past without giving the producer any choice but to accept the lesser amount. The books already written cannot be 'unwritten' but there remains no incentive to write further books. Australia will be reduced to adapting resources produced for English or USA educators. This would be a shame.</p> <p>Our government surely has more pride and integrity than to refuse its own authors a just recompense for their work. I hope the Federal Government is above such base behaviour.</p> <p>Alan McSeveny Author of the Signpost, On Your Mark and Maths Builder series of Maths textbooks, a publisher of much of my own work and publisher of the Maths Builder teaching/learning website</p>
123	Robert Boakes, Individual	<p>As an academic and authors of several books, like most of my colleagues I receive very limited payment in terms of royalties. Partly this is because material from my books is available electronically to members of universities, a situation I have no problem with. However, the proposed legislation would reduce the financial incentives for writing scholarly books even further and add to the many unfortunate deterrents to investing large amounts of time and labour in writing serious books.</p>
124	Gary Crockett, Individual	<p>I cannot believe the government intends to rob creators of their incomes by introducing a fair use bill. If the government introduces this bill I will delete all of my online educational information and never again publish anything that can be used for educational purposes. The government has destroyed so many jobs on the Australian government by incompetent decisions. They should not add to that incompetence by changing the laws that protect the intellectual copyright of people like myself! There will be repercussion on the government if they do!</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
125	Marguerite Marshall, Individual	<p>Please do not introduce a US-style “fair use” arrangement to copyright as it would damage Australian writers, creators, publishers and the local creative industries.</p> <p>The wholesale US style “fair use” system has led to the erosion of rights of authors and artists in North America.</p> <p>A recent analysis from PriceWaterhouseCoopers showed that a change to “Fair Use” in Australia could result in a loss of GDP of over \$1 billion.</p> <p>The PWC report said such a change would undermine domestic production of creative and educational works, lead to expensive litigation and ultimately a dearth of Australian voices in the creative landscape.</p> <p>The Australian local market represents a fraction of the US market, and “fair use” would destabilise an industry which contributes \$7.4 billion to the domestic economy. It would lead to serious job losses.</p> <p>Australia, like most countries, has exceptions in its copyright law to allow the use of copyright content for socially desirable purposes without needing permission from the content creator. Australia’s special provisions for education and libraries are some of the broadest in the world particularly for digital content and use.</p> <p>Our copyright system has proven it can evolve to encompass developments in technology, business practices and consumer behaviour.</p> <p>Introducing “fair use” will not do this. But it will further erode the ability to create Australian content in small industries in a very small marketplace.</p> <p>I support the Copyright Agency’s undertaking to continue to work with government, industry and stakeholders to modernise Australia’s copyright system.</p>
126	Leonie Westenberg, Individual	<p>The changes to the Fair Use of created material in Australia will have a negative impact on those who can least afford it, that is to say, on individual creators of works such as workbooks for school use (myself included) and on small Australian companies that produce our works. This then, in turn, negatively affects small business, employment and the economic sector in addition to providing a hindrance to the creation of future works by individual authors since the monetary gain will be negligent.</p>
127	Jane Fievez, Australian Teaching Aids	<p>What is the Productivity Commission thinking of destroying the protection of copyright, thus Productivity, for authors, artists and small design and manufacturing businesses, for profit by theft of ideas by large international business? Look at Canada for goodness sake. For far too long Australian businesses both small and large have been silent and tolerating decisions taking by bureaucrats and people who should be looking at increasing business profits from industry in this country, thus taxes. These taxes actually support our whole economy and their wages, rather than succumbing to the desires of the big multinationals, who treat us as gullible fools and take everything they can for free and don’t even pay the proper taxes and levies here that they should, as reported by our Government’s recent investigations.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
128	Merridy Malin, Individual	<p>I am writing because I am very disturbed about the recent recommendation of Australia's Productivity Commission Report recommending a change to the USA copyright Fair Use system which allows large enterprises to use copyrighted material at no cost.</p> <p>As it is, the majority of Australian writers and creators struggle to survive on their current incomes. This proposed new law will rob them of their right to be paid for their creations when used by enterprises into the future. This system threatens their existence and for what benefit? These large corporations do not need to bleed the small creators to survive. Australia already has a world-leading copyright system which has the flexibility to change in response to innovations in technology and so forth. Informed experts, are already working on such changes in a collaborative endeavour between the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>We're Australians, not Americans, let's not be seduced by the smooth-talking rationale of US corporate interests. Let's not damage our own home-grown national treasures. I want my grandchildren to grow up with ready access to Australian literature. We have much to be proud of. Let's not squander this by being mesmerized by Corporate USA. The US Fair Use system is not fair to the creators.</p> <p>Based upon the Canadian experience with the system, Pricewaterhouse Coopers predicted that if Australia adopted the Fair Use system that Australian produced creative works would decline, litigation would rise and Australia's A 'fit-for-purpose licensing system' would be detrimentally undermined.</p> <p>Please don't follow the USA in this regard.</p>
129	Katherine Lyall-Watson, Individual	<p>I am a playwright and published writer. It takes me on average four years to research and write a play and another couple of years to get that play to production. My hope is that I can get to a critical mass where I have enough plays being produced to be able make a modest living from the royalties. If the Commission decides to change the copyright laws so that I only maintain my copyright and royalties for 15-25 years, you will be invalidating years of work and professional practice.</p> <p>I have the right to retain ownership of my work in the same way that any individual may maintain ownership of any other business that they have built and it is very concerning that your report is underpinned by the belief that this should not be the case.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned about the parallel importation legislation being proposed. I want my children to read books that are published with Australian spelling and words, not the Americanised versions. Many of my friends have had their books published in America and have had to change character names and place names as well as phrases and dialogue to suit audiences there. Parallel importation will make these versions cheapest and will stop publishers investing in Australian content.</p> <p>I, along with thousands of Australian authors, am deeply concerned that these changes will affect my ability to continue to write, earn a living and find a publisher. I respectfully ask that you reconsider your position.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
130	Ian MacFarlane, Individual	I am a writer member of APRA and a published author. I object strongly to the commission's recommendation that my intellectual property could be freely infringed without compensation. It is hard enough to make even a modest living as a musician/author without the commission giving away my rights under the Copyright Act. I urge the commission to make its recommendations friendly to creators and not unjust mistreatment.
131	Liane Moriarty, Individual	As an Australian author who has sold over six million copies of my books worldwide, I am strongly opposed to the removal of restrictions on parallel importation. My books, all of which are set in Australia, would never have been published anywhere at all if an Australian publisher (Pan Macmillan) had not been prepared and able to take a chance on an unknown author. I receive messages on a weekly basis from international readers writing to thank me for giving them an insight into the Australian way of life. "Your books make me want to visit Australia"; is a comment I hear again and again. I want other Australian authors to have the same opportunity I've had to appear on the New York Times bestseller lists. Australians want Australian fiction to be read around the world and it will no longer happen if we choose to destroy the Australian publishing industry.
132	Patricia Clarke, Individual	I oppose any change to the present copyright law. I am an author of many books and articles as was my late husband. Our books have cost more to research costs than they have generated in income. The present copyright provisions hold out some prospect that when there is a resurgence of interest in the subjects of our books and articles I would still hold copyright in them.

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
133	Andrew Pople, Final Draft	<p>I write to express my concern at the implications of the draft report for Australia's publishing industry and the creation of Australian writing and works of literature.</p> <p>I am a journalist and broadcaster with particular focus on literature and publishing. In my work I see the impact Australian writing has in celebrating and creating Australian culture. Through our rich literary culture we come to understand ourselves as a nation. Through the creation of new works we discuss and shape our national culture into the future. Put simply Australian Writing is our national culture; it is the means by which we examine and discuss who we are.</p> <p>The removal of parallel import restrictions and relaxing of copyright has the potential to deal a double blow to Australian publishing and writing.</p> <p>Removing parallel importation restrictions threatens to flood the market with cheap imports, thus decimating the financial underpinning of Australia's publishers. The flow on effect is less money to invest in new Australian writing and a gradual withering of writing as cultural creation.</p> <p>Relaxing copyright for authors threatens their ability to make money from their work. For many authors their work is not only their art, but their superannuation, or investment in a safe retirement. These changes threaten to impoverish current Australian writers and discourage the next generation from picking up their pens.</p> <p>Australian writing and publishing is simply too important a cultural resource to allow these changes to go through.</p> <p>I would encourage the commission to abandon these changes and safeguard Australian Writing. Books are not simply another 'product' to be brought to market as cheaply as possible (if your plan could successfully do this; consider the New Zealand example). Books are the repositories of our identity and the legacy for future generations of Australians.</p> <p>Please protect them.</p>
134	Stuart Greenbaum, University of Melbourne	<p>There is considerable industry opposition to the proposed 'Fair Use' copyright doctrine relating to Australian authors, and visual artists. While I am a 'musical' artist (composer) I am a member of CAL, APRA, AMCOS and AMC; and I work with authors through interdisciplinary collaboration and have done so for around 30 years. The very term 'fair use' naturally leads to the question - 'fair for whom?'. Writers (including Tim Winton) clearly do not think it fair. But more disturbing is the income lost for emerging new voices and the Australian industry that could or might support them. This new proposal looks like abandoning protection for artists in favour of free market forces that do not foster or protect. I am against it. We have the opportunity to make a stand for the role of the arts as the voice and soul of a society. Don't sell it.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
135	Sharyn Munro, Individual	<p>I strongly object to changing our existing and world leading fit-for-purpose copyright system. It works well, is fair, supports Australian creators and encourages the use of Australian content.</p> <p>I do not want to see a 'Fair Use' American style exception introduced. As has been seen in Canada, the results are not in Australian creators' interest, nor, ultimately, in the Australian public's interest.</p> <p>We deserve payment for all our work, especially payment by large enterprises who can well afford it. We earn little enough as it is.</p>
136	Lyndall Hough, Individual writer	<p>I am writing to you to express my concerns over the recommendations made by you in your recent draft report on Intellectual Property Arrangements.</p> <p>The Productivity Commission has proposed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The term of copyright be reduced to 15-25 years from creation.</li> <li>2. Parallel importation rules on books be removed.</li> <li>3. Australia adopt US-style "fair use" exceptions to our Copyright Act.</li> </ol> <p>The following links detail how these changes would affect Australia's books and authors:  <a href="http://www.asauthors.org/copyright-under-threat">www.asauthors.org/copyright-under-threat</a>  <a href="http://bookscreateaustralia.com.au">http://bookscreateaustralia.com.au</a></p> <p>From my point of view, if these changes were introduced they would very significantly affect my ability to earn a living from my writing. I am also a partner in a small publishing partnership and these changes will affect any future work we produce.</p> <p>I reject the recommendations of the Productivity Commission and uphold Australian artists and publishers rights to their work and their right to earn fair pay from their work.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
137	Craig Smith, Individual	<p>I have read the sections of the Draft Report that bear on copyright and the book trade.</p> <p>I've illustrated several hundred books over 40 years, about half eligible to earn royalties. So am familiar with the rhythm of income from Copyright Agency, Lending Rights, and sales - including foreign editions.</p> <p>The steady growth of publishing (trade and educational) since the early 70's is a magnificent success story.</p> <p>Publishing is based on risk taking. I'm grateful for the many times publishers have risked serious money on me. It has often not delivered any profit for any of us - but occasionally it does.</p> <p>The opportunities for new, emerging and experienced authors will be diminished if Australian publishers cannot have the minimal shielding afforded by PIR.</p> <p>The absurdity of this is the UK and US have this market geo-blocking and have no intention of giving it up.</p> <p>I am not at all persuaded both as consumer and book producer that books are expensive here. Certainly not to warrant the wrenching that this change could bring about.</p> <p>The Productivity Commission recommendation on copyright duration is puzzling - I mentioned my career is now at 40 years - I resent the ridiculous notion that work done up to 2001 would now be open slather. The Commission may perceive this to be straightforward. Perhaps a straightforward contract lawyer's picnic.</p> <p>Allowing that Australia can't move on this unilaterally anyway, it makes you wonder about the Commission's bona fides in the associated fair use or fair dealing discussion.</p>
138	Geoffrey Elliott, Individual	<p>I object to changing the current copyright law as it stands to the the suggested Fair Use law</p> <p>the current copyright law is easy to understand and protects the interests of creators</p> <p>Fair Use would take away some key important safeguards , why would anyone in the creative world agree to that</p> <p>Geoffrey Elliott painter printmaker photographer</p>
139	Christopher Ison, Individual	<p>Such an amendment to the copyright act undermines the rights of intellectual property. It seems that it would make a mockery of "All rights reserved" when I copyright an image. Speaking as a photographer, it is increasingly more difficult to make a living with a camera and giving organisation the right to "fair use" of my intellectual property where I do not get a say in the matter is anything but "fair".</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
140	Joseph Forgas, UNSW	<p>I strongly SUPPORT the Commission's recommendations to extend the 'Fair Use' provisions to use copyright materials for free, even though I am a writer and I do receive regular copyright income. I believe that the public interest in promoting easier access to copyright materials far outweighs the selfish concerns of some copyright holders. I particularly object to the scare campaign and misleading communications from the Copyright Agency, who obviously represent their own commercial interest rather than the public interest.</p> <p>A 'Fair Use' exception will produce significant benefits to Australia and I do not believe that it will harm the future creation of Australian content.</p> <p>I look forward to the early adoption and introduction of these reforms.</p>
141	Kate Gwynne, Individual	<p>In publishing, copyright, and in particular territorial copyright, is the core system by which writers and creators are rewarded for their ideas. Trade in rights is the way the business works. Authors have the right to decide if, when and how their work is made public. Copyright is a property right. Calling it a monopoly is misleading and deceptive. Free isn't fair. A wide-ranging educational exception has devastated educational publishing in Canada; Allowing parallel imports would make it harder to invest in Australian authors, so there would be less diversity and fewer Australian titles for Australian readers; The biggest difference between the US-style 'fair use' and our own 'fair dealing' is that ours includes 'equitable remuneration. Ours is like a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Theirs is for a fair day's work, without any pay. The report says copyright is weighted too much in favour of creators. Their changes will reduce the incomes of Australian writers. They'll get lower royalties and lower advances. Far fewer high-quality, local educational resources vital to Australian curricula will not be produced Consumer are already free to buy books from anywhere in the world There is no guarantee that books will be cheaper if PIRs are removed. Look what happened in New Zealand. Prices fell further in Australia, but the range of titles available shrank. Australian publishers are not dependent on Government subsidies</p>
142	Carole Simmonds, Tea Tree Gully & District Historical Society Inc	<p>On behalf of our society we would not like to see the Fair Use exception introduced, as people who have done the hard work have the right to have their work wholly covered by copyright. When an agreement is reached by parties for use of any part of a person's work, copyright must remain with the author, student, teacher etc.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
143	Bob Moffatt, Wet Paper Publications	<p>Over the past 30 years we have received over \$250,000 from copyright education lending rights and copyright payments. With this money we have been able to pay upfront for artwork, photograph and licences, new computers, software and technology training focus group surveys for product development, establish networks for customers to improve our products, basic wages, rent and insurance. The CAL payments each year are reinvested each year into product improvements, without them we could just not do it. We have been able to use the CAL payments recently to develop our web site so our books can be read on line. You need start-up capital for this and the \$25,000 payments we received from the education sector helped us develop <a href="http://www.wetpaper.com.au">www.wetpaper.com.au</a>. Just go and have a look at it and you can see where the money went. These years payments will go towards developing contractors and web page functionality to allow students to read our books off line. Improving our web page functionality. Doing some research into how students like our ebooks pay for airfares to travel interstate to see schools in Western Australia. Pay for campervan hire and food so we can conduct the research. So you see if you cut these payments out, you will kill off the small business publishers who are probably the closest to the education digital revolution and are trying to make this new technology work. Thanks for the opportunity to make this submission</p>
144	Nathan Kirchner, EnExG Laing O'Rouke	<p>I understand the intentions behind this initiative, but I believe that the category of 'software' has been ill conceived. Let me explain;</p> <p>Patents should be, and are, a device to protect Inventions - an invention is 1) an idea with significant novelty, and 2) an embodied realisation of that idea.</p> <p>I agree that historically these embodiments are typically physical. However, in today's world I feel it is fully acceptable that such an embodiment be purely digital - a.k.a. 'Software'. It makes sense to me that such 'Software' is patentable.</p> <p>At the same time, clearly 'Software' exists which is perhaps less Inventive (with fundamental novelty), and more impressive in the sheer scale of the implementation. It makes sense to me that this 'Software' is included under copyright - and is not patentable.</p> <p>Please note though, I believe that the deciding factor is whether the 'Software' Inventiveness has a fundamentally novel idea or rather whether it is an implementation regardless of the complexity of the implementation.</p> <p>In short - I believe that 'Software' is the incorrect broad stroke with which to determine whether something is patentable or not, and rather 'Software' need to be recognized as a viable form of idea embodiment (especially so in the digital age) and patentability need be determined upon the Inventiveness / novelty and contributions of the ideas which are embodied.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
145	Rhonda Tallnash, Individual	I am outraged that you are even considering the 'Fair Use' clause which is anything but fair! I am the author of eight children's books that are unique in the Australian flavour, language and illustrations. It has cost me thousands of dollars for an illustrator and having those printed in regional Victoria - therefore keeping all the business within Australia and strapped regional areas. I also sell one book at a time at great expense and effort and make bugger all! To have some Yank being able to steal my work and not pay me is an outrage. Where is the consideration of the effort money and expertise within Australia! Just another sell-out to the big end of town. Elections are always upon us and my vote and the votes of my friends and immediate family who know how hard I have worked for absolutely no profit, are all valuable then. This is publicity any party that wants to stay in power can't afford to have! Bloody well leave my copyright rights alone!
146	Mark Jeffery, Individual	I oppose any reduction of writers copyright fees. Authors can barely scrape a living as it is. It is appalling that the productivity commission is even proposing such moves. Do not change copyright fees for authors. How on earth are they meant to make a living if you do?
147	Christobel Matingley, Individual	As the author of 54 books published since 1970 I am totally opposed to any changes in Parallel Importation Rules and Copyright. Australia should be promoting and rewarding its creators, if we aim to be The Clever Country, not penalising them for the sacrifices they have in many cases made to share their creativity and research. Authors contribute to education, culture, Australia's fourth largest industry and Australia's image internationally. PIRs would drastically sabotage our culture, reduce job opportunities, and sacrifice diversity. Introducing so called "Fair Use" would destroy the rights of creators and all the benefits of our vibrant society.

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
148	Sheridan Jobbins, Individual	<p>As a screenwriter and soon to be published author, I respectfully ask that you consider the position of the original author when thinking about changing the copyright laws of Australia. At the moment, the 75 year post death copyright ownership of original material is the last bastion of possible income for authors once they have stopped writing.</p> <p>If, as many writers do, you only create a handful of work in your life time, the possibility to continue earning income from them (or it) is only possible due to the protections of copyright. For authors, our copyright may be the only legacy we are able to leave our families.</p> <p>Original works are made at the author's expense, in our own time, from our own initiative and ideas. It is not merely a novel or screenplay. The author of an original work is the whole factory, front office, and management committee. Finding an agent or publisher to represent our work is often the result of dozens of unpublished works. It can take a lifetime.</p> <p>Apart from the need to tell stories about our place, in our words, with our values and ideas - please consider the livelihood of the originating author when making your decision. It's hyperbole, but not unfamiliar to say, our original novels and screenplays are our babies. Please don't give them away to strangers.</p> <p>At the moment, Screenwriters do not benefit in any way from material published on the internet. The Writers' Guild of America struck in 2006 for .01 of a cent of any dollar earned from on-line sales (Netflix, Amazon, Sky etc) and we lost. We get nothing. Freeing the copyright so that producers can use our material for free after 15 years, will be of no benefit to us whatsoever.</p> <p>The mechanisms of Creative Commons exist for authors who want their original work to be freely shared. Please leave that choice with us, and don't make changes to the copyright laws.</p>
149	Deborah Jordan, Individual	<p>The Commission seems unaware of the range and depth of academic scholarship both here and internationally in the burgeoning field of the history of the book which is often underpinned by stringent economic empirical analysis. Since the 'death of the author' a book is seen as the result of a series of complex negotiations between advisor, writer, editor, publisher, reviewer, critic, bookseller, librarian and so on. Even my own research on territorial copyright in the period 1965-1995 reveals it's vital importance in independent publishing.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
150	Alison Goodman, Individual	<p data-bbox="766 358 1101 392">Dear Productivity Commission,</p> <p data-bbox="766 425 1412 896">I wish to protest the plan to repeal Parallel Importation Laws as suggested by the Productivity Commission report. I am an Australian author and proud to be so. Repealing the PIL protection will seriously affect Australia's ability to maintain a vibrant publishing industry and could, in fact, destroy it. It is this industry that enables Australian stories to be told and fosters Australian literary talent, particularly up and coming authors who find their first market in their home territory. It is Australian publishers who give these new writers their chance to be heard and the repeal of the importation laws will seriously affect the ability of those publishers to underwrite the development of new talent. Fewer and fewer Australian voices will be heard amidst the roar of cheap overseas imports. Our publishing industry is at the heart of our culture so please do not drive a stake of short sighted economics through that vulnerable and vital organ.</p>
151	Ray Wing-Lun, Individual	<p data-bbox="766 929 1412 1153">I oppose the introduction of "fair use" as it puts the onus on the individual who has laboured and taken risk to create IP to claim due payment from larger companies in a high cost legal framework. The consumer and the larger companies may gain in the short term by a system where payment for the IP is reduced. In the long term, both will only benefit if the system rewards the creator of the IP in demand - so there is a new product to use.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1164 1412 1377">I oppose the repeal of parallel importation rules. The potential for dumping from overseas publishing companies will take sales and income from local producers and sellers of IP. While consumers gain a short term gain, again local producers and sellers lose the financial reward for creating new local IP and so will reduce local IP. This effectively means erosion of local culture - again a loss for local consumers.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1388 1412 1523">I also oppose the reduction of term of copyright. Young writers and artists stand to lose income well within their lifetime - making a further hurdle to enter the financially high risk creative arts vocations. This again is an obstacle to the production of local IP for local consumers.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1534 1412 1635">I would expect that the Productivity Commission be concerned with the continued production of local IP and cultural products, the provision of appropriate reward for producers of local IP and cultural products.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
152	Geraldine Brooks, Individual	Anyone who believes Australians need to read their own stories and hear their own voices reflected in a diverse and vibrant literature should be appalled by the report of the so-called Productivity Commission. As a writer, I'm already feeling the effects of these bad proposals as Australia's publishing firms find themselves unable to project future revenues and face a bleak outlook. You think Google and Amazon care if our authentic Australian voices are heard, nurtured, developed? We'll be drowned out and silenced by the thud of cheap product being dumped on our shores. As someone who is published in many countries, I can say with absolute conviction that the Australian publishing industry is the best in the world. Please let's not break it for the spurious, untested assumptions in these recommendations.
153	Catherine Greer, Individual	I disagree with proposed changes to the Intellectual Property Arrangements.
154	Matthew Ward, Individual	<p>The Productivity Commission recommends, in Section 8, that software and business methods be specifically excluded from being patented.</p> <p>I personally feel that the Productivity Commission has missed the point in terms of what Software Patents achieve. In a nutshell: copyright protects software code, whereas patents protect functionality. This is important: code can remain hidden from copying, but functionality is typically public-facing, and can be readily copied using dew developers and new code (i.e. without any need to see the original code)</p> <p>Many smaller technology companies rely on innovation to find a place in the market. They rely on software patents to protect those innovations from being copied (or at least to provide assurances to investors and collaborators that the innovations cannot be copied).</p> <p>Without software patents, there is absolutely nothing to prevent a Google, Apple or Microsoft from copying each end every innovative software functionality developed by Australian SMEs and start-ups, preventing such Australian businesses from ever gaining leverage or relevance in a marketplace.</p> <p>Software patents provide an important layer of security, and can turn a SME from a target for copying into a target to acquisition or licensing. They are necessary for many smaller technology companies to stand a chance of raising capital, holding onto market share, and implementing exit strategies.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
155	Khyiah Angel, Typology Publishing	<p>I'm an author and publisher of hybrid works published in paperback form with multimodal material incorporated into the paper format. My PhD research is also in this space.</p> <p>I am creating a new form of 'book as object' here in Australia, for the Australian market. I have put a lot of time, and money into setting up my publishing house to present this hybrid-style novel to the world. If this goes ahead, there will be no point because despite the time, effort, research and creative work over the years, that has gone into this project, it will not be feasible to continue. I will be forced to seriously consider taking it offshore to enable me to produce and distribute it in any meaningful way.</p>
156	Anne Schofield, Individual	The Australian publishing industry needs to be protected - success of the Sydney Writer's Festival proves that it is a strong industry and Australian authors need as much support as they can get without competition from UK and USA publishing companies
157	Victoria Hamilton-Russell Individual	<p>As an Australian who enjoys reading Australian stories I want those stories to be written and those authors to earn an appropriate living from their efforts. I cannot believe our government is so willing to give away The Authors rights and being so flippant about their responsibilities to their constituents.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe this will be good for Australians.</p>
158	Garry Hurle, Individual	The copyright of written material must be protected without reservation.
159	Barbara Lynch, Individual	As the author of over 100 technical books I believe that a 'Fair Use' exception will damage Australia's world-leading fit-for-purpose copyright system, harm the future creation and dissemination of Australian content, most particularly for students and teachers. Don't be conned by the US publishers who want free access to our material.
160	Victoria, Hamilton- Russell, Individual	<p>As an Australian who enjoys reading Australian stories I want those stories to be written and those authors to earn an appropriate living from their efforts. I cannot believe our government is so willing to give away The Authors rights and being so flippant about their responsibilities to their constituents.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe this will be good for Australians.</p>
161	Marion Nicholas, Individual	I strongly oppose the Commission's recommendation that we exchange our present copyright regime for the American "fair rights" model. Free is not fair! Marion Nicholas
162	Paul Schnackenburg, Individual	<p>Dear Commission,</p> <p>After reading your issues report and draft report I feel strongly that adopting a "fair use" approach to copyright is the wrong way to go.</p> <p>Australia's current copy right laws and permissions work well and do not need to be altered.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
163	Alyce Caswell, Individual	<p>In the corporate world, many employees start on an entry level salary. After years of hard work (not to mention blood, sweat and tears), a person earns promotions and pay rises. This experience and effort accumulates over many years, very often for more than half a person's life. And it is rewarded.</p> <p>Imagine, then, that you tell a man or woman who has worked their way up the corporate ladder that they will be forced back down to an entry level salary because the hard work they put in 15 years ago no longer counts. It would be liking saying they did not earn their current position. This is unfair.</p> <p>It is also unfair to tell a writer that they should no longer benefit from the hard work they put in to reach their current professional level. This is punishing someone for working, for trying to put food on the table.</p> <p>I ask that copyright remains with an author at least until their death, because every scrap of income from older copyright represents the promotions and pay rises that are afforded to everyone else.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
164	Linda Jaksic, Individual	<p>Writers need to make a living. Reducing copyright to 15-25 years is against the Australian value of fairness. Jackie French's open letter summed up the arguments best. If Malcolm Turnbull wants an innovative revolution then he needs to protect creators' livelihoods.</p>
165	Helene Byfield, Books Kinokuniya, Sydney	<p>The book industry in Australia is vibrant and self-sustaining, employing over 20,000 people in publishing, bookselling, printing and other businesses.</p> <p>Should PIR be lifted, I worry that we will lose two significant areas of Australian cultural identity, the Australian Publishing industry (where cultural artefacts are developed and nurtured) and the Australian Retail Bookstores (the place where these artefacts are celebrated, promoted and consumed). The Australian book market will shrink significantly if it becomes an "open market" as local publishers will not have funding provided by international book sales to invest in local authors and stories, and smaller, independent bookstores will find it hard to operate as they will not have the buying power wielded by the major chains or discount department stores, all in all, we will see fewer Australian stories, and have fewer places in which to celebrate them.</p> <p>There is no accurate, in-depth information currently available on the state of the Australian Book and Publishing industry as the ABS no longer records what happens in this industry. The economic data referenced by this report is out-dated and irrelevant, and I urge the commission to take a closer look at what is happening in this vibrant, necessary, and culturally significant sector before making decisions which could lead to its destruction.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
166	Clare Way, Individual	I believe copyright laws should remain as is and that writers and publishers material should not be copied for free. It would greatly affect my income as a writer if Copyright payments were taken away. I would be forced to give up writing as commission payment is not enough. As a writer we deserve to be recognised and paid if our material is copied. Please do not change this law.
167	Charles Foley, Individual	As a copyright holder I object to the USA type "Fair Use" policy
168	Peter Bridge, Hesperian Press	<p>21 May 2016</p> <p>Recently one of my authors has pointed out that a few of my titles are being pirated on the internet as pdf downloads, with thousands of such downloads.</p> <p>This is exceptionally annoying as they are both my personal copyright and the publications of Hesperian Press.</p> <p>I thought that much of this had been brought under control with the "defeat" of Google in the court actions a few years ago.</p> <p>Has the criminal google pack merely delivered their scans to associates to sidestep the legal process?</p> <p>As a small publisher, who cannot get access to state and federal grants, and with all the titles still in print, I depend on sales to survive.</p> <p>I am not very competent in the manipulation of e-materials and so was unaware of stealing of my works.</p> <p>The pirates appear to be large international groups and to have copied from all and sundry.</p> <p>I would appreciate your advice as to what can, or will be done, by our government to control this. At the very least all such sites should be blocked, if possible, from delivering stolen copyright material to Australia.</p> <p>[The emails re several books are included. I have undertaken an incomplete search through my publication list by placing the titles in inverted commas and found the following copyright works made available.]</p> <p>As I will be away for several weeks from tonight I have not had time to complete the collecting of attachments to this letter.</p> <p>However I fully support your efforts to protect the copyright and rights of Australian writers and publishers and to combat the rort of "fair use".</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
169	Igor Spajic, Individual	<p>I am a published author and illustrator.</p> <p>My output of material is reliant upon a number of factors. One of these is the reward for my work. Apart from intangibles, this is in the form of money.</p> <p>A tangible reward allows me to transfer time from other pursuits or work into my creative efforts. Creative works are rewarding not just for the individual creator, but for related professions (publishing, proofing, editing, etc.)</p> <p>Creative works may also be among the most rewarding efforts to bring income to the nation. The value in tourism of just one creative work (the Sydney Opera House) is incalculable, but exceeds the return that would have resulted from a less unique or creative design.</p> <p>Other creative exports such as books and films also bring economic benefits beyond the works themselves. Imagine the boost to the New Zealand economy given by the 'Lord of the Rings' and 'Hobbit' movies - their production and the permanent attractions in their wake.</p> <p>There is far too much content now available in the digital space, most of it free, and most it must be said of mediocre quality. It is difficult enough to gain the attention of readers just to see and evaluate your work. Then you must compete for paid sales.</p> <p>In this situation, an attack upon the income streams of creators for finished work will serve as a negative incentive. Why create anything if it's pirated and you can never harvest the full reward from your work?</p> <p>Good work cannot be free. Someone always pays - in currency (reader) in time (author) in lost opportunities (authors with little or no chance of a fair return for work).</p> <p>The incomes for writers have dropped alarmingly during this online revolution. There is little enough incentive now. As creators, we do not ask to suck on the government's tit; nor are we asking for tariffs and artificial barriers.</p> <p>We demand simply the legal protections our works deserve, especially for the economic value they create. 'Fair use' is foul use.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
170	Lynn Ward, Individual	<p>I am involved in the creation of books in Australia, as an author, as a reader of books, and as a person who works in the education sector with a passion for Australian creativity and literacy. I work hard at writing but I cannot make an income from what I do. To pay my rent and my other bills I have to work hard at my other jobs as well.</p> <p>I earn very little from all the hard work I put into writing but that is something I have had to face, however, it must be so discouraging for others still trying to get published. While we still have an Australian publishing industry there is still a chance for Australian creators to make their mark but I believe that if parallel imports were approved the Australian publishing industry would cease to exist. Once that happens, do you honestly believe that an overseas publisher will even consider publishing works by Australians that reflect Australia and its societies and our ways of life? I believe the answer is a definite NO, simply because we don't have the market to make such publications viable to large overseas corporations.</p> <p>I also vehemently oppose any proposal to cut the length of copyright terms. It is arrogant in the extreme to assume a right to a creator's work after 25 years. Why should I, or my children, not have access to what is morally still mine because it has been decreed that I no longer own it after 25 years? Would you give up a house you built after 25 years? Would you give away a business you built up?</p> <p>The current proposal to reduce our term of copyright and to allow the introduction of parallel imports is immoral.</p> <p>(The Big Beet Omnibus Scholastic 2013, Sally Snickers "Knickers Walker Books Australia 2014, A Perfect Place for a Wombat Omnibus Scholastic due in 2016)</p>
171	Jessica Hunt, Individual	<p>I support the repeal of the Parallel Import Laws in combination with measures that directly support Australian writers.</p> <p>As an avid reader, I find it extremely frustrating that in Australia books are so much more expensive than they are overseas. The current laws act as a tax on knowledge. By making books a luxury product, they act to discourage reading, to the detriment of Australian society.</p> <p>I hope that my views will help to redress the imbalance between the submissions reflecting interests of readers vs the interests of publishers.</p>
172	Barrie Brennan, Individual	<p>In the contemporary world it is important to maintain the status of domestic standards, e.g. in copyright. National Australian agencies should have the rights of Australians as a primary objective. The current proposal provides greater attention to the right of verses water than Australians. That process should be reversed.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
173	George Wilkie, Individual	As an architect and author I am concerned that the Australian Government believes it has the charter to give away individual citizens rights. Copyright is not a privilege given by governments to give or take to use their narrow agenda. It is a long established right that protects the powerful from stealing the intellectual and creative product of individuals. No foreign power, government or commercial organisation should gain free access to copyright material generated and protected in Australia.
174	Annabelle Brayley, Individual	I live in outback Australia and write stories about ordinary Australians who do extraordinary things - mostly in the outback, sometimes elsewhere like those in my latest book OUR VIETNAM NURSES. This is significant social history and they are important stories that need to be shared. Who else is going to do that if publishers like Penguin Books Australia, who took a gamble on me four years ago when together we published Bush Nurses, are no longer able to offer that opportunity to a new, unknown storyteller?
175	Louisa Deasey, Individual	I don't believe these recommendations work in favour of the public or the author and will not result in an Australia well-versed in its own country's authors.

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
176	Allan Jones, Retired previous engineer	<p>I am an individual inventor, and my problems with my work as an inventor in Australia are the high cost of patenting. A suggestion I wish to make that would help reduce my costs is that a university that has a patent attorney should be available at lower fees to non-university applicants as well as university people.</p> <p>This would be a taxpayer funded assistance to both the university and to other inventors, possibly allowing the employment of more patent attorneys at universities, fees could be set at lower amounts for all applicants.</p> <p>This new approach could include more new patent attorney jobs, training, and innovation in patent processing, like better data systems, and response reminders for various steps in the patent application process.</p> <p>Another support for inventors more generally would be a degree of some standing being given to inventors who have succeeded in getting an international patent grant past or present, this would help with being recognised by industry, IP, or plant initiatives as a person who is an inventor and has letters patents to their name.</p> <p>I feel these changes would enhance the status and ability of an individual inventor like myself, and judging by all the lapsed patent applications in the patent office, it is an indicator that we are missing out on at least a portion of our budding inventors and innovators, my own works can be found on the internet under my name as inventor-- that is Allan Richard Jones, I still invent machines but feel that at the moment these projects have little chance of reaching Australian or world markets from here.</p> <p>What has happened with one invention of mine, is that it had no positive response in Australia, yet is being made overseas in three countries and employing people there.</p> <p>Adding to my previous submission that refers to the use of university employed patent attorneys, being trained and provided for the individual and small to medium inventor outside the university, I add the following; If the university-based patent attorney was to work also as an interconnected assessor of the applied for inventions as well as lodging the IPC paperwork there should be a selection of attorney expertise for various fields of invention. Added to this idea that needs more detail than listed here to get it right, should be a cooperative approach where the university based patent attorney selecting outside individual inventions can join in with the capital returns of the selected inventions thus reducing the cost to just lodgements fees in the IPC convention. This is a return based pro bono arrangement, the inclusion of confidential liaison with other parts of the university and the small to medium manufacturing would also help to progress many individual forms of invention that at present is facing overwhelming costs in both patenting and in prototype development that is based on a hotch potch arrangements with very little prospect of inclusion in Australian-based industrial development scene. For further discussion on this, I can refer to my own experience in all of these discussed fields. One qualifier should be even if there is no inclusion in the venture the patent work should be still available at much lower cost to the individual inventor. One might consider this type of industrial development to also be part of share investment/ bonds or the like as a form of capitalisation of invention. This can be seen as an introduction agency for the elevation of industrial development, jobs and growth involving people and universities.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
177	Clare Press, Individual	<p>I am concerned that introducing parallel book imports and American-style changes to our copyright laws will damage the books industry in Australia irrevocably.</p> <p>Our current laws already allow for the sharing of information for socially desirable purposes, e.g. in education, while ensuring writers are paid for their work. Writing, in case you have forgotten, is a profession. We professional writers do not write for charity, or as a mere hobby, and our output is not worthless, and yet these recommendations treat it as so. At least, they treat us - as its authors - as without value. More broadly, the knock-on effects of what the Commission proposes include not only serious and far-reaching job losses in the books industry, but also a deep attack on the fabric of our Australian literary culture.</p> <p>I have read the material around this subject in a balanced way, and can see no benefits in the government accepting these recommendations.</p> <p>As a published author of two books, I am alarmed that Australia is considering this move which destined to if not outright cripple, at least severely hobble, the local industry. We should be fostering, nurturing and encouraging Australian arts and literature, encouraging local stories to be told for local audiences - and writing is an integral part of this. To my mind, these recommendations represent the opposite.</p>
178	Ian Luke, Individual	<p>Stripping authors of copyright ownership at any time is not only a gross injustice, theft and an act of bastardry, it serves to discourage involvement in literature. Married to constant attacks upon our education system, it serves a long term plan to dumb down our populace, and whilst that may be what the LNP think they want, because they are told it's what they want by those who fund them, it will be an utter disservice to the entire country.</p>
179	Di Bartok, Di Bartok Writing Services	<p>Writers make little money as it is. This proposed change to copyright law would cripple creativity in this country. It must not happen.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
180	Nicholas Manning, Individual	<p data-bbox="766 358 1412 414">**My books are my future. If the laws change, there will be no more reason to write. **</p> <p data-bbox="766 421 1412 504">I am a full time author. People often mistakenly think that books make a heap of money when they are first released, then fall quietly into oblivion a couple of years after.</p> <p data-bbox="766 510 1412 728">There are certainly some books that work like that - namely the blockbusters that everyone has heard of. But not all books work that way. Most books never become famous, but instead quietly and surely earn a low, steady stream of income. That income exists long after the author has written their book, because when someone reads a book, they'll often read other books that the author has written too (aka, the back catalogue).</p> <p data-bbox="766 734 1412 929">My decision to write full time was not an easy one; giving up a regular job meant living on a very low wage until I could write enough books that my back catalogue would support me. This can take years and years of hard work. And I'm still not there yet, so it certainly doesn't give me enough money to invest, buy a house, or save for my retirement.</p> <p data-bbox="766 936 1412 1232">But I'm happy to write regardless, because writing books *is* investing in my retirement. None of my books are famous - most don't make very much money. But the income from my books are cumulative. Each one adds to the combined income, making it a little higher. When the time is right, I will be able to stop writing and use this income like other people use their Super - to retire, and support myself just like a pension plan. It also means I will have something to leave my children - a gift to bequeath them just like other people leave houses, or shares, or managed funds.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1238 1412 1377">Changing the copyright laws would mean that my back catalogue would be removed from me just as I need it most. It means my income would be removed from me. It means I could not afford to retire. And it means I could no longer afford to write.</p> <p data-bbox="766 1384 1412 1440">Please do not change the copyright laws for books or film. I beg you.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
181	Charlotte Nash-Stewart, Individual	<p>To the Productivity Commission</p> <p>I make my living writing. It pays poorly, even as a “bestselling” author, I make minimum wage on a good year. But it does pay enough that I meet my bills and contribute to the household, and the country. Yes, I do this job because I love writing. But you better believe it is a business that I take seriously as just that: a business. And like all small businesses, my income fluctuates. I plan. Long term. I'm careful. And the recommendations in your report just cut the legs out of my long-term viability.</p> <p>Authors work on building a backlist over many years, a body of work that can support their ongoing creation of more work. Losing the ability to profit from a book as little as 15 years after creation strips out a backlist. We don't many millions like pharmaceutical companies. With few exceptions, we make a few hundred (maybe a few thousand if lucky) a year off a book that's been out for a while. But those few dollars make the difference between being a viable business and not. And that's without even talking about parallel importation.</p> <p>We aren't just artists who are easy targets. We're business people running marginal businesses with little support. We're not asking for money, we're asking for basic rights that nations like the UK and USA would never dream of giving up. Many of us teach as part of that. We contribute to Australian culture, literacy, and economy. These possible changes to copyright put us on an unequal footing to every other artist in the world (except NZ and Canada, and just ask them how good it's been for them).</p> <p>This report is so misguided, so galling, so out-of-date that the whole writing community wonders what the hell is happening. We're all waiting to hear it's a massive joke. But none of us are laughing.</p>
182	Robyn Short, Freelance Journalist	<p>Adopting a fair use doctrine in Australia could lead to universities and schools and other organisations refusing to pay licence fees for the vast amount of copyright material they now have access to. This would have an adverse effect on the production of Australian educational resources, opening the door for materials dominated by US and British creators.</p>
183	Sarah Greenwood, Individual	<p>As an Australian creator, I believe that I should be paid when someone uses my work for education or any other purpose. Australian creators rely on many sources for their income and a 'Fair Use' exception to the copyright system, along with heavy funding cuts to the sector and fewer spaces for artists to work and exhibit in, would just be another blow to our industry.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
184	Jordan Thomas, Beehaviour.Net Pty Ltd	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>At behaviour, we've invested considerable funds in developing our online software platform.</p> <p>Whilst we understand copyright may protect any copying of the software code, it will not stop a competitor seeing how our product operates and then replicating the inventive and commercially valuable features of our product.</p> <p>The only way we can hope to stop that occurring is by relying on patent protection.</p> <p>Without the availability of patent protection for the inventive features of our software we simply could not commit the considerable capital to develop our product and our business. Our business as it grows will employ more Australians and benefit the country, and we need patent protection for our software to help us achieve that and protect our investment.</p> <p>We believe software patents are extremely important in encouraging new and valuable innovation.</p>
185	Karen Devine, Devine Educational Consultancy Services	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>My microbusiness specialises in writing educational materials for the Year 7-12 High School Market. It specialises in HSIE and PDHPE resources in the format of workbooks, Blackline Masters and PowerPoint Presentations. At present my small income from this part-time activity is funded by sales of products, but largely by copyright payments from the huge amount of copying done of these resources. If such copyright payments cease, it is no longer financially viable for me to continue to write for this sector. Hence, my 25 years of educational/teaching and resource writing experience will end. I urge you to NOT head down the path of Fair Use which has stifled creative expression in other parts of the world and which will force me to quit creatively using my talents in providing resources for NSW students.</p>
186	Paul Thurstan Smith, Vanilla n Spice	<p>Creative works need copyright protection for the period that has been established for decades. Authors and writers are generally reliant on their royalties and copyright in order to survive. Any reduction in our copyright protection will seriously and adversely impact on creative output, and therefore reduce our Productivity rather than increase it.</p>
187	Jennifer Miller, Individual	<p>As an academic author who writes for various publications I am incensed that any government could consider removing my rights to my own work, or that they could place commercial rights or nefarious economic considerations above the interests of writers and their hard-earned intellectual property. Who stands to gain by this? Who stands to lose? Why would any government wish to facilitate the theft of ideas, literature, articles or whole books? I write also in support of our great Australian authors who have struggled for international recognition and who, after several decades, now are seen as some of the best in the world. Do not diminish their achievements. Their right to their own control of this precious material is theirs and theirs alone. We are weary of the greed, of the grasping on behalf of vested interests. Enough.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
188	Jennifer McLeod, Individual	<p>I am a chronicler of Aussie life. I write Australian stories with an Australian voice. This change to copyright is wrong. It means in 15 years from now, someone could pick up the book that I sweat over and built from my imagination and profit from it - they could've bought it in a second hand bookshop (no author royalty there) then cast the latest heartthrob in a movie version and make millions at the box office. (No author credit required.) I want to be able to leave my work as a legacy to my family. They need to benefit from my hard work (not some opportunist) because my family has supported me all these years.</p> <p>The same report changes to parallel import rules a policy change that will see our young readers brought up NOT on Australian stories by Australian authors, but on imported books that will flood in from America and the UK because our industry and Australian literature has died a slow death and writers have been forced to find "more productive employment like waiting tables.</p>
189	Rachelle Sadler, Individual	<p>I respect the rights of Australian creators and reject a 'Fair Use' exception. Please support our Australian creators and industries by upholding what is truly fair and maintaining our current copyright practices.</p>
190	Suzanne Parkes, Individual	<p>I am replying to the Productivity Commission's Report on Australia's intellectual property arrangements:</p> <p>I am an author. I may not make a large amount of money but it is extremely significant to me, not only the payment, but also the recognition of my moral rights in the story.</p> <p>I am stunned that the Productivity Commission is now considering changing the copyright laws to 15-20 in total instead of the current life of author plus 70 years. How can anyone truly believe it fair that anyone could now photocopy it, reprint it, turn it into a film or theatre, without my receiving any recompense?</p> <p>Writing books is often a long procedure. If we are lucky it may take two or three years others may take ten before they come to fruition. Under the proposal if I took say 5 years to write my book after an additional 10 years it would be under free domain. All my hard work for someone else to use.</p> <p>It would certainly make me think twice before publishing.</p> <p>I note that the Productivity Commission states, long periods of copyright, coupled with no form of registration, results in excessive search costs for users wishing to identify the copyright owner, and the common extreme of causing works to be orphaned.</p> <p>I doubt there are many people left in Australia that don't know about Google typing in the book title and/or author's name will soon give them the information.</p> <p>I am also concerned about Parallel importation. I worry that it will erode the Australian flavour of books as more and more Australianisms are erased to suit the US market. We deserve books written by Australians for Australians.</p> <p>I think our publishing industry should be protected, in the same way the UK and US books are protected, against overseas editions being flooded in. I am against any changes that will affect an author's royalties and our publishing industry that supports us.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
191	Jane Jolly, Individual	Hands off our royalties! This is an outrageous proposal. The average income from their art, for writers and illustrators in Australia, is \$13000. This means we all have to have other jobs. Day jobs. If you value the arts in Australia, and try to imagine life without the arts, then the intellectual property and royalties of Australian artist needs to be protected and needs to be ongoing....much much longer than the measly 15-20 year proposed. This money is rightfully ours and our heirs...children etc. This proposal MUST be stopped in its tracks for the financial security of all Australian artists.
192	James Aitchison, Individual	As an Australian author of over 160 published books, I am at a loss to understand why the Commission seeks to destroy a vibrant local industry. Why penalise writers for writing? Why penalise passionate local publishers? Why drive book printers out of business? We should be proud of our books and authors.
193	John Denlay, Individual	I am concerned with the PC's proposal for expanding the "fair use" exemptions from Copyright as these will directly impact on local copyright creators, such as artists. I am concerned that this sector will face reduced incentives to create new works (as their ability to create revenue from these works will be diminished).
194	Timothy John Anderson, Hereticpress.com	A couple of dozen reasons why Google is a criminal company stealing the hard work of others for their own profit. This is my access denied page to which I redirect Google inspired forum spammers motivated by Google's advertising money. <a href="http://members.optusnet.com.au/~dogstar27/index.html">http://members.optusnet.com.au/~dogstar27/index.html</a> This single American court case is supporting Google to rip of the work of all the world's authors and will retard incentive for all creative authors. Damn Google stealing the work of authors to make advertising revenue for themselves. They really are a criminal company with no regard for intellectual property rights of others.

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
195	Belinda Aucott, Yarn PR / Indesign Media	<p>My name is Belinda Aucott and I write to condemn your proposed changes to the parallel imports law and copyright laws in Australia.</p> <p>To do so is to dis-incentivise some of the most original and hardworking people in our economy. This includes me.</p> <p>I am currently writing my first novel. It is a domestic thriller that deals with local issues in NSW such as domestic violence, racism and police corruption. It is important to me to write it and I have already penned 35,000 words of what will be 150,000 words. I have to squeeze in 3 week holidays to work on it as I am unmarried and have to support myself.</p> <p>As well as being someone who has written every day since I was 10 years old I also make a living through writing. I am a writer, journalist and publicist earning \$150,000 a year.</p> <p>I am at the successful end of the spectrum - but it has taken me almost 20 years to gain the financial recognition and contacts to work in my chosen field.</p> <p>Please do not limit the power of writers to contribute to Australian culture. I beg you.</p> <p>The productivity commission recommendations are abhorrent to me.</p> <p>I am 35,000 words through my first draft and should have a book ready to take to a publisher next year.</p> <p>I need to know that I can publish it and make some money back.</p> <p>Consider deeply what you are doing. You will push me back to Paris where I lived for 2 years or to England where I was also a former resident and I will not be able to contribute to the current public debate as I currently do.</p> <p>Many people like me will leave.</p> <p>And Australia's fragile cultural value will once again be diminished.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
196	Louisa Eddleston, Individual	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a creator of black line masters for the past 15 years and an experienced primary teacher I wish to register my deep concern about any changes being suggested that may affect the current Australian educational copying scheme.</p> <p>As an author/artist who creates works exclusively for use in schools, allowing free copying of my materials simply because they are for educational purposes is unfair. It is the equivalent of allowing anyone who works in a school to go to their local coffee shop, buy a \$4 cup of coffee and get free refills for life. Just as this would ruin the coffee shop, as 60-80% of my income comes from copyright payments, I would no longer be able to produce new works. Years of hard work would become worthless. I have 20 titles, all still available, but the royalties and Educational Lending Rights payments for all these works would leave me well below the poverty line without copyright payments.</p> <p>I am not alone in this situation and allowing these changes to go ahead could result in virtually no new works being produced for the Australian educational sector. In a country trying to create an education system able to meet the challenges of the future this would be a huge backward step. At a time when the new Australian curriculum is being introduced, teaching materials specifically designed for Australia will be more important than ever.</p> <p>I would also like to mention Dominie, the wonderful, family run publisher who has produced all my books and materials. A change to the Fair Use will affect a great number of people working at my publisher and at all Australian publishers. Are we really ready to let yet another Australian industry disappear?</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
197	Anika Berkman, Individual	<p>I am extremely concerned about elements of the proposed changes to copyright in Australia to 15 years after creation. This reduction limits the ability of authors to ensure a share of all profit from their work during the book's commercial lifetime and will only drive local authors overseas in a bid to protect their copyright.</p> <p>Writing requires an investment of time, money, intellectual and creative capital. Authors are not paid during the writing period (often years around other full time employment) and must rely on royalties from sales to justify the time and expense. As with all business ventures, not all books will be commercially successful, but one only needs to consider a book with a long commercial life to see the ridiculous nature of this proposal. Had J.K Rowling published in Australia the first four books would already be out of copyright and Rowling would no longer be entitled to royalties despite selling thousands of copies a year.</p> <p>The insulting and callous assumption that writers write without consideration for, or aspiration for compensation, demonstrates the lack of respect with which authors are viewed by the Commission. If share portfolios and income gained therein came to an end after only 15 years there would be uproar. For authors, the copyright to our books is an asset like any other investment, with the potential to provide income.</p> <p>My first book is currently under consideration at one of Australia's four largest publishers, but if I cannot guarantee favourable conditions within Australia then I will have no choice but to publish overseas where I will be adequately protected from misuse, my right to royalties will not be unfairly limited, and I can retain the rights to my product for my lifetime, and then bequeath this asset to my heirs.</p> <p>I urge the Commission to reconsider this change.</p>
198	Yolanda Cool, Individual	<p>With regards to the Australian publishing industry proposed changes to Fair Use of created materials in Australia in terms of copyright. If the current concept is adopted it will negatively reflect upon both authors and small publishing companies, within Australia.</p> <p>If the US fair use system was introduced into Australia, there would be less Australian content on our screens, on our bookshelves and in our schools and universities. PwC recently estimated that introducing fair use in Australia could result in a loss of GDP of more than \$1 billion. This has been demonstrated by the fair use laws being adopted by Canada with the immediate and profound effect of Canadian produced material for schools and universities. As they have refused to pay the copyright license fees.</p> <p>At present Australia's copyright system is world-leading and has proven it can evolve to allow developments in technology, business practices and consumer behaviour. There are sensible reforms to the Copyright Act that are already well advanced in an unprecedented collaboration between rights holders, libraries and education institutions. Sensible developments would include the introduction of a regulatory framework for "extended collective licensing" (ECL) to enable better licensing solutions. To create solutions that benefit teachers, libraries and people with disabilities, and are also fair to content creators.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
199	Glen Moralee, Individual	As a photographer, I'm highly concerned that this will give others more freedom to use my photographs in uses that I would expect them to be paying for them. For example to use on their website, social media, in advertising, for sale, for modification into something they can claim as their own. With this in mind, I also worry about musicians and other such people's copyrights. I see no reason why someone should be able to jump on the back of someone else's hard work to benefit for themselves.
200	James Mifsud, Latitude 21 Photography	<p>At present if an enterprise uses photographs, art, music or writing the creator of the work receives financial compensation.</p> <p>By adopting a 'Fair Use' policy in Australia, enterprises will be allowed to make use of photographs and other artistic works without compensating the creator.</p> <p>The 'Fair Use' system was introduced in Canada with disastrous consequences for photographers.</p> <p>I cannot allow my work as a photographer be used by major corporations without due compensation, these may be an image to some people, this is food on my table and fuel in my car</p>
201	Bob Sommerville, Individual	<p>I am a working photographer self-supporting my retirement. I sell my work at a very reasonable cost compared to a commercial service. I donate works and services to community bodies to help with promotion and fundraising and images are accompanied with a Usage Rights statement to reserve rights and copyright. Unauthorised use by a third party is theft. It is no Fair Use for a party to use my images without written authority or without consideration that the work/images are my property to be used freely and without notice. Fair Use does not include me engaging a service such as a plumber or accountant and then declining payment as I consider his/her service should be given freely. The cost of the standard of equipment I use is not refunded or partly refunded if I should consider it Fair Use for my purposes. My intellectual input is not to be decided by a party unknown to me (or even known to me) as having no value. Fair Use is NOT Fair Use of my photography as determined by any other party. Fair use is determined by me by my specific authority.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
202	Michael Mobbs, Individual	<p>The proposal is a triumph of ideology over business sense. I agree with conservative thinker, Roger Scruton generally here “A product can have a price however freely it roams; but it can have a value only when attached to somewhere definite”), and in particular with Tim Winton when he wrote in the Sydney Morning Herald ( 20 May, 2016: Part of what makes our industry viable and our literary output distinct is the concept of territorial copyright (which protects intellectual property in a particular country). And once again it's under threat. Not in New York or London of course. The Americans and the Brits aren't stupid; they'll keep theirs because to give that up is to set fire to your own house.</p> <p>No, sadly, it'll only be us doing that. We'll be the ones putting ourselves at a self-destructive disadvantage. To no logical purpose whatsoever.</p> <p>This pointless abrogation of independence will usher in a new colonial era of publishing. Once again Australian writers will be edited in London and read in export editions as they were when I was a kid. That's a huge and pointless step backwards. Back to tugging our forelocks like good colonial subjects. Or just giving in and getting on the boat.</p>
203	Gaby Naher, The Naher Agency	<p>The abolition of PIRS would devastate the Australian publishing industry at significant cost to Australian writers and readers. My author clients could no longer ever hope to sell English language rights in their work to other territories, so would need to make the difficult choice between being published locally OR being published out of London or New York. When opting for the latter, their local royalty would be a fraction of what it would be if they were published by an Australian publisher.</p> <p>Quoting Henry Rosenbloom of Scribe Publishing, 'The consequences of all this would be catastrophic. Without the income and the profits from overseas originated books, or the income from overseas English-language rights sales, local publishers would become much reduced - and in some cases disappear. Local authors would find their incomes and opportunities diminishing further, in response to their publishers straitened circumstances. And in one of the greatest of ironies, book prices would probably go up, as publishers sought to compensate for their limited market.'</p> <p>Inevitably Australian authors would be forced to publish in the UK or US as they did some fifty years ago. Australian publishers and agents would become extinct. The biggest losers, by a long shot, would be future generations of Australian readers.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
204	Howard Treisman, Avoka Technologies	<p>This submission is in relation to Draft Recommendation 8.1 of the draft report.</p> <p>We have invested many millions of dollars in developing our software product, Avoka Transact. In fact, the government has also indirectly invested in our software through an R&amp;D Grant. This has resulted in many jobs in Australia, and income to Australia through the sales of our product overseas.</p> <p>There are several innovative features in our product, and trademark protection is a key mechanism to prevent our competitors from replicating our innovations. In addition, the value of our company is based in part on our intellectual property, and the patents we hold over this IP.</p> <p>Without the availability of patent protection for the inventive features of our software we simply could not commit the considerable capital to develop our product and our business. Our business as it grows will continue to employ more Australians and benefit the country, and we need patent protection for our software to help us achieve that and protect our investment.</p> <p>We believe patents are extremely important in encouraging new and valuable innovation. And we believe that software, in particular, is a rich area for Australia to invest in.</p>
205	Kaye Dobbie, Individual	<p>I wish to state my objection to the changes to Parallel Importation Restrictions. This seems to me likely to impact upon writers and publishers here in Australia in a negative way. If a writer is published in the US or UK, as well as Australia, there's nothing to stop their work being imported and sold more cheaply here, therefore losing that author royalties, and causing the publisher to lose sales. We have a thriving publishing industry here in Australia. Let's keep it that way.</p>
206	Patricia Hayward, Individual	<p>In recent years, I have seen the publisher of my first textbook (Albatross Books) be forced out of business, and seen Macmillan who published two of my textbooks (originally owned by a European individual) become Pan Macmillan. They were successful enough that all of these are now out of print.</p> <p>So the only income I got, and which was declared on my tax return for 2014-2015 was \$1970 from the Copyright Agency Limited and \$666 from Electronic Lending Rights.</p> <p>It is discouraging to see Australian publishers go under, and to see authors producing original Australian material for an Australian market - in my case, Religion textbooks for the NSW HSC course Studies of Religion - not get SOME financial reward for their efforts.</p> <p>I am on a Disability Support Pension. We try to live within our pension incomes but this additional income as listed above is of greater significance to a pensioner than the commission might realise.</p> <p>The way the NSW syllabuses are written, it is not good enough to buy textbooks from overseas. They are specifically written in the Australian context for Australian students and teachers. Free is not fair. It is not fair to the authors and it is not fair to the publishers.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
207	Vanessa Dean, Individual	<p>I believe the introduction of “fair use”; is unfair. This allows large enterprise to use copyright material for free. The use of the authors work is unknown, no fees are paid and creators work is not recognised which could lead to less production of educational resources.</p> <p>Currently in Australia there is a fair copyright scheme. Institutions pay for creators work which is collected by Copyright Agency Limited and paid to the authors and creators.</p> <p>I am a published author of many primary school maths workbooks which address the Australian curriculum. Why would I continue to create new works for other people to use, copy for free and receive no payment for my intellectual property or time and money spent creating the material? Authors already find it difficult to survive on book sales and copyright payments alone. Introduction of “fair use” is not fair at all and would only add to the financial pressure. Don't force authors to stop creating materials relevant for Australian schools resulting in educators looking to other countries for resources when we have a wealth of talent here. All we are asking is for payment to be made when our materials are used by people who have created it.</p>
208	Diane Sinclair-Thomas, Individual	<p>It is outrageous to suggest that photographers, artist, writers and musicians would not be compensated if their images, writing, music and art works are used by others.</p> <p>This is how these people make a living.</p> <p>I can't go into Coles and just help myself to milk.</p>
209	Suzanne Hall, Individual	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed changes to the Australian Copyright Act and to ask that the parallel importation of books be disallowed. I believe it is fair and reasonable for writers (who are creators) to be entitled to fair, reasonable and ongoing payment for their work as the current Australian legislation allows for. I believe the proposed changes are un-Australian.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
210	Adam Van Rooijen, Individual	<p>In publishing, copyright, and in particular territorial copyright, is the core system by which writers and creators are rewarded for their ideas.</p> <p>Trade in rights is the way the business works.</p> <p>Authors have the right to decide if, when and how their work is made public.</p> <p>Copyright is a property right. Calling it a monopoly is misleading and deceptive.</p> <p>Free isn't fair. A wide-ranging educational exception has devastated educational publishing in Canada;</p> <p>Allowing parallel imports would make it harder to invest in Australian authors, so there would be less diversity and fewer Australian titles for Australian readers;</p> <p>The biggest difference between the US-style 'fair use' and our own 'fair dealing' is that ours includes 'equitable remuneration. Ours is like a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Theirs is for a fair day's work, without any pay.</p> <p>The report says copyright is weighted too much in favour of creators. Their changes will reduce the incomes of Australian writers. They'll get lower royalties and lower advances.</p> <p>Far fewer high-quality, local educational resources vital to Australian curricula will not be produced</p> <p>Consumer are already free to buy books from anywhere in the world</p> <p>There is no guarantee that books will be cheaper if PIRs are removed. Look what happened in New Zealand. Prices fell further in Australia, but the range of titles available shrank.</p> <p>Australian publishers are not dependent on Government subsidies</p>
211	Elaine Forrestal, Individual	<p>The so-called 'fair use' described in this document is, in fact, very unfair to all Australian writers, but particularly unfair to individuals like myself who earn their living, such as it is, by writing books!</p>
212	Ray McHale, Marketing based Assets International Pty Ltd	<p>This submission is in relation to Draft Recommendation 8.1 of the draft report.</p> <p>We have invested considerable funds in developing Valuiza, a cloud-based software service.</p> <p>Whilst we understand copyright may protect any copying of the software code, it will not stop a competitor seeing how our product operates and then replicating the inventive and commercially valuable features of our product.</p> <p>The only way we can hope to stop that occurring is by relying on patent protection.</p> <p>Without the availability of patent protection for the inventive features of our software we simply could not commit the considerable capital to develop our product and our business. Our business as it grows will employ more Australians and benefit the country, and we need patent protection for our software to help us achieve that and protect our investment.</p> <p>We believe software patents are extremely important in encouraging new and valuable innovation.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
213	Patrick Armstrong, Individual	<p>For over 50 years I have combined free-lance writing with work as an academic. I have written text-books for school and university use, and the occasional article for newspapers and magazines. The rewards are , usually a few hundred dollars a year, sometimes less. In some years after costs have been paid there has been a net loss. But if one has something to say it is sometimes important to say it. An academic should be laying his or her expertise, knowledge and the results of research before the public. It is also important that Australian students have access to texts written and published in Australia. This is particularly true of my own field, geography, for which I have written several texts.</p> <p>Alas, writing over recent years has become increasingly unprofitable. True a very small sum is received from Public Lending Right and the official , regulated, photocopying of authors works in schools and universities, but this is little recompense in relation to the severe assaults there have been on authors incomes. The pirating of work, illegal photocopying and the massive rise in the electronic media have been highly destructive. I recently found that several of my works were available online, yet I had never given permission for this. It is impossible for a part-time writer to take on the large international concerns responsible for distribution (legal or illegal) of his work. I know that my text-books are widely copied unofficially and I receive nothing from this.</p> <p>Changes of the type envisaged have had a terrible effect on publishing and creativity in Canada, particularly on educational publishing. Australia is in terms of population, is a small country: yet Australians have been highly creative, having their own voice. They should be allowed to continue to do so.</p> <p>The plight of the small-scale, specialist, part-time writer in Australia is little short of desperate. It should not be further damaged.</p>
214	Anonymous Anonymous, Individual	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I have this morning heard a radio broadcast in which an Australian author expresses significant concern about the removal of the prohibition of parallel importation of books. She was saying that it would tend to reduce local writing and publishing activity in Australia. I have read this section in the draft report and I note that most of it talks about the effect on pricing, and there is only a relatively smaller section at the end which deals with whether there will be a reduction in Australian produced content. The purpose of my submission is to encourage the commission to consider further what impact removing the ban on parallel importation will have on how many Australian books (books by Australian authors) are produced. I did read the recommendations around government subsidies for local writers, art prizes, etc.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
215	Jade Raykovski, Individual	<p>My response to the Productivity Commission's Report on Australia's intellectual property arrangements:</p> <p>I am an aspiring writer; I've just completed the first draft of a children's book, and am preparing myself for multiple revisions and the task of getting it accepted by an agent or publisher. This is especially daunting as I work full-time, and sustaining the passion and focus for this book can be difficult when it needs to be juggled with a 40-hour work week and 2-hour daily commute.</p> <p>I know that how it has to be, however; I understand that unless my book takes off like the Harry Potter series, chances are I'll never be able to fully support myself through writing. I did have the hope, however, that maybe one day I could move to part-time or freelance work, with the results of my writing filling the gap. That if I did manage to publish children's books, the royalties from their sales could help me towards writing my next book. I dared to have that dream.</p> <p>You can imagine what I felt reading the report's recommendation on copyright lasting 15-25 years after creation; that would mean if I had a book published at 25, I could lose my copyright and royalties as early as 40 years of age. How is that fair? Something I have worked on, that I have created and that I own, is somehow no longer mine but everyone's? I do not pretend to understand it.</p> <p>And then the proposal to remove parallel import restrictions. Those overseas bestsellers are what allow Australian publishers to invest in the Australian publishing industry, to invest in Australian authors. While there might be a short-term gain for consumers, the long-term effects would be damaging for both consumers and the publishing industry as a whole.</p>
216	Paul Phillips, Individual	<p>Creative industries will be gone, good bye to the arts, good bye to sustainable local culture. Good bye to me providing a life for my family.</p>
217	Tania Chandler, Individual	<p>Reducing copyright from 70 years after death, to 15-25 years after the creation of work would be ridiculously unfair to authors who already receive so little for their huge efforts.</p> <p>I can't articulate it better than this: 'The book industry is not a protected industry. We are not asking for money, or for a subsidy. We are asking for the same rules and intellectual property rights that prevail for writers and book publishers in the USA, in Britain, in Europe'.</p> <p>(Peter Carey, Thomas Keneally, Richard Flanagan)</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
218	Margot Hillel, Children's Book Council of Australia	<p data-bbox="691 353 1362 421">Submission to the Productivity Commission Regarding Proposed Changes to Copyright Laws</p> <p data-bbox="691 450 1362 618">The Children's Book Council of Australia (CBCA) has been supporting Australian writers and illustrators since our inception in 1945. Through our work, we know that literature for children and young adults makes a significant contribution to building and maintaining our Australian cultural life.</p> <p data-bbox="691 622 1362 954">As the premier organisation on literature for young people in this country, the CBCA is strongly opposed to any changes to intellectual property laws which could damage the distinctive voice of the books created in this country or which could damage the livelihood of creators and ultimately the publishing industry as a whole. High-quality Australian children's literature has a long lifespan and the CBCA affirms that authors and illustrators deserve to be duly compensated for both the quality and longevity of their work. We urge the government to give careful consideration to the correct balance between content creators and end users in intellectual property reform.</p> <p data-bbox="691 958 1362 1099">Finally, we respectfully suggest that additional research and genuine consultation into the impact of the suggested changes on the various stakeholder groups affected is needed. CBCA would be willing and interested in being part of such a consultation group.</p>
219	Laura Henning , Individual	<p data-bbox="691 1133 1362 1155">I am a writer.</p> <p data-bbox="691 1167 1362 1279">As a disabled person, my job prospects are limited but my imagination, dedication and work ethic are not. I studied Creative Writing at University with the intention of making novel writing my career.</p> <p data-bbox="691 1283 1362 1361">I am a single mother to two young girls. They need me to provide for them and part of that provision should be into the future, after I'm gone.</p> <p data-bbox="691 1366 1362 1507">It is illogical to gut and destroy the Australian book industry on the promise of cheaper books. Books are already ludicrously cheap. It is insane to give my rights and my future earnings to overseas publishers so that all but me-the author- make money.</p> <p data-bbox="691 1512 1362 1590">This is the future of Australian voices. This is the future of Australian creativity and culture. This is my future. This is my children's future.</p> <p data-bbox="691 1594 1362 1650">The 15-25 years proposed will not make for cheaper books. It will kill a proud, thriving and vital industry.</p> <p data-bbox="691 1655 1362 1715">As people we understand ourselves through story. Please don't kill our collective narrative.</p>
220	Wendy Fitzgerald, Individual	<p data-bbox="691 1749 1362 1890">I am very concerned there could be changes to the rights to intellectual property of authors, illustrator and creators around children's books. Creators should retain the copy right of their own intellectual property. Any such changes would be very wrong.</p>



Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
221	Candice Lemon-Scott, Individual	<p>As an author and creator of original work it would affect my livelihood were intellectual property terms be reduced. A creator should by rights own the work for as long as it is being produced. It would be grossly unfair for bookstores, publishers and other parties involved in selling the work to continue to get paid while the creator would not for their own work. This is akin to saying a person can buy an investment property but not receive the rental income from it indefinitely. Most authors, myself included, do not earn enough to live off earnings from writings and those that do only are able to through the accumulation of titles where payment for each still in print is paid. Authors already do not receive money to invest in their future through regular employment as others do through employer superannuation contributions, so ongoing intellectual property payments for the life of the author and for their offspring is the only investment they have for retirement and as inheritance for children.</p>
222	Louise Park, Individual	<p>I am very concerned about the Productivity Commission's proposal to change the rules surrounding our Australian Children's Publishing Industry. I understand the proposal is to change from "fair dealing" to "fair use" for author's work-allowing others to plagiarise. Also, if we abolish parallel import rules we will be allowing in a flood of cheap overseas books. This will have a detrimental effect on our Australian publishing and it would be very unfair to bring down the copyright from the current 75 years to as little as 15 years. There are a lot of people in the Australian children's book industry who are very worried about this.</p> <p>I do not think this is fair and in line with the government's innovation policies on jobs and growth for Australians.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
223	Donald Richardson, Individual	<p>From p.6 of attachment:</p> <p>'...unfortunately, the [2000 Moral Rights Amendment to the Copyright] Act contains within itself the means of its own denaturation. It allows to offenders the defence of 'reasonableness'. S.195AR(2) lists several conditions under which it would be 'reasonable' not to identify an author without committing infringement of the right of attribution of authorship. These include obvious situations, like difficulty or expense, and whether the work was created in the course of the author's employment or under a contract for the performance of services but concludes with the catch-all clincher:</p> <p>(e) any practice, in the industry in which the work is used, that is relevant to the work or the use of the work. So, there is no infringement of the artist's moral rights if an article follows the regular practice of publishing, and there is no doubt (as the Mackennal case indicates) that it is a long-established journalistic practice for the correct attribution of artists and designers to be ignored.</p> <p>How can it be that this act can have been drafted with such a self-abnegating clause? Appeals to senior journalists who may have taken part in the discussions of the drafting of the act yielded no response, but they or their colleagues must have known exactly what they were doing, and hoodwinked the politicians. Whenever infringers are challenged, they invariably quote S.195AR(2)(e) as their legal defence.'</p> <p>This legislation is 'a fool' and must be redrafted. Additionally, I call for a inquiry into how the industry fooled the legislators.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
224	Annie White, Individual	<p>31st May 2016</p> <p>Submission to the Productivity Commission Draft Report (April 2016) Intellectual Property Arrangements</p> <p>I am writing to strongly object to the recommendations made in your draft report on Intellectual Property Arrangements, which was released on 29 April 2016.</p> <p>I have worked as an illustrator, and more recently a writer, of children's literature for the past 40 years. During this time, I have worked full time as a children's book creator and, as with any freelance business, have experienced very busy times and some quite lean periods. Retaining copyright in my work is of paramount importance. I believe copyright provides an incentive to create new works and a legal framework for the control of those creations.</p> <p>My major concerns are as follows:</p> <p>1. Term of Copyright</p> <p>While I understand that it is not possible for Australia to reduce the term of copyright to 15-25 years as proposed in your report, due to a range of free trade agreements, the recommendation was nonetheless very disturbing to me as an illustrator and author. I have the right to retain ownership of my work in the same way that any individual may maintain ownership of any other business that they have built and it is very concerning that your report is apparently underpinned by the belief that this should not be the case.</p> <p>2. Parallel Importation Rules</p> <p>Your draft report proposes a change to Australia's parallel importation rules for books. I believe, however, that the current system has sufficient safety nets in place to protect the interests of the consumer, while still allowing myself and my fellow authors to retain control of their rights and income and enjoy a level playing field with our fellow authors in the UK and USA.</p> <p>3. Fair Use</p> <p>Territorial copyright helps publishers manage risk and support the creation of new Australian stories. Without these rules, as an author, I would lose income and the support of a vibrant local publishing industry.</p> <p>Australian law currently sets out</p>
225	Peter Wilkins, Wilkins Tourist Maps Pty Ltd	<p>I object to changes proposed for the easing of copyright material. As a onetime journalist, newspaper editor and currently a cartographer I am a creator of original works and maps which are published in hard copy and on the web. Over 50 years of travelling, photographing, writing and creating specialised maps I believe i have earned the right to receive some compensation for my effort and works. Copyright provides me some protection and compensation for my original works and I think it is unfair that someone without the same talents or expertise can simply copy my work and build a reputation or gain financial advantage by using it without authorisation. Let's have a Fair Go for those with the talent to create and reward them for their effort. A sample of work created and copyright by me is attached.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
226	Robert Arambasic, Brunswick Bound	Do not want to see the Parallel Import restrictions lifted for the reasons outlined in the attached document.
227	Stephen Kimber, Individual	Copy ( a writer's work - and I am a writer) deserves to be protected under existing copyright legislation in Australia, not swept aside as simply content (with no art, with no cultural significance; merely an economic weight to be bartered on scales that allege freedom of access for consumers). A writer's work relates, whether he or she intends it such or not, to the space and time not only of its making but to the space and time of its maker and readers. Australian writers thus create contextually Australian work, not mere content. Copy belongs to a place and time; it is the right of that copy's writer that the work be acknowledged (even if the reader disregards it). No-one wants the attached story but - aesthetic value aside - that does not mean its worth is nought. Productivity commission - Stop putting merely or purely economic value on things.
228	Sue Williams, Individual	I think we should retain the existing restrictions on the parallel importation of books and keep the existing arrangements re copyright and 'fair use'. Altering these will have a negative impact on authors such as myself, the publishing industry and the culture of Australia. We will see fewer Australian writers published as it will be more difficult for local publishers to take the necessary financial risks to take on unknown, new authors. Australians will therefore see less of their own culture reflected in the books available to them. Books are important to our culture. Please refer the attached file for further detail.
229	Jo Phillips McClelland, A Reader's Heaven, Bookstore	<p>Authors rely on royalties to make up the small payment they receive for many hours of work. Even with the royalties, they are not likely to make the equivalent to minimum wage for their work.</p> <p>It is ludicrous to think that writers and artists have no interest in making money. That's like saying artists don't want to eat or live in a house. They need money to survive the same as anyone else.</p> <p>The government keeps talking about innovation, but the surest way to kill innovation is to take away the royalties an artist, inventor, or writer will make in Australia. This will only chase innovators to other countries where their work will remain theirs and be rewarded.</p> <p>Creative minds are already undervalued in our society and underpaid; please don't take away their ownership of their work. This will destroy the already struggling book market in Australia and discourage innovators from building their products here.</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
230	Stephen Filmer, Individual	<p>I am a low income software developer. It is almost impossible to write code without infringing upon one or more existing software patents. It is also almost impossible to keep abreast of any patents that are relevant. I will give 2 examples that hopefully shows how absurd the current situation is:</p> <p>A client wanted a simple program written that kept track of water on a farm. How much for example is in dam a, dam b ; etc. He was presently doing what he required using excel, by manually adding and subtracting columns etc He then went on to tell me there was already a “software”; patent around that described a method of doing this. The company holding the patent had written a program; however it was expensive and buggy. They also had no intention of improving it as they had a captive market. Thanks but no thanks - couldn't do the job.</p> <p>Example 2: I wrote a program that helped farmers grade there fields. The algorithm based on an academic paper that was 40 years old. Have had threats (suing) from a competitor who has written the same software and applied and was granted a patent. The system is broken - how can one obtain a patent based on someone else's academic paper. Sure I can pay for a review on the patent but to do it properly I am looking at 5K. Why is this my problem.</p> <p>If I use things like linked list's I am infringing an Oracle patent. If I write a protection system for my code - there is another patent infringement.</p> <p>Please make it possible for someone to sit at a computer for an hour and write a simple algorithm without infringing someone's patent.</p>
231	John Cozzi, For Pity Sake Publishing	<p>Having sat through an afternoon of public hearings I am compelled to send through to you this link of a keynote address given recently by acclaimed author Roxana Robinson. I have attached the link here. I encourage the commissioners to read her address as it offers an extremely accurate and precise explanation as to why the approach which is currently being proposed by the Productivity Commission WILL have a serious deleterious impact on writers, illustrators and independent publishing in Australia. the link is here.</p> <p><a href="https://www.authorsguild.org/industry-advocacy/money-go-roxana-robinson/">https://www.authorsguild.org/industry-advocacy/money-go-roxana-robinson/</a></p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
232	Shakira Hussein, The University of Melbourne	<p data-bbox="689 353 1356 421">Submission to the Productivity Commission Draft Report (April 2016) Intellectual Property Arrangements.</p> <p data-bbox="689 448 1356 537">As an academic and author, I wish to register my objection to the Commission's Draft Report into Intellectual Property Arrangements. My concerns include but are not limited to:</p> <p data-bbox="689 542 1356 631">The proposal to reduce the term of copyright seems frankly unworkable and raises serious questions about the Commission's familiarity with the publishing industry.</p> <p data-bbox="689 636 1356 828">My book (From Victims to Suspects: Muslim women since 9/11) is published by New South, an independent Australian publisher. Abolishing the parallel importation rules would threaten the sustainability of such publishers and the authors they support. Many stories and topics of vital interest to Australian readers and to the Australian social fabric would therefore remain unaddressed.</p>
233	Rex Sadler, Individual	<p data-bbox="689 855 1356 1052">As a Australian high school textbook author, I believe that the introduction of "fair usage" will lead to the destruction of our home publishing industry. Fees from copyright make up an important part of my income. Without substantial CAL payments, I and many other successful education writers will cease producing teaching resources at the present level and standard.</p> <p data-bbox="689 1057 1356 1373">Australian Maths, Science and English texts books are among the best in the world. Before members of the panel make their decision, I would suggest they have a look at a sample of the outstanding textbooks produced in our country. Even as an English author, I am astounded by the beautiful layout and teaching methods in our chemistry, physics, biology and maths textbooks. They really make learning enjoyable. However, authors put in thousands of hours and they want to receive a fair reward. At the present time this is happening. It won't happen under "unfair abuse".</p>

Brief Submission	Submitter Details	Submission
234	Rob McInnes	<p>The following is a supplement to my earlier comments on s51(3), and is limited to making the Commission aware that the US Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission have reviewed their guidance on the IP/antitrust interface in the USA. It would be useful for the Commission to review and consider how this issue is viewed by public policy makers and implementers, who have real expertise and experience in intellectual property (including its commercial application). I note the guiding principles behind the US review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The agencies apply the same antitrust analysis to conduct involving intellectual property as to conduct involving other forms of property, taking into account the specific characteristics of a particular property right.</li> <li>- The agencies do not presume that intellectual property creates market power.</li> <li>- The agencies recognize that intellectual property licensing allows firms to combine complementary factors of production and is generally procompetitive.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2016/08/ftc-doj-seek-views-proposed-update-antitrust-guidelines-licensing">https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2016/08/ftc-doj-seek-views-proposed-update-antitrust-guidelines-licensing</a></p> <p>If the Commission wishes to have regard to overseas models when considering the IP/antitrust interface, I would suggest that the USA has had considerably more success than the EU, in putting in place the conditions for a vigorously competitive technology sector based on innovation protected by intellectual property.</p>
235	Alan Mitter	<p>It came up on Q &amp; A 19/9/16, that certain expiry date/s applicable to owners of intellectual property, e.g. song writers, musicians, book authors, etc., you name it... is/are to be revised/reduced - I am not aware of the particular details - but I would like to submit that any deadline on a person's ownership of their intellectual property less than the term of his/her natural life is morally invalid. What a person owns is theirs till they die. To open that person's property to ownership and profit by others during the person's lifetime, without their consent, amounts to simple theft. The theft might be 'legal' under the guise of a copyright expiry date, but it is still theft, and as such, corrupt. Even if ownership is said to terminate with the owner's death, the question still remains. As the property is the owner's own possession; how then may that property not be bequeathed to the owner's beneficiaries, and forever be justly passed on to subsequent other beneficiaries? So, it seems that not even a 'death of owner' expiry date on copyright should ever be considered as being truly valid, but should always be considered to be part of that person's estate and be universally treated as such? This, I submit should be the only truly just practice to be adopted, commonly known, and universally understood.</p>