

Peter Evans
44/46 Morrison Street
Redcliffe 6104 WA.
4479 5496

(date) 27.12.04

①

(Submission) Patents and Experiments
options paper ⁴⁵⁰

Dear / Sir / Maddam?

Overall the options paper is clear on many issues and definitions and is of a very good standard.

The only concerns that I have is in regards to the guiding principles, for example the statement "that the overriding requirement that only changes are not in conflict with Australia's international treaty obligations". A clear definition of what is meant to be a conflict of interest is needed?

The mounting of innovation as the primary driver for economic growth is a concern for how is innovation defined?

The idea of having courts to decide certain issues is a good idea.

option

C = the issues of providing clarity to reduce inefficiencies is necessary.

CI = An increased scope for courts to interpret definitions contrary to Acort interests is defensibly necessary.

(C/2) The Formulation of Examples and Guidelines may be difficult
But I feel some Form of Guidelines and Examples are necessary.

(C6) Needs more detailed in determining the Scope of any exemption Claims made.

(C7) should also have exemptions and the Viability of all Social-Significant qualities included in the Recommendation.

* The ACIP preferred options of (C1) and (C8) are quite OK.

The Idea of Compulsory Licensing is a very good idea p(58)
As mentioned the Compulsory Licensing of (I/P) Structures patents at cheap affordable rates with a patent watchdog is a very good idea.

This idea can run in conjunction with pre/grant and post grant Mechanisms

A clearer Definition of Exploit is needed in regards to patents.

patent Law must run in conjunction with any Social-Significant Issues that arise out of Commercial I/P patenting
This is necessary for Human beings survival.

Thank you for your Time / P.A. Evans