Open letter to Italian patent office and to the minister of economic development.

Open letter to Italian patent office and to the minister of economic development.

Santa Maria Capua Vetere, 22/ 06/2015

Subject: Procedure for examination patent application no. CE2014A000011 filed on 03/09/2014 entitled marine floating platforms with suspended pumping stations for down and upwelling.

Dear Sirs,

with reference to the ministerial letter dated 14 / 05 / 2015. Prot. N.0068889, received on 09/06/2015, the present is intended to clarify the position of the undersigned. He pressed that has already sent an email to justification on 15.06.2015, through your call center, and had a clarification phone with your engineer. ……. in which he explained that he never received your ministerial 12/12/2014 prot. 0219747 which he would not respond. Instead, he has received the ministerial 13/10/2014 prot. No. 0178342, which has regularly responded by registered letter, as confirmed by your ing …….. As above, your refusal as correct from the point of view, it should be considered unfair. However, the undersigned, is not intended to undergo bureaucratic appeal procedure that would penalize quadrupling filing costs, excluding all other

expenses that would result. For use against whom? We should not be on the same side? The undersigned is only a pensioner and has never profited from his inventions, which address issues of public interest, as in the present case. If his inventions, until now, have not been realized it is due mainly to public bodies, which, not only do not develop ideas for global protection of the environment, but also hinder them by their silence, even when they exceed the patent exams. To these difficulties, in this case, were added inefficiencies of post offices. But if it is true that an examiner has too many questions to be examined, it is also true that not all patent applications have the same growth potential for the country. The undersigned thinks that this patent application deserved an email or a phone call in addition to the letter of notice with no appeal. In fact, the proposed system could be one of the most important inventions for the purpose of sustainable and to combat acidification and global warming. Whoever it may be viewed on the website http://www.spawhe.eu, in Italian and English, along with many other patents, largely fallen. To the state of, internationally, there is no other system that could bring to the surface nutrients in the oceans to create phytoplankton and zooplankton and at the same time increase the alkalinity that industrial development has done wrong to lose to the marine waters.

It should not be a case that the patent offices are located within the Ministries of Economic Development of the different countries. But myself who proposed at least two dozen patents in the public interest, a filing European patent and even four international patents, has never noticed any benefit from this strategic location. At least in Italy and in Europe. It should be obvious that the patents of “public utility” of private inventors, not associated with any company and no entity, they are all Italian. Just for that should have a fast track. In addition, cost less, not having to pay thousands of hours of work, research and other expenses to develop them. Instead

inventors are left alone, especially by those who would gain the most benefits: Ministry of economic development, environment, energy. They must seek trading partners, although propose structural solutions that go against the individual interests of private companies. Beyond the personal kindness of some examiner, as a citizen who wants to participate with his experience to improve the environmental and energy systems, he found no institutional collaborations, nor to the ministry of economic development, nor in the environment, in the regions and even in the European institutions. Having said that, in this case, beyond the formal errors that may have been there and that the undersigned has already tried to correct, on his own initiative, attached the claims rewritten in Italian and in English, so you cancel your measure. To you it costs nothing to cancel a hasty decision, but it would cost much opposition to the undersigned. Probably, would serve little, because the patent for the utility for the country, will die too, if other public or private entities not intervene, but at least, we can say that in Italian patent office there are no bureaucrats, but men and women who understand and frankly, the undersigned, have always appreciated, especially, for the advice received.

The undersigned, at most, would be available to deposit again the patent application but can not, having the same idea entered a European public competition, which is still in progress. It makes no sense to receive a prize for the idea, while filing patent has refused to blame of the Italian post office and the bureaucracy that does not prevent the loss of a letter, with current computer systems. ntellectual property as it is conceived, internationally, only protects the industrialists that they can pay, while it is a mockery of private inventors, especially when dealing with environmental issues, global and structural, not commercial. Knowing how to work in private industry and public bodies, the undersigned is

aware that neither of these currently are in a position to propose global solutions for environmental protection. He was also aware of the difficulties that would meet to push through their own solutions. However, he believed, and considers that the world may know environmental solutions alternatives to those proposed by multinationals, which for commercial reasons do not address the problems globally. In the absence of public solutions that go in this direction, the undersigned has tried to do what he could. It is confidently awaiting your decision. But if the bureaucracy does not allow exceptions, meanwhile it will publish on its website and facebook the reasons for rejection of the patent application, in the hope, unlikely, that an Italian public body, take out the money for the appeal in a timely manner (within on 09.08.2015) against the Ministry of Economic Development to defend the forfeiture of patent useful to the development of the country and the global environmental protection. The situation is paradoxical but it must be highlighted. Are not unjustified the concerns of the Pope, who without mincing words believes that governments, science, the economy, are not doing enough to protect the global environment and for greater equity in the distribution of wealth. But the complaints however authoritative as those of the Pope, are of little use unless it is proved that can be done better, when designing industrial, environmental, urban, agricultural, energy. Anyone who has read the content of the patent application in question, can not believe that the inventor has decided to do it all alone. As always after the filing of patent sought stakeholders, especially public that they should propose these patents, without ever having found. Not their fault, but of those who believe environmental design to researchers who focus on individual disciplines, while are needed synergies or interrelated experiences. On this subject, the undersigned has already given. Now it’s up to others. Especially to the Ministry of Economic Development, which opposes formal procedures, ranging is respected, but without losing sight of the essence of the engine of development, which are the ideas. Which instead they are mortified. To

myself, who can not afford the economic cost of the property, unjustly, called intellectual, and that is content with the moral, it has happened that other important patent applications in the public interest, the most fortunate in the preliminary and definitive Italian European, have been made available to Italy and the European Commission, asking nothing in return. No one took the opportunity, preferring plants that do not produce the wrong welfare and escaping the comparison. Paradoxically, in this case, with rejection at an early stage, the inventor was luckier. It has been spared the costs of the extension of the European or international search interlocutors public outside the country, too, very hard to find.

Thank you.

Best regards

Luigi Antonio Pezone