

June 23, 2020

**VIA REGULATIONS.GOV (Docket No. USTR–2020–0020)**

Edward Gresser  
Chair of the Trade Policy Staff Committee  
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative  
600 17th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20508

**Re: “2020 AGOA Eligibility Review”—South Africa, Nigeria, Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda—IIPA’s Written Comments on the Annual Review of Country Eligibility for Benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, 85 Fed. Reg. 28695 (May 13, 2020)**

To the Trade Policy Staff Committee:

The International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA) submits these comments in response to the May 13, 2020 request for public comments by the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGO) Implementation Subcommittee of the Trade Policy Staff Committee, chaired by the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, in connection with the review of the eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries to receive AGOA benefits.

**A. Description of the IIPA and its Members**

IIPA is a private sector coalition, formed in 1984, of trade associations representing U.S. copyright-based industries working to improve copyright protection and enforcement abroad and to open foreign markets closed by piracy and other market access barriers. Members of the IIPA include: Association of American Publishers ([www.publishers.org](http://www.publishers.org)), Entertainment Software Association ([www.theesa.com](http://www.theesa.com)), Independent Film & Television Alliance ([www.ifta-online.org](http://www.ifta-online.org)), Motion Picture Association ([www.motionpictures.org](http://www.motionpictures.org)), and Recording Industry Association of America ([www.riaa.com](http://www.riaa.com)).

Collectively, IIPA’s five member associations represent over 3,200 U.S. companies producing and distributing copyrightable content. The materials produced and distributed by IIPA member companies include: entertainment software (including interactive video games for consoles, handheld devices, personal computers and the Internet) and educational software; motion pictures, television programming, DVDs and home video and digital representations of audiovisual works; music recorded in all formats (from digital files to CDs and vinyl) for streaming and other online services as well as broadcasting, public performance and synchronization in audiovisual

materials; and fiction and non-fiction books, educational, instructional and assessment materials, and professional and scholarly journals, databases and software in all formats.

Historically, the U.S. copyright-based industries have been one of the fastest-growing and most dynamic sectors of the U.S. economy.<sup>1</sup> Inexpensive and accessible reproduction technologies, however, make it easy for copyrighted materials to be pirated in other countries, including in the online environment. IIPA's goals abroad include for foreign countries to adopt copyright laws and enforcement regimes that keep pace with market and technological trends to encourage the creation and dissemination of copyright materials, and to deter piracy of unauthorized materials in these countries. Such strong and effective copyright laws and enforcement regimes create a framework for trade in creative products, foster technological and cultural development, and encourage investment and employment in the creative industries.

## **B. AGOA and the Protection and Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights**

As sub-Saharan Africa economies develop, governments should look to intellectual property law and enforcement mechanisms that can incentivize their own creative industries and foster economic growth and stability. Unfortunately, as the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) noted in a recent report, piracy is a “widespread issue for rights holders operating in [the sub-Saharan Africa] market” and “poor administration of copyright regimes is a common issue in the key markets.”<sup>2</sup> The U.S. Government's AGOA review is one of only a few regularly occurring opportunities to examine intellectual property protection and enforcement in AGOA-eligible countries and to provide guidance to make these mechanisms more effective. IIPA appreciates the opportunity to participate in the process.

Internet use in Africa has skyrocketed. According to Internet World Stats, in December 2019 there were 526.7 million users in Africa, up 11,567% since 2000. Nigeria was estimated to have 126 million users, South Africa was estimated to have 32.6 million users, and Kenya was estimated to have 46.9 million users. This impressive technological growth, unfortunately, is accompanied by illegitimate activities that will hamper legitimate economic growth if left unchecked. To effectively ensure a safe, healthy, and sustainable digital marketplace, AGOA-eligible countries should assess whether their legal regimes are capable of responding to today's challenges, including rampant online piracy.

For the copyright industries to flourish in AGOA-eligible markets, these countries need to: (i) have copyright laws that meet high standards of protection; (ii) provide efficient copyright enforcement and sound legal structures to enable healthy licensing of works and recordings; and

---

<sup>1</sup>See Stephen E. Siwek, *Copyright Industries in the U.S. Economy: The 2018 Report* (December 6, 2018) available at: <https://iipa.org/reports/copyright-industries-us-economy/>. Based on 2017 data, this study found that the “core” copyright industries in the U.S. outpaced the U.S. economy, growing at 5.23% between 2014 and 2017, while the U.S. economy grew by 2.21%. The core copyright industries generated over \$1.3 trillion dollars of economic output in 2017, accounting for 6.85% of the entire economy. Core copyright industries are those whose primary purpose is to create, produce, distribute, or exhibit copyright materials.

<sup>2</sup>U.S. International Trade Commission, “U.S. Trade and Investment with Sub-Saharan Africa: Recent Trends and New Developments,” Investigation No. 332-571, March 2020 [hereinafter USITC Africa Report], 172, <https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/pub5043.pdf>.

(iii) eliminate market access barriers and unfair competitive practices. Markets with these features also will help AGOA-eligible countries to develop, nurture, and enjoy the fruits of their own cultural and creative output. The ongoing implementation of the African Continental Free Trade Agreement provides an important opportunity to reinforce these principles and ensure the continent enjoys the benefits of adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights.

These principles are echoed by two WIPO studies conducted in 2013 and 2014 concerning the creative industries in Kenya, Burkina Faso, and Senegal. Among the recommendations from the two studies were the following: Greater respect for contracts, as “contracts are in many cases non-existent [in Kenya], which as such is a hurdle for the audiovisual industry to become more professional;” ratification and implementation of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) (collectively, the WIPO Internet Treaties), which should be “urgently considered as Internet legal and illegal distribution is rapidly changing the market;” and “a concerted effort against audiovisual piracy in both East-Africa and West-Africa,” which “would have a positive effect on the market.”<sup>3</sup>

Unfortunately, in AGOA-eligible markets rights holders and copyright-dependent services generally confront inadequate and ineffective copyright protection, deficient local laws, weak enforcement, and market access barriers (or other discriminatory or unfair competitive practices). These shortcomings enable parties to engage in piracy, some on a commercial scale, because it is a high-profit, low risk enterprise, unencumbered by the considerable costs associated with either producing and licensing works, or protecting them against theft.

IIPA highlights below serious concerns with copyright law reform efforts in **Nigeria, Kenya, and South Africa**, as well as some positive indications of improvements in copyright protection and enforcement in **Nigeria, Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda**.

The protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights are important prerequisites for AGOA eligibility.<sup>4</sup> The adequate and effective protection and enforcement of copyright is the foundation on which both U.S. and local creators and investors base their production and distribution activities in AGOA-eligible markets. Creators from AGOA beneficiary countries recognize the importance of adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement to incentivize investment in the production of cultural works, and allow local artists to sustain their livelihoods. There is no shortage of news reports that highlight local artists struggling to make a

---

<sup>3</sup>See Tarja Koskinen-Olsson, “STUDY ON COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION OF RIGHTS AND COLLECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF RIGHTS IN THE AUDIOVISUAL SECTOR”, WIPO Committee on Development and Intellectual Property, August 12, 2014. [https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip\\_14/cdip\\_14\\_inf\\_2.pdf](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip_14/cdip_14_inf_2.pdf); and Bertrand Moullier, Benoit Muller, “SCOPING STUDY ON STRENGTHENING AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE AUDIOVISUAL SECTOR IN BURKINA FASO AND CERTAIN AFRICAN COUNTRIES”, WIPO Committee on Development and Intellectual Property, September 25, 2013, [https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip\\_12/cdip\\_12\\_inf\\_3.pdf](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip_12/cdip_12_inf_3.pdf).

<sup>4</sup>See AGOA Section 104(a)(1)(C)(ii) (19 U.S.C. § 3703(a)(1)(C)(ii)) and AGOA Section 111 (adding Section 506A to the Trade Act of 1974 authorizing the President to designate AGOA eligible countries if he determines they meet the criteria of AGOA Section 104 and the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) country eligibility criteria of Section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974, including Section 502(c)(5) (19 U.S.C. § 2462(c)(5))).

living in the face of widespread piracy in sub-Saharan Africa.<sup>5</sup> One story quotes a Cameroonian saxophonist, referring to the proliferation of pirated content across Africa, stating simply: “Who is paying the price? Right now it’s the artists.”<sup>6</sup> In addition to economic and cultural benefits, adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights importantly supports good governance principles, including rule of law, judicial independence, control of corruption, and political stability.<sup>7</sup>

As a key element to AGOA eligibility, it is crucial that AGOA beneficiaries demonstrate some progress toward the adequate and effective protection of intellectual property. We urge the Administration to continue to consider copyright laws and enforcement practices under the intellectual property eligibility criteria of AGOA.<sup>8</sup> As IIPA has explained in previous AGOA-related filings, just what amounts to “adequate and effective” protection of intellectual property rights is a flexible measure that rightly changes over time.<sup>9</sup> The obligations of the WTO Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (“TRIPS Agreement”), which provide global minimum standards of copyright protection and enforcement, are central to this determination. Also central to the determination are the standards provided under the WIPO Internet Treaties, which contemplate many of the legal norms for a sustainable and healthy online marketplace. These treaties establish a foundation for essential legal frameworks that foster the continued growth of legitimate digital trade by providing copyright holders with a full panoply of exclusive rights in the digital networked environment to protect their valuable content.

**Nigeria** has a growing film industry, now the second largest in the world by production volume, as well as a vibrant and growing music industry.<sup>10</sup> Nigeria’s Minister of Information and

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Peace Hyde, “The Fortune and Fury Behind Nollywood,” Jan. 30, 2018, [Forbes Africa](https://www.forbesafrica.com/life/2018/01/30/fortune-fury-behind-nollywood/), <https://www.forbesafrica.com/life/2018/01/30/fortune-fury-behind-nollywood/> (quoting Kofi Ansah, an emerging Ghanaian movie producer: “Piracy works with informal networks and to be honest, there is really no fear of punishment because you hardly hear of anybody who has been arrested on the grounds of video piracy. That is where the law needs to act. Instill a fear of imprisonment and people will behave accordingly.”); Sharon Kantengwa, “Rwanda: Why Rwanda’s Hillywood Dream Is Still Elusive,” Mar. 2, 2018, [The New Times](https://allafrica.com/stories/201803020040.html), <https://allafrica.com/stories/201803020040.html> (quoting Willy Ndahiro, an actor and founder of Hillywood Actors and Modelling Agency: “Rwandan films are not well protected property rights infringement. Although the law was put in place in 2009, stakeholders have not put into account any implementation and instead movies are increasingly being pirated.”); Muhamed Bah, “Gambia: Film Makers, Actors Lament On Challenges Within the Industry,” July 6, 2018, [FOROYAA Newspaper](https://allafrica.com/stories/201807060745.html), <https://allafrica.com/stories/201807060745.html> (quoting Sheikh Tijan Sonko, a film producer, actor and entertainer: “Government must do all they can to assist them in their fight against piracy on their products; that this is the worst illegal activity that is killing their work; that they will not make any gain either for the nation or themselves, if this illegal activity continues.”).

<sup>6</sup> See Aarni Kuoppamäki, “Stolen melodies: Copyright law in Africa,” November 6, 2018, [DW.com](https://www.dw.com/en/stolen-melodies-copyright-law-in-africa/a-44149899), <https://www.dw.com/en/stolen-melodies-copyright-law-in-africa/a-44149899>.

<sup>7</sup> See USITC Africa Report at 169 (noting that evaluating the “overall IP environment” in sub-Saharan Africa requires, among other things, looking at factors including “rule of law, judicial independence, control of corruption, and political stability,” and further observing that “legal and political factors can play an important role in the IP environment” in sub-Saharan Africa).

<sup>8</sup> For AGOA intellectual property eligibility criteria, see AGOA Sections cited *supra* note 4.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., IIPA’s 2009 Public Comments in the Annual Review of AGOA Country Eligibility, available at <https://iipa.org/files/uploads/2018/01/IIPAAGOAFilingtoUSTR101909-1.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> Universal Music recently launched a division in Nigeria, and Netflix has increased its investment in Nigeria as well as other key markets in Sub-Saharan Africa. See Richard Smirke, “Universal Music Grows African Presence With

Culture, Lai Mohammed, has stated, “When we talk about diversifying the economy it is not just about agriculture or solid minerals alone, it is about the creative industry—about the films, theatre and music.”<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately, pervasive piracy remains a significant obstacle for Nigerian authors and artists, who, as a result, struggle to receive any compensation for their works.<sup>12</sup> Illustrating the problem, a Nigerian actor commenting on the decline of that country’s Hausa language film industry (known as “Kannywood”) said, “We are all not happy and surely, piracy was what destroyed us.”<sup>13</sup> In its recent report, the USITC found that piracy “remains the largest threat” to the film industry in Nigeria, citing to a 2014 Nigeria Copyright Commission (NCC) report that estimated that Nigeria lost over \$1 billion annually to film piracy.<sup>14</sup> Stronger copyright protection and enforcement are needed to support the country’s burgeoning creative sector.<sup>15</sup>

Nigeria ratified the WPPT and WCT in 2018, but it has not implemented the treaties, and, as a result, its legal regime has fallen short of international copyright norms in several key respects. A draft copyright bill, first circulated in 2015, had a number of significant deficiencies. IIPA understands that a new bill may be tabled again in 2020 to commence the copyright revision process. Nigeria needs a substantially revised bill from the 2015 draft to implement the WIPO Internet Treaties properly. For example, the 2015 legislation proposed a making available right subject only to remuneration, not as an exclusive right as set out in the WPPT. In addition, in accordance with the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (“Berne Convention”) and the TRIPS Agreement, new legislation should abolish the current copyright registration requirement (Section 23 of the Copyright Act provides for fines of up to N100,000 (US\$277) for failing to register works) to ensure registration for works or recordings is voluntary. Any new law also should provide a three-step test limitation on exceptions. Other fixes needed from the 2015 proposal: amend the provisions from 2015 that would have granted broad immunity to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) from copyright liability and include expeditious timetables for takedowns and provisions to address repeat infringers; private copying exceptions, and with them, provisions for levies, should apply only to content that is lawfully acquired—the exceptions should not be misused to operate as a license to legalize piracy; and the term of protection for sound recordings should be extended to 70 years.

---

Launch Of Nigeria Division,” July 17, 2018, Billboard, <https://www.billboard.com/articles/business/8465836/universal-music-nigeria-western-africa-ezegovic-eze>; Christopher Vourlias, “Netflix’s Head of African Originals Lays Out Streamer’s Plans for the Continent (EXCLUSIVE),” Feb. 28, 2020, Variety, <https://variety.com/2020/digital/news/netflix-head-african-originals-lays-out-plans-for-continent-1203518648/>.

<sup>11</sup> See Franck Kuwonu, “Nigeria’s ‘new oil’ export is beating the charts,” May 28, 2018, Business Report, <https://www.iol.co.za/business-report/opinion/opinion-nigerias-new-oil-export-is-beating-the-charts-15194513>.

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Dionne Searcey, “Nigeria’s Afrobeats Music Scene is Booming, but Profits Go to Pirates,” June 3, 2017, NY Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/03/world/africa/nigeria-lagos-afrobeats-music-piracy-seyi-shay.html>.

<sup>13</sup> See, Mohammed Lere, “Nigeria: Kannywood is on the Brink of Collapse – Actor,” June 24, 2019, Premium Times, <https://allafrica.com/stories/201906240774.html>.

<sup>14</sup> USITC Africa Report at 185.

<sup>15</sup> See Samuel Andrews, “Netflix Naija: creative freedom in Nigeria’s emerging digital space?,” March 19, 2020, The Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/netflix-naija-creative-freedom-in-nigerias-emerging-digital-space-133252>; Kuwonu, <https://www.iol.co.za/business-report/opinion/opinion-nigerias-new-oil-export-is-beating-the-charts-15194513>. See also Joseph Onyekwere, “Nigeria: Outdated Laws, Bane of Nigeria’s Creative Industry, Says Idigbe,” May 15, 2018, The Guardian, <https://allafrica.com/stories/201805150315.html>.



One additional concern in Nigeria is the ongoing dispute between the NCC and the collective management organization COSON Limited that is responsible for managing performance rights in musical works and sound recordings. The NCC recently announced the appointment of external auditors to conduct an audit of COSON. The music industry supports this audit, but recommends that its findings be shared with rights holders as a key step towards enabling local and international music rights holders (authors, producers and performers) to license their works and recordings effectively in Nigeria. Last, because there are a number of unlicensed online entertainment services in Nigeria, which are harming many markets outside of Nigeria, there needs to be more effective online enforcement.

The East African Community (the regional intergovernmental organization of **Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda**) passed the EAC Creative and Cultural Industries Bill of 2015, which would establish a Creative and Cultural Industries Council, whose purposes include “to enhance awareness of intellectual property rights, and consequently strengthen the foundation for successful creative and cultural industries.”<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, Tanzania has withheld its assent for this initiative, putting its future in jeopardy.<sup>17</sup> Tanzania’s continued reluctance to adopt the EAC Bill is deeply concerning; adoption of the Bill is long overdue. IIPA encourages Tanzania and the rest of the East African Community to follow through with this important commitment to incentivize its creative and cultural industries with dedicated resources and the assistance of international capacity building wherever available.

**Kenya’s** Attorney General Kihara Kariuki recently highlighted the creative industries’ contribution to Kenya’s economy, citing a study estimating the contribution to be 5.3% of GDP and stating, “The protection of the copyrights will essentially put money into the pockets of authors, producers and all creators.”<sup>18</sup> Yet Kenya’s local artists and producers are stymied by the negative impact of widespread piracy in the country, which has stunted its marketplace for creative content.<sup>19</sup> Kenya’s copyright legal and enforcement frameworks remain deficient. In 2019, Kenya enacted an amendment to its Copyright Act intended to address some of the challenges of the digital age. While the new law provides rights holders with some important protections, there are concerns regarding the scope of those protections, including whether they are consistent with international standards and best practices.

---

<sup>16</sup>See Section 6 of the Creative and Cultural Industries Bill; see also Anthony Weseka: “New regional law to protect local artistes,” Daily Monitor, Aug. 27, 2015, <http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/New-regional-law-to-protect-local-artistes/-/688334/2847294/-/15f4mkrz/-/index.html>.

<sup>17</sup>See Zephania Ubwani, “East Africa: EALA Bills Hang in the Balance After Rejection By Tanzania,” April 24, 2017, The Citizen, <https://allafrica.com/stories/201704240739.html>.

<sup>18</sup>See Anyango Otieno, “AG: Kenya to ratify copyright protection, information laws”, June 11, 2019, The Standard, <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2001329381/how-copyright-creative-works-can-boost-gdp>.

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., “DStv ‘Sambaza’ lowers pay for MultiChoice creatives,” October 30, 2019, Business Daily, <https://www.businessdailyafrica.com/corporate/companies/DStv-piracy-lowers-pay-for-MultiChoice/4003102-5330054-14kuv4bz/index.html> (Multichoice Kenya, a television producer, states that infringement “has made it hard for us to pay our talents adequately at the prevailing market rate” and is “stifling the company’s ability to pump more investments into the Kenyan economy.”); Halligan Agade, “Film industry: How to get fans back into the cinema,” January 27, 2020, CGTN Africa, <https://africa.cgtn.com/2020/01/27/film-industry-how-to-get-fans-back-into-the-cinema/> (“Film producer Michael Mwangi says the big issue is piracy and unless authorities come up with radical measures then the already low numbers in the cinema halls will continue to nosedive.”).

Kenya has announced its intention to accede to the WIPO Internet Treaties, but there has been no stated timeframe for accession.<sup>20</sup> While the recently passed copyright law amendment appears to provide many of the exclusive rights required by the Treaties, unfortunately there is uncertainty regarding the nature and scope of these protections. For example, contrary to the requirements of the WPPT, the law does not expressly include public performance as part of the right of communication to the public, and it does not expressly define the making available right. The Government of Kenya should revise the law to ensure that the exclusive rights of public performance and making available are fully and explicitly protected, consistent with the WPPT. Also in accordance with the WPPT, the definition of “publication” in Kenya’s law should be revised to clarify that protections for exclusive rights apply to all sound recordings, including those “born digital” that are not released in physical formats.

Kenya’s copyright law creates uncertainty regarding the rights of communication to the public and broadcasting regarding sound recordings and audiovisual works. Although the law protects these rights as exclusive rights, Article 30A provides only a right of remuneration for the communication to the public and broadcasting of sound recordings and audiovisual works. This ambiguity should be resolved to clarify that these important rights are exclusive, in accordance with international standards. In addition, as discussed below, the law should also clarify that exclusive rights should not be subject to management by Collective Management Organizations (CMOs), unless rights holders expressly authorize a CMO to manage their rights on a voluntary basis and, in that case, only in accordance with the terms of that authorization.

Kenya’s legal framework for CMOs falls well short of international standards and best practices. For example, rights holders are unable to voluntarily establish CMOs, nor do they have the right to withdraw from existing CMOs. Moreover, government intervention has undermined rights holders’ freedom to contract and control over their works and sound recordings. The rate-setting process for royalties is non-transparent, arbitrary, and unaccountable to rights holders. As a result, royalty rates are not set according to the commercial value of the use of the rights. Furthermore, there is considerable uncertainty regarding rights holders’ share of revenues collected by CMOs, and there are also concerns regarding CMO governance. IIPA encourages the U.S. government to work intensively with the Government of Kenya to correct the extensive problems with CMOs, and encourages the Government of Kenya to work with the creative industries to develop an effective collective management system.

In 2020, an interagency task force in Kenya proposed draft intellectual property legislation that included extensive provisions on copyright protection and enforcement. While IIPA applauds the Government of Kenya’s efforts to upgrade its copyright legal framework, the draft legislation fails to address many of the concerns outlined above. Moreover, certain provisions—including regarding scope of protections, term of protection, technological protection measures (TPMs), exceptions and limitations, intermediary safe harbors, and collective management—fall short of the requirements of the Berne Convention, the WIPO Internet Treaties, and/or international best practices. IIPA hopes the Government of Kenya will address concerns raised by the copyright

---

<sup>20</sup>Kenya’s Attorney General recently affirmed that the government “is considering ratification of the WIPO Internet Treaties.” See Anyango Otieno, “AG: Kenya to ratify copyright protection, information laws”, June 11, 2019, The Standard, <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2001329381/how-copyright-creative-works-can-boost-gdp>.

industries to ensure Kenya meets its international commitments and complies with international norms.

**South Africa's** current legal regime fails to provide adequate and effective protection of copyrighted materials. IIPA applauds President Ramaphosa for recently referring two bills that would further weaken that legal regime back to Parliament for redrafting. If enacted, these bills would violate South Africa's international obligations (including obligations under the Berne Convention and the TRIPS Agreement) and would result in a clear lack of adequate and effective intellectual property rights protection. The bills are also inconsistent with obligations of the WIPO Internet Treaties. South Africa's Cabinet has approved the country's accession to these treaties, but at present, South Africa remains just a signatory, and not yet a member of either the WCT or WPPT. In November 2019, the U.S. Government initiated a review of South Africa's eligibility as a Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) beneficiary developing country based on IIPA's petition outlining the inconsistency of the bills and South Africa's copyright legal and enforcement regimes with the GSP criteria to provide "adequate and effective protection" of U.S. copyrighted materials.<sup>21</sup> Attached as an appendix to this submission is the South Africa country report of IIPA's 2020 Special 301 submission to USTR, which includes a full description of the deficiencies in the two pending bills, as well as other deficiencies in South Africa's legal and enforcement regimes.

Significant reforms are needed to South Africa's Copyright Law and Performers' Protection Act in order to bring the country's legal framework into compliance with international agreements, including the TRIPS Agreement, and the WIPO Internet Treaties. For example, South Africa lacks basic protections required to enable trade in copyrighted materials for the digital environment. This includes the right of copyright owners to control the distribution of copies of their works and sound recordings, and to control the manner in which their works and sound recordings are communicated to the public. South Africa also lacks adequate protections for TPMs, which foster many of the innovative products and services available online by allowing creators to control and manage access to copyrighted works (for example, via streaming services), and to diversify products and services. At the same time, TPMs enable consumers to enjoy desired content on a variety of platforms, in many different formats, and at a time of their choosing. In addition, South Africa's legal regime does not provide adequate civil remedies or criminal penalties to allow rights holders to recover their losses from infringement or to deter piracy. Without an adequate means to remedy infringement or deter piracy, the path for legitimate services to operate is difficult.

In 2017, a Copyright Amendment Bill (CAB) was introduced, which was preceded by a Performers' Protection Amendment Bill (PPAB), intended to bring South Africa's laws into compliance with international agreements. However, as IIPA detailed in extensive comments to the Portfolio Committee of the National Assembly of the South African Parliament, these bills fell far short of international norms for the protection of copyrighted works in the digital era. Following criticism from many local and foreign rights holder groups, including IIPA, the Portfolio

---

<sup>21</sup>See Generalized System of Preferences (GSP): Notice Regarding a Hearing for Country Practice Reviews of Azerbaijan, Ecuador, Georgia, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Thailand, South Africa, and Uzbekistan, and for the Country Designation Review of Laos, 84 Fed. Reg. 63955 (Nov. 19, 2019).



Committee undertook a revision of the bills, culminating at the end of 2018 in revised versions of the CAB and the PPAB.

Unfortunately, the revisions of the CAB and the PPAB addressed only a few discrete problems; many of the most problematic provisions for rights holders carried over to the new versions. Moreover, even more troubling provisions were introduced in the new versions. This process transpired without adequate consultation with the public. Where opportunity for public consultations was provided, comments submitted by rights holders apparently were disregarded entirely. These two highly problematic bills were adopted by the National Assembly in December 2018, and by the National Council of the Provinces in March 2019; but, as noted above, in June 2020 the President referred the bills back to the National Assembly.

The list of rights holders' concerns with these bills is long. Many provisions lack clarity and will undermine the creation, licensing and dissemination of copyrighted materials in South Africa. Adoption of this legislation risks major negative disruption of the creative industries, and will ultimately harm the creators and producers of copyrighted materials that the legislation is purported to protect (which is why there have been demonstrations in South Africa by local rights holders against the bills). In sum, the legislation falls far short of needed legal reforms to improve the South African marketplace for copyright creators and producers, and ultimately may harm consumers as well if rights holders are unable to continue in the marketplace. If these bills enter into force, South Africa's copyright framework would move even further away from providing adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights.

Some of the immediate and primary issues of concern with the two bills include:

- The bills would severely restrict the freedom of rights holders to contract in the open market, which is a key factor for the healthy growth of the entire creative sector. These restrictions would fundamentally impair the value of copyrighted materials by depriving rights holders of the ability to license and otherwise derive value from their copyrighted works and sound recordings. For example, both the CAB and the PPAB limit certain assignments of rights to a maximum of 25 years, and both bills provide ministerial powers to set standard and compulsory contractual terms for contracts covering seemingly any transfer or use of rights.
- The bills would create an overbroad amalgamation of copyright exceptions and limitations that includes a more expansive version of the U.S. "fair use" rubric appended to a proliferation of extremely open-ended new exceptions and limitations to copyright protection (on top of "fair dealing" provisions), resulting in a vast and unclear thicket of exceptions and limitations.
- Rather than providing a robust legal framework for the protection of creative works within which private parties can freely negotiate the terms of their relationships, the bills would overly regulate the relationship between creative parties, which will undermine the digital marketplace and severely limit the ability of rights holders to exercise exclusive rights in their copyrighted works and sound recordings. For example, the bills include mandates for

the mode of remuneration for audiovisual performers, to the detriment of both performers and producers.

- The bills would not provide adequate criminal and civil remedies for infringement, including online piracy, and would deny rights holders the ability to effectively enforce their rights against infringers, thus thwarting the development of legitimate markets for copyrighted works and sound recordings.
- The bills' provisions on TPMs are inadequate, and overbroad exceptions to prohibitions on the circumvention of such measures will further impinge on the ability of legitimate markets for copyrighted materials to launch and develop.

These provisions are inconsistent with South Africa's international obligations, far exceeding the scope of exceptions and limitations permitted under the TRIPS Agreement (Article 13) and the Berne Convention (Article 9). Moreover, aspects of both bills are incompatible with the WIPO Internet Treaties. The incompatibility of these provisions with a healthy, sustainable and fair digital marketplace for creators, both domestic and foreign, runs afoul of the AGOA eligibility criteria to provide "adequate and effective protection" of intellectual property rights.

Furthermore, this legislative process is occurring against a backdrop of increasing online piracy in South Africa. Growth in bandwidth speeds, coupled with lax controls over corporate and university bandwidth abuse, drive this piracy. In addition, piracy devices (i.e., set-top boxes equipped with apps for accessing pirated content) and sticks pre-loaded with infringing content or apps, continue to grow in popularity in South Africa. Enforcement in South Africa is not, at present, adequate or effective. To facilitate a healthy online ecosystem, South Africa should appoint cybercrime inspectors and develop a cybercrime security hub recognizing copyright as one of its priorities.

### **C. Request for Review of Conditions in Sub-Saharan Africa**

IIPA requests that the Administration continue to assess the progress of AGOA-eligible governments in legislative measures and enforcement of copyright protections, and to identify those countries that could benefit from U.S. assistance in capacity building to meet the requirement to provide "adequate and effective" protection of intellectual property rights (IPR). Such an exercise would further benefit both AGOA-eligible nationals and U.S. companies seeking to do business in those nations by creating better conditions for creators, thereby encouraging economic development, cultural diversity and the rule of law.

Widespread online copyright piracy remains a very serious problem among all African countries. As a result, many copyright-based sectors and companies may still be reluctant to invest in these smaller markets where piracy is, in effect, out of control. As AGOA-eligible countries consider reforms to their copyright systems, they should be encouraged to work with stakeholders and the U.S. Government, while mindful of the requirement to provide adequate and effective protection of IPR under AGOA.

Several AGOA-eligible countries have either enacted legislation or are considering the implementation of the WIPO Internet Treaties. So far, eleven countries in sub-Saharan Africa have deposited their instruments to join the WCT and the WPPT: **Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Senegal, Togo, and Nigeria**. While **Kenya, Namibia, and South Africa** signed the WCT and WPPT between 1996 and 1997, these three important AGOA-eligible countries have yet to ratify or implement either of the treaties.

IIPA recommends that USTR require, as part of the annual review process, that the eligible AGOA countries provide an update on the status of their current copyright legislation as well as their plans, if any, to amend their copyright legislation and to accede to relevant international instruments. Such information would be most useful in advance of the determination of the recommendations for AGOA eligibility.

As noted above, South Africa's CAB and the PPAB are riddled with problematic and troublesome provisions that run afoul of international norms and would, if enacted, result in international treaty violations, stifle opportunities to invest in South Africa's creative economy, and, importantly, place South Africa out of compliance with AGOA's eligibility criteria. In addition, USTR should monitor legislative reform efforts in Kenya and Nigeria and engage with these governments to ensure the resulting copyright legal frameworks meet AGOA's eligibility criteria.

## CONCLUSION

IIPA appreciates this opportunity to provide the TPSC and the AGOA Subcommittee with our views on the AGOA. It is essential that the annual AGOA review remain an opportunity to evaluate the progress of its beneficiaries toward meeting their intellectual property rights criteria, and to identify opportunities to enhance IPR protection and thereby expand economic development. It is also essential to undertake reviews of the conditions in such countries to determine if capacity building assistance can make a difference. We look forward to working with you to foster improved copyright protection in sub-Saharan Africa as a region.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Rosenbaum  
Counsel

International Intellectual Property Alliance

# SOUTH AFRICA

## INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALLIANCE (IIPA) 2020 SPECIAL 301 REPORT ON COPYRIGHT PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

**Special 301 Recommendation:** IIPA recommends that USTR place South Africa on the Priority Watch List in 2020.<sup>1</sup> IIPA further recommends that through the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) review, the U.S. Government continue to send a clear message that the Copyright Amendment Bill (CAB) and the Performers' Protection Amendment Bill (PPAB) are fatally flawed, and work with the South African Government to remedy the deficiencies in South Africa's legal and enforcement regimes, including by redrafting the bills to address the serious concerns detailed below and in IIPA's previous submissions. If, at the conclusion of the review, South Africa has not made requisite improvements, the U.S. Government should suspend or withdraw GSP benefits to South Africa, in whole or in part.

**Executive Summary:** South Africa's current copyright protection and enforcement framework is not up to the challenges of the digital age. New technologies are providing South Africa's consumers with increasing access to legitimate creative content and exciting opportunities for the growth of the copyright industries and all creators. Unfortunately South Africa's inadequate response to growing piracy enabled by these same technologies threatens to undermine this progress. An important emerging market and a dominant economy in sub-Saharan Africa, South Africa is uniquely positioned to demonstrate how a modern copyright regime can contribute to the growth of creative industries in an era of rapid digital and mobile expansion throughout the country and the region. It is now more important than ever to maintain and expand proper incentives for investment in the creation of original material—motion pictures, music, video games, books and journals in all formats—by ensuring that rights holders enjoy, in law and practice, exclusive rights that enable them to securely disseminate their content and develop new legitimate services. IIPA is encouraged that South Africa's government has stated its commitment to protecting intellectual property and its desire to bring its laws into compliance with international treaties and commitments.

IIPA is seriously concerned, however, about two bills that are sitting on the President's desk, which are not only inconsistent with the WIPO Internet Treaties (WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT)), but, if enacted, would also violate South Africa's obligations under the TRIPS Agreement, potentially violate South Africa's Constitution, and move South Africa even further away from international norms. Since 2015, South Africa has embarked on a project to update and amend its Copyright Act and Performers' Protection Act, which, after numerous revisions, resulted in two fundamentally problematic bills—the CAB and the PPAB. These bills raise many concerns, including that they undermine the potential of the modern marketplace because they fail to establish a clear legal framework—particularly in the digital arena where the potential for growth is most evident. Many of these defects stem from an approach that focuses on government interference in negotiations and the distribution of revenue from licensing, rather than on laying a foundation for a vibrant free market in creative materials. A number of troubling issues in the bills have clear potential to drive a formal challenge in the Constitutional Court. Among these, the bills' inadequate protections for trade of copyrighted works and sound recordings in the digital environment would render South Africa's law incompatible with the very standards the government has stated an intention to implement.

Considerable work remains to make the bills acceptable and frankly, implementable in practice, and the full extent of the clarifications needed to establish a robust system of copyright incentives through amendments to the Copyright Act go beyond those raised in this report. The bills require redrafting, not only to address their deficiencies as outlined by multiple stakeholders, but also to reduce ambiguity and thereby establish greater certainty in the law

---

<sup>1</sup>For more details on South Africa's Special 301 history, see previous years' reports at <https://iipa.org/reports/reports-by-country/>. For the history of South Africa's Special 301 placement, see <https://iipa.org/files/uploads/2020/02/2020SPEC301HISTORICALCHART.pdf>.



for rights holders and users alike. As currently drafted, the bills would put South African creators and artists at a serious disadvantage relative to their counterparts in other countries. Considering the importance of the task of modernizing South Africa's Copyright Act, and the degree of concern raised by the creative industries with the current bills, IIPA recommends that the U.S. Government continue to send a clear message that the proposed bills are fundamentally flawed and should be returned to Parliament due to fundamental reservations regarding their constitutionality (as has been raised by local creators and copyright owners) for redrafting to address the concerns of *all* stakeholders and ensure the provisions comply with international agreements.

## **PRIORITY ACTIONS REQUESTED IN 2020**

- Redraft the CAB and the PPAB to make them implementable, ensure compatibility with international agreements and commitments, and avoid undermining the existing commercial practices of the creative industries.
- Engage in effective enforcement against online piracy, including by appointing cybercrime investigators and developing a cybercrime security hub recognizing copyright as a priority.
- Ratify and fully implement the WIPO Internet Treaties.
- Monitor implementation of 4G and 5G networks to ensure it does not lead to a higher level of piracy, and improve education and increase enforcement commensurate to the increased threat.

## **COPYRIGHT LAW IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Significant reforms are needed to South Africa's Copyright Law and Performers' Protection Act in order to bring the country's laws into compliance with international agreements, including TRIPS, and the WIPO Internet Treaties.<sup>2</sup>

In 2017, a CAB was introduced, which was preceded by a PPAB, intended to bring South Africa's laws into compliance with international agreements. However, as IIPA detailed in extensive comments to the Portfolio Committee of the National Assembly of the South African Parliament, these bills fell far short of international norms for the protection of copyrighted works in the digital era. Following criticism from many local and foreign rights holder groups, including IIPA, the Portfolio Committee undertook a revision of the bills, culminating at the end of 2018 in revised versions of the CAB and the PPAB.

Unfortunately, the revisions of the CAB and the PPAB addressed only a few discrete problems; many of the most problematic provisions for rights holders carried over to the new versions. Moreover, even more troubling provisions were introduced in the new versions. This process transpired without adequate consultation with the public. Where opportunity for public consultations was provided, comments submitted by rights holders apparently were disregarded entirely. These two highly problematic bills were adopted by the National Assembly in December 2018, and by the National Council of the Provinces in March 2019. At the time of this filing, the bills continue to await Presidential assent.

While there seems to be some consideration of the bills in process at the Presidential level, the bills contain many provisions that lack clarity, risk major negative disruption of the creative industries, pose significant harm to the creators they purport to protect, and fall far short of needed reforms. Major issues of immediate and primary concern to the copyright industries are the following:

- The bills would severely restrict the freedom of rights holders to contract in the open market, which is a key factor for the healthy growth of the entire creative sector. These restrictions would fundamentally impair the value of copyrighted materials by depriving rights holders of the ability to license and otherwise derive value from their copyrighted works and sound recordings. For example, both the CAB and the PPAB limit certain

---

<sup>2</sup>South Africa's Cabinet recently approved the country's accession to the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT), the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) (collectively, the "WIPO Internet Treaties"), and the Beijing Treaty.



assignments of rights to a maximum of 25 years, and both bills provide ministerial powers to set standard and compulsory contractual terms for contracts covering seemingly any transfer or use of rights.

- The bills would create an overbroad amalgamation of copyright exceptions that includes a more expansive version of the U.S. “fair use” rubric appended to a proliferation of extremely open-ended new exceptions and limitations to copyright protection (on top of “fair dealing” provisions), resulting in a vast and unclear thicket of exceptions and limitations.
- The bills would overly regulate the relationship between creative parties, including mandating the mode of remuneration for audiovisual performers, which would undermine the digital marketplace and severely limit the ability of rights holders to exercise exclusive rights in their copyrighted works and sound recordings, rather than providing a robust legal framework for the protection of creative works within which private parties could freely negotiate the terms of their relationships.
- The bills would not provide adequate criminal and civil remedies for infringement, including online piracy, and would deny rights holders the ability to effectively enforce their rights against infringers, thus thwarting the development of legitimate markets for copyrighted works and sound recordings.
- The bills’ provisions on technological protection measures are inadequate, and overbroad exceptions to prohibitions on the circumvention of such measures will further impinge on the ability of legitimate markets for copyrighted materials to launch and develop.

These provisions are inconsistent with South Africa’s international obligations, far exceeding the scope of exceptions and limitations permitted under the World Trade Organization Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement (the “WTO TRIPS Agreement”) (Article 13) and the Berne Convention (Article 9). Moreover, aspects of both bills are incompatible with the WIPO Internet Treaties.

## **2018 COPYRIGHT AMENDMENT BILL (CAB) AND PERFORMERS’ PROTECTION AMENDMENT BILL (PPAB)**

Beyond their individual failings, the two bills suffer from fundamental systemic failings that are not amenable to discrete fixes. Rather than incentivize new creative output, many of the proposals in the CAB and the PPAB are based on a false premise, i.e., that there is a fixed market for works and that the government’s role is to regulate the internal relationships of the creative community, and their authorized distributors. This premise is incorrect, and will instead result in a stagnation of South Africa’s cultural community. Without a fundamental reset of its copyright reform process, South Africa will be taking a step backward in its effort to strengthen copyright incentives. South Africa would be better served by providing clear and unencumbered rights, and minimal restrictions on contractual freedoms, to allow the creative communities to increase investment to meet the growing demand for creative works of all kinds, in all formats, at all price points. This is important particularly in the context of the President’s clear objective to improve levels of foreign direct investment, as well as the imperative to improve the lives and legacies of South Africa’s own artists and creators.

It is important to note that the CAB and PPAB are extremely broad-reaching documents. IIPA’s comments in this filing are not comprehensive, but instead highlight some of the major concerns for the U.S. copyright industries. It should also be noted that the bills, when read together, are incoherent. For example, Section 3B of the PPAB purports to set out the nature of copyright in sound recordings, which is already enumerated in the Copyright Act, as amended by the CAB. Thus, in addition to the very significant flaws in the bills described below, from a technical perspective, the bills are inadequate and risk introducing widespread uncertainty into South African law.

## 1. **Severe Intrusions into Contractual Freedom**

Several provisions in the CAB and the PPAB constitute severe intrusions into private contractual relations. As such, these provisions restrict how private parties can collaborate to facilitate the public's access to copyrighted works, threatening the market value of books, films, sound recordings, musical works, music videos, video games, and other works created by South African creators.

**A. Limitation on term of assignments:** Sections 22(b)(3) of the CAB and 3A(3)(c) of the PPAB limit the term of assignments for literary and musical works and performers' rights in sound recordings, respectively, to a maximum term of 25 years from the date of agreement, and in the case of performers' rights in sound recordings, provide for automatic reversion of rights to the performer after that period. These provisions raise serious concerns, including that Section 3A of the PPAB, by proposing to limit the term of contracts between performers and copyright owners to a maximum term of 25 years, would detrimentally disrupt the well-established practices of the recording industry in South Africa for the creation and use of sound recordings. This would risk serious harm to the recording industry, performers, and other creators in South Africa because a major incentive for investment would be removed through the effective halving of the term of assignment of recordings from 50 years to 25 years.

In effect, these provisions would make it impossible to clear rights in many works after 25 years, rendering these works unusable, with no one able to receive any revenues from them. Sound recordings typically involve performances from a large number of performers. The copyright owner of a sound recording (i.e., the record company) will often have a long-term relationship with the featured artist, but is far less likely to have such a relationship with, for example, a performer who entered into a one-off agreement to provide the backing vocals or other musical performances in the sound recording. Under the PPAB, each such performer would have rights that, according to Section 3A, would be transferred to the copyright owner (the record company in most cases) to enable the copyright owner to license the use of the sound recording by third parties. Yet Section 3A provides that the record company would cease to have those rights after 25 years, meaning that the record company would need to seek out thousands of performers (with whom, in the case of session or "backing" musicians, the company often has no long-term relationship) to obtain their mutual consent to an extension of the 25-year term. The inability to locate just one session musician involved in a sound recording would render the sound recording unusable, ending the revenues that come to record companies, performers, authors, or publishers from the exploitation of that recording. That cannot be the intent of this legislation.

Section 3A would have a broader negative effect on performers. Introducing new artists to the market and promoting their careers require large upfront investment from record companies, with no certainty to when, if ever, the investment will be recouped. Limiting the term of agreements between record companies and artists would increase the economic risk even further and would likely reduce the number of investments by record companies in new talent. The provision requires urgent reconsideration to avoid the serious harm that it risks causing to all participants in the South African music industry. Moreover, although audiovisual works are now excluded from this provision, its enactment would nevertheless increase legal uncertainty and introduce a disincentive to the acquisition of literary properties by film companies for adaptation into film and TV. This would ultimately inhibit financing of film projects and would jeopardize film production in South Africa.

**B. Sweeping ministerial powers to set contractual terms:** Section 39 of the CAB and Section 3A(3)(a) of the PPAB create ministerial powers to prescribe "compulsory and standard contractual terms," including setting royalty rates regarding "uses" of copyrighted works and across any form of agreement covering performers' rights. These provisions are not only unjustified, but are seemingly premised on a lack of understanding of the myriad of contractual relationships that underpin the creation of copyright content, which often comprises many different rights from various parties, and which are licensed for use by third parties in a variety of ways. Empowering ministers to impose contractual terms risks imposing a degree of rigidity into the South African creative economy that will stifle investment and innovation.

These provisions would unfortunately restrict the flexibility in transfer agreements between sound recording performers and producers. That flexibility is needed to address the varying relationships between performers and copyright owners. For example, the relationship and contractual agreement between the featured artist and the copyright owner will differ substantially from that between a performer appearing as a one-off session musician and the copyright owner. Neither performers nor copyright owners would benefit from prescribed contracts, which would inevitably fail to meet the differing needs of performers depending on their role in a sound recording. There is simply no evidence of a market failure that would justify this extensive interference into contractual relations. Furthermore, the proposals would impose unwarranted contractual formalities on all contractual partners.

**C. Mandating the mode of remuneration for audiovisual performers:** The CAB includes a proposal (Section 8A) to regulate the remuneration terms of private contractual agreements between performers and copyright owners. Even though it proposes a significant interference into private contractual arrangements, to the particular detriment of certain performers, Section 8A was never published for consultation (except for Section 8A(6)). The result is a proposal that would substantially undermine the economics and commercial practices concerning the production of audiovisual works. While Section 8A may be intended to provide appropriate remuneration to performers, in practice, the proposal would cause substantial harm to a large category of the performers who perform background roles.

Audiovisual works are comprised of performances by lead/featured performers and extra/non-featured performers. Lead or featured artists are remunerated in accordance with the terms they have negotiated with the producer, and these terms almost invariably are on a royalty basis (in addition to lump-sum advances). Extra/non-featured performers, on the other hand, are remunerated by way of lump-sum payments, typically by way of one-off contracts, rather than by way of longer-term partnerships with producers.

Unfortunately, Section 8A appears to propose removing the possibility of lump-sum payments and replacing them with royalty payments. Rather than benefitting performers, this provision would in fact result in many performers, who otherwise would receive remuneration from performing in an audiovisual work, receiving little or nothing from the exploitations of the work. This is because many creative projects are loss-making for the producer. As a consequence of proposed Section 8A, extra/non-featured performers would no longer enjoy being paid a lump sum immediately in return for their one-off performances and would instead have to wait to be remunerated on a royalty basis, which would only happen if the work in question actually succeeded in generating revenues. The current commercial practices avoid that outcome by paying extra/non-featured performers on a lump sum basis, irrespective of whether the works in which they perform succeed or not. This provision also risks a direct negative impact on investments in South African productions and a reduction in the number of South African “background” performers engaged to perform in audiovisual works.

**D. Prohibition on contractual override:** The risks posed by the CAB are further compounded by the prohibition on contractual override in Section 39B(1), which prohibits any contractual terms that deviate from the provisions of the bill, thereby removing the possibility for parties to determine their own contractual arrangements in a manner that avoids the harm caused by certain provisions of the bill.

## **2. *Inadequate Protection of Performers’ Rights***

South Africa’s intention to ratify the WIPO Internet Treaties is welcome and would represent a significant step towards establishing an appropriate legal framework. Regrettably, a number of provisions in the bills, including the level of protection afforded to certain performers’ rights, are incompatible with the treaties.

Section 5 of the PPAB sets out the rights granted to performers. In the PPAB, performers’ rights are also enumerated under Section 3. The amendments to Section 5 are therefore, in part, duplicative of Section 3. More importantly, though, Section 5(1)(b) downgrades the performers’ exclusive rights of distribution and rental to mere remuneration rights, a proposal that would be incompatible with WPPT (and the WIPO Beijing Treaty), which do not

permit these rights to be diminished to the level of mere remuneration rights. Furthermore, providing mere remuneration rights with respect to distribution and rental, subject to rate-setting by the Tribunal (Section 5(3)(b)), would prejudicially devalue these performers' rights. Experience in South Africa, and internationally, shows that Tribunal-set remuneration falls well below the commercial value of the rights licensed.

Section 5(1)(b) would also substantially and detrimentally disrupt the sale and rental of sound recordings and audiovisual works because one set of rights would be subject to private negotiation (the producers' rights), and the performers' rights would ultimately be subject to Tribunal rate-setting. The consequence would be a transfer of value from those who create and invest in recorded performances to the licensees of those performances, the latter likely ending up paying less, resulting in reduced revenues for producers to invest in South African performers.

### **3. Fair Use**

The CAB drastically expands the exceptions and limitations to copyright in South Africa's law for, among other things, educational and academic uses and uses by libraries, galleries and museums. It also allows for perpetual and unassignable claims to royalties by authors, composers, artists and filmmakers (with retrospective effect); unlimited parallel importation; and the override of contracts. The broad exceptions, which are duplicated in the PPAB, will create a disproportionate imbalance against creators and producers of copyright-protected works and undermine the predictability needed to support a robust marketplace for copyrighted works. Additionally, they appear to far exceed the scope of exceptions and limitations permitted under South Africa's international obligations, namely under Article 13 of the WTO TRIPS Agreement (and Article 9 of the Berne Convention and the corresponding provisions in the WIPO Internet Treaties). The government should be guided by a 2016 High Court decision that firmly rejected an expansive reading of South Africa's provisions on exceptions and limitations, rejecting arguments that copyright stifled freedom of expression, and holding that copyright is a constitutionally protected property interest. The case rejected any interpretation of the "public interest" that would serve to constrain copyright protection.<sup>3</sup>

While it is true the proposed "fair use" provision resembles certain aspects of the fair use statute in U.S. law, it is inaccurate to contend, as some have suggested, that South Africa is proposing to adopt U.S. fair use. South Africa's proposed broader fair use provision, along with the other proposed exceptions and limitations to copyright protection, are blatantly inconsistent with the three-step test, which is the internationally-recognized standard that confines the scope of copyright exceptions and limitations,<sup>4</sup> for the following reasons:

- First, South Africa lacks a deep and rich body of case law that, in the United States, helps to mitigate the inherent uncertainty of the scope or applicability of the fair use exception. Without the foundation of a well-developed body of case law, South Africa's untested broad fair use doctrine would only result in uncertainty for both rights holders and users on the parameters of permissible uses (since U.S. fair use is determined on a fact-intensive case-by-case basis).<sup>5</sup> Compounding this shortcoming is that high legal fees and protracted timeframes for cases in South Africa will deter and undermine efforts by rights holders to access the courts in hopes of confining this broad exception. The International Center for Law & Economics, analyzing whether the U.S. should require trading partners to adopt U.S.-style fair use, concluded that "the wholesale importation of 'fair use' into other jurisdictions without appropriate restraints may not result in a simple extension of the restrained and clearly elaborated fair use principles that exist in the U.S., but, rather,

---

<sup>3</sup>See *South African Broadcasting Corporation v. Via Vollenhoven & Appollis Independent, et al.*, Case No. 13/23293, The High Court of South Africa, Gauteng Local Division, Johannesburg (Sept. 2, 2016) <http://www.saflii.org.za/za/cases/ZAGPJHC/2016/228.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup>See, e.g., Article 13 of the TRIPS Agreement and Article 9 of the Berne Convention.

<sup>5</sup>Although a handful of countries have recently enacted fair use provisions, IIPA is not aware of any significant case law that has been developed under the fair use statutes in any of these countries.

something completely different, possibly even a system untethered from economics and established legal precedents.”<sup>6</sup>

- Second, the South Africa proposal includes language even broader than the U.S. fair use statute, which further heightens the uncertainty discussed above, and the risk that an unacceptably wide range of uses in South Africa will be considered “fair” and non-infringing. For example, the proposal includes “ensuring proper performance of public administration” as among the purposes to which fair use is applicable. Extending fair use to such undefined access and use purposes that are not included in the U.S. statute adds to the uncertainty of how South Africa’s judges will apply fair use, and the risk that they will apply the fair use doctrine well beyond the scope of its application in the United States. In addition, the South Africa proposal requires that “all relevant factors shall be taken into account, including but not limited to” the four factors imported from U.S. law. This dictate to consider “all relevant factors,” which is not affirmatively stated in U.S. law, could similarly result in a broader range of uses in South Africa considered “fair” than those permitted under U.S. law. Therefore, rather than proposing to adopt U.S. fair use, South Africa has proposed a new copyright exception, borrowing certain statutory language from the United States, while adding new and broader language, and without incorporating the corpus of U.S. jurisprudence that is integral to defining the scope of U.S. fair use and its interpretation.
- Third, the proposal retains South Africa’s existing “fair dealing” system, while expanding the impact of fair dealing exceptions by effectively removing the limiting standard of “fair practice.” It also introduces a number of extremely broad, new exceptions and limitations to copyright protection, all of which have the potential to adversely impact the legitimate market for educational texts, locally distributed works, and online works in general. A 2017 study by PricewaterhouseCoopers looked at the impact of these broad exceptions on the South African publishing industry, and predicted “significant negative consequences” would result from the adoption of the proposed fair use provision and the other broad exceptions.<sup>7</sup> Taken alone, the “fair use” and the “fair dealing” aspects of the proposed bill are each too broad. Taken together, the proposed “hybrid” model creates an unprecedented mash-up of exceptions and limitations that will deny rights holders fundamental protections that enable licensing of their copyrighted works and sound recordings, and, because the provision is drafted so unclearly, will also deny users certainty regarding what works and what uses are permissible without a license.
- Fourth, the uncertainty that will be caused by the proposed hybrid model is particularly problematic in South Africa because its legal system lacks statutory and punitive damages, which rights holders in the U.S. rely on to deter and remedy infringement, and enforcement in South Africa has been historically inadequate. As a result, bad actors in South Africa would be undeterred from taking advantage of the uncertainty created by these exceptions to infringe copyrights. A copyright system that consists of open-ended and unclear exceptions, weak affirmative rights, and non-deterrent enforcement is the archetype for inadequate and ineffective protection of intellectual property rights.
- Fifth, the risks posed by the fair use provision, and the other unclear and very broad exceptions discussed above, are further compounded by the prohibition on contractual override in Section 39B(1) (discussed below), which renders unenforceable any contractual term that prevents or restricts a use of a work or sound recording that would not infringe copyright under the Copyright Act (as amended by the CAB).

---

<sup>6</sup>See International Center for Law & Economics *Dangerous Exception: The Detrimental Effects of Including ‘Fair Use’ Copyright Exceptions in Free Trade Agreements*, 15 (2015), [http://laweconcenter.org/images/articles/dangerous\\_exception\\_final.pdf](http://laweconcenter.org/images/articles/dangerous_exception_final.pdf).

<sup>7</sup>See *The expected impact of the ‘fair use’ provisions and exceptions for education in the Copyright Amendment Bill on the South African publishing industry*, available at <http://www.publishsa.co.za/file/1501662149slp-pwcreportonthecopyrightbill2017.pdf>. The study notes that a 33% weighted average decline in sales would likely occur, with concomitant reductions in GDP, VAT, and corporate tax revenue collections. Some 89% of publishers surveyed noted that the CAB, if adopted in its current form, would negatively impact their operations, likely resulting in retrenchments and possible business closures.



For these reasons, if the proposed legislation is enacted, South Africa's legal framework for exceptions and limitations to copyright protection would clearly violate South Africa's international obligations, would be inconsistent with international treaties it has stated an intent to join, and would further erode the already inadequate level of copyright protection in the country.

#### **4. Exceptions and Limitations**

In addition to the introduction of "fair use" into South African law, the following new or expanded statutory exceptions contained in the CAB are likewise of concern:

**A.** Section 12B(1)(i) and 12B(2) allow individuals to make copies for "personal uses." These broad exceptions in effect allow for private copying without any remuneration for rights holders, which is out of step with international norms (and has in fact been challenged successfully, for example, in EU courts in relation to a proposed UK exception). Furthermore, such private copying exceptions are typically accompanied by a remuneration system by which rights holders are compensated for the private copying of their works. The proposed exception also permits copying in an "electronic storage medium," which risks undermining existing licensing practices with regard to digital content services.

**B.** Section 12B(1)(f) grants an exception for making translations for the purpose of "giving or receiving instruction." The scope of this proposed exception could be interpreted too broadly, particularly as it allows for communication to the public, albeit for non-commercial purposes. Though the bill attempts to limit the scope by defining its purpose, it could undermine the author's translation rights, which is a significant market for authors and their publishers, and one for which just compensation is warranted.

**C.** Section 12C provides an exception for temporary reproduction of a work "to enable a transmission of a work in a network between third parties by an intermediary or any other lawful use of work; or . . . to adapt the work to allow use on different technological devices . . . as long as there is no independent, economic significance." This provision also allows copying for *reformatting*, where such copies are an integral and essential part of a technical process, if the purpose of those copies or adaptations is to enable a transmission. Such language could hinder efforts to work with online intermediaries to stop piracy. If any such exception is to be included, IIPA recommends that the word "lawful" be replaced by "authorized," so that this provision meets its principal objective (ensuring that incidental copies made in the course of a licensed use does not give rise to separate liability) without frustrating enforcement efforts where the "incidental" reproduction within the jurisdiction of South Africa is the only justiciable act in a claim against an unauthorized transmission.

**D.** Section 12B(1)(a) provides a broad and circular exception for quotation, permitting any quotation provided that "the extent thereof shall not exceed the extent reasonably justified by the purpose," but without enumerating the permitted purposes such as, for example, criticism and review. The result is an exception that appears to permit quotations for any purpose whatsoever, which risks causing substantial harm to rights holders and renders the proposed exception incompatible with the internationally-recognized three-step test for copyright exceptions and limitations.

**E.** Section 12D permits the copying of works, recordings, and broadcasts for educational purposes with very few limitations. Subsection 12D(7)(a) on open access for "scientific or other contributions" is overreaching and will likely undermine the rights of authors and publishers and deny authors academic freedom. Subsection 12D(4)(c) specifically authorizes the copying of entire textbooks under certain conditions, even those that are available for authorized purchase or licensing, if the price is deemed not to be "reasonably related to that normally charged in the Republic for comparable works." The impact of these provisions on normal exploitation of works for educational markets is likely to far exceed what is permitted under international standards.

F. Section 19D provides an exception for persons with disabilities, which is defined as, essentially, disabilities that relate to the ability to read books. This provision would benefit from tighter drafting. While South Africa is not a signatory to the Marrakesh VIP Treaty, it would be prudent to bring provisions designed to facilitate access for visually impaired persons in line with the Treaty by including the requirement that the exception may apply only to authorized entities.

## **5. Exclusive Rights of ‘Communication to the Public’ and ‘Making Available’**

The CAB would add Section 9(f) to the Copyright Act, confirming that sound recording producers have the exclusive making available right set out in WPPT Article 14. This is a positive clarification, as this right underpins the digital music industry. However, the wording of proposed Section 9(e) regarding sound recording producers’ exclusive right of communication to the public, omits an express reference to “public performance,” as provided for in the WPPT definition of “communication to the public,” which explicitly “includes making the sounds or representations of sounds fixed in a phonogram audible to the public.” To avoid ambiguity in the legal framework, we submit that the new Section 9(e) should expressly refer to public performance. (Existing Section 9(e) in the Copyright Act provides sound recording producers with an exclusive right of communication to the public.)

Furthermore, the meaning of proposed Section 9A(aA) (and equivalent provisions in relation to exploitation of other categories of works, and in the PPAB with respect to performers’ rights) is not clear. While it is understood that these provisions are intended to ensure accurate reporting of authorized uses of works, to the extent they could be interpreted as providing a legal license for such uses, they would be wholly incompatible with the WIPO Internet Treaties, while undermining the economic feasibility of South African creative industries. These provisions should therefore be clarified to avoid any such confusion.

## **6. Technological Protection Measures**

Technological protection measures (TPMs) are vital tools for the copyright-based sectors in the digital era, enabling creators and rights holders to offer consumers their desired content, at the time and in the manner of their choosing, while also empowering rights holders to explore new markets opened up by current and emerging technologies. It is welcome that the CAB introduces provisions (and the PPAB incorporates them by reference) on TPMs. Unfortunately these provisions are completely inadequate, and therefore fall short of the requirement of Article 18 of WPPT and Article 11 of the WCT that contracting parties provide “adequate legal protection and effective legal remedies against the circumvention of effective technological measures.”

This issue is of paramount importance when considering the central role of digital distribution to the current and future economics of the creative industries. While the recorded music industry in South Africa is now predominantly a digital industry, piracy remains a serious obstacle to continued growth in this area. The introduction of adequate provisions on TPMs is therefore essential to protect against piracy and enable the development of new business models. Moreover, many film and television producers are seeking to respond to consumer demand by establishing online platforms to provide content to consumers or licensing film and television programming to online services. TPMs are essential to the functionality of these platforms and to the licensing of this high-value content.

First, the definition of “technological protection measure” in Section 1(i) is problematic because it refers to technologies that prevent or restrict infringement, as opposed to technologies designed to have that effect or control access to copies of works. The plain reading of this definition would be that a TPM that is circumvented is therefore not one that prevents or restricts infringement (because it has not achieved that aim), and therefore the circumvention of it is not an infringement. The provision should be clarified to ensure that a protected TPM is one that effectively protects a right of a copyright owner in a work, or effectively controls access to a work. Furthermore, paragraph (b) of the definition should be removed; that a TPM may prevent access to a work for non-infringing purposes should not have the effect of removing its status as a TPM. This provision is furthermore inconsistent with the proposed exception of Section 28P(2)(a), which is intended to enable the user to seek assistance from the rights

holder in gaining access to the work for a permitted use. As it stands, paragraph (b) of the definition is open to abuse and would provide a charter for hacking TPMs. In this respect, see also our comments below with respect to Section 28P(1)(a).

Second, we also recommend that the definition of “technological protection measure circumvention device” be amended to include devices that (a) are promoted, advertised or marketed for the purpose of circumvention of, or (b) have only a limited commercially significant purpose or use other than to circumvent TPMs. This would ensure that the definition encompasses a broader range of harmful TPM circumvention devices, consistent with best international practices.

Finally, the exceptions in Section 28P regarding prohibited conduct with respect to TPMs (in Section 28O) are inadequately defined, therefore rendering them incompatible with the three-step test and substantially reducing the effectiveness of the protections afforded by Section 28O. Under Section 28P(1)(a) it would be extremely burdensome, if not impossible, for rights holders to establish that the use of a TPM circumvention device by a user was not to perform an act permitted by an exception.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, a provider of an unlawful circumvention technology could rely on Section 28P(1)(b) to claim it is acting lawfully merely by showing that the technology can be used to access a work to perform a permitted act. There is a substantial risk that this provision would be abused by those providing circumvention technologies for unlawful purposes. The same is true of Section 28P(2)(b), which permits assisting a user to circumvent TPMs after a “reasonable time.”

## **7. Penalties for Infringement**

The CAB lacks appropriate remedies for infringement. The criminal fines provided will not assist copyright owners in recovering their losses from infringement, as the money does not go to them. Additionally, the bill does not provide copyright owners any additional civil remedies in cases of online infringement. Online piracy remains a persistent and growing threat to the creative industries. In 2016, nearly one billion films and TV shows were pirated. With regard to worldwide streaming piracy, in 2018 there were an estimated 32.5 billion total visits to streaming piracy sites across both desktops and mobile devices.<sup>9</sup> Given the scope and scale of online piracy, there is a serious need for more mechanisms to combat infringement and further remedies for rights holders.

IIPA reiterates its recommendations to introduce enforcement provisions that are effective in the digital age and protect the online marketplace, such as: (1) ensuring online platforms do not make or allow unauthorized use of copyrighted works on their platforms; (2) preventing the unauthorized distribution of electronic formats of copyright works; (3) alleviating the burden of proof on claimants with respect to technical allegations in claims that are not in dispute; and (4) providing for appropriate and adequate damages for online infringement.

## **8. Intellectual Property Tribunal**

Proposed amended Sections 29 through 29H would establish an Intellectual Property Tribunal to replace the existing Copyright Tribunal. The Tribunal’s purpose would purportedly be to assist the public in the transition to the new copyright regime by resolving disputes and settling the law, particularly in relation to the proposed “fair use” and other exceptions. This assumes that the Tribunal will be staffed with qualified professionals, adequately resourced, and accessible to the parties it is intended to serve, though none of these things are required by the bill, nor do the proposed provisions sufficiently delineate the Tribunal’s scope. Indeed, the CAB adds a Schedule 2 to Section 22(3), which would allow any person to apply to the Tribunal for a license to make a translation of a work, including broadcasts, or to reproduce and publish out of print additions for “instructional activities,” with few limitations. To the

---

<sup>8</sup>In this regard, see the discussion above regarding the proposed “fair use” and other unclear and overly broad exceptions proposed in the bills, which would compound this problem.

<sup>9</sup>This estimate is based on SimilarWeb data, taking into account streaming sites with at least 10,000 copyright removal requests in the year according to the Google Transparency Report.

extent that a revitalized Tribunal is to be considered, it would best serve the South African market with a much more limited mission, confined to copyright matters related to collective licensing.

Another significant concern with these provisions is the lack of benchmarks for how the Intellectual Property Tribunal should determine royalties in the event of a dispute between a collective licensing body and a user. It is imperative that the legislation set out that rates should be determined with reference to the value to the user of the rights in trade and the economic value of the service provided by the collective licensing body. Licensing rates should reflect market forces based on a willing buyer and a willing seller, and not by reference to a perceived and vague “public good.” If creators are not rewarded at market-related rates, even the best copyright regime in the world will not achieve its objectives.

## **9. *Collective Management of Rights***

IIPA is concerned by proposed Section 22B, which may be understood to preclude a Collective Management Organization (CMO) representing, for example, both copyright owners and performers. Such an interpretation could prohibit the existing collaboration between performers and producers in the SAMPRO CMO, which administers needletime rights on behalf of both recording artists and record labels. This would be inconsistent with industry standards and contrary to the interests of those rights holders, the users (licensees), and the public at large. Joint sound recording producer and performer organizations operate in some 40 territories. By working together on the licensing of rights, performers and producers save costs, increasing the proportion of revenues returned to them. This also reduces transaction costs to users, who can take a license from one CMO that covers both performers’ and producers’ rights. The provision should be clarified.

As a general point, it is also vital that any rates set by the Tribunal for performance rights (including “needletime”) reflect the economic value of the use of recorded music in trade. This would be consistent with international good practice, which seeks to ensure that rights holders are remunerated adequately for the high value of recorded music.

## **10. *State Intervention in Private Investments and the Public Domain***

The CAB contains concerning provisions that revert rights to the government in situations that could discourage investment, while unnecessarily diminishing the public domain. The proposed Section 5(2) transfers to the state all rights in works “funded by” or made under the direction or control of the state. This provision could be broadly interpreted to include works developed with a modicum of government involvement and may well diminish incentives for public-private cooperation in creative development.

## **11. *Term of Protection***

At present, sound recordings only receive a term of protection of 50 years from the year in which the recording was first published, and for literary, musical, and artistic works, the term of protection is 50 years from the author’s death or 50 years from publication if first published after the author’s death. The CAB should be revised to include a proposal to extend the term of protection for copyrighted works and sound recordings to 70 years. This will provide greater incentives for the production of copyrighted works and sound recordings, and also provide producers with a stronger incentive to invest in the local recording industry, spurring economic growth, as well as tax revenues, and enabling producers to continue offering works and recordings to local consumers in updated and restored formats as those formats are developed.

## **MARKET ACCESS ISSUES IN SOUTH AFRICA**

**Broadcast Quota:** In 2014, the Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA) began the Review of Regulation on South African Local Content: Television and Radio. While the regulations have yet to be

finalized, IIPA recommends that market forces, rather than discriminatory quota regimes, should be used to determine programming allocation.

**Online Value-Added Tax:** In May 2014, South Africa published regulations relating to registration and payment of value-added tax on all online transactions conducted in, from, or through South Africa. Currently levied at 15%, this onerous tax includes online selling of content such as films, TV series, games, and e-books.

## **COPYRIGHT PIRACY AND ENFORCEMENT ISSUES IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Creative sectors in South Africa are growing, but face the challenge of illegal competition. Improved infrastructure and accessibility to broadband internet has changed the landscape of copyright piracy in South Africa over the last decade. Physical piracy (e.g., sale of pirated CDs and DVDs) is not as prevalent as it used to be, although the sale of USB drives and CDs containing pirated music, especially of local artists and gospel songs that are not available online, remains a concern. The dominant concern in South Africa, however, is increasing piracy in the digital environment.

**Internet Piracy:** Although South African consumers have increasing options available to stream legitimate creative content, online piracy continues to grow in South Africa. Growth in bandwidth speeds, coupled with lax controls over corporate and university bandwidth abuse, drive this piracy. South Africa's government recently agreed to open the spectrum paving the way for implementation of 4G and 5G networks. While this will boost distribution and consumption of legal content, without efforts to increase education and improve enforcement, it also will likely lead to higher levels of piracy. Easy access to pre-released film and television content through international torrent, linking, and cyberlocker sites also fuels online piracy in the country. As South Africa lacks injunctive relief for rights holders, consumer access to these infringing sites continues unabated. South Africa needs a legal framework that facilitates rights holders in addressing unauthorized use in all ways and supports consumer education and awareness programs.

**Piracy Devices and Apps:** Set-top boxes and memory sticks pre-loaded with infringing content or apps continue to grow in popularity in South Africa. Consumers use these devices to bypass subscription services or to consume unauthorized copyrighted content such as music, movies, TV series, or sporting events. These devices are most commonly sold to South African consumers online. There are some companies that develop devices pre-loaded with infringing music content for use in various stores, pubs, and taverns. In January 2018, the Durban Commercial Crime Unit executed a search and seizure warrant for IPTV boxes and Play Station peripherals after it received a filed complaint. Actions like this are helpful, but much more is needed to effectively combat the growing problem. There are a number of examples of enforcement and consumer education programs that are effective in other markets and could be replicated in South Africa. It is critical for South Africa to gain more understanding of these approaches and to work proactively with experts from the applicable creative industry sectors to localize and implement similar programs.

**Parallel Imports:** The Copyright Law does not protect against parallel imports. As a result, the motion picture industry has sought protection under the Film and Publications Act. Industry stakeholders are in the process of developing a MOU with the Film and Publication Board, which will focus on joint cooperation on enforcement against parallel imports.

**Enforcement:** South Africa's enforcement framework is not up to the challenge of its counterfeiting and piracy problems. Border enforcement is inadequate because of a lack of manpower, and lack of *ex officio* authority, which places a burden on the rights holder to file a complaint and institute costly proceedings to ensure that goods are seized and ultimately destroyed. Civil enforcement is not a practical option because a High Court application or action currently takes two to three years to be heard. And criminal enforcement suffers from a lack of specialized prosecutors and judges equipped to handle intellectual property cases. South Africa recently set up a specialized unit tasked with financial crimes and counterfeiting (known as the "HAWKS" unit), but it does not appear to be adequately



resourced or have a suitable remit to take effective action against digital piracy. There is also a need for ongoing training and education for South Africa's police and customs officials to improve the process for detention and seizure of counterfeit and pirated goods. In particular, law enforcement officials should better understand the arduous procedures and timelines in the Counterfeit Goods Act (which prohibits rights holders from getting involved in many of the required actions), including that non-compliance will result in the release of counterfeit and pirated goods back to the suspected infringer. The Electronic Communications and Transactions Act (ECTA), read with the Copyright Act, is the law that rights holders rely upon for title, site, and link take downs. The lack of cybercrime inspectors continues to limit the full potential of this law. To facilitate a healthy online ecosystem, South Africa should appoint cybercrime inspectors and develop a cybercrime security hub recognizing copyright as one of its priorities.

The enactment of the Films and Publications Amendment Act, No. 11 of 2019, which extends application of the Films and Publications Act to online distributors of publications, films, and video games, could be a positive step for enforcement because it establishes an Enforcement Committee for investigating and adjudicating cases of non-compliance with any provision of the Act. Once it enters into force, South Africa's government should implement the Act to improve enforcement against online piracy.

IIPA encourages South Africa to enact the Cybercrimes Bill, which was passed by the National Assembly in November 2018, and focuses on cyber-related crimes, including copyright infringement through peer-to-peer networks. Financial institutions that become aware their computer systems were involved in the commission of an offense are required to report the offense to the Police Service within 72 hours. It is unclear when this bill will be considered by the National Council of Provinces; but enactment of this Bill would provide additional enforcement tools to combat online infringement.

The Interpol Intellectual Property Crime Conference held recently in Cape Town provided local law enforcement with information on best practices and resources for combatting IP theft, including access to the Interpol Intellectual Property Investigators Crime College (IPIC). Law enforcement should take advantage of these initiatives, including the IPIC training courses to assist with local and regional training of new and existing units.

## **GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES (GSP)**

In November 2019, USTR opened an investigation, including holding a public hearing in January 2020, to review country practices in South Africa regarding intellectual property rights and market access issues, and to determine whether South Africa still qualifies for beneficiary status under the GSP. Under the statute, the President of the United States must consider, in making GSP beneficiary determinations, "the extent to which such country is providing adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights," and "the extent to which such country has assured the United States that it will provide equitable and reasonable access to the markets ... of such country." IIPA requests that through the GSP review, the U.S. Government continue to send a clear message that the proposed CAB and PPAB are fatally flawed, and work with the South African Government to remedy the deficiencies in South Africa's legal and enforcement regimes, including by redrafting the bills to address the serious concerns detailed above and in IIPA's previous submissions. If, at the conclusion of the review, requisite improvements are not made by the Government of South Africa, IIPA requests that the U.S. Government suspend or withdraw GSP benefits to South Africa, in whole or in part.