



March 16, 2000

Chairman of the GSP Subcommittee  
of the Trade Policy Staff Committee  
600 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Room 518  
Washington, DC 20508

Re: Pre-Hearing Brief in Support of the GSP 1999  
Country Practices Review Against Uzbekistan  
65 Fed. Reg. 7410 (Feb. 14, 2000) and 65  
Fed. Reg. 11104 (Mar. 1, 2000)  
Case: Uzbekistan 016-CP-99

To the Chairman and the Entire Subcommittee:

The International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA) submits this brief in support of the decision by the Trade Policy Staff Committee to accept IIPA's June 16, 1999 petition to review the status of Uzbekistan as a GSP beneficiary developing country in relation to its intellectual property rights practices. Under separate cover, we also submit notice of our request to present oral testimony at the GSP hearings, now scheduled for April 13 and 14, 2000. This document serves as our brief for those hearings.

## **IIPA AND ITS MEMBERS**

The IIPA is a coalition of seven trade associations representing U.S. copyright-based industries in bilateral and multilateral efforts to open up foreign markets closed by piracy and other market access barriers. These member associations represent over 1,450 U.S. companies producing and distributing works protected by copyright laws throughout the world — all types of computer software including business software and entertainment software (such as videogame CD's and cartridges, personal computer CD's and multimedia products); motion pictures, television programs and home videocassettes; music, records, CDs, and audiocassettes; and textbooks, tradebooks, reference and professional publications and journals (in both electronic and print media).

IIPA and its seven member associations, and in turn those member companies, are interested parties to this proceeding. These companies have significant economic interests in being able to

enter the Uzbeki market; invest, sell and distribute their products; and enjoy effective legal protection against the infringement – theft – of these products.

## **LEGAL REFORM AND TREATY ADHERENCE**

---

In November 1993, Uzbekistan and the United States signed a bilateral trade agreement detailed in the C.I.S. summary (see Appendix A). This agreement entered into force on January 13, 1994. On August 30, 1996, the Uzbeki Parliament adopted the Law on Copyright and Neighboring Rights providing a comprehensive revision of the copyright law in Uzbekistan; the law went into force on September 17, 1996. Since that time, there have not been any revisions to the Copyright Act, nor to the relevant enforcement laws. However, in 1999, Uzbekistan drafted amendments to the Copyright Law; reportedly, the draft is currently under consideration by the government. Neither has Uzbekistan acceded to any of the relevant copyright or neighboring rights treaties as it obligated itself to do in the bilateral agreement over six years ago.

The Uzbeki Law on Copyright and Neighboring Rights of 1996 established protection for the first time of computer programs, databases and sound recordings. The exclusive economic rights provided to authors (Art. 22) include “the right to exploit the work in all forms and by all means” such as by reproduction and dissemination; public presentation; rental; public performance; broadcasting including cable distribution or satellite transmission; recording of a work by technical means and communication of a technical recording (including by radio or television); and translation or transformation. There are numerous provisions that remain that regulate the terms and conditions of author’s contracts. The producers of phonograms are afforded the exclusive rights of: public presentation; adaptation or other transformation; distribution (including commercial rental); and importation. The law does not clearly specify a right of reproduction. In addition, the law provides a right of remuneration only for producers of sound recordings for the public communication of the recording; the broadcasting; or the communication to the public by cable.

Uzbekistan is not a member of the Berne Convention. Neither is Uzbekistan providing any rights to American or other foreign sound recordings, nor is Uzbekistan a member of the Geneva Phonograms Convention; American sound recordings are completely unprotected. Joining Berne and Geneva Phonograms and providing protection for American sound recordings are all obligations of the bilateral trade agreement that Uzbekistan promised to fulfill over six years ago.

In addition, Uzbekistan does not clearly provide protection for pre-existing works. When Uzbekistan extends protection for foreign sound recordings, it must clearly protect pre-existing works and sound recordings that are at least 50 years old to comply with the bilateral treaty obligations and international norms.

The Uzbeki Copyright Law does provide explicit copyright protection for computer programs and databases as required under the bilateral trade agreement. However, there are no known civil ex parte search procedures necessary to provide effective enforcement against end-user pirates.

Uzbekistan did not amend its Criminal Code, following passage of the 1996 Copyright Act to adopt deterrent penalties for intellectual property violations, in breach of the bilateral agreement’s obligation to provide “adequate and effective” protection and enforcement. The

Criminal Code (Art. 149) does provide for liability for infringement of copyright and patent violations, but does not include neighboring rights violations. In any case, the existing penalties are too weak and must be amended to strengthen and broaden the provisions for all copyright and neighboring rights violations. Reportedly, Article 149 is under review for revision, including the addition of criminal liability for neighboring rights violations. IIPA has not seen any drafts currently under consideration.

IIPA recommends that the draft criminal reform also include revisions to the Criminal Code and Criminal Procedures Code to provide police with the proper ex officio authority to commence criminal copyright cases. Further, the Customs Code must be amended to provide Customs officials with ex officio authority to seize suspected infringing material at the border as required by the TRIPS Agreement and as is necessary to conduct effective border enforcement.

IIPA is aware of Resolution #215 of the Cabinet of Ministers, April 19, 1994, that established a licensing system for the production, reproduction and sale of records, cassettes and CDs. However, IIPA has no reports of how these provisions have been implemented, if at all, and their effectiveness against pirate production enterprises that are so common in this region.

Uzbekistan was not a signatory to either of the two new WIPO treaties. The Uzbeki government should be encouraged to ratify both the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT).

## **COPYRIGHT ENFORCEMENT**

---

The Uzbeki copyright regime must be amended to include basic civil, administrative, criminal and customs remedies to bring the enforcement regime up to the international norms. Currently, Uzbekistan is not providing “adequate and effective” protection and enforcement as it is obligated to do under the bilateral agreement. There are significant legal reform deficiencies and there is no effective police, prosecutorial, judicial or border activity underway. The Uzbek government must adopt the necessary legal reforms, including accession to the relevant treaties to protect foreign works and sound recordings. Then the authorities must commence police raids and seizures at a minimum, and must act to stop the retail distribution of illegal material through the use of administrative and criminal sanctions.

The Criminal Code currently does not provide deterrent penalties and must be amended. The Administrative Code does not provide any sanctions for violations of neighboring rights infringements. There are several articles in the Code that provide administrative sanctions for infringements of the sale of goods. The Administrative Code must be amended to provide for fines and the forfeiture of business licenses for retail establishments that are operating pirate operations. IIPA understands that currently amendments to the Code are under consideration to include liability for the illegal distribution of works and phonograms.

Border enforcement as in other countries in the region, is very weak in Uzbekistan. This is allowing illegal copies to freely cross borders for sale in Uzbekistan and other countries. This in turn, is causing significant harm to the copyright industries, in particular the music industry.

The recording industry (International Federation of the Phonographic Industry, IFPI), reports that most of the music piracy is in the form of audiocassettes; further they report that illegal musical cassettes produced in neighboring countries including in particular Russia, are entering Uzbekistan as a result of the poor border enforcement. The IFPI reports there are no known optical media plants in Uzbekistan although the opportunity is there for the start-up of pirate CD and cassette operations due to the climate and infrastructure. The recording industry estimates trade losses in Uzbekistan were \$25 million in 1999 – considerably more than for almost any other country in the C.I.S.; music piracy levels were estimated to be at about 90%.

The Business Software Alliance (BSA) estimates that trade losses due to software piracy in the Commonwealth of Independent States (C.I.S.) other than Russia were \$34.1 million in 1998, the last year that these figures were available. That year, the level of piracy was estimated to be 93%.

There are no official piracy or loss figures for the motion picture, entertainment software, or book industries.

## **CONCLUSION**

In sum, we have detailed the numerous deficiencies in the Uzbeki copyright legal and enforcement regime to assist you in your deliberations. We would be pleased to respond to any questions or clarifications you may have concerning this information.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Schwartz  
Counsel  
International Intellectual Property Alliance

## **APPENDIX A TO IIPA PRE-GSP HEARING BRIEF**

### **COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES (CIS)**

#### **SUMMARY OF ISSUES IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE C.I.S.**

---

As a result of numerous similarities with the problems confronted by the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (C.I.S.), IIPA has grouped ten of the twelve countries under this single heading for the convenience of reporting on those problems. This filing encompasses separate but similar reports on the countries of: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan; IIPA recommends that each of these ten countries should be placed on the Watch List in 2000.

Separately, IIPA has filed reports on Russia and Ukraine, recommending the placement of each of those countries on the Priority Watch List for 2000.

The major deficiencies of most of the ten countries of the C.I.S., further detailed in each country report below, are: (1) the failure to fully comply with the legal reforms of the bilateral trade agreement signed and ratified by each country; and (2) the failure to comply with the World Trade Organization (WTO) TRIPS Agreement, especially the enforcement obligations. A majority of these countries are not members of the Geneva Phonograms Convention and have no point of attachment for American or other foreign sound recordings, five or more years after they were obligated by the bilateral agreements to do so. Many of these ten countries are not yet members of the WTO, and are therefore not yet bound by the TRIPS Agreement obligations, but almost all of the countries are seeking WTO membership and will therefore have to comply with them on the date of adherence to the WTO.

Last, in almost all cases, even where legal reforms have been adopted, there is virtually no on-the-ground enforcement in any of these countries – neither effective civil, administrative, criminal or border enforcement is in place. In addition to being a WTO TRIPS obligation, this complete breakdown in enforcement is a total bar to the entry of any legitimate copyright industries into the local markets. It is also permitting the countries of the C.I.S. to become a haven for the production and distribution of pirated material, including optical media material consisting of music CDs, CD-ROMs containing business and entertainment software, and DVDs containing audiovisual material. This material, much of it produced by organized criminal enterprises, is not only hampering the development of legal markets in the countries of the C.I.S., but is spreading and thus doing significant harm to other legitimate markets in neighboring countries in Eastern and Central Europe.

Three steps are needed to curb this problem: (1) police and prosecutors must commence raids, seizures, deterrent criminal actions; (2) effective border enforcement must be implemented; (3) optical media production regulations must be implemented to shut down illegal plants.

## COMPLIANCE WITH BILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

---

In 1990, the U.S. and the Soviet Union signed a far reaching bilateral trade agreement including extensive intellectual property rights obligations. These obligations included the enactment and enforcement of a (pre-TRIPS Agreement) modern copyright regime. As a result of the tumultuous events of August 1991, the 1990 U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trade Agreement, which required the U.S.S.R. to adopt a Berne-compatible copyright law by December 31, 1992, never entered into force because the U.S.S.R. did not implement it before it dissolved. The U.S. government determined that each country of the C.I.S. could (re)sign the 1990 U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trade Agreement with only minor technical amendments, including new deadlines to meet the Agreement's obligations, and a statement from each country of the C.I.S. acknowledging its succession to the Soviet Union's Universal Copyright Convention obligation, dating from May 27, 1973.

All twelve of the former republics of the Soviet Union did sign these agreements (see dates below). Once each agreement was signed, it was agreed it would enter into force upon an exchange of diplomatic notes between the U.S. and each new country. At such time that country would be eligible for "Most Favored Nation" (MFN; now known as "Normal Trade Relations") status. All of the countries have now put the agreements into force. Once in force, each country agreed to make its "best efforts" to enact all of the IPR components of the trade agreement, in the case of every country but the Russian Federation, by December 31, 1993. The Russian Federation agreed to complete its obligations by December 31, 1992.

The bilateral trade agreements were signed and entered into force in each country on the following dates:

**Armenia** (Signed April 2, 1992; entry into force on April 7, 1992);  
**Azerbaijan** (Signed April 12, 1993; entry into force on April 21, 1995);  
**Belarus** (Exchange of letters January 6 and February 16, 1993; entry into force on February 16, 1993);  
**Georgia** (Signed March 1, 1993; entry into force on August 13, 1993);  
**Kazakhstan** (Signed May 19, 1992; entry into force on February 18, 1993);  
**Kyrgyz Republic** (Signed May 8, 1992; entry into force on August 21, 1992);  
**Republic of Moldova** (Signed June 19, 1992; entry into force on July 2, 1992);  
**Russian Federation** (Signed June 1, 1990; entry into force on June 17, 1992);  
**Tajikistan** (Signed July 1, 1993; entry into force on November 24, 1993);  
**Turkmenistan** (Signed March 23, 1993; entry into force on October 25, 1993);  
**Ukraine** (Signed May 6, 1992; entry into force on June 23, 1992);  
**Uzbekistan** (Signed November 5, 1993; entry into force on January 13, 1994).

The obligations of the bilateral trade agreements (Article VIII of each Agreement and in the accompanying Side Letter on IPR) include:

(1) Joining the Berne Convention (Paris Act); (2) Providing protection for sound recordings, including a right of reproduction, distribution (and importation), and a commercial rental right; (3) Providing a point of attachment for foreign (American) sound recordings and making best efforts to join the Geneva Phonograms Convention; (4) Providing full retroactivity (per Article 18 of Berne); (5) Protecting computer programs and databases (as "literary works" consistent with Berne, and now TRIPS); (6) Providing adequate and effective protection and enforcement (which is understood

to include deterrent civil and criminal penalties, as well as border measures); and, (7) Establishing a working group with each country to monitor the continuing progress of copyright and other IP protection and enforcement.

Nine countries in the C.I.S. — the Russian Federation (1995), Ukraine (1995), Georgia (1995), the Republic of Moldova (1995), Belarus (1997), Kazakhstan (1999), Azerbaijan (1999), the Kyrgyz Republic (1999), and Tajikistan (2000) — are members of the Berne Convention. This means that the other three countries, Armenia, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, are in breach of this trade agreement obligation.

Only four countries provide sound recording protection for American sound recordings — the Russian Federation (1995), the Kyrgyz Republic (1998), Georgia (1999) Ukraine (2000). Only the Russian Federation (1995) and Ukraine (February 2000) are members of the Geneva Phonograms Convention of the twelve countries in the C.I.S. This means that ten countries in the C.I.S. are in breach of the bilateral trade agreement obligation to join Geneva Phonograms. The Kyrgyz Republic (December 20, 1998) and Georgia (October 6, 1999) are new members of the WTO, and are thus obligated under TRIPS to provide a point of attachment and a minimum level of rights for foreign (American) sound recordings. This means that in eight of the twelve countries, sound recordings are completely unprotected, six years after the bilateral trade agreements required such protection.

Two countries are members of the new WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) — Belarus and the Republic of Moldova; the Kyrgyz Republic is also a member of the WIPO Copyright Treaty, or WCT. The U.S. deposited its instrument of accession in September 1999 to the WCT and the WPPT. However, since the WPPT is not yet in force, and will not be until thirty countries ratify it, there is no point of attachment for American sound recordings at this time by accession or ratification to that treaty.

The Russian Federation and Ukraine explicitly do not provide retroactive protection for works or sound recordings in breach of the clear obligation in the bilateral agreement.<sup>1</sup> This lack of protection for pre-existing works and sound recordings is also a violation of Berne (Article 18 and the national treatment obligations) and the TRIPS Agreement (Article 14.6 for sound recordings and Article 9 for works). Belarussian experts claim that their law probably does provide retroactive protection, though this is less than clear with respect to sound recordings. For the other nine countries of the C.I.S. it is unclear what, if any, retroactive protection they do or do not provide for works and sound recordings. The countries of the C.I.S. that are not providing retroactive protection for works and sound recordings must do so or they are in breach of the bilateral agreement; those countries where such protection is unclear should clarify that protection. This

---

<sup>1</sup>The issue of retroactive protection, at least back to 1973, was additionally required in every country in a special bilateral provision (not found in the Soviet agreement) which obligated each country to act as a successor state to the Soviet Union's obligations under the Universal Copyright Convention (U.C.C.). Thus a "gap" in protection for American works in each of the (non-Berne) countries of the C.I.S. was avoided, from May 27, 1973 to the present. This is because the Soviet Union became a party to the 1952 text of the Universal Copyright Convention on May 27, 1973. UNESCO (secretariat of the U.C.C.) reportedly treats all of the former republics of the U.S.S.R. as successors to the Soviet Union and confirms every republic's adherence to the U.C.C. from that date. Only five countries — the Russian Federation, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Ukraine — have formally confirmed their membership in that Convention. At the time of the signing of the bilateral agreements, the USG requested that each country send such a confirmation letter to UNESCO to avoid any confusion about this status.

problem of protection for pre-existing material, especially for sound recordings, is a regional problem because such protection is not currently provided in Poland, the Czech Republic, and (possibly) Romania creating an environment for the production and wide-spread distribution of back catalog material.

Some form of explicit copyright protection for computer programs and databases is provided in every country except Turkmenistan. However, almost no country in the C.I.S. provides criminal ex parte search provisions necessary for effective enforcement against end-user piracy (and as required by the WTO TRIPS Agreement); the availability of civil ex parte search provisions is unclear in virtually all of these countries.

Only a few of the countries have amended their Criminal Code to adopt any criminal provisions applicable for IPR violations; almost none of the countries have adopted deterrent penalties to stop commercial piracy, especially necessary against the organized criminal enterprises operating in this region. Neither have most of these countries adopted the necessary Customs Code revisions to provide ex officio authority to properly seize material at the border. And none of these countries are providing "adequate and effective" enforcement on-the-ground as required by the bilateral agreements or the WTO TRIPS Agreement.

Last, only the Russian Federation and Ukraine have held meetings of their working groups with United States government officials. In the other ten countries there have been no such formal meetings to follow-up on these bilateral agreement obligations, to IIPA's knowledge.

## **SUMMARY OF LEGAL REFORMS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY**

---

As noted, three countries of the C.I.S. are members of the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT): Belarus, Kyrgyz Republic and the Republic of Moldova. Two are members of the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT): Belarus and the Republic of Moldova.

Armenia and the Russian Federation have joined the Brussels Satellite Convention. The Republic of Moldova is a member of the Rome Convention. In September 1993, the C.I.S. Treaty on Cooperation in Copyright and Neighboring Rights was signed. This obligated member states to confirm their membership in the U.C.C. (1952 text); to mutually protect their works on this basis; and, to develop national legislation at the level of the Berne, Geneva Phonograms, and Rome Conventions. This Treaty does not provide for the creation of any inter-governmental executive body.

On December 20, 1998, the Kyrgyz Republic joined the World Trade Organization (WTO); it was the first country in the C.I.S. to join the WTO. On October 6, 1999, Georgia became the second C.I.S. member to join the WTO. Eight other C.I.S. nations are in the process of acceding to the WTO. Working Parties have been established for Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. The U.S. Congress has made it clear, in the legislation implementing the Uruguay Round, that the Administration should work to encourage "acceleration" of TRIPS compliance by existing and acceding WTO members. Consistent U.S. policy requires any nation newly acceding to WTO to be in full compliance with TRIPS at the time of accession. In IIPA's view, the TRIPS obligations merely spell out in greater



detail the C.I.S. countries' existing bilateral obligations under the trade agreements with the U.S. to provide "adequate and effective protection and enforcement" of intellectual property rights.

A dangerous development in breach of the bilateral agreement continues to unfold in several countries of the C.I.S., including the Russian Federation. That is the comprehensive reform of the civil codes of these nations that is underway.<sup>2</sup> In most cases, the efforts to revise the civil code will (or have) result(ed) in the addition in that code of new copyright provisions inconsistent with Berne, TRIPS, and the bilateral agreements. These efforts to revise the civil codes should be opposed. For example, in the case of Russia, drafts of the civil code reform (as recent as 1999) included IPR provisions completely incompatible with the bilateral trade agreement, the Berne Convention, and TRIPS. In 1996 a so-called Model Civil Code for the countries of the C.I.S. was reportedly adopted by the C.I.S. Inter-parliamentary Assembly in St. Petersburg. Detailed provisions on copyright and neighboring rights were included that were contradictory to existing international standards of protection for copyrights.

Each country of the C.I.S. should enact separate copyright, customs, and criminal provisions and procedures, rather than build on the foundation of the Soviet-era civil codes.

To the best of our knowledge, eleven countries have passed major revisions to their copyright laws:

**Armenia** (May 13, 1996; effective June 6, 1996; amended January 12, 2000)

**Azerbaijan** (June 4, 1996; effective October 23, 1996)

**Belarus** (May 16, 1996; effective July 18, 1996; amended August 11, 1998; effective August 19, 1998)

**Georgia** (Civil Code in force on November 25, 1997; amended June 22, 1999; effective July 8, 1999)

**Kazakhstan** (February 9, 1996; effective June 10, 1996)

**Kyrgyz Republic** (December 16, 1997; effective January 23, 1998)

**Republic of Moldova** (November 23, 1994; effective March 2, 1995; amended May 28, 1998)

**Russian Federation** (July 9, 1993, effective August 3, 1993)

**Tajikistan** (November 13, 1998; effective December 17, 1998)

**Ukraine** (December 23, 1993, effective February 23, 1994)

**Uzbekistan** (August 30, 1996; effective September 17, 1996)

Turkmenistan is reportedly in the process of drafting new copyright legislation; until it is adopted, the Civil Code (Chapter IV, 1961) from the former Soviet era is still the operational law.

---

<sup>2</sup>Prior to the break-up of the Soviet Union, the text of the U.S.S.R.'s 1961 "Fundamentals of Civil Legislation" was the governing copyright law throughout the Union. Based on the "Fundamentals," each of the republics adopted in its civil code a separate chapter for copyright protection. The main features of these civil codes were: a 25-year term of protection, no protection for producers of sound recordings or performers, and broad exceptions to protection. The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted amendments to the Fundamentals in May 1991, but they did not become effective because of the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. The 1991 amendments entered into force in the Russian Federation on August 3, 1992 by special decree. Several of the republics still treat the old civil codes as in force; it is not known whether any of these include the 1991 amendments drafted by the former U.S.S.R.

As a result of their MFN/NTR status, all of these countries are now beneficiaries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible countries (duty-free tariffs on certain imports). Part of the discretionary criteria of the GSP program is that the country provide “adequate and effective means under its laws for foreign nations to secure, to exercise, and to enforce exclusive rights in intellectual property, including...copyrights.” In 1998 (the latest full year of statistics), the countries of the C.I.S. received the following preferential trade benefits under GSP:

	<u>Amt. GSP Duty-Free</u>	<u>Percent.of U.S. imports that benefit from GSP</u>
<b>Armenia</b>	\$510,247	50.4%
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	\$0	0%
<b>Belarus</b>	\$6,761,685	47.6%
<b>Georgia</b>	\$0	0%
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	\$90,205,615	66.32%
<b>Kyrgyz</b>	\$29,863	56.29%
<b>Moldova</b>	\$512,659	< 1.0%
<b>Russian</b>	\$423,561,309	24.78%
<b>Tajikistan</b>	\$0	0%
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	\$0	0%
<b>Ukraine</b>	\$16,775,064	6.4%
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	\$2,258,837	68.19%

On June 16, 1999, IIPA submitted a request to the United States government in accordance with U.S. law, that the eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan as a GSP beneficiary developing country be reviewed, and that its GSP benefits be suspended or withdrawn, in whole or in part, if requisite improvements are not made by each of these countries to remedy the deficiencies which adversely affect U.S. copyright owners. On February 14, 2000 the United States government accepted the IIPA petitions for: Armenia, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. The United States government is withdrawing GSP benefits from Belarus (for reasons unrelated to intellectual property matters).

## **APPENDIX B TO IIPA PRE-GSP HEARING BRIEF**

### **METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATED U.S. TRADE LOSSES AND LEVELS OF COPYRIGHT PIRACY ABROAD IN 1999**

Estimated trade losses due to piracy are calculated by IIPA's member associations. Since it is impossible to gauge losses for every form of piracy, we believe that our reported estimates for 2000 actually underestimate the losses due to piracy experienced by the U.S. copyright-based industries. This methodology is also used as the basis for the statistics provided in IIPA's February 18, 2000 Special 301 submission to the U.S. Trade Representative.

Pirate production for export for the records and music, computer programs and book publishing industries is included in the loss figure for the country of manufacture, not the country of ultimate sale. For example, the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) reports losses estimated at \$60 million from sales in several Eastern European countries and Russia, of Czech-produced CDs. The relevant amounts are included in the Czech Republic losses for records and music (which even notes that \$60 of the \$62 million in estimated losses in the Czech Republic are the result of exports); the loss figures in Russia and the other "receiving" Eastern European countries do not report these losses. There are rare exceptions noted in the filing. For example, in the Paraguay report, the RIAA notes that \$270 million of the estimated \$280 million in losses are due to the transshipment of pirate CDs from Asia. In the motion picture industry, losses are generally counted in the country in which the sale of product occurs.

#### **COMPUTER SOFTWARE: BUSINESS APPLICATIONS**

---

The Business Software Alliance (BSA)'s calculation method compares two sets of data -- the *demand* for new software applications, and the legal *supply* of new software applications.

Demand: PC shipments for the major countries are estimated from proprietary and confidential data supplied by software publishers. The data is compared and combined to form a consensus estimate, which benefits from the detailed market research available to these member companies.

Two dimensions break the shipments into four groups. Splitting the PC shipments between Home and Non-Home purchasers represents the market segments of each country. The PC shipments are also compared to the change in the installed base of existing PCs. The part of PC shipments which represents growth of the installed base is called "new shipments" and is separated from the "replacement shipments" which represent new PCs that are replacing older PCs.

A scale of the installed base of PCs by country compared to the number of white-collar workers was developed. PC penetration statistics are a general measure of the level of technological acceptance within a country. The level of penetration, for a variety of reasons, varies widely from country-to-country. This level is then ranked and each country is assigned to one of five maturity classes.

The number of software applications installed per PC shipment is provided by member companies, and the following ratios for the four shipment groups are developed:

Home-New Shipments  
Non-Home - New Shipments  
Home - Replacement Shipments  
Non-Home - Replacement Shipments

For each shipment group, ratios are developed for each of five maturity classes. U.S. historical trends are used to estimate the effects of lagged technological development by maturity class.

Piracy rates can vary among applications. Grouping the software applications into three Tiers and using specific ratios for each Tier further refined the ratios. The Tiers were General Productivity Applications, Professional Applications, and Utilities. These were chosen because they represent different target markets, different price levels, and it is believed, different piracy rates.

Software applications installed per PC shipped are researched and estimated using these dimensions:

1. Home vs. Non-Home
2. New PCs vs. Replacement PCs
3. Level of Technological Development
4. Software Application Tier

From this work, a total software applications installed estimate was calculated for each country.

Supply: Data was collected by country and by the 26 business software applications. Shipment data was limited in some instances, hence, uplift factors were used to estimate U.S. and world-wide shipments.

Piracy Estimates: The difference between software applications installed (demand) and software applications legally shipped (supply) equals the estimate of software applications pirated. The piracy rate is defined as the amount of software piracy as a percent of total software installed in each country.

Dollar Losses: The legal and pirated software revenue was calculated by using the average price per application. This is a wholesale price estimate weighted by the amount of shipments within each software application category.

To develop the wholesale dollar losses for U.S. software publishers, the wholesale dollar losses due to piracy were reduced by the ratio of the software shipped by U.S. software publishers as a percent of software shipped by all software publishers.

## **COMPUTER PROGRAMS: ENTERTAINMENT SOFTWARE**

---

The Interactive Digital Software Association (IDSA)'s calculation method uses market data of dedicated platform and PC entertainment software in both compact disc and cartridge formats, and hardware shipments along with an estimate of the level of piracy in the target country. Where possible, losses due to exports and/or online piracy are included. Export losses are attributed to the source country, where possible. Here are the basic steps involved in determining losses to entertainment software publishers:

1. For each dedicated platform, the 1998 entertainment software units are divided by hardware units. This results in the number of applications per dedicated platform.
2. For each multimedia PC, the 1998 entertainment software units are divided by hardware units. This results in the number of entertainment applications per multimedia PC.
3. The number of applications per PC or dedicated platform is estimated (this varies country-to-country). The actual number of applications per dedicated platform or PC is then subtracted, resulting in the number of illegal applications per hardware unit.
4. The number of illegal applications per hardware unit is divided by the estimated number of applications per hardware unit, resulting in the estimated percentage of illegal software units in use.
5. The illegal software units per hardware unit is multiplied by the average wholesale price (which varies country-to-country) which is multiplied by the number of legitimate hardware units. This results in the dollar amount lost to piracy.

## **MOTION PICTURES**

---

Many factors affect the nature and effect of piracy in particular markets, including the level of development of various media in a particular market and the windows between release of a product into various media (theatrical, video, pay television, and free television). Piracy in one form can spill over and affect revenues in other media forms. Judgment based on in-depth knowledge of particular markets plays an important role in estimating losses country by country.

Video: Losses are estimated using one of the following methods:

1. For developed markets:
  - a. The number of stores that rent pirate videos and the number of shops and vendors that sell pirate videos are multiplied by the average number of pirate tapes rented or sold per shop or vendor each year;
  - b. The resulting total number of pirate videos sold and rented each year in the country is then multiplied by the percent of those pirate videos that would have been sold or rented legitimately and adjusted to reflect the US producers' share of the market.
2. For partially developed markets:
  - a. The number of legitimate videos sold or rented in the country each year is subtracted from the estimated total number of videos sold or rented in the country annually to estimate the number of pirate videos sold or rented annually in the country;
  - b. The resulting total number of pirate videos sold and rented each year in the country is then multiplied by the percent of those pirate videos that would have been sold or rented legitimately and adjusted to reflect the US producers' share of the market.
3. For fully pirate markets:
  - a. Either: (a) the number of blank videos sold in the country annually is multiplied by the percent of those tapes used to duplicate US motion pictures to equal the number of pirate copies of US motion pictures sold in the country each year; or, (b) the number of VCRs in the country is multiplied by an estimated number of US motion pictures on video that would be rented and sold per VCR per year;
  - b. The figure resulting from each of the foregoing calculations is an estimate of the number of legitimate sales of videos of US motion pictures that are lost each year in the market due to video piracy. These estimates are adjusted to reflect the wholesale price of legitimate videos, to equal losses due to video piracy.

TV and Cable: Losses are estimated using the following method:

1. The number of TV and cable systems that transmit U.S. motion pictures without authorization is multiplied by the average number of U.S. motion pictures transmitted without authorization by each system each year;
2. The resulting total number of illegal transmissions is multiplied by the average number of viewers per transmission;

3. The number of viewers of these illegal transmissions is allocated among those who would have gone to a theatrical exhibition or who would have rented or purchased a legitimate video. The number of legitimate transmissions of the motion picture that would have been made is also estimated;
4. These figures are multiplied by the producers' share of the theatrical exhibition price, the wholesale share of the video cost or the license fee per legitimate transmission, as appropriate, to estimate the lost revenue from the illegal transmissions.

Public Performance: Losses are estimated using the following method:

1. The number of vehicles and hotels that exhibit videos without authorization is multiplied by the average number of viewers per illegal showing and the number of showings per year;
2. The resulting total number of viewers of unauthorized public performances is allocated among those who would have gone to a theatrical exhibition or who would have rented or purchased a legitimate video. The number of legitimate TV and cable transmissions that would have been made of the motion pictures is also estimated;
3. These figures are multiplied by the producers' share of the theatrical exhibition price, the wholesale share of the video cost or the license fee per legitimate transmission, as appropriate, to estimate the lost revenue from the illegal performances.

## **SOUND RECORDINGS AND MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS**

---

RIAA generally bases its estimates on local surveys of the market conditions in each country. The numbers produced by the music industry generally reflect the value of sales of pirate product rather than industry losses, and therefore undervalue the real harm to the interests of record companies, music publishers, performers, musicians, songwriters and composers.

Where RIAA has sufficient information relating to known manufacture of pirate recordings that emanate from a third country, this loss data will be included in the loss number for the country of manufacture rather than the country of sale.

In certain instances where appropriate, RIAA employs economic data to project the likely import or sale of legitimate sound recordings, rather than merely reporting pirate sales. In these instances, projected unit displacement is multiplied by the wholesale price of legitimate articles in that market rather than the retail price of the pirate goods.

## **BOOKS**

---

The book publishing industry relies on local representatives and consultants to determine losses. These experts base their estimates on the availability of pirate books, especially those found near educational institutions, book stores and outdoor book stalls. A limitation here is that experts can only gauge losses based on the pirated books that are sold; it is impossible to track losses for books which are pirated but not available for public purchase. The trade loss estimates are calculated at pirate prices which are generally (but not always) below the prices which would be charged for legitimate books. Also included are conservative estimates of losses due to unauthorized systematic photocopying of books.

## **PIRACY LEVELS**

---

Piracy levels are also estimated by IIPA member associations and represent the share of a country's market that consists of pirate materials. Piracy levels together with losses provide a clearer picture of the piracy problem in different countries. Low levels of piracy are a good indication of the effectiveness of a country's copyright law and enforcement practices. IIPA and its member associations focus their efforts on countries where piracy is rampant due to inadequate or non-existent copyright laws and/or lack of enforcement.