

INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALLIANCE

2007 SPECIAL 301 REPORT

DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

The U.S. government's negotiation of regional and bilateral free trade agreements (FTAs) offers an important opportunity to persuade our trading partners to further modernize their copyright laws and enforcement regimes. The FTAs have set new global precedents in copyright protection and enforcement, providing further impetus to e-commerce and to global economic growth and employment. However, these beneficial impacts of the FTAs will not be realized unless the obligations they create are rigorously fulfilled in the national laws of our trading partners. The U.S. government should be generous with advice and technical assistance in helping our FTA partners to fully implement the terms of the FTAs; but the U.S. government also should not hesitate to invoke the dispute settlement procedures of the respective FTAs when FTA partners fail to live up to the obligations they have undertaken and which constitute the commercial benefits of the deals for U.S. copyright industries. In this section of the report we identify outstanding FTA implementation issues with several of our partners – Bahrain, Jordan, Morocco, and Singapore – which we believe could be the basis for dispute settlement proceedings unless they can be promptly and satisfactorily resolved on an informal basis.

BAHRAIN

The United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement went into force on August 1, 2006. A review of the newly enacted Bahrain Copyright Law, Law No. 22 of 2006 related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights (issued on June 25, 2006, published on July 5 in Edition 2745 of the Official Gazette) has revealed various compliance issues with the FTA. In addition, a review of a draft optical disc law we have seen has also revealed some compliance issues (we are unaware of whether that law has been finally agreed upon, although the FTA obligations are in force). It is disappointing that the Bahrainis have enacted FTA-incompatible legislation constituting a significant denial of benefits to U.S. right holders, including a major violation in terms of the rights that must be afforded to producers of sound recordings.

FTA Issues in Law No. 22

Based on our analysis, we conclude that the following provisions either leave Bahrain in violation of its current FTA obligations, or raise serious issues as to compliance.

- **Equitable Remuneration (Article 18(2)) for Producers of Phonograms Violates FTA Article 14.6.3:** Article 18(2) of Law No. 22 provides:

Without prejudice to the rights established under the provisions of this Law, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations shall have a right to receive a single equitable remuneration for the direct or indirect use of sound recordings and for broadcasts broadcast for commercial purposes or communicated to the public by any means, unless otherwise agreed to in writing.

This provision, which was not in the draft law forwarded to the Consultative Council and Chamber of Deputies, is an attempt to implement 14.6.3(b) and (c), but the terms “use,” “broadcasts broadcast” and “communicated to the public by any means” (to the extent these latter two terms relate to sound recordings) are overly broad, and deny the exclusivity required by the terms of the FTA to producers of sound recordings as to their rights. The provision must be deleted. If it is to be kept, it must be amended to abide by the limitations imposed in the FTA over which kinds of acts in respect of phonograms may be subject to remuneration, as follows:

Without prejudice to the **exclusive** rights established under the provisions of this Law, producers of phonograms ... shall have a right to receive a single equitable remuneration for **analog and other noninteractive transmissions and free over-the-air broadcasts** ~~the use of direct or indirect sound recordings and broadcasts broadcast or communicated to the public by any means~~, unless otherwise agreed to in writing.

- **Express Provision on National Treatment Are Missing, in Addition to “First Publication” Language Concerning Related Rights:** FTA Articles 14.1.5 and 14.6.1 deal with national treatment generally and as to related rights, respectively. In addition, Article 14.6.1 further requires that Bahrain consider that “A performance or phonogram shall be considered first published in the territory of the other Party if it is published in that territory within 30 days of its original publication.” These provisions of the FTA are there to ensure that U.S. works and sound recordings (and performances) are not discriminated against in the Bahraini market (and vice versa). Express provisions in the Bahraini Law No. 22 are missing.
- **Bahrain Law Does Not Include Express *Ex Officio* Criminal Authority as Required by FTA Article 14.10.27(d):**¹ Nowhere in Chapter 13 (Sanctions) of Law No. 22 is there a provision for Bahraini officials to exercise *ex officio* criminal authority. Notably, Article 62(4) does provide *ex officio* authority in the area of customs enforcement, so it may be inferred that there is no *ex officio* authority in criminal enforcement, which would violate the requirement of FTA Article 14.10.27(d) that “authorities may initiate legal action *ex officio*, without the need for a formal complaint by a private party or right holder.”
- **Destruction of Devices and Products Involved in TPM and RMI Violations is Not Provided For in Violation of FTA Article 14.10.14(d):** FTA Article 14.10.14(d) requires that civil remedies against violations involving TPMs and RMI must include “destruction of devices and products found to be involved in the prohibited activity.” Law No. 22 Article 64(5) refers only to “materials and implements that have been used in the manufacture or creation of ... infringing goods” which suggests it is only applicable to copyright infringement, not violations of TPMs and RMI. This must be clarified, and amended if necessary to provide for this remedy required by the FTA.

¹ We also note that *ex officio* authority as to customs authorities may be unclear. FTA Article 14.10.23 requires that “competent authorities may initiate border measures *ex officio*, with respect to imported, exported, or in transit merchandise, without the need for a formal complaint from a private party or right holder.” However, according to Article 62(4) of Law No. 22, Bahraini Customs can act on an *ex officio* basis only when sufficient proof is “apparently” available. It should be confirmed that the meaning of “apparently” comports with the FTA notion of “sufficient information” as per FTA Article 14.10.20.

- **Ex Parte Civil Search Provisions Fail to Comply with FTA Article 14.10.17:** Article 14.10.17 of the FTA provides, “Parties shall act upon requests for relief *inaudita altera parte* expeditiously and generally execute such requests within 10 days, except in exceptional cases.” Article 63(4) of Law No. 22 provides,

The President of the court shall where appropriate and requested act *inaudita altera parte* in any case where any delay is likely to cause irreparable harm to the right holder, or where there is a demonstrable risk of evidence being destroyed. Provided that the other party shall be notified of the order without delay which may, where appropriate, be without delay after executing the order.

The Bahrain provision does not indicate that requests shall be acted upon “expeditiously” and does not indicate they shall generally be executed “within 10 days,” but instead restates the TRIPS language, and in addition, indicates “that the other party shall be notified of the order without delay which may, where appropriate, be without delay after executing the order.” The failure to provide for the express terms of the FTA and, in addition, the provision that a defendant will be notified “without delay” raise questions as to whether the Bahrainis comply with the terms of FTA Article 14.10.17.

- **“No Mandate” Clause on TPMs is Missing from Bahrain Legislation:** FTA Article 14.4.7(c) provides,

In implementing subparagraph (a), neither Party is obligated to require that the design of, or the design and selection of parts and components for, a consumer electronics, telecommunications, or computing product provide for a response to any particular technological measure, so long as such product does not otherwise violate [the prohibitions on circumvention of TPMs].

This language is missing from Law No. 22.

- **Absence of Provision to Award Costs, Attorneys’ Fees to Prevailing Party Violates FTA Article 14.10.8 and 14.10.14:** There is no provision in Law No. 22 that the prevailing party shall be awarded costs and attorneys’ fees as required by FTA Article 14.10.8 (as to copyright infringement) and 14.10.14 (as to TPMs and RMI violations). Article 64.6 provides, “The competent court shall assess the expenses and fees of the experts and specialists, authorized to initiate any mission in the lawsuit, according to the volume and nature of the mission assigned to them without any unreasonable prevention to take such measures,” which goes to experts and is also required by FTA Article 14.10.16. Other articles deal only with service providers, but do not satisfy the FTA requirement.²
- **Software Exception Appears Overly Broad to Meet the Three-Step Test:** FTA Article 14.4.10(1) provides that limitations and exceptions to copyright must be confined to “certain special cases that do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work, performance, or phonogram, and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the right holder.”

² Article 46 defines the term “monetary relief” to include “costs, attorneys’ fees, and any other form of monetary payment to be reimbursed,” but this is expressly limited to the section on service provider liability, and Article 50(3) provides, “The service provider shall not be responsible for costs or attorneys’ fees associated with any judicial proceeding for the issuance of an order in accordance with the provisions of this article. Those requesting an order shall bear all the expenses, fees, and charges.”

Leaving aside other possible exceptions that go beyond this requirement, one exception that appears to violate the three-step is the software-specific exception in Article 26(b) of Law No. 22. Specifically, it states,

The legitimate holder of a copy of a computer program may, without the author's permission and without compensation, make ... [a]n adapted, altered or modified copy of a program, or a copy translated to another program, if such copy is essential for the compatibility of the program with a particular machine and is made only for the personal use of the legitimate holder of the original copy.

We believe the Bahrainis have attempted here an approximation of a limitation which exists in U.S. law, namely, Section 117(a)(1), which provides that it is not an infringement of copyright for the owner of a computer program to copy or adapt a computer program if "such a new copy or adaptation is created as an essential step in the utilization of the computer program in conjunction with a machine and that it is used in no other manner." The purpose of the Bahraini provision seems to be the same as 117(a)(1), namely, to ensure that someone who is the lawful owner of a computer program may use it on a particular machine, and to allow adaptation or copying when such adaptation or copying is an "essential step" to use the program on that machine. The Bahraini provision, however, goes well beyond what is required to use the program on a particular machine, exempting such activities as altering or modifying the program or even translating the program "to another program." Such activities take the Bahraini provision outside the scope of what the three-step test as enumerated in the FTA would allow. One possible way to resolve the issue would be to amend Article 26(b) as follows:

The legitimate holder of a copy of a computer program may, without the author's permission and without compensation, make ... A copy or an adapted, altered or modified copy of a program, or a copy translated to another program, if such copy is essential for the use compatibility of the program onwith a particular machine and is ~~made only~~ for the personal use only in that manner by of the legitimate holder of the original copy.

- **ISP Liability: Provision That "Cached" Copy Must Not be Modified When "it is transmitted to subsequent users" May Be Inconsistent With FTA Article 14.10.29(b)(iv) Limitation on Liability for ISPs for "Caching":** The FTA includes the potential safe harbor for service providers for "caching carried out through an automatic process" when the service provider meets certain conditions. This safe harbor does not contemplate that the ISP would engage in the subsequent transmission of the interim copies to further users, although it does contemplate users accessing the cached content. Article 49(2) of Law No. 22 provides that in order to qualify for the safe harbor, a service, among other things, must "not make any modification to the content of the temporarily cached copy of the material as it is transmitted to subsequent users." Since this "condition" suggests that it would otherwise be acceptable for a service provider to transmit cached material to "subsequent users," it may be inconsistent with the FTA.
- **ISP Liability: Conditions for ISP Safe Harbors With Respect to Storage and Information Location Tools Must Be Notice "or" Knowledge to Satisfy FTA Article 14.10.29(b)(v):** To qualify for the safe harbor for "storage at the direction of a user of material residing on a system or network controlled or operated by or for the service provider" or "referring or linking users to an online location by using information location

tools, including hyperlinks and directories,” a service provider must, according to FTA Article 14.10.29(b)(v), “expeditiously remov[e] or disable[e] access to the material residing on its system or network on obtaining actual knowledge of the infringement or becoming aware of facts or circumstances from which the infringement was apparent, such as through effective notifications of claimed infringement.” However, the exact terms of Article 49(3)(b) and (c) of Law No. 22 could make it appear that a notice is required (i.e., it is not set out as “notice” or “knowledge” but as “notice” and “knowledge”). It must be confirmed that the law means that as long as the service provider knows or becomes aware of facts or circumstances from which infringement is apparent, it must expeditiously take down infringing material in order to qualify for the safe harbor.

- **FTA Article 14.10.20 and 14.10.21 Border Measures Requirements that Information Requirement or Security Requirement Shall “not unreasonably deter recourse to these procedures” is Missing from Bahrain Law (Article 62(1) and (3)):** Based on experience in this field, industry believes that the authorities might impose lengthy and costly procedures in the absence of the FTA language.
- **Maximum Criminal Fine of 4,000 Dinars (US\$10,612) May Not Meet FTA Article 14.10.27 Requirement of “removing the monetary incentive if the infringer”:** Article 14.10.27(a) provides that criminal remedies must be “sufficient to provide a deterrent to future acts of infringement consistent with a policy of removing the monetary incentive of the infringer.” It is difficult to see how 4,000 Dinars will be viewed as “deterrent” consistent with 14.10.27(a). The minimum fine is only 500 Dinars (US\$1,327). For large-scale commercial pirates, it is very difficult to imagine the monetary incentive for piracy could be reduced by such static and low fines.
- **Definition of “communication to the public” in Bahraini Law Does Not Match FTA Definition with Respect to Phonograms:** The definition of “communication to the public” in FTA Article 14.6.4(g) is supposed to include, as to phonograms, the “making [of] the sounds or representations of sounds fixed in a phonogram audible to the public,” but nowhere is this definitional distinction found in the Bahrain law.
- **Vague Provision of Bahraini Law on “authorized” Acts with Respect to TPMs, Decryption of Encrypted Satellite Signals, etc. Leaves FTA Compliance in Doubt:** Article 68 of Law No. 22 provides:

Without prejudice to the provisions of Article (45) of this Law, it is not an infringement of the rights of authors or owners of related rights to import, use, possess, sell, or distribute copies of works, performances, or phonograms when approved or authorized by the owner of the rights in such works, performances or phonograms.

Since this provision refers to Article 45, dealing with, among other things, unlawful circumvention of TPMs or unauthorized decryption of encrypted satellite signals, a concern is that this might be interpreted as an exception to these prohibitions. If this provision is intended to say that right holders may authorize decryption or the lawful use of a TPM to access or otherwise use works or phonograms, this appears to be a confirmation of right holders’ ability to freely contract. In that case, we question the need for the provision. On the other hand, if it is intended to signal that the activities mentioned in Article 45 are permissible in cases in which approval or authorization is not required of a right holder, this

provision would violate the FTA. We would urge you to seek clarification as to the meaning of this provision which we believe may have been inserted into the legislation in the eleventh hour before passage.

- **Implementation of Government Legalization Requirement Unknown:** FTA Article 14.4.9 provides, “[e]ach Party shall issue appropriate laws, orders, regulations, or administrative or executive decrees mandating that its agencies use computer software only as authorized by the right holder. Such measures shall actively regulate the acquisition and management of software for government use.” The Bahraini law contains nothing on this point, and we are unaware of whether the Bahrainis have satisfied this obligation.
- **Unclear Implementation of Requirement to Prohibit “retransmission of television signals ... on the Internet”:** FTA Article 14.4.10(b) provides, “[n]otwithstanding subparagraph (a) and Article 6.3(b), neither Party shall permit the retransmission of television signals (whether terrestrial, cable, or satellite) on the Internet without the authorization of the right holder or right holders of the content of the signal and, if any, of the signal.” There is no specific provision in Bahrain’s law to deal with this requirement, and we are unaware of what theory they would apply to cover such activity (e.g., under the exclusive broadcast right).
- **Civil Remedies Against Those Who Decrypt Encrypted Satellite Signals Do Not Expressly Include Remedy Against “any person that holds an interest in the encrypted programming signal or the content of such signal” as Required by FTA Article 14.7(2)**
- **Statutory Damages May Be Too Low to “constitute a deterrent” as Required by FTA Article 14.10.7:** The Bahrain Law No. 22 provides for a maximum of 9,000 Dinars (US\$23,876) per infringement, which may be too low to “constitute a deterrent” and to “compensate fully the right holder.” Industry indicates that such low damages will almost surely result in their not employing statutory damages, which further suggests the provision cannot provide the necessary deterrent and could leave the provision as dead letter.

FTA Issues in Draft Optical Disc Statute

IIPA has only recently reviewed a draft optical disc statute for Bahrain and is not aware of the status of this draft, but notes preliminarily the following deficiencies in comparison with the FTA Side Letter. The draft, if passed without these changes, would violate the U.S.-Bahrain FTA Optical Disc Side Letter.

- **Article 2 (“Requirement of a License”):** The Bahrain draft would set a horrible precedent by exempting from the license requirement anyone who would produce “for the purpose of, and to the extent required for, research by a research institution.” This is not permissible under Para. (a) of the FTA OD Side Letter. A research institution producing discs must apply for a license like everyone else. The text “except for the purpose of, and to the extent required for, research by a research institution” must be deleted.
- **Article 18 (“Inspection”):** The Bahraini draft is missing the language “Every licensee shall produce its records for and permit inspection by the competent authorities at any time.” This is very important to ensure 1) records are not destroyed or hidden in other locations and are actually produced; and 2) that licensees do not obstruct inspectors from engaging in

inspections. It is also the case that failure to provide records and obstruction must be made offenses under the FTA, pursuant to FTA OD Side Letter Para. (g) of the side letter.

- **Article 22(5) and (9) (“Offences”)**: The Bahraini draft Article 22(5) requires proof that the production was “for commercial gain” while draft Article 22(9) does not require proof of “commercial gain” (the latter is consistent with FTA OD Side Letter Para. (i); the former would not be, unless the phrase “for commercial gain” modifies only “traffics”). In addition, in both 22(5) and 22(9), the phrase “knowing, or having reason to know,” must be removed in order to achieve FTA compliance, since FTA OD Side Letter Para. (i) requires strict liability for this kind of activity.
- **Article 23 (“Forfeiture and Revocation of License”)**: Article 23 of the Bahraini draft has the words “article or thing” which we assume refers to “equipment.” Since Article 23(2) refers to “Any forfeiture of optical discs, articles or things under Paragraph (1),” it appears the deletion of “article or thing” from 23(1) was a mistake. In any event, “equipment” must be confirmed to be included in Article 23(1) in order to comply with FTA OD Side Letter Para. (g).