

# INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALLIANCE

## 2007 SPECIAL 301 REPORT

### VENEZUELA

**Special 301 Recommendation:** IIPA recommends that Venezuela remain on the Special 301 Priority Watch List in 2007.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Venezuelan government seems to be fostering piracy by its unwillingness to enforce copyright law and stop the sale of pirate products. The streets of Caracas are plagued with pirated music, movies, games and software and the copyright industries' ability to engage in commercial distribution and conduct anti-piracy campaigns safely and effectively has been limited. Enforcement, both on the streets and at the borders, by Venezuelan authorities remains ineffective. The Venezuelan tax authorities (SENIAT) have been very vocal about combating piracy (its goal is to increase tax revenues) but local industries have seen no effective actions. The few border operations and raids have had little effect on the high piracy levels easily found in the main cities of Venezuela. Objectionable copyright legislation proposed two years ago by the government has fallen off the legislative docket, and should not be reintroduced. Comprehensive copyright law reform in alignment with international standards (such as the WIPO Internet Treaties) is what is needed in Venezuela.

#### **PRIORITY ACTIONS IN 2007**

##### **Legislation**

- Complete the deposit and ratification of the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT).
- Stop any reintroduction of the government's proposed copyright "reform" bill (as drafted in 2004) because its provisions would undermine Venezuela's TRIPS obligations as well as its bilateral copyright obligations to the U.S.
- Congress passed an amendment to the 1993 Film Law in 2005 which contains a number of highly damaging provisions to the audiovisual sector and which may serve as a negative precedent for other countries. MPA is monitoring the draft of the implementing regulations and will intervene in this process, when necessary.

##### **Enforcement**

- Instruct the Venezuelan enforcement agencies to make anti-piracy enforcement a priority in order to foster the growth of local content industries and encourage local investment.
- Improve border enforcement to intercept and seize infringing copyright products.
- Provide IPR training to both prosecutors and judges.

## **COPYRIGHT PIRACY AND ENFORCEMENT IN VENEZUELA**

The lack of adequate criminal and border enforcement has contributed to a situation where copyright piracy is widespread in Venezuela. Enforcement activities and copyright protection have deteriorated in a climate in which the government does not count intellectual property protection as a priority.

For 2006, the business software industry reports that the most harmful form of piracy is the widespread availability of pirated and counterfeit software programs, both burned and pressed, found on the streets throughout the country. In addition, the use of infringing or unlicensed software by legitimate businesses and government agencies is another major problem which undercuts the development of a legitimate market. The Business Software Alliance (BSA) also reports that internet piracy, including websites for both download and for hard-goods sales, is on the rise in Venezuela, and there are no actions being taken by Venezuelan enforcement officials to address internet crimes. BSA reports that it continues to work with SENIAT on joint public awareness projects as well as trainings. During 2006, BSA held nine workshops and seminars for enforcement authorities, training more than 410 officials.

The Motion Picture Association (MPA) reports that during 2006, optical disc piracy continued to grow via street sales in Caracas and in other urban centers. Demand for pirated DVD films has grown with the availability of low-cost DVD players on the local market. In addition, video store piracy remains pervasive in Venezuela, supplied by large scale laboratories with national distribution systems. Counterfeit packaging is common. Pirate videos are typically available before the local home-video release window has commenced. Regional broadcast television stations often transmit unauthorized U.S. motion picture product before their video release, adversely impacting both the theatrical and home video markets in Venezuela. Finally, although Internet piracy is currently not a major issue in Venezuela, with the increased availability of broadband both in homes and Internet cafes, illegal Internet downloads and Internet-based hard good sales of CD-R and DVD-R are expected to become more of a threat to legitimate sales and distribution.

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) reports continued high levels of illegal photocopying in and around universities, affecting a wide variety of academic books. In addition to enforcement by authorities against photocopy facilities making unauthorized copies, the publishing industry would like to see involvement by university administrations themselves in encouraging the use of legitimate materials on campuses. Pirated videogames remain widespread, with most imported from Taiwan, Hong Kong and China, and transshipped through Paraguay. The piracy situation for the industry worsened in 2006, in part due to the difficulty of pursuing criminal actions given the rather poor state of the country's courts.

The recording industry reports that music piracy continues to grow unchecked. The streets of Caracas like most major cities around the country are inundated with vendors offering national and international artist albums and compilations. In fact, at Plaza Caracas, in front of the building of the Copyright Office (SAPI), dozens of vendors sell thousands of burned CD-Rs with pirate music. The international recording industry (IFPI) withdrew its anti-piracy group from Venezuela in 2003 because it was not able to carry out any type of campaign. The local trade group received (through informal channels) notification that the government would not take actions against street vendors or their suppliers because of the important political base of support they represented. As a result, over the last five years two-thirds of the Venezuelan market for recorded music has been lost to piracy.

**VENEZUELA**  
**Estimated Trade Losses Due to Copyright Piracy**  
*(in millions of U.S. dollars)*  
**and Levels of Piracy: 2002-2006<sup>1</sup>**

INDUSTRY	2006		2005		2004		2003		2002	
	Loss	Level	Loss	Level	Loss	Level	Loss	Level	Loss	Level
Business Software <sup>2</sup>	124.0	84%	95.0	82%	39.0	79%	33.0	72%	27.1	52%
Sound Recordings & Musical Compositions <sup>3</sup>	50.6	80%	33.0	83%	31.0	80%	29.0	80%	29.3	75%
Motion Pictures <sup>4</sup>	NA	NA	30.0	63%	25.0	NA	25.0	50%	25.0	65%
Books	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.0	NA
Entertainment Software	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>174.6</b>		<b>158.0</b>		<b>95.0</b>		<b>87.0</b>		<b>99.1</b>	

**Major enforcement challenges continue:** Enforcement of the copyright law by Venezuelan government authorities remains very weak. During 2006, there were not enough effective actions taken against the widespread street piracy. Both prosecutors and judges should be provided with additional training on IPR crimes so that sentences, when eventually meted out, are actually deterrent.

BSA reports that the authorities to 10 *ex officio* actions, and there were 7 administrative actions. BSA reports good cooperation with SENIAT, the police and prosecutors, and participates in a SENIAT committee on IPR issues.

Other agencies are ineffective. The Copyright Office (SAPI) has no real enforcement powers, though it is able to impose minor administrative remedies. The industries report that their relationship with SAPI is not very strong or positive. COMANPI, the anti-piracy brigade which was once well regarded in the region, had its budget cut years ago and copyright actions declined dramatically, and it now focuses on trademark actions. No change in focus toward copyright was reported in 2006. Few cases make it through the system, and for those that do, the courts continue to issue non-deterrent penalties and inadequate damages.

<sup>1</sup> The methodology used by IIPA member associations to calculate these estimated piracy levels and losses is described in IIPA's 2007 Special 301 submission at [www.iipa.com/pdf/2007spec301methodology.pdf](http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2007spec301methodology.pdf). For information on the history of Venezuela under Special 301 review, see Appendix D at (<http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2007SPEC301USTRHISTORY.pdf>) and Appendix E at (<http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2007SPEC301HISTORICALSUMMARY.pdf>) of this submission.

<sup>2</sup> BSA's 2006 statistics are preliminary. They represent the U.S. publishers' share of software piracy losses in Venezuela, and follow the methodology compiled in the Third Annual BSA/IDC Global Software Piracy Study (May 2006), available at <http://www.bsa.org/globalstudy/>. These figures cover, in addition to business applications software, computer applications such as operating systems, consumer applications such as PC gaming, personal finance, and reference software. BSA's 2005 piracy statistics were preliminary at the time of IIPA's February 13, 2006 Special 301 filing; the 2005 data was revised and posted on the IIPA website in September 2006 (see <http://www.iipa.com/statistics.html>), and the 2005 revisions (if any) are reflected above.

<sup>3</sup> Estimated trade losses for the recording industry in 2002 reflect the impact of significant devaluation that year.

<sup>4</sup> MPAA's trade loss estimates and piracy levels for 2006 are not yet available. However, such numbers will become available later in the year and, as for 2005, will be based on a methodology that analyzes physical or "hard" goods and Internet piracy. For a description of the new methodology, please see Appendix B of this report. As the 2006 loss numbers and piracy levels become available, they will be posted on the IIPA website, <http://www.iipa.com>.

## **COPYRIGHT LAW AND RELATED REFORMS IN VENEZUELA**

**Copyright Law of 1993:** The 1993 Venezuelan copyright law, while relatively comprehensive in many respects, needs to be revised to reflect the modern standards found in the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT). In addition, ratification of the two WIPO “Internet” Treaties (WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT)) remains a priority for the copyright industries.

**Stop any reintroduction of the objectionable copyright bill:** For the last two years, the copyright industries have objected to a bill introduced in 2004 which purported to amend the copyright law. On November 4, 2004, a group of deputies from President Chavez’s political movement (*Cambio*) formally introduced a copyright “reform” bill, *Ley del Derecho del Autor y la Autora y Derechos Conexos* (LDAADC), into the Venezuelan National Assembly.<sup>5</sup> This radical legislation was approved in the first reading on February 2, 2005, essentially without discussion and without ever having been first assigned to any committee. This legislation, if adopted as originally drafted, would severely undercut not only the current 1993 law, it would violate the IPR criteria in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program,<sup>6</sup> the Berne Convention, and the WTO TRIPS Agreement. In essence, these provisions would severely hamper any ability of national or international right holders to create exploit their works in Venezuela.

The industries appreciate all efforts by those within the Venezuelan government to discourage the passage of this bill and encourage the passage of more robust and comprehensive legislation in accord with international standards. During 2006, the bill’s legislative progress was slow, in part due to the opposition of SENIAT (the Tax and Customs Superintendent, *Servicio Nacional Integrado de Administración Aduanera y Tributaria*), which views the measures in the bill as unfavorable to the fight against piracy. In addition, Congressional elections in late 2006 mean

---

<sup>5</sup> As IIPA described in both our 2005 and 2006 Special 301 reports on Venezuela, the legislative history section (*Exposición de Motivos*) of this bill indicates that this legislative effort arose from the earlier “political distortions” and a “state of social and economic injustice” that gave rise to the existing 1993 copyright law. Among its many troubling deficiencies, the bill proposes the following, for example: (1) deleting all rights for phonogram producers and broadcasters (violation of TRIPS, the WPPT, the Rome Convention and Andean Community Decision No. 351); (2) requiring mandatory registration for works and performances; (3) lowering the term of protection from 60 to 50 years; (4) removing presumptions of ownership in favor of movies and software producers; (5) lowering criminal penalties from 1–4 years to 1–2 years; (6) making it very difficult to assign or transfer works; (7) removing all *ex parte* injunctions and actions; (8) requiring a mandatory royalty in favor of natural authors of 50% of all earnings from commercialization of work; (9) limiting all transfers of rights to commercialize a work to ten years for cinematographic, scientific, and technological works, and only two years in the case of certain other classes of works, such as artistic, musical and literary works. Transfers would also be limited in term based on whether the contracting party has made a financial investment in the project for which the transfer is sought; (10) providing very broad and expansive exceptions to protection; (11) providing an unclear making available right; (12) not covering point-to-point transmission, ISP liability, or providing notice and takedown provisions; (13) not establishing an importation right, and not providing statutory civil damages and criminal penalties for unauthorized parallel imports of copyrighted materials; (14) not providing civil or criminal remedies against the alteration of electronic rights management information (ERMI) or against circumvention of technological protection measures (TPMs); (15) not providing effective border measures; (16) giving the State the right to seize certain works by eminent domain for reasons of “collective benefit,” such as information related to public health, maps, artistic and musical works; and (17) eliminating work-for-hire provisions.

<sup>6</sup> Venezuela is a beneficiary under the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program, which requires beneficiary countries to afford “adequate and effective” intellectual property rights protection to U.S. copyright owners. During the first 11 months of 2006, \$630 million worth of Venezuelan goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code. For more information on the history of Venezuela under Special 301 review, see Appendices D and E of this submission: Appendix D (<http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2006SPEC301USTRHISTORY.pdf>) and Appendix E (<http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2007SPEC301HISTORICALSUMMARY.pdf>).

that this legislation will have to be reintroduced in 2007, if the government wants to continue pressing for its adoption. The copyright industries would oppose such reintroduction.

**Customs Regulations (2005):** In October 2005, SENIAT issued administrative rules applicable to the import and transit of IPR goods through customs. These regulations appear aimed at better implementing TRIPS' border provisions to enable customs authorities to deal (intercept and seize) with suspect shipments, including those in free trade zones and customs warehouses. Customs authorities may ask agents or consignees to show authorizations granted by the right holders in order to show the lawful nature of the goods.

**Film Law Amendments (2005):** In September 2005, the Venezuelan Congress passed a comprehensive amendment to the 1993 Film Law, which contains a number of highly damaging provisions to MPA member company all-media operations in Venezuela and which may serve as a negative precedent for other countries. The objectionable provisions included, for example:

- (a) a 20% local theatrical printing obligation based on the number of imported prints;
- (b) a progressive screen quota that requires theaters with more than 5 screens to fulfill a 12-week quota per complex; those with 2 to 5 screens have a 6-week quota per complex; and those with one screen, a 3-week quota;
- (c) a 20% distribution quota of national films calculated on total annual title distribution;
- (d) mandatory registration of exhibitors, producers, importers, exporters, distributors, broadcasters, etc., and national and foreign films. This could lead to the release of confidential information to competitors and government officials;
- (e) mandatory exhibition of short films without remuneration;
- (f) an obligatory control stamp for home entertainment products;
- (g) mandatory theatrical holdover; and
- (h) numerous and onerous taxes.

**Law on the Crime of Smuggling (2005):** Adopted at the end of 2005, the National Congress adopted a law penalizing smuggling. Sanctions for smuggling are imprisonment of 4 to 8 years. Fines and destruction of the seized goods and implements are also enumerated. The Attorney General's office has primary jurisdiction for investigation and prosecutorial decision-making, with the input of SENIAT. The copyright industries continue to hope that this law will actually be implemented in practice, but had no reports in 2006 of any anti-piracy actions being taken under this law.