**SWITZERLAND**

INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALLIANCE (IIPA)

2015 SPECIAL 301 REPORT ON COPYRIGHT PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

**Special 301 Recommendations:** IIPA recommends that USTR place Switzerland on the Watch List in 2015 and urges that USTR increase its bilateral engagement with Switzerland in the coming year.¹

**Executive Summary:** Switzerland missed a crucial opportunity in 2014 to stem high levels of online piracy with quick action on the unanimous recommendations of the Arbeitsgruppe Urheberrecht 2012, or Working Group on Copyright (AGUR12), published in December 2013. Instead, in June 2014, the Federal Council instructed the Department of Justice to respond to those recommendations on a severely protracted schedule, with a bill not to be presented to the legislature until the end of 2015.² Any such proposed amendments would not become law before the end of 2018 (if at all). One recommendation of the AGUR12 that could have been actionable in the very near term, namely a public awareness campaign, has been wholly ignored. The Swiss music industry continues to attempt to navigate the increasingly narrowed evidentiary criteria that must now be met for prosecutors to take action against instances of online copyright crimes; but that effort shows little promise of bringing the existing enforcement standstill to resolution. All told, five years after the 2010 Logistep decision that led to an overbroad understanding of the type of public network data that is protected from collection by private parties for copyright litigation, online infringements continue to be met with no effective civil or criminal enforcement in Switzerland.

Switzerland remains a haven for existing and new services heavily engaged in infringing activity that have opened or moved headquarters or servers to Switzerland. From there, they provide a global service to export pirated content. This long-lasting and ongoing activity can be directly attributed to the reality that Swiss law enforcement still provides no effective consequences for online copyright infringement on any scale. The Swiss Government should take immediate action to clarify what evidence collection practices are or are not permissible for effective copyright enforcement under the Data Protection law. It should also revise the announced schedule for copyright law reforms so that the unanimous December 2013 recommendations of the AGUR12 may be incorporated into Swiss law on a fast-track basis, to enter into force by the end of 2016. Such amendments should include measures to fairly and effectively address websites providing access to both hosted and non-hosted infringing content and repeat infringers, as well as a civil liability limited to certain service providers hosting structurally infringing sites.

**PRIORITY ACTIONS REQUESTED IN 2015**

- Clarify permissible evidentiary procedures for civil and criminal online copyright enforcement to permit law enforcement to resume online copyright enforcement as soon as possible;
- Accelerate the introduction of a bill to incorporate the compromise recommendations of the AGUR12 as published in Section 9.3 of the final AGUR12 report dated December 6, 2013;
- Demonstrate a commitment to the reduction of pervasive piracy by participating with the private sector in a broad-based information campaign, as recommended in the AGUR12 report;
- Clarify Switzerland’s exceptions to copyright to ensure that single copies for private use are permissible only as long as they derive from a legal source; and

¹For more details on Switzerland’s Special 301 history, see previous years’ reports at http://www.iipa.com/countryreports.html. For the history of Switzerland’s Special 301 placement, see http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2015SPEC301HISTORICALCHART.pdf.

- End the discrimination of neighboring rights under collective rights management by deleting the 3% cap in Article 60(2) of the Swiss Copyright Act.

**THE NATURE OF PIRACY IN SWITZERLAND**

Switzerland suffers not only from increasing domestic piracy rates for music, film, video games, and entertainment software, but also from a growing reputation as a safe haven for certain Internet service providers (ISPs) to base operations dedicated to piracy on a global scale.

Some of the world’s most popular Internet services for the unauthorized sharing of copyrighted works have opened or moved headquarters or services to Switzerland, including the file storage service Uploaded.net, currently ranked number 411 of the world’s most popular websites according to Alexa, and Oboom.com, an ad-based file storage service that fuels piracy by incentive programs and, as with Uploaded, through the sale of “premium accounts” permitting immediate downloads of multiple files at once. The hosting provider Private Layer (with data center and hosting operations in Switzerland and corporate operations in Panama) hosts a large number of illegal websites including the BitTorrent indexing site Bitsnoop, the linking site Putlocker.is, and the streaming cyberlocker site Nowvideo.sx (which offers uploaders rewards of about US$20 per 100 downloads, and refuses to comply with takedown notices). These services have a worldwide clientele affecting Russia, Poland, the United States, the EU, and beyond, and are accountable for significant traffic of pirated content.

Swiss Internet users utilize a broad range of mechanisms to access pirated content online. Peer-to-Peer (P2P) BitTorrent activity for the purposes of sharing infringing material remains popular. Cyberlocker services for storage and sharing of illegal files are also still available, though with some decline in favor of BitTorrent networks since the closure of Megaupload in 2012. Stream ripping sites and applications, which permit a user to create a local copy of unauthorized streamed content, are still high in usage. Downloading and streaming for private use are widely viewed as legal, as long as there is no uploading.

**ONLINE COPYRIGHT ENFORCEMENT IN SWITZERLAND**

Copyright industries in Switzerland have kept up efforts to resume criminal and civil actions against online infringement under Swiss law, almost entirely ceased in the aftermath of the 2010 decision of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court in the Logistep case, which prosecutors have interpreted broadly as barring the collection and use of any IP address data identifying defendants in criminal copyright cases. This is despite a clarification from the Swiss Data Protection Authority (FDPIC) stating that under Swiss privacy laws, the decision only barred the specific data harvesting that was used in that case, and only from use in civil actions. In fact, the Data Protection Commissioner has opined that the anti-piracy activities of the type carried out by IIPA members, including the music and film industry, are compliant with the Data Protection Act, and is supportive of rights holders’ best practices. Yet rights holders are currently proscribed from analyzing the IP addresses of suspected infringers for purposes of establishing the existence of an underlying direct infringement as part of a secondary liability claim, notwithstanding the fact that such information is made publicly available by users who participate in P2P file sharing on public networks.

Subsequent to the 2010 Logistep decision, Swiss prosecutors halted all investigations of online copyright crimes until, on February 3, 2014, the Zurich Supreme Court remanded a case against a heavy uploader of pirated material via the “Gnutella” P2P file-sharing protocol. That case had been refused by the public prosecutor due to the fact that the relevant user data had been collected by a private entity, but now will be investigated by law enforcement and ultimately will require further court interpretation of the Data Protection Act. On a separate track, rights holders are pursuing a case of online piracy in which, as suggested by the courts, private parties collected no
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user data (despite the fact that such data is publicly visible), but instead relied only on the presence of unauthorized files online. To do so, rights holders identified musical recordings of Swiss origin (with Swiss-German lyrics), so that Swiss uploaders could be certain to be implicated in the action handed over to the District Attorney’s investigators. However, such an approach may not be practical with respect to non-Swiss materials—and as a general matter places a greater burden on law enforcement in conducting investigations—but appears to be the only enforcement path remaining in Switzerland’s rocky copyright regime.

Although the existing Swiss Data Protection Act does not require such limited evidentiary rules, some have concluded that amendments to the law are the best way to move prosecutions forward. Unfortunately, the process of developing compromise recommendations and bringing legal changes into force is not set to be complete until late 2018 at the earliest—eight years after the Federal Supreme Court handed down the Logistep decision, a laughable delay given the fast-paced and ever-changing online environment at issue. It was nearly two years after the Logistep decision that the Federal Department of Justice and Police recognized at last the magnitude of this enforcement deadlock and other concerns, and agreed to set up AGUR12, a stakeholder working group made up of artists, producers/distributors, collecting societies, copyright user organizations, and consumer organizations, along with government participants and ISP representatives brought in as experts. After more than a year of deliberations, on December 6, 2013, AGUR12 published its unanimous compromise recommendations for reform — the significance of which cannot be overstated given the variety of viewpoints that were represented in the working group. The Federal Council considered the recommendations for six months, and on June 6, 2014, announced that it had tasked the Federal Department of Justice and Police with drafting a bill for legislative consultation by the end of 2015, drawing from the AGUR12 recommendations on copyright and “the conclusions of a working group that is currently examining the civil responsibility of providers in general.”

Swiss rights holders have serious concerns about their government’s will to accept and prioritize the implementation of AGUR12 package of recommendations. The Swiss Government should revisit its timeline for adoption of changes to the law, and prioritize quick implementation of the AGUR12 recommendations, including:

• Introduction of a fair and effective mechanism to address websites providing access to both hosted and non-hosted infringing content via a governmental body;

• Introduction of a simplified mechanism to deter repeat infringers, which ultimately leads to civil liability for the holder of an infringing IP address;

• Introduction of liability for certain hosting providers, similar to the form of liability known in German courts as “Störerhaftung,” leading to a take-down/stay-down obligation for certain providers; and

• A right of information for the collection and use of data (including IP addresses) for copyright enforcement purposes.

Until the situation in Swiss courts changes, as copyright owners are unable to enforce their rights online, Switzerland appears to be in violation of its obligation to “ensure that enforcement procedures … are available under [its] law so as to permit effective action against any act of infringement of intellectual property rights,” under the World Trade Organization Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Article 41.
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THE SWISS COPYRIGHT ACT AND RELATED LAWS

In addition to the urgent developments regarding Internet piracy enforcement in Switzerland, IIPA continues to have other long-standing concerns with certain aspects of the copyright and related laws in Switzerland. These were explained in detail in IIPA’s 2013 Special 301 submission on Switzerland. In summary:

First, the private copy exception in Article 19 of the Swiss Copyright Act is too broad, and has been interpreted to allow the making of copies of works or phonograms that come from unlawful sources. According to the Swiss Federal Council’s announcement, the Swiss Government intends to confirm that downloading from an illegal source is permitted. In addition, a new effort is underway to expand the private copy exception to include the ability to make copyrighted material available on a non-commercial website, as long as the site has a small amount of data traffic. Such an exception flies in the face of international copyright norms, and would certainly not meet the guidelines of the Berne Convention set forth under the three-step test of Article 9(2).

Second, Swiss law allows acts of circumvention of technological measures “for the purposes of a use permitted by law” (Article 39(a)(4)), an exception that is also far too broad, particularly given the inappropriately wide scope of the private copying exception. Taken together, these exceptions would allow individuals to circumvent access or copy control measures in order to copy from illegal sources and share with friends. As a consequence, devices and circumvention software are widely available in Switzerland.

Third, Articles 22(a) to 22(c) of the Copyright Act, regarding mandatory collective administration, provide overbroad benefits to state-licensed broadcasting organizations, at the expense of record producers and artists.

Fourth, Article 60(2) of the Swiss Copyright Act caps the remuneration payable to rights owners (collected via collecting societies) at 10% of the licensees’ income for authors and 3% for neighboring rights owners. This discrimination of the neighboring rights leads to poor revenues that are substandard in comparison to most European countries. In 2010, the Swiss performing artists and record producers collecting society “Swissperform” initiated arbitration proceedings against this cap. In 2014, the Swiss Federal Supreme Court has dismissed the case in the final instance. In its judgment, the Federal Supreme Court stated that the 3% and 10% caps serve as a rule of thumb for what is an equitable remuneration under collective rights management. It acknowledged that the remunerations for performing rights are in fact higher in other European countries, but was unable to intervene on the merits. Rather, it held that it is up to the Swiss legislature to set these caps based on a political assessment. With this judgment, the Swiss Federal Supreme Court clearly shows the path for reform: The Swiss Government should now end this unusual and unjustified discrimination of the neighboring rights and provide for a fair and equitable remuneration for both performing artists and producers.

Fifth, there is a need for camcording legislation to combat the illicit recording of movies at movie theaters, a major source of pirated motion pictures on the Internet, as well as on street corners and flea markets around the world.

Sixth, although Article 12 Section 1bis of the Swiss Copyright Act states that copies of audiovisual works may not be distributed or rented if this prejudices the right holder’s public performance right—e.g., if the audiovisual work is still in the theaters—an explicit criminal sanction for the violation of this principle is needed, in order to deal effectively with an influx of French-language DVDs imported from Canada and freely distributed while the motion pictures are still playing in Swiss cinemas.
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5 See http://www.iipa.com/rbc/2013/2013SPEC301SWITZERLAND.PDF.
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