IIPA
International Intellectual Property Alliance®

1000 F Street, NW, Floor 2
Washington, DC 20004
Tel (202) 968-4472
www.iipa.org · Email: info@iipa.org

September 17, 2026

FILED VIA REGULATIONS.GOV–DOCKET USTR–2026-0496

Mark DiPlacido
Chair of the Trade Policy Staff Committee
Office of the United States Trade Representative
1724 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Re: 2026 China WTO Compliance Report — International Intellectual Property Alliance's Written Comments in Response to "Request for Comments and Notice of Public Hearing Concerning China's Compliance with World Trade Organization (WTO) Commitments" (91 FR 53476, August 18, 2026)

To the Trade Policy Staff Committee:

The International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA) appreciates this opportunity to submit these written comments to the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) in response to the above-captioned Federal Register Notice on China's compliance with its World Trade Organization (WTO) commitments. IIPA is a private sector coalition, formed in 1984, of trade associations representing U.S. copyright-based industries working to improve copyright protection and enforcement abroad and to open foreign markets closed by piracy and other entrenched market access barriers. Members of the IIPA include: Association of American Publishers (www.publishers.org), Entertainment Software Association (www.theesa.com), Motion Picture Association (www.motionpictures.org), and Recording Industry Association of America (www.riaa.com).[1]

China is a significant market for the creative industries with an expanding online marketplace. China leads the world in the number of cinemas and China's total box office revenue was US$7.4 billion in 2025, up 22% from 2024. China was also the fifth largest music market in 2024 with year-on-year growth of 9.6%. For video games, China had a record 722 million players in 2024 with revenues of US$49.2 billion.

Market access restrictions remain the primary driver behind persistent, evolving, and rampant piracy in China. For example, the severe restrictions on (i) the distribution of digital content, e.g., through video-on-demand (VOD), (ii) lengthy delays and deterrence concerns in court cases, and (iii) legislative and procedural shortcomings all hamper rights holders' ability to

[1] Collectively, IIPA's four member associations represent over 3,100 U.S. companies producing and distributing copyrightable content. The materials produced and/or distributed by IIPA-member companies include: video games for consoles, handheld devices, personal computers, and online; motion pictures and television programming distributed in all formats (including cinema, television, online, mobile, DVD, etc.); music recorded in all formats (from digital files to CDs and vinyl) for streaming and other online services, as well as broadcasting, public performance, and synchronization in audiovisual materials; and fiction and non-fiction books, educational, instructional and assessment materials, and professional and scholarly journals, and databases.

effectively utilize and protect their copyrighted content. These and other longstanding obstacles drive Chinese consumers to domestic and foreign online piracy services to access often unapproved foreign content. More recently, Chinese companies have discovered and exploited the profitability of exporting pirated content, piracy services, and piracy devices (PDs) from China to foreign markets. In 2025, this troubling piracy-as-an-export trend expanded to cloud storage services that disseminate infringing content through popular Chinese social media platforms, e-commerce platforms, and piracy linking sites.

IIPA was pleased to see the 2021 amendments to the Copyright Law, which included some positive aspects, and welcomed the National Copyright Administration of China's (NCAC) recent publication of the draft revised Regulations on the Implementation of the Copyright Law (2026 Draft Regulations), an important and long-overdue step towards implementing the 2021 Copyright Law amendments. The 2026 Draft Regulations contain several positive provisions that provide greater certainty for rights holders. However, the amendments to the Copyright Law and the 2026 Draft Regulations omitted several critical reforms, including extending the term of protection to match the international standard of at least 70 years and amending the scope of the making available to the public right.

IIPA is grateful to the NCAC for its regularized campaigns against piracy. The NCAC has initiated special enforcement campaigns every year since 2005, and some have led to meaningful criminal actions. Most recently, NCAC has indicated that it will take "rolling" submissions of targets, which is a positive sign. However, IIPA members still do not see meaningful reductions in most commercial-scale online piracy across all categories of content, and in most cases, administrative penalties remain low. Chinese authorities usually do not act against geo-blocked piracy services that are not accessible within China. Such services are believed to be operated (at least in part) from China and distribute content globally, while seeking to evade local enforcement. Meanwhile, uncertainties about legal liability make enforcement through Chinese courts difficult. While non-copyright remedies might be available, Chinese authorities show reluctance to get involved when services are geo-blocked in China despite the widespread harm these services are causing outside of the market. Such targets include the *LokLo*k app (and its variations), the *MagisTV* boxes (and their variations) as well as piracy services like *UnblockTech* and *SVI Cloud*. Many of the illegal Internet Protocol Television (IPTV) services advertised to customers worldwide are accessed on devices originating from China but these devices are not pre-loaded with infringing software, making it difficult for rights holders and enforcement authorities to collect evidence of copyright infringement within China.

Current measures remain insufficient to deter piracy across the board. Addressing unauthorized content on social media, cloud, and search services, and e-commerce platforms remains challenging, partly due to overly burdensome procedural requirements imposed by certain platforms. Such requirements, coupled with the significant number of listings and slow processing of complaints, create practical difficulties for rights holders in removing unauthorized listings. Additionally, compared with intermediaries in other markets, intermediaries in China are slower to respond, relying on outdated standards and weaker deterrent mechanisms for repeat offenders. A major cloud and search engine service in China even permits users to search for shows and movies and watch them right in the service's browser. Rights holders welcome further clarification, strengthening, and streamlining of the application of copyright laws regarding civil,

criminal, and administrative enforcement actions brought in China as current measures remain insufficient.

Finally, China remains one of the most challenging markets in the world for the distribution of copyrighted content. Extensive market access barriers, both in law and in practice, severely restrict foreign participation in the market and leave the market open to pirated content and services. Notably, some of these barriers violate China's multilateral and bilateral obligations with the United States. Rather than continuing to pursue policies that impede access to its market, which exacerbate Chinese domestic and global piracy, China should meet its trade commitments, eliminate market access barriers, and take the necessary steps to open its marketplace to the U.S. creative industries. These comments spell out some of these problems, with particular focus on the following:

(1) Additional market access barriers to the distribution of creative content, including online, and ongoing production and investment restrictions;

(2) Continued gaps and deficiencies in China's legal regime, including both copyright law and enforcement measures;

(3) The need for enhanced enforcement to address existing and evolving online piracy that significantly impacts Chinese and international markets; and

(4) The need to immediately and fully implement all the terms of the 2012 U.S.-China Film Agreement and fulfill Phase One Agreement services purchasing obligations.

IIPA believes that progress on these issues is crucial to successful U.S. trade and economic policy plans with China. As far back as the 2012 round of the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED), the Chinese government recognized the importance of increasing sales of legitimate intellectual property-intensive products and services in line with China's status as a globally significant marketplace. It follows from this recognition that real progress on copyright protection and enforcement, as well as on market access for copyright-dependent goods and services, must be measured based on whether sales and licensing of those copyright-intensive products have significantly increased. For IIPA members, this significant increase has yet to be fully realized. IIPA appreciates the inclusion of intellectual property (IP) licensing in the 2020 Phase One purchasing commitments and encourages the Chinese government to move expeditiously to meet its Phase One obligations to expand trade.

Previous IIPA comments and testimony have thoroughly documented the challenges faced by the motion picture and television, music, publishing, and entertainment software industries, and the 2026 IIPA Special 301 country report on China provides details on these challenges as they stood in January 2026.[2] The following discussion highlights both potential WTO compliance issues in China and how addressing the four key areas of change noted above can secure positive commercial gains for the creative industries going forward, which remains the ultimate goal of

[2] See IIPA's 2026 Special 301 submission on China (IIPA 2026), available at https://www.iipa.org/files/uploads/2026/01/CHINA-2026-COPYEDITED-1.16.26-1.pdf.

IIPA members' efforts in China.

I. Continued Discrimination Against Foreign Creative Content

The piracy and enforcement concerns outlined below are exacerbated by China's pursuit of policies that impede foreign creators' and rights holders' access to the Chinese marketplace, thereby restricting the supply of legitimate products to Chinese consumers while piracy enjoys free rein. China is also still not in compliance with the WTO's ruling in the landmark market access case (DS 363) brought by the United States regarding many market access barriers in music, audiovisual products, and publications. In addition, many of the market access barriers discussed below raise concerns under China's international obligations, including under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the Phase One Agreement (including Article 1.2 to ensure fair and equitable market access to persons that rely upon IP protection).

A. Longstanding Regulations and Proposals that Discriminate Against U.S. Producers and Distributors of Creative Content

After the WTO case concluded in 2009, China eased several market access restrictions, but many core activities of copyright industries remain restricted or prohibited. For example, the Special Administrative Measures for Foreign Investment Access (the "Negative List"), revised in 2024, continues to prohibit, among other things, foreign investment in the "editing, publication and production of books, newspapers, periodicals, audio and video products, and electronic publications," and in "online publishing services, online audio and video program services." This continues to have a chilling effect on foreign investment, including in online publishing services where, prior to the rules, some latitude appeared to have been granted.[3] However, the 2024 Negative List continues to permit foreign investment in online music services, which remains a welcome positive step. Rather than continue to pursue policies that impede access to its marketplace, China should meet its trade commitments and take steps to open its marketplace for the music, publishing, video game, and motion picture and television industries by easing or eliminating the market access barriers discussed below.

B. Increase the Number of Approvals for Foreign Video Games to Match the Number of Domestic Approved Video Games

In June 2016, China updated its content approval regulations for mobile video games that make it extremely difficult for foreign publishers of mobile games to access the Chinese market. While there has been an annual increase in the number of imported game licenses approved in China since 2022, the percentage of these imported games originally published by U.S. publishers or adapted from U.S. IP has continued to decrease each year — four out of 44 in 2022, five out of 58 in 2023, and six out of 75 as of late 2024. In some positive news, as of September 24, 2025, China had approved 79 imported online games in 2025, indicating a notable pickup versus 2024's pace. However, only nine of those are from U.S. publishers, a significant underrepresentation of

[3] Among other things, these rules unfortunately restrict the distribution of foreign audiovisual content on online video platforms, even if the distributor has received a home entertainment permit from the former General Administration of Press and Publication (GAPP).

the contribution of U.S. game publishers to the global video game market. Overall, parity with domestic approvals has not yet been reached. China should increase the number of approvals for foreign video games to match the number of approved domestic video games and ensure games originally published by U.S. producers or adapted from U.S. IP have equal access to the Chinese market.

C. Address China's Burdensome Content Review Regime to Books Intended for Other Markets, Lift Content Review Procedures for Imported Physical Sound Recordings, and Avoid Instituting Troublesome Regulations for Online Games

Censorship of the U.S. creative industries by the Government of China not only blocks access into China, but also impacts the content brought to the worldwide marketplace. For example, China appears to extend its content review regime even to books merely being printed in China but otherwise intended for distribution in other markets. Books that were previously printed in and exported from China without issue now appear subject to the more stringent application of the regime. Extending the reach of its burdensome content review regime to books merely being printed in the country but otherwise intended for distribution in other markets places an arbitrary and unjustified discriminatory burden on foreign publishers that, for decades, have used printing partners in China, and is arguably a disguised restriction on international trade.

Additionally, sound recordings that are imported into China in a physical format are required to undergo a strict content censorship procedure, comply with a series of formalities, and receive approval before distribution in the market. These requirements should be removed.

Finally, in December 2023, China's National Press and Publication Administration (NPPA), the primary regulator for video game publication, approval, and supervision, released for public comment a proposed bill entitled *Measures for the Administration of Online Games*. This draft provides a framework for the establishment of online video game publishing and operating entities, management, and supervision of online video games. It reflects the Chinese government's heightened and detailed oversight of online video games, emphasizing content compliance, protection of minors, and promotion of cultural values. Key provisions include: (1) extended license review period; (2) video game license management; (3) video game mechanics and monetization restrictions; (4) loot box controls; (5) beta testing requirements; (6) digital payment system requirements; (7) cultural content promotion; (8) enhanced penalty framework; (9) domestic server and storage requirements; and other requirements. While the video game industry actively supports the goals of online safety and digital wellness, these proposed regulations and burdensome licensing requirements may unfairly impact IP rights holders by targeting the business models that many video game companies have come to rely on. It is imperative that this proposal not place an undue burden on the video game industry, including by creating vacuums that can be filled with demand for pirated games.

D. Repeal Additional Impediments to China's Market for U.S. Audiovisual Content

China continues to introduce additional impediments to its market for U.S. audiovisual

content, limiting the U.S. creative industry's ability to fully access and compete fairly and inhibiting its potential growth in this massive and fast-growing market. A myriad web of policies significantly curtails the number of U.S. film and television programs licensed in China for online distribution and inhibits the ability of the film, television, and streaming industry to compete in the Chinese market. China caps the overall online distribution of foreign films and TV dramas at 30% and requires online distributors to register content and submit it for review. This results in extended delays and uncertainty. Opaque sub-quotas and approval rules (by country and genre) within the 30% cap further exacerbate industry uncertainty and contribute to an uneven playing field. Moreover, U.S. producers generally are only able to submit partial or full seasons of television series following their domestic run. This is because foreign titles must have already premiered in the home country and must have a rating score of above six out of ten on online platforms like Douban or IMDb before submission.

In practice, these policies have reduced the foreign content cap to significantly less than the available 30% cap. These restrictions on U.S. content in China create a demand vacuum that is ultimately filled by pirated content.

Since 2019, the National Radio and Television Administration (NRTA) has also required administrative licensing for domestic online audiovisual works, essentially applying the same censorship rules and standards for offline (theatrical) and online VOD content. Furthermore, imported films with public screening permits are required to be resubmitted for online distribution approval, creating a second (duplicative) content review resulting in further and frequently significant delays.

To help ease these additional regulatory burdens, China should establish defined and prescribed content review time frames for online distribution; establish a fast-track online registration system for already approved foreign content (in particular, for theatrical films which have already received a censorship approval for cinema release, including library/catalogue films that received such approval pre-2019); and establish an independent expedited review approval process for foreign content on a special case-by-case basis.

E. Implications of the Revised Anti-Espionage Law

In July 2023, the revised Anti-Espionage Law, originally introduced in November 2014, came into effect. The revisions significantly broaden the scope of what constitutes "espionage" and grant relevant authorities enhanced powers to investigate and prosecute suspected espionage activities. Many provisions in the revised law were previously included in existing regulations, such as the Anti-Espionage Law's Implementing Rules from 2017, which outlined enforcement procedures; and the Provisions on Anti-Espionage Security Precautions from 2021, which have largely been integrated into the updated law. The consolidation of these amendments into a single, powerful Anti-Espionage Law with broad applicability is significant. The most significant change is the expanded definition of "espionage," which now encompasses the collection, storage, or transfer of any information deemed to be relevant to national security interests, including "documents, data, materials, or items." This definition was previously limited to classified information and state secrets. Such a broad interpretation could lead to uncertainties even in the context of friendly collaborations, including when foreign investment is permitted, such as in

online music services. For example, Chinese companies may now be unwilling or cautious to share with potential foreign investors key financial or business-related information that would be considered necessary to establish a joint partnership.

II. Gaps and Deficiencies in China's Legal Regime, Including Both Copyright Law and Enforcement Measures

Prior IIPA filings have documented in detail developments in the Chinese legal system for the protection of copyright.[4] These reform processes, including the ongoing implementation of the Phase One Agreement, provide important opportunities to update the legal regime in China for more effective copyright protection and enforcement.

A. Fully Implement Amendments to the Copyright Law

After years of IIPA and other stakeholders pressing for progress on amendments to the Copyright Law, in November 2020, the National People's Congress (NPC) passed amendments that entered into force in June 2021. In July 2026, NCAC published the 2026 Draft Regulations, a long-overdue step toward implementing the 2021 Copyright Law amendments and providing greater certainty for rights holders. The following are some positive copyright-related provisions in the 2021 amendments and the 2026 Draft Regulations, along with additional challenges that China should address:

Rights of public performance and broadcasting for producers of sound recordings: It is vital that China ensures the effective implementation and application of these new performance rights, including the protection of foreign sound recordings, ensuring the effective exercise and management of these rights in accordance with international best practices, and providing an adequate framework for tariffs that reflect the economic value of the use of the rights in trade. Specifically, China and the United States are both World IP Organization (WIPO) Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) members, and the United States grants Chinese rights holders full national treatment with respect to sound recordings. Nevertheless, Chinese courts are denying protection for foreign, including U.S. sound recordings, on the erroneous grounds that China has not withdrawn its reservation on Article 15 of the WPPT. This acts as a major disincentive for U.S. companies to invest in the Chinese music market. The NCAC should issue guidance clarifying that China grants sound recording public performance and broadcast rights to foreign rights holders through national treatment. Unfortunately, the 2026 Draft Regulations did not resolve these ambiguities. While Article 39 provides that foreign producers of phonograms shall enjoy rights under international treaties acceded to by China, the provision does not address China's reservation under Article 15 of the WPPT. The 2026 Draft Regulations should be clarified to ensure China provides protection for foreign rights holders.

Damages and enforcement procedures: The Copyright Law amendments also include some positive reforms that will improve the enforcement environment in China, including increasing the maximum statutory damages tenfold and, upon *prima facie* evidence,

[4] See prior IIPA filings on China at: https://www.iipa.org/reports/reports-by-country/.

shifting the burden of proof to the accused infringer to show the use was authorized by the rights holder or is otherwise permissible under the Copyright Law. However, other than the encouraging outcome in the *Kuaishou* decision from August 2025, in which *Tencent* was awarded significant punitive damages, and while the government reports increased instances of punitive damages in IP cases, more generally, damages remain largely non-deterrent; application of statutory damages can remain elusive; and some forms of injunctive relief against the entire service remain unavailable as cases are "title-based", focusing on the infringement of a particular work involved in a case rather than the operation of the infringing service. On damages, it can often be difficult to obtain evidence to quantify the financial gain made by an infringer in civil or criminal actions, sometimes leading the authorities to struggle for an appropriate deterrent remedy. Courts reportedly claim to be concerned, without basis, that larger damages awards will encourage "copyright troll" behaviors and cause significant caseloads. Lastly, in order to address high volume unauthorized usages online, the civil procedure law should allow for U.S.-style disclosure or U.K.-style pre-action disclosure procedures that are also available in many other jurisdictions. Unfortunately, the 2026 Draft Regulations do not address these concerns regarding non-deterrent damages and inadequate enforcement procedures.[5]

Three-step test: The amendments elevate certain elements of the three-step test from the Berne Convention and the TRIPS Agreement into the law to appropriately confine exceptions and limitations. China should ensure all exceptions to and limitations on copyright protection in the Copyright Law are appropriately narrow in scope and otherwise consistent with the three-step test.[6] Furthermore, certain exceptions — including for educational or scientific research, encryption research, and reverse engineering — appear overbroad (certainly broader than those found in U.S. law).

Protections against the circumvention of technological protection measures (TPMs) including prohibitions against the act of circumvention as well as trafficking in circumvention devices or components: It is critical that China properly implement these amendments to ensure the protections for TPMs and against their circumvention are adequate and effective. For example, protections should apply to TPMs that control and manage authorized access to copyright works ("access controls") and a prohibition against circumvention should apply to both access controls and TPMs that protect rights (including against unauthorized copying) in those works ("copy controls"). China should also ensure that rights holders have standing to bring suit in cases in which the TPM was employed by a licensee platform. While the 2026 Draft Regulations include a definition for TPMs, unfortunately, the regulations do not expressly confirm protection for both access controls and copy controls and do not provide effective remedies against acts of circumvention and trafficking in circumvention devices, technologies, components, and services. In addition, Article 45 appears to exclude TPMs from protection when there is "harm to the public interest," a very open-ended exception that could undermine even basic protections.

B. Address Shortcomings in the Copyright Law and the Criminal Law

[5] These deficiencies regarding non-deterrent damages and inadequate enforcement procedures raise questions regarding China's enforcement obligations under the TRIPS agreement, including Articles 41 and 42.
[6] See, e.g., Article 13 of the WTO TRIPS Agreement

Despite the above improvements, neither the Copyright Law as amended in 2021 nor the 2026 Draft Regulations addressed several deficiencies in China's legal framework. China should make the following changes to its copyright framework to keep up with global best practices, emerging technological advances, and new digital business models:

1. Match the international standard of at least 70 years of protection for sound recordings and works, including audiovisual.
2. Clarify the legal basis for mechanisms that ensure Internet service providers (ISPs) can impose effective relief to remove infringement, including, where applicable, to disrupt or disable access to structurally infringing websites on a no-fault basis, upon rights holders' applications to appropriate authorities.[7]
3. Improve available online liability rules and notice-and-takedown provisions to encourage intermediaries to act in a more expeditious, efficient, and effective manner.
4. Now that courts are no longer relying on the "server test" (which once required that the act of making available occurs via copies stored in China), laws and regulations should, where the opportunity arises, clarify and confirm that the test is no longer applicable, which will pave the way for the authorities to take action against piracy even when elements of it may occur outside China.[8]
5. Provide protection against unauthorized retransmissions of copyrighted content over the Internet (including criminal liability for live streaming of pirated content).
6. Clarify that only passive and neutral intermediaries that do not contribute to infringement are eligible for the safe harbors from monetary liability, and that such intermediaries adopt and implement a repeat infringer policy.
7. Marketplaces should be required and all relevant intermediaries encouraged to institute a "know your business customers" (KYBC) policy to ensure they keep up to date and accurate information about their customers and to allow rights holders to obtain accurate information to protect their rights against direct infringers.

Additionally, legislation and judicial practices in China currently cannot respond to the evolution in commercial-scale video game piracy, especially regarding the newer forms of video game piracy mentioned above. Unfortunately, the copyright protections and remedies needed to stem these new forms of illicit video game modification are unavailable. In practice, under the copyright law, rights holders must either divide the online video game into individual copyrighted

[7] In January 2021, the Cyberspace Administration of China (CAC) released the draft *Measures on Administration of Internet Information Services* (revised draft for public consultation) that appeared to stipulate a similar mechanism, although further clarifications were required to ensure that rights holders could request the relevant governmental agencies to require Internet access providers to prevent access to infringing websites (and other online services). However, there has been no further movement on the draft by the CAC or on the implementation of the 2019 *Guidelines* that included similar mechanisms.

[8] China should further revise its legal framework to ensure adequate and effective enforcement against apps and websites that facilitate unauthorized access to copyrighted works stored on servers outside of China; and by clarifying the right of "communication over information networks" to reject the "server principle" and provide a clear legal basis under which piracy services may be held liable for IP infringements carried out by third parties using their services or networks. Furthermore, the adoption of the "server principle," which requires that the act of making available occur via copies stored in China, can hinder enforcement actions against unlicensed services operating outside China. In recent years, Chinese enforcement authorities, including the courts, appear to be moving away from the "server principle," whereby they would act favorably against an infringer only when there was proof that the infringing materials were stored on a server in China. In particular, courts in Beijing, Shanghai, and elsewhere are no longer denying relief based on this principle, although it is still advantageous for rights holders to show a nexus between the pirate operator and the pirate content stored on the operator's server. However, the problem remains that administrative enforcement authorities cite limited resources and the ability to investigate as a reason not to enforce, as they are unable to collect needed evidence to take effective action.

works — such as text, art, or music — which incurs high litigation costs and difficulty in evidence collection or must protect the entire online game as a type of audiovisual work. Nevertheless, the lack of explicit classification of online video games as a type of work under copyright law leads to uncertainty for game companies seeking to protect their rights.

Finally, the Government of China should also adopt reforms that address shortcomings in China's Criminal Law. In particular, China should meet its obligations in the WTO TRIPS Agreement by revising the criminal threshold to ensure that criminal penalties are available for all online piracy on a "commercial scale."[9] The Government of China should also separately define criminal violations regarding trafficking in devices, technologies, or services that circumvent TPMs; and separately criminalize the manufacture and distribution of PDs that are exported for the primary purpose of infringing or facilitating infringement.

C. Fully implement the Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement Commitments of the U.S.-China Phase One Agreement

IIPA welcomed the conclusion of the Phase One Agreement, signed by U.S. President Trump and Chinese Vice Premier Liu on January 15, 2020. In the agreement, China made several enforceable commitments that address certain concerns identified in these comments, particularly regarding IPR enforcement. Unfortunately, some IP-related commitments remain not fully or consistently implemented. For example, the Government of China committed to improve the transfer of cases from administrative enforcement to criminal enforcement (Article 1.26) and provide deterrent level penalties (Article 1.27). IIPA reports that implementation of these two commitments is wholly inconsistent, and in some situations, completely lacking. Additionally, China committed to improve its efforts to tackle online infringement, including the proper handling of counter-notification (Article 1.13(d)). While China's "e-commerce" law does require platform operators take "necessary measures" against infringing goods or services, and, importantly, the standard of knowledge for a platform operator to take action is that the platform "knows or should know" that the good is infringing, the law (Article 43) does not explicitly adopt effective practices for handling counternotices. This means sellers of infringing products could avoid responsibility by merely objecting to rights holders' notices of infringement. IIPA urges China to follow through on its Phase One commitments and encourages the U.S. government to work with China to ensure full implementation.

D. Ensure Legislative Proposals Related to Artificial Intelligence Meet the Standards Set Forth by the G7 Hiroshima AI Process

On several occasions throughout the last two years, the Government of China discussed regulating artificial intelligence (AI). In particular, China published *Cybersecurity Technology – Labelling method of content generated by artificial intelligence* in February 2025 and the *Measures for the Identification of Artificial Intelligence-Generated and Synthetic Content* in March 2025. Both of these legally binding measures took effect on September 1, 2025. On copyrights in particular, reports in 2024 indicated that NCAC was in the process of drafting a decree that may have introduced a text and data mining (TDM) exception. However, more recent reports suggest

[9] See WTO TRIPS Agreement Article 61. China should clarify that a single episode of a television program counts as one copy toward the threshold.

NCAC may no longer be considering this concerning approach. As China looks to possibly regulate AI, IIPA strongly encourages the Government of China to look towards the G7 Hiroshima AI Process, which has set forth important rules of the road for the development of AI systems.

For example, the International Code of Conduct for Organizations Developing Advanced AI Systems includes the following: "Organizations are encouraged to implement appropriate safeguards, to respect rights related to privacy and intellectual property, including copyright-protected content." The International Guiding Principles for Organizations Developing Advanced AI Systems includes the following principle: "Implement appropriate data input measures and protections for personal data and intellectual property." In the June 17, 2025, G7 Leaders' Statement on AI for Prosperity, the G7 Leaders indicated they would "leverage the outcomes of the Hiroshima AI Process (HAIP) to foster trust." The Leaders further committed to "[p]romote economic prosperity by supporting SMEs to adopt and develop AI that respects personal data and intellectual property rights, and strengthen their readiness, efficiency, productivity and competitiveness" and stated, "We recognize the need to respect intellectual property rights in enabling these efforts."[10] China should also provide meaningful stakeholder engagement and due process regarding this type of work, including by affording adequate opportunity to review and comment on legislative and regulatory proposals governing copyright and AI.

E. Fully implement the *Judicial Proposals on Enhancing IP Protection and Serving Promotion of High-Quality Development of Film Industry*

In November 2023, the Supreme People's Court (SPC) released *Judicial Proposals on Enhancing IP Protection and Serving Promotion of High-Quality Development of Film Industry* (Proposals). The Proposals, supported by multiple associations of the local film industry, call for the enhancement of IP protection for a specific industry (film). They include four key objectives for the film industry: (i) accelerate accomplishment of high-quality development of the film industry under the rule of law, and advocate and execute industry practices that encourage innovation and creation; (ii) intensify copyright awareness, strictly implement the Copyright Law, improve protection of film copyright and copyright-related rights, including respecting the rights of screenwriters, directors, cinematographers, lyricists, composers, and performers; (iii) utilize technical measures of content protection (for example, blockchain and digital watermarking) and innovate the license system to reduce infringement from the source; and (iv) actively and widely publicize IP protection during the process of disseminating films, for example, through industry forums and public service advertisements with the theme of anti-piracy and anti-camcording. The Government of China should appropriately implement the *Proposals*.

III. Address Existing and Evolving Online Piracy

China's market for legitimate, licensed content continues to be harmed by piracy, which is only exacerbated by the market access restrictions discussed above that entirely restrict or delay the availability of legitimate, licensed content. Online piracy in China — including illegal downloading and streaming of copyrighted content through piracy websites, apps, and devices —

[10] See G7 Leaders' Statement on AI for Prosperity, June 17, 2025, available at https://g7.canada.ca/assets/ea689367/Attachments/NewItems/pdf/g7-summit-statements/ai-en.pdf.

has evolved extensively in recent years and remains a significant concern.

For example, the Entertainment Software Association (ESA) reports that in 2024, China ranked eleventh in the world in the number of connections by peers participating in the unauthorized file-sharing of ESA member video game titles on public peer-to-peer (P2P) networks. According to this same metric, China ranked 13th in the world for unauthorized file-sharing of console-based video games and 12th for PC-based video games. Video game piracy in China is sophisticated and difficult to combat. Current video game piracy trends in China include: game cracking and hacking; private server operations; reskinning and cloning; direct code theft; substantially similar code duplication; and gameplay cloning. Reskinning can involve making minor modifications to the source code of original games before releasing them but involves more intricately copying elements of the pirated game, such as text, images, audiovisual materials, gameplay, and rules. These actions, by virtue of modifying the original game, pose greater challenges in establishing infringement compared to traditional piracy. As online games have become more sophisticated and the development costs for original developers have risen, these newer forms of piracy pose a growing threat. Counterfeit merchandise and misappropriation of video game IP are also common.

Online journal piracy remains a significant and persistent challenge. Given the lack of deterrence in the marketplace, online platforms engaged in providing unauthorized copies of journal articles, academic textbooks, and consumer books continue to operate. These platforms host unauthorized PDF copies of academic monographs, edited collections, and textbooks, and facilitate access to infringing content online in several other ways, including by providing users with search tools using Internet bots, and by bypassing TPMs to gain unauthorized access to legitimate online services. Pirated print publications and compromised log-in credentials continue to be available on e-commerce sites, which also serve as platforms through which producers of pirated and counterfeit textbooks and consumer books advertise and sell the infringing copies. *Lib-Gen*, a repository of large volumes of pirated content, remains among the top sites by Chinese Internet users and is mimicked by Chinese-language piracy platforms. Some Chinese copycat sites have also added payment processing services to their cloned repositories of infringing book and research content, while the copied pirate repositories lack such processes. There has been some progress as several domains of the piracy site *Sci-Hub* were blocked in January 2024, but traffic to the sites has again increased.

Music piracy remains a problem despite the positive market movement, hampering the development of the legitimate market to its full commercial potential. A major issue is unlicensed use of music on user-uploaded content (UUC) platforms such as *Xiaohongshu*, *Xigua*, *Ximalaya,* and *Youku*. From January to June 2025, a total of over 100,000 infringements were reported across various UUC platforms. While the platforms may remove reported infringements, removal times are long and vary, and the platforms take no measures to prevent the same recordings from immediately reappearing on their services or against repeat infringers.

Structurally, there is an increase in the availability of pirated content on cyberlockers such as domestic cloud-based storage providers like *Baidu Wangpan*, *Xunlei Cloud*, *Aliyun,* and *Kua Ke (Quark)*. *Baidu Wangpan* is particularly egregious in allowing users to search for, and then watch, the latest pirate content without ever being diverted from its own embedded player. The

infringing content on these storage services is then disseminated through popular Chinese social media platforms, e-commerce platforms, and piracy linking sites (or, as mentioned, on its own platform). Further exacerbating this problem are the cyberlockers' inconsistent and slow processing times for takedown notices alongside burdensome requirements to prove ownership before any action is taken. Pirate streaming sites (such as *Allanime, Ddys, Vidhub, Meijutt, Dy2018, and Czzy77),* illicit streaming devices *(*such as *SVICloud, EVPad, and Unblock Tech),* Internet protocol TV (IPTV) services and apps (such as *Wang Fei Mao, MagisTV, 99kubo, Juhe yingshi, WanMei, YingShi DaQuan, Hanju TV, and LokLok*), and Piracy-as-a-Service (PaaS) providers directed to global audiences that are operated from within China remain a growing problem. For example, companies that run apps like *LokLok (*also known as *Lokiok, and LokTV)*, which target Southeast Asian markets; companies that manufacture, promote, distribute, and export PDs such as *MagisTV* (rebranded as *FlujoTV*), which target Latin American markets; and sites like *GIMY*, which target Taiwan, are just some of the growing number of piracy operations that focus their illicit behavior outside of China.

China is also a large exporter of high-quality counterfeits, such as CDs and "deluxe edition" collection sets that have almost identical artwork and packaging to the genuine products and that contain genuine-looking source identification codes. The production of counterfeit vinyl is also an issue in China. For example, following a criminal investigation initiated in 2022 into the "Sound of Vinyl," a prominent seller on the Taobao platform, 13 defendants were convicted of copyright infringement offenses relating to the production of 1.2 million vinyl products, infringing the rights in 1,000 sound recordings (local and international repertoire). The sale of digital storage devices pre-loaded with unauthorized music content is also prevalent and has been pursued by administrative and criminal action. For example, in 2024 the operator of an e-shop on *Pinduoduo* that sold 35,000 USBs containing over 200 infringing sound recordings was subject to administrative penalties by the Heng Yan cultural law enforcement agency. What is more, stopping the distribution of counterfeit products remains challenging, with some major marketplaces (e.g., *Pinduoduo*) not complying at all with takedown requests and others that will take down the infringements but not take meaningful action against sellers.

A. Fully Implement the *2019 Guidelines on Strengthening the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights*

In late 2022, the China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) published a three-year Plan (Plan) (replacing the prior 2020-2021 plan) implementing the *Guidelines on Strengthening the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights*, which were jointly released by the Office of the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) Central Committee and the Office of the State Council in November 2019.[11] CNIPA's plan specifies 114 measures related to IP in six categories (with deadlines). The Plan contains items, which remain unimplemented to date, related to the protection and enforcement of copyright, including lowering criminal thresholds, streamlining evidence processes, establishing a list of repeat infringers, and regulating websites to "remove infringing content, disrupt pirated website links, [and] stop the dissemination of infringing information."

[11] The *2019 Guidelines on Strengthening the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights (the Guidelines)* were issued jointly by the Communist Party of China's Central Committee (CPCCC) and the State Council.

As noted in the *Guidelines*, China should separately define criminal violations regarding the circumvention of TPMs or trafficking in circumvention technologies. As the world's primary manufacturer, producer, supplier, and exporter of video game circumvention devices and software components, China drives significant amounts of online video game piracy around the world. Game copiers or modification chips are devices commonly used to bypass TPMs in a video game console to allow the downloading and playing of infringing video games on "modded" consoles or handhelds. The harm they cause is not limited to console and handheld makers because almost all games developed for play on consoles or handhelds, including those developed and published by third parties, can be illegally downloaded from the Internet. In addition, some Chinese software developers have started exporting software that circumvents TPMs used by legitimate digital music services such as Spotify.

Additionally, two other measures in the *Guidelines* will help advance the protection and enforcement of copyright, including measure 56, to "[p]ush IP Courts to hear IP criminal cases, continuously push reform of 'Three in One (criminal, civil, and administrative cases in one court)' IP trial mechanism," and measure 51, to "[f]urther enhance management of website platforms, push fulfillment of platform accountability, and based on opinions of related departments, dispose suspected IP infringement information/content online, in accordance with laws." The "Three in One" approach is one that IIPA members would like to see fully implemented, particularly as China remains the hub for the manufacture, promotion, and distribution of PDs, such as illicit streaming devices (ISDs), and TPM circumvention devices, including ones that are mass exported from China, which fuels much of the world's piracy problems.[12]

B. Improve the Transparency and Effectiveness of Administrative Enforcement

Rights holders acknowledge NCAC's efforts against copyright piracy, which sometimes are referred to local law enforcement agencies for follow-up. Such efforts have had an active role in addressing the unauthorized online distribution of music, helping the Chinese recorded music industry to rise to the fifth largest music market in the world.[13]

While some referrals to NCAC do result in criminal action, many larger cases do not progress meaningfully after referral to local law enforcement agencies, resulting in little lasting impact or deterrence. Prior IIPA filings have documented in detail the significant challenges rights holders have with administrative enforcement in China.[14] One major challenge remains Chinese authorities' traditional unwillingness to tackle China-based piracy websites and China-based services that are geo-blocked in China but are used outside China to infringe content at commercial scale. This growing, problematic situation presents an urgent challenge for China's enforcement agencies to take meaningful action against these nefarious operations. While there was a recent conviction in China over a notorious but geo-blocked piracy website targeting users in Japan, and other criminal prosecutions against subscription-style websites including a couple of ongoing

[12] This problem is so rampant that the entire Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) member community has examined the landscape for legal protections on this issue, and Singapore and Malaysia have already enacted and implemented laws to crack down on piracy device (PD)/illicit streaming device (ISD) resellers. The Government of China can do more to tackle this problem.
[13] IFPI Global Music Report 2025.
[14] See prior IIPA filings on China at: https://www.iipa.org/reports/reports-by-country/.

cases, these anecdotal examples have not succeeded to date in improving the overall effectiveness of administrative enforcement. The following highlights existing and ongoing concerns rights holders have with China's administrative enforcement of copyrights:

1. Administrative authorities are unwilling to act against previously sanctioned entities unless the rights holder files a new complaint for the same infringing conduct. Repeat infringers also rarely receive enhanced penalties.

2. Rights holders must meet lengthy procedures involving repetitious and complicated evidentiary requirements.

3. China's administrative enforcement entities remain unprepared to meet the emergence of modern technologies and services for enabling mass infringement, especially in the online and mobile environments.

4. While the annual "Sword Net" campaigns and administrative outcomes are regular NCAC activities, IIPA would like to see more timely and detailed information across all provinces regarding the results of administrative actions, including next steps.

5. IIPA encourages Chinese authorities to take administrative action against piracy services that are not accessible within China when these services are hosted or their operators are located within China. Otherwise, China-based operations that target users outside China are simply able to evade enforcement action by geo-blocking their own services from access within China or serving a separate set of content to users accessing these services from within China. The scope of these actions should also include targets such as PaaS providers, entities that manufacture, promote, distribute, or export PDs, and entities that allow unauthorized movie broadcasts in mini-VOD locations.[15]

6. Most administrative enforcement agencies, including NCAC, local Copyright Administrations (CAs), and Cultural Law Enforcement Agencies (CLEAs) lack the resources and trained personnel necessary to tackle China's persistent piracy. Cross-regional coordination between these administrative enforcement authorities is also lacking and the general capacity to deal with online piracy in different regions varies widely.

7. The transfer of copyright cases from administrative to criminal authorities for investigation and prosecution is not streamlined and uneven in practice; timelines are lengthy; and the transfer process is inefficient.

8. There is no efficient mechanism between NCAC, the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT), and Internet service providers (ISPs) for shutting down infringing websites operating without a business license (consistent with the *Guidelines*).

9. Chinese authorities seem unable to tackle a growing problem of pirate services established

[15] The Motion Picture Association (MPA) submitted 15 targets to the National Copyright Administration of China (NCAC) under the 2024 "Sword Net" campaign and 20 targets in 2025 "Sword Net" campaign. MPA has only seen a few meaningful actions taken by local enforcement agencies with regard to the targets.

outside China that target Chinese consumers.

10. China's Customs Database allows rights holders to record IP and authorized licensees for use in preventing infringing items from being exported from or imported into China. However, the database is solely in Chinese and does not support any other languages. It would be helpful for the database to support other languages, at least English, to reflect the transnational nature of infringement activity across China's borders. Additionally, the database should allow for automatic updating as opposed to a manual entry process, which is both time-consuming and inefficient.

C. Improve the Effectiveness of Civil and Criminal Enforcement

The past few years have seen several positive civil and criminal piracy enforcement cases signaling that Chinese courts, including the judiciary, may be slowly improving how these cases are handled and ultimately decided. On the civil side, courts in the past have been conservative in their damage awards granted in copyright infringement cases, rendering civil enforcement ineffective. However, on August 22, 2025, *Tencent* won two major final appellate judgments against *Kuaishou* in the Guangdong and Chongqing Higher People's Courts for copyright infringement. The courts awarded *Tencent* approximately US$12.5 million in total damages, including substantial punitive damages. Both courts found *Kuaishou* liable for contributory infringement, and the Guangdong court found *Kuaishou* liable for direct infringement. The decisions cited *Kuaishou's* failure to remove infringing content despite repeated complaints, active promotion of infringing videos, and technical ability to prevent such acts. The rulings ordered *Kuaishou* to implement takedown and filtering measures but did not impose a service-wide injunction. These are notable developments, but it remains to be seen if courts will start granting such punitive damages more broadly and in cases involving foreign rights holders.

Additionally, a new judicial interpretation entitled "*Interpretation on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in Handling Criminal Cases of Infringement upon Intellectual Property Rights*" ("JI") came into force on April 26, 2025. Under the JI, it appears intermediaries could be treated as accomplices to IP crimes. Specifically, the JI provides that joint criminal liability could be imposed when one knows that another person is committing an intellectual property infringement crime and still provides services or support such as funding, payment, and settlement, business location, transportation, storage, delivery, and posting, Internet access, server hosting, online storage, and communication transmission. While the JI appears to include potential liability on intermediaries providing services such as online storage and server hosting, it remains to be seen if any proactive and effective enforcement action will be taken against such services.

Additionally, the existing delays, costs, and procedural burdens associated with civil and criminal enforcement, contrasted with usually lower damages or non-deterrent penalties, pose significant challenges for IP rights holders. The following are some areas where China can improve the effectiveness of its civil and criminal enforcement.

Penalties: Chinese courts must issue deterrent-level civil and criminal penalties against operators of piracy websites. Judgments from courts in different regions can reach contrasting penalties despite cases involving similar facts, impacting judicial certainty and credibility.

Injunctions: China should provide a full range of broad injunctive relief for civil enforcement, including injunctions to halt the operation of piracy services (e.g., apps), and including injunctions where appropriate against intermediaries. Injunctions should also be available against ISPs in copyright cases, including against access providers, requiring them to stop providing access to unlicensed copyrighted content that has been subject of a law enforcement action, but which remains available. Moreover, when injunctions are granted, the relief is limited to only the infringement of titles at issue in a litigation rather than any future infringements of a rights holder's copyrighted works.

Identifying Piracy Operators: Since the operation of piracy services may often be overseas or multinational, cross-border enforcement cooperation is critical and needs to be improved. For example, many piracy websites use overseas servers and have applied for personal information protection from overseas domain registrars, making it effectively impossible for rights holders to collect information and lodge a complaint with Chinese enforcement agencies. Chinese enforcement agencies should reach out to other law enforcement agencies to request the necessary information to unmask operators of piracy services.

Formalities: China should rely on presumptions of copyright ownership and reduce documentation requirements (such as requiring copyright registration certificates in every instance) to establish copyright ownership in all legal cases.

Territoriality: Because of uncertainties surrounding the legal liabilities for copyright infringements occurring outside China's jurisdiction, but under the control of a Chinese individual or entity, rights holders find it difficult to take action against these individuals or entities through Chinese courts.

Multiple Jurisdictions: Rights holders are facing new enforcement complications in China with respect to the Regulations on the Jurisdiction of Cross Provincial Corporate Crime Cases issued on March 5, 2025. In the months following the Regulations' entry into force, certain Public Security Bureaus (PSBs) have refused to take actions in criminal cases involving defendants in multiple jurisdictions, citing a need to obtain approval from each local PSB with jurisdiction. Very few PSBs will agree to take new cases, and those who have are placing new cases on hold. Because many IP enforcement cases involve defendants from multiple jurisdictions, this regulation has created significant procedural delays extending into late 2025. As local legal experts have noted, cross-jurisdictional enforcement can be valuable to rights holders, "particularly when local PSBs lack expertise in IP issues, have limited capacity, or when there are concerns about local protectionism."[16] Clarifications are necessary to permit IP enforcement cases to move forward expeditiously.

Cases with Multiple Works: When filing civil cases, if there are several copyright works and recordings that are infringed by the same infringer, rights holders are required by some Local People's Courts to file separate cases (i.e., are forced to file a series of separate cases with only

[16] *See* Hou, Sophia, Jurisdictional Challenges in China's Criminal Enforcement Landscape, May 30, 2025, available at https://rouse.com/insights/news/2025/jurisdictional-challenges-in-china-s-criminal-enforcement-landscape.

one work involved per case), instead of allowing rights holders to file a single case regarding all the infringed works/recordings involved. This practice leads to an artificial increase in the number of cases accepted by the courts, but also unnecessarily increases rights holders' litigation costs, the workload of the courts, and judicial waste. This burdensome narrow form of civil action in copyright cases is a major shortcoming because it covers up the severity of copyright infringement when often thousands of titles are pirated by the same infringer, making it more difficult, for example, to claim punitive damages caused by massive copyright infringement. Historically, penalties for single-title infringement have often been much lower than warranted (except, for example, in the case of a highly popular work), whereas the outcome of a case involving multiple counts of infringement might be different. These lower remedies would likely not be considered deterrent, considering the overall scope of piracy by the infringer.

Apostille Convention Implementation: IIPA is closely monitoring the rollout of the Apostille Convention in China, particularly considering the inconsistent application of still-present legalization requirements in certain types of enforcement actions. For example, in a recent case where four China-based manufacturers were accused of exporting infringing video game controllers abroad, a Chinese court was unwilling to accept properly legalized foreign evidence stemming from the seizure of the infringing controllers by Belgian customs officials, where the evidence identified the manufacturers as the source of the infringing controllers.

As China makes progress on improving these civil and criminal concerns, it can take exemplary, effective, and deterrent actions against a range of well documented notorious piracy services, including pirate streaming sites (such as *Allanime, Ddys, Vidhub, Dy2018, and Czzy77),* ISDs *(such as SVICloud, EVPad, and Unblock Tech),* IPTV services and apps (such as *Wang Fei Mao, MagisTV, 99kubo, Juhe yingshi, WanMei, YingShi DaQuan, Hanju TV, and LokLok*), and PaaS providers.

IV. Immediately and Fully Implement all the Terms of the 2012 U.S.-China Film Agreement and Fulfill its Phase One Services Purchasing Obligations

Chinese companies are investing heavily in content and media, with a greater number of co-productions and financing from China. IIPA urges China to meet its trade commitments and open its marketplace to U.S. producers instead of continuing down its current protectionist path. These policies are unacceptable and should be reversed, particularly when China remains the second largest film market in the world. As discussed below, China should instead focus its attention on the complete implementation of the 2012 U.S.-China Film Agreement (Film Agreement) and fulfill its Phase One services purchasing obligations, including on the IP licensing of audiovisual works, as well as other market-opening steps for the motion picture and television industries.

Hailed as a "breakthrough," the Film Agreement promised to economically uplift U.S. and Chinese producers and distributors. Unfortunately, nearly fifteen years after its signing, China has failed to meet its obligations under the Film Agreement. Not implementing key provisions of the Film Agreement has enabled a consistent shortfall in U.S. producers' ability to access China's theatrical marketplace, as well as the broader marketplace for other types of distribution in China, such as via VOD and television.

As part of the Film Agreement, China committed that in 2017 it would make a meaningful increase to compensation for revenue-sharing theatrical releases, as the current 25% U.S. share of revenue is considerably lower than comparable markets and the international standard. Moreover, distributors are further deducting ticket service fees before calculating the U.S. studio share, resulting in an actual allocation of less than 25% of the gross box office revenue specified in the MOU.[17] Further, the official quota on revenue-sharing releases of 20-plus-14 (enhanced format) remains. Despite a large number of domestic productions (511 in 2025)[18] and over 90,000 theatrical screens,[19] China has retained government control of key distribution elements, severely limiting private Chinese distributors' ability to import and distribute foreign content. China must be pressed to comply with its obligations.

China further committed in the Film Agreement to promote and license privately owned Chinese distributors to engage in national theatrical distribution of imported films without the involvement of any state-owned enterprise. This requirement has also not been implemented. The Chinese Film Administration (CFA) still permits only one film importer, the China Film Group (CFG), and two distributors of foreign films: CFG and Huaxia Film Distribution Company Ltd. CFA has yet to approve any new private Chinese distributors. The CFA and CFG also determine the release dates and duration of theatrical runs of foreign films, often constraining U.S. producers' ability to realize the full commercial value of films.

IIPA recommends that China immediately act in a transparent and expedited manner on the following issues, which have been long delayed from the 2012 Film Agreement:

1. Fully implement all the terms of the Film Agreement, including the requirement to enhance compensation in 2017 (such review has been delayed for over nine years), liberalize the distribution market for private third-party Chinese distributors, and finalize a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

2. Substantially increase U.S. producers' share of revenues for the box office revenue share films from the current 25% to a level consistent with international norms and ensure online ticketing fees are not deducted from the gross box office reducing U.S. revenue film share to less than 25%.

3. Ensure that U.S. producers have control over release dates, address the problem of U.S. films being locked out from prime release dates in China, and end the practice of "double booking" of U.S. films.[20]

4. Ensure U.S. producers receive timely responses to quota allocations and film content

[17] This practice is inconsistent with global best practices, where cost of sales is not deducted from gross box office calculations, a point reinforced by the fact that for public reporting of "Gross Box Office" Chinese distributers still state the amount without netting out such fees. Online ticket sales platforms and related fees postdate the MOU and shifted the cost of ticket sales-which had not been deducted from Box Office calculations from cinemas to third parties/platforms.
[18] Official data from Chinese Film Administration (CFA), available at https://www.chinafilm.gov.cn/xwzx/gzdt/202601/t20260105_944809.html.
[19] According to Beacon Data, the actual running screens in 2025 is 83,355.
[20] "Double booking" refers to the practice of intentionally dating major theatrical releases against each other with the goal of diluting their respective box office results.

review determinations (with a prescribed content review time frame of no more than four weeks from the time of submission), and effective access to box office ticketing system information to ensure proper reporting of revenues.

V. Conclusion

IIPA appreciates this opportunity to provide USTR and the TPSC our views on China's compliance with its WTO commitments. As discussed above, the motion picture and television, music, publishing, and entertainment software industries continue to face significant challenges in China. It is critical that China fully implements its WTO obligations, including dismantling the barriers that prevent U.S. creative industries from fully accessing the Chinese market and taking the necessary steps to adequately address China's growing piracy problems. We look forward to working with you to meet the goals identified in this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin M. Rosenbaum/

Kevin M. Rosembaum
Executive Director
International Intellectual Property Alliance