INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALLIANCE 2001 Special 301 Report MACAU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY¹

IIPA recommends that Macau remain on the <u>Watch List</u>, with an <u>out-of-cycle review</u> to evaluate Macau's enforcement progress.

Macau has taken some important steps in the battle against optical media pirate production, which but two years ago threatened to overwhelm the shores of Asia and elsewhere with export pirate product. The year 2000 was a good one for enforcement against optical media piracy. Raids, seizures and arrests led to favorable court judgments imposed on commercial pirate producers and distributors. A raid in June 2000 netted the largest year-to-date single seizure of pirated optical media in the world (over 635,000 discs), and hundreds of thousands of pirated discs netted from similar raids were destroyed in 2000. In December 2000, eleven optical disc production lines (estimated value U.S.\$7.05 million at original purchase price) ordered forfeited in an earlier court decision against a commercial pirate were destroyed. By these actions, the Macau government has demonstrated the willingness to effectively raid pirate optical media plants and downstream commercial distributors, seize and destroy pirate copies, and seize and destroy the tools of pirate production. As a result, most pirate optical media production has been driven off the Macau peninsula (and neighboring islands that together make up Macau SAR).

The main gap in Macau's antipiracy program is the continued failure to impose deterrent penalties. While defendants engaged in criminal piracy operations, whether production or downstream distribution, are indicted and convicted for their piratical activities, suspended prison sentences (for periods of one to two years) are the norm, and fines remain non-deterrent (one of the larger fines meted out for piracy was 120,000 Patacas (U.S.\$14,937), in a case involving the seizure of eleven optical media production lines and 229,584 pirated CDs and VCDs). Only more prosecutions proceeding to conclusion, with stiffer fines and imprisonments imposed on commercial pirates, will provide a lasting deterrent, driving out for good pirate optical media production that has scarred Macau's recent history.

IIPA recommends that an <u>out-of-cycle review</u> in September should evaluate whether Macau has:

- successfully prosecuted copyright infringers (especially manufacturers and distributors/exporters) through the courts within six months of a successful raid;
- implemented Source Identification (SID) code requirements for masters and optical discs, including systematic monitoring by Macau authorities; and
- effectively enforced the copyright law, regardless of whether those activities are under the purview of the soon-to-be-formed Customs Department or the existing Economic Services.

¹ For more details on Macau's Special 301 history, see IIPA's "History" appendix to filing.

MACAU ESTIMATED TRADE LOSSES DUE TO PIRACY IN 2000 (not available)

PIRACY AND ENFORCEMENT IN MACAU

Driving Pirate Optical Media Production Out of Macau

Optical media piracy — the unauthorized manufacturing and export of audio CDs, video CDs (VCDs), digital versatile discs (DVDs), and CD-ROMs containing computer software, multimedia products and literary material — arrived in Macau in 1997, as pirate syndicates fled China's crackdown on underground CD plants. This brand of piracy continues as the greatest threat to the markets in Macau and neighboring China (where much of the pirate product produced in Macau is exported), although, as already noted, the year 2000 witnessed sustained enforcement actions against optical media piracy in Macau that have successfully driven out much of Macau's pirate optical media production.² There remains some activity as pirate CDs and VCDs continue to be shipped out of the country, particularly flowing into China, and some materials have also been found in Hong Kong that are believed to be sourced in Macau. Macau Economic Services reports that there are currently only six active registered optical disc factories in Macau, but industry reports that the number is more like nine plants with ten production lines. Much of the piratical activity continues to be associated with organized enterprises engaged in exporting piracy to other parts of the world. There is always the concern that one or more of these plants might shift to the production of pirate DVDs.

As noted above, the main gap in Macau's antipiracy program is its continued failure to impose deterrent penalties. Defendants are prosecuted and convicted for piratical activities but receive suspended prison sentences (for periods of one to two years) and fines that barely even rise to the level of a 'cost of doing business', much less to the level needed for true deterrence in the market. Perhaps most significantly, it does not appear that anyone being prosecuted now or prosecuted in the past for optical media piracy in Macau has ever been sent to jail for his crimes. Lack of transparency of the Macanese court system makes a full evaluation even more difficult, but it is apparent that Macau's legal system must promptly deliver more prosecutions proceeding to conclusion, with stiffer fines and non-suspended imprisonments (where appropriate) imposed on commercial pirates. As noted in the introduction to this report, for 2001, IIPA looks to the Macau government to demonstrate that it copyright infrinaers can successfully prosecute (especially manufacturers and distributors/exporters) through the courts within six months of a successful raid, as one of a series of steps to be evaluated in an <u>out-of-cycle review</u> later in the year.

Government Legalization of Software Use

The government of Macau also made some important strides in coordinating its usage of software in its ministries, specifically entering into a private arrangement with business software industry representatives to obtain legal licenses for much of its software usage: Macau's

International Intellectual Property Alliance

² As of December 31, 2000, the motion picture industry reported 18 joint operations with Macau Economic Services and successful raids on six registered optical media factories, resulting in the sealing of one DVD mastering line, five VCD production lines and four printing machines, the seizure of hundreds of stampers, 707,739 pirated VCDs, 3,780 pirated DVDs, and the shutting down of 81 pirate retail shops.

government entities have had no coordinated and transparent method of tracking software procurement or monitoring software use on their internal computer systems. While the arrangement is an important first step, the government of Macau must next work on the issuance of a high: level government decree mandating the use of legal software by all governmental and quasi-governmental entities and by all government contractors. The decree should be implemented through audits of the software usage practices of affected entities; adoption of coordinated and transparent procurement practices that both treat software as a separate asset from hardware, and earmark an adequate budget for software licensing to ensure full legalization; and establishment of effective software management practices going forward.

Additional Steps for 2001

Macau Government Must Implement Source Identification (SID) Code Requirements for Masters and Optical Discs

While Macau has adopted more stringent regulatory controls than almost any other jurisdiction on the importation of the main raw material for optical media production — optical grade polycarbonate — these controls have not yet been effective. For example, a December 1999 raid on an unregistered VCD factory in Macau turned up tons of polycarbonate, enough to manufacture nearly 200,000 units of pirate product. While most of the year 2000 passed without Macau implementing and monitoring Source Identification (SID) code requirements for masters and optical discs, finally, on December 15, 2000, Macau Economic Services signed an agreement with Philips and IFPI for the allocation of SID codes to the agency for the implementation of mandatory embossing of SID codes on all optical discs produced in Macau. There is a grace period of two months for the registered optical disc manufacturers to comply, which has just elapsed. IIPA, in conjunction with local industry representatives, will closely monitor the situation and the effectiveness of this implementation in 2001, as one of a series of steps to be evaluated in an <u>out-of-cycle review</u> later in the year.

Customs Department or Economic Services Must Continue Sustained Enforcement

Copyright enforcement is currently carried out by the Economic Services and Marine and Customs Police. The government appointed a Commissioner of Customs on July 1, 2000, and is looking to establish Macau Customs as a separate agency in early 2001. This new body will reportedly assume full responsibility for enforcement sometime in 2001. Economic Services investigates copyright complaints, and infringers are prosecuted at no expense to the copyright owner. As noted in the introduction to this report, in 2001, IIPA looks to the Macau government to effectively enforce the copyright law, regardless of whether those activities are under the purview of the Customs Department or the Economic Services, as one of a series of steps to be evaluated in an <u>out-of-cycle review</u> later in the year.

COPYRIGHT LAW AND RELATED ISSUES

Optical Media Regulations

In 1998 Macau put in place part of the legal structure needed to combat optical media piracy effectively. Its licensing and registration system for transactions in optical media production equipment, raw materials (polycarbonate) and finished product is, in some ways, even more comprehensive than that of its neighbor, Hong Kong. In October 1999, Macau adopted several essential improvements to this regulatory regime, including licensing requirements for all retail establishments dealing with optical media products, and requiring all optical media products manufactured in Macau to bear a Source Identification (SID) code. These new requirements should greatly enhance the ability to link seized pirate product with a specific Macanese production facility, to trace the path of pirate stampers and finished product as it migrates from Macau into other markets, and to crack down on distribution of pirate product within Macau.

Further improvements are needed, however. The system should include a title verification requirement, obligating producers to verify with representatives of copyright owners the legitimacy of customer orders to undertake mastering or reproduction activities, before beginning work on any such order, at least with regard to VCD products and sound recordings. Enforcement officers should also be given greater powers to conduct unannounced inspections of premises and production records (according to Macau law, the Department Head of the Economic Services has the authority to summon the Fire Services for forced entry, but there is no previous record to show that this authority has ever been used). At present, the Inspection Team from Macau Economic Services does not have the authority to force entry to the registered optical disc factories. If the factory does not voluntarily open its doors (mainly strong metal doors with television monitoring systems at the entrances), Economic Services needs to apply for search warrants from the prosecutor. The process is too slow, greatly detracting from the effectiveness of these raids (as pirates are tipped off by the initial visit and quickly dispose of all evidence). Enhanced legal tools, including those to provide for provisional measures (including the possibility of forced entry) to preserve evidence and avoid undue harm to right holders, should be implemented as soon as possible. If rigorously enforced, such measures would have a considerable impact on Macau's persistent optical media piracy problem.

Copyright Law

During 1999, Macau adopted a wholesale modernization of its outdated copyright and neighboring rights laws. On October 1, 1999, Decree Law No. 43/99/M went into effect. This legislation remains the governing law in the Macau Special Administrative Region that came into existence on December 20, 1999. In general, and with some notable exceptions, Macau's new law seems to meet international standards embodied in the WTO TRIPS Agreement and the Berne Convention, both of which are applicable to the Macau SAR.³ It even contains some provisions responsive to the more expansive WIPO Copyright Treaty, such as a broad right for copyright owners to control the "making available" of their works on demand, and provisions

³ Macau was, by virtue of its status as a Portuguese territory, a founding member of the World Trade Organization as of January 1, 1995. The Paris text (1971) of the Berne Convention applies to the Macau Special Administrative Region, by virtue of the membership of the People's Republic of China, with effect from December 20, 1999.

protecting the integrity of rights management information. In addition, some of the problems identified by IIPA in earlier drafts of the Macau legislation have been corrected. However, several highly problematic provisions remain. These include the following:

- A new provision (Article 57.3) seems to say that first publication (or "divulgation," essentially a first communication to the public) of a work without the author's consent is acceptable if "the author, having knowledge of the publication or divulgation, does not stand in opposition." If this reading is correct, the provision is clearly incompatible with Berne and TRIPS standards, which give the author exclusive rights to control these acts.
- The law still lacks an authoritative statement that the national treatment requirements of the TRIPS Agreement trump the otherwise applicable rule of "material reciprocity" which Article 50.2 establishes as the standard for protection of foreign works.
- The scope of some exceptions to protection need clarification, especially those for "private use" (Article 60) and "scientific or humanitarian purposes" (Article 61{}).
- The copyright law's detailed regulations governing contracts in protected materials contain a number of provisions that could interfere with the rights of copyright and neighboring rights owners to exploit their creations freely. These include, for instance, prohibitions against "manifestly disproportionate" profits, and an apparent compulsory license for reprinting of a sold-out work, which license is explicitly made applicable "to all forms of reproduction" and "any necessary adaptations," when the authorized entity "does not make sure that the reasonable needs of the public are met" (Article 38).
- Provisions on protection of sound recordings under neighboring rights employ outmoded definitions, fail to align neighboring rights with copyright in the manner required by current international standards, such as the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and include two objectionable provisions that appear TRIPS-incompatible. Article 175, which creates a "presumption of consent" to any use of a sound recording if the right holder cannot be located, after due diligence, within 8 to 20 days (depending on whether the right holder is within or outside Macau), essentially guts the producer's neighboring rights, especially for a foreign producer. Article 179 creates a presumption that an authorized broadcast of a performance may be recorded and reproduced without seeking the performers' consent, thus opening a loophole for trafficking in bootleg recordings.
- Macau authorities have previously indicated that they will use Articles 195 to 200, which
 were initially applicable only to collective rights management organizations, to require
 that all copyright industry antipiracy operations be registered with the government,
 establish domicile in Macau, and submit to other restrictions. If this interpretation is
 applied, the ability of the copyright industries to enforce their rights in Macau could be
 seriously impaired.
- While the criminal provisions have been considerably improved from earlier drafts of the legislation, it is still questionable whether the authorized punishments provide adequate deterrence, and for some reason no fine has been authorized for the key offense of counterfeiting (Article 211). In addition, the draft articles authorizing seizure and forfeiture of pirate product and the means of their production, and heavier sentences for

recidivists, have been omitted; at least the former, and preferably both, must be restored in order to achieve substantive compatibility with TRIPS Articles 41 and 61.

• Finally, civil enforcement provisions remain almost entirely lacking in this law. Macau authorities should be asked to spell out in detail which other provisions of applicable law they rely on to fill this huge gap.

While these and other aspects of Macau's new law need to be clarified and, where necessary, corrected to meet current international standards, this activity must not be allowed to detract from the attention needed to address the primary antipiracy challenge facing the Macau SAR: enforcement. Macau's current legal structure, while needing improvement, provides an adequate basis for the necessary vigorous and sustained enforcement against optical media piracy.