

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF SELECTED COUNTRIES' PLACEMENT FOR COPYRIGHT-RELATED MATTERS ON THE SPECIAL 301 LISTS

Prepared by the International Intellectual Property Alliance
February 2002

ARGENTINA

Argentina has been on the Special 301 lists since 1989, fluctuating between the Watch List and the Priority Watch List. In April 1996, USTR elevated Argentina to the Priority Watch List because of serious problems involving patent legislation and the lack of criminal penalties for infringement of computer programs. The USTR has kept Argentina on the Priority Watch List every year since 1996. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted U.S. concern that despite the 1999 ratification of the WIPO Copyright Treaty and Performance and Phonograms Treaty, "enforcement against copyright piracy and trademark counterfeiting remains significantly below TRIPS standards." In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that despite inadequate implementation of a 1998 law criminalizing software piracy, Argentina strengthened its copyright laws by "ratifying the latest act of the Berne Convention."

Argentina currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program that offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. Part of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. On January 15, 1997, the Clinton administration withdrew 50 percent of the trade benefits grants to Argentina under the GSP program, and increased duties were placed on about \$260 million worth of Argentina's imports under the GSP program, resulting in only about a \$13 million penalty. In 2000, \$218.4 million of goods from Argentina entered the U.S. under the GSP duty-free code, accounting for roughly 7% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$108.8 million of Argentine goods (or 6.6% of Argentina's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 9.4% decrease over the same time period last year.

ARMENIA

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Armenia, the agreement was signed on April 2, 1992 and entered into force on April 7, 1992.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because almost none of the CIS countries had met their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

In 2001, IIPA recommended and USTR agreed to place Armenia on the Watch List. In the 2001 Special 301 submission, IIPA regrouped 10 of the 12 CIS countries (excluding Russia and Ukraine for much more serious piracy problems) due to the similarity of copyright concerns each country faces. These deficiencies include the lack of legislative implementation of the bilateral trade agreements, failure to comply with the WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the failure to adopt optical media production and distribution controls. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that “Armenia has several remaining steps to take in order to fulfill its intellectual property commitments under the 1992 U.S.-Armenia Trade Agreement and to become TRIPS consistent in preparation for accession to the WTO.”

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners. In February 2000, the administration accepted IIPA’s petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, and on May 12, 2000, the U.S. government held public hearings on the GSP petitions regarding these five countries. The U.S. government has not yet decided on whether to withdraw or suspend GSP benefits in Armenia, Kazakhstan or Uzbekistan.

In 2000, \$10.1 million of Armenian goods entered the U.S. under the GSP duty-free code, accounting for nearly 45% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$13.8 million of Armenian goods (or 46% of Armenia’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 47.3% increase over the same time period last year.

AUSTRALIA

In 1994, Australia was named to the Watch List. Between 1991 through 1994, IIPA filings cited a number of issues which harmed U.S. copyright industry sales and exports in Australia, notably the threat to remove parallel import protections for sound recordings and computer programs; the failure to provide exclusive rental rights to sound recordings; the denial of national treatment to the U.S. recording and music publishing industries in the administration of Australia’s audio levy; concerns about the strength of copyright protection for computer programs; and a severe problem of bootleg recordings of U.S. performers. In 1991, Australia was placed on the USTR Priority Watch List, where it remained until 1993.

Australia was briefly dropped from the Watch List after some legal reforms were undertaken but was reinstated to the Watch List because of deficiencies in the protection of pharmaceutical test data in 1996. In 1997, noting the renewed threat to weaken or eliminate the importation right, IIPA recommended placement of Australia on the Watch List. USTR agreed and Australia remained on the Watch List through 1999 in part because of what was described as “serious concern” over 1998 legislation abolishing the importation right for sound recordings and pending legislation abolishing the importation right for other copyrighted works including software, electronic games, and gaming equipment.

Although Australia was removed from any Special 301 List in 2000, the USTR noted in its May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement the possible initiation of future WTO dispute settlement cases against several countries, including Australia, for apparent noncompliance with TRIPS obligations.

AZERBAIJAN

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Azerbaijan, the agreement was signed on April 12, 1993 and entered into force on April 21, 1995.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In its May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

In 2001, IIPA recommended and USTR agreed to place Azerbaijan on the Watch List. In the 2001 Special 301 submission, IIPA regrouped 10 of the 12 CIS countries (excluding Russia and Ukraine for much more serious piracy problems) due to the similarity of copyright concerns each country faces. These deficiencies include the lack of legislative implementation of the bilateral trade agreements, failure to comply with the WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the failure to adopt optical media production and distribution controls. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that “Azerbaijan has yet to fulfill its intellectual property commitments under the 1995 U.S.-Azerbaijan Trade Agreement,” citing failure to adhere to the Geneva Phonograms Convention as well as weak criminal provisions for IP violations.

THE BAHAMAS

The Bahamas has made very little progress in meeting the commitments it undertook in an exchange of letters between its government and the U.S. government dated October 26 and November 9, 2000, or to implement its commitments contained in a letter of April 2000. Those series of commitments involve the need for legal and regulatory reform of Bahamas' copyright law and regulations which created a overbroad compulsory license for unauthorized re-transmission by cable television systems of any copyrighted work transmitted over its territory, including encrypted transmissions. Such provisions violate the Bahamas' obligations under the Berne Convention. In 2001, the IIPA recommended that the Bahamas be placed on the Watch List in order to monitor the promises made in the bilateral agreement. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR announced that an out-of-cycle review would be conducted. On February 12, 2002, USTR announced the outcome of the out-of-cycle review and placed Bahamas on the Watch List. USTR pointed to the failure of the Bahamas to amend certain objectionable provisions in its copyright law, and made clear "that the key concern remains the existence of provisions in the Bahamian law allowing for compulsory licensing to Bahamian cable operators of retransmission of premium cable television programming." Bahamas' efforts to amend the copyright law, address remaining problems in its regulations, and engage rightsholders in the regulatory process have not resulted in concrete action to satisfy its bilateral commitments.

The Bahamas currently participates in the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI). It is also a beneficiary country under the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA), but is currently ineligible to receive CBTPA trade benefits. One of the CBI discretionary criteria requires that the Bahamas provide "adequate and effective means under its laws for foreign nations to secure, to exercise, and to enforce exclusive rights in intellectual property, including ... copyrights." In 2000, \$74.4 million in Bahamian goods entered the U.S. under the CBI, representing 27.3% of the Bahamas' total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$68.8 million in Bahamian goods (or 25.2% of the Bahamas' total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered under the CBI, representing an increase of 3.5% over the same period last year.

BAHRAIN

IIPA first recommended placing Bahrain on the Watch List in 1993, and renewed its recommendation over the next two years, citing severe video and audio piracy problems, including exports. In April 1995, USTR placed Bahrain on the Watch List. From 1996 through 1998, IIPA recommended that Bahrain remain on the Watch List because its law was out of sync with its international obligations under TRIPS, and because piracy levels continued to be high while enforcement was weak. USTR agreed all three years. In 1998, the USTR urged Bahrain to bring its copyright regime into line with its obligations under the Berne Convention and the WTO, and to increase enforcement actions against the piracy of copyrighted works of all types. Bahrain did not appear on any Special 301 list in 1999 or 2000.

Bahrain currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program that offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of

the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$61.8 million of goods from Bahrain entered the United States under the GSP duty-free code, accounting for 18% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$53.2 million of goods from Bahrain (or 14.6% of Bahrain's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code.

BELARUS

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Belarus, the negotiations for such a bilateral trade agreement were completed and initialed in June 1992; then on January 6 and February 16, 1993, there were exchanges of letters that put the agreement into force. The agreement entered into force on February 16, 1993.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In both 1998 and 1999, IIPA made individual filings focusing on concerns in Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, the countries with the most serious IPR problems (although problems persist in other former republics) in addition to the filing made for Russia. In 1998, Belarus was placed on the Other Observations list. The next year, Belarus was elevated to the Watch List. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR kept Belarus on the Watch List in 2000.

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. GSP benefits for Ukraine were withdrawn in 2001. GSP benefits were withdrawn from Belarus for reasons unrelated to intellectual property matters.

BOLIVIA

In February 1995, IIPA recommended that Bolivia be added to the Special 301 Watch List because of widespread piracy of all kinds of copyrighted works unchallenged by any meaningful government enforcement efforts. In 1996, IIPA again advocated that Bolivia be placed on the Watch List; USTR placed it on the Special Mention list and added an out-of-cycle review (OCR). In December 1996, upon conclusion of the OCR, the USTR announced that Bolivia was being elevated to the Watch List because it had not yet taken adequate steps to combat copyright piracy, particularly in the area of illegal computer software production; to adequately implement the Andean Pact Decision 351 on copyright requirements; or to revise its copyright law to conform

with international standards. Bolivia stayed on the Watch List in 1997. In April 1998, Bolivia signed a bilateral investment treaty with the U.S. and in so doing, committed to becoming TRIPS-compatible within twelve months. As a result, the USTR placed Bolivia on the Other Observations list for 1998. However, USTR has kept Bolivia on the Special 301 Watch List since 1999.

In 1995, IIPA also requested that USTR initiate investigations of Bolivia's copyright practices under the statutory provisions of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program and the Andean Trade Preferences Act (ATPA), both of which include discretionary criteria that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. IIPA never received notice of any formal action on its 1995 GSP and ATPA petitions, and thus concluded that they were not accepted.

In 2000, \$5.8 million of goods from Bolivia entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 3.1% of its total imports to the U.S. Another \$61.5 million of Bolivia's imports to the U.S. received benefits under the ATPA program, accounting for 33.4% of its total imports that year. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$6.2 million of Bolivian goods (or 4.1% of Bolivia's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 26.4% increase over the same time period last year. Another \$52.4 million of Bolivian goods entered the U.S. under the ATPA in the first 11 months of 2001, representing a decrease of 5.8% from the same period last year.

BRAZIL

During the 1990s, Brazil received a significant degree of attention from the U.S. government under the Special 301 bilateral trade tool. On April 30, 1993, USTR designated Brazil as a Priority Foreign Country. As a result of the ensuing Section 301 investigation, the Brazilian government committed in a February 1994 diplomatic agreement to take certain concrete steps to improve its IPR regime, including the early implementation of TRIPS, improving protection for computer software, addressing certain tax issues affecting computer software, and improving copyright enforcement in general. Over the next few years, Brazil's placement on the Special 301 lists seesawed between the Special Mention list and the Watch List. On May 1, 1998, the USTR removed Brazil from the Special 301 list, in recognition of its legislative accomplishments on copyright legal reform, adding: "However, Brazil must take further significant steps to combat piracy."

In February 1999, IIPA recommended that Brazil be elevated to the Priority Watch List because of the continuing failure of that government to address the rising piracy problems and deteriorating enforcement actions by the government authorities despite very active participation in antipiracy efforts by the affected copyright industries. USTR put Brazil back on the Watch List in April 1999, noting that "the lack of effective enforcement is a serious and growing concern. Some efforts have been made to improve copyright enforcement, but these efforts have fallen short given the scale of the piracy problem in Brazil and the absence of a coordinated strategy on the part of the government. We have particular concerns with proposed legal reforms that could reduce criminal penalties for intellectual property crimes and remove policy authority to engage in *ex officio* searches and seizures on their own initiative ... We also look to the Brazilian government to

ensure full implementation of all TRIPS obligations, including enforcement obligations, no later than January 1, 2000."

The 2000 deadline came and went. Despite IIPA's recommendation that Brazil be elevated to the Priority Watch List, the USTR kept Brazil on the Watch List, and noted in the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement:

"...Progress has not been sufficient on Brazil's commitment to increase effective enforcement actions, from raids through judicial decisions, against intellectual property infringement; the rate of CD piracy in Brazil continues to worsen. Failure to address this problem could lead to the collapse of the market for legitimate CDs in Brazil."

The USTR noted in its April 30, 2001 press release that "[t]he serious copyright piracy problem shows little sign of abatement." Despite this, the USTR was "pleased to see the establishment of an Inter-Ministerial Committee To Fight Piracy pursuant to the Presidential Decree of March 2001."

IIPA's dissatisfaction with the lack of progress being made by Brazil to enforce its copyright law led us to file an August 2000 petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Brazil under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners. The petition was accepted, a hearing was held, and the review remains underway. In 2000, \$2.1 billion of goods from Brazil entered the United States under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 15% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$1.8 billion of Brazilian goods (or 13.6% of Brazil's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 6.9% decrease over the same time period last year.

BULGARIA

By 1995, it was clear that not only had Bulgaria failed to carry out its intellectual property protection obligations under the 1991 bilateral agreement with the United States, but the Bulgarian government had begun to play a direct role in massive piracy. One of the compact disk plants was operated by the government in partnership with a leading pirate company; another was operating on land leased by the government; and both were churning out pirated sound recordings for export into Russia, Europe, and other markets. Accordingly, in February 1995, IIPA asked USTR to designate Bulgaria as a Priority Foreign Country and to withdraw Bulgaria's preferential trade benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program.

Faced with the prospect of sanctions under Special 301, and aided by a change in government in Sofia, Bulgaria moved quickly to address the issues highlighted in IIPA's filing. On the eve of USTR's Special 301 decision, the U.S. and Bulgaria exchanged letters in which Bulgaria promised to accede to the Geneva Phonograms Convention "on a priority basis" and to protect U.S. sound recordings published in the last 50 years; to establish a title verification system to prevent piracy of compact disks, laser disks, CD-ROMs and videos; and to enact deterrent criminal penalties applicable to a broad range of infringements, including inflation-adjusted fines and

mandatory destruction of pirate product. In response to these commitments, USTR listed the country on the Special Mention list without otherwise ranking it for Special 301 purposes for 1995.

In 1996, the IIPA filing commended Bulgaria's enactment of criminal sanctions and its accession to the Phonograms Convention, but noted that other critical commitments, such as title verification, had not been met, and that real enforcement against piracy was virtually nonexistent, while high volume pirate CD production continued unchecked. IIPA recommended that Bulgaria be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In its April 30 report, USTR listed Bulgaria on the Special Mention list, noting that a title verification decree had just been issued, but criticizing lax enforcement and increased exports of pirate product. It scheduled an out-of-cycle review (OCR), which concluded on October 2, 1996. At that time, Ambassador Barshefsky placed Bulgaria on the Watch List, citing the lack of progress in suppressing the production and export of pirate CDs and CD-ROM products. In its 1997 filing, IIPA called for elevating Bulgaria to the Priority Watch List because of its continued failure to enforce its laws aggressively against the unauthorized production and world-wide export of CD-based products, and the overall lack of criminal prosecution. IIPA noted that deterrent penalties remained absent from the Bulgarian law, although the primary problem was the lack of effective enforcement, not the legal framework. As the piracy problem escalated in 1997 with a production capacity level of over 40 million units, USTR announced an out-of-cycle review (OCR). Upon completion of the OCR in January 1998, Bulgaria was elevated from the Watch List to the Priority Watch List because of its persistent failure to take any meaningful action to eliminate the massive volume of exported pirate music CDs and CD-ROMs. In that January out-of-cycle review and again in its February 1998 301 submission, IIPA recommended designation of Bulgaria as a Priority Foreign Country (PFC) because of the longevity of the problem, and the lack of political will to shut down the production and export of illegal goods.

With the possibility looming of a PFC designation in April, the Bulgarian authorities finally took action in February and March 1998, to control the production and distribution of pirate CDs by Bulgarian plants by closing all of the plants and re-opening them only upon compliance with the newly introduced Plant Licensing Decree. The United States government decided to keep Bulgaria on the Priority Watch List in April, and to conduct a six-month out-of-cycle review in 1998 to monitor the progress and success of these production controls. Satisfied that progress was being made, USTR announced in November 1998 that it was moving Bulgaria to the Watch List, a placement supported, albeit cautiously, by IIPA. At the time of the announcement in November 1998, both USTR and IIPA agreed that title verification had to be significantly improved, and that additional controls on optical media production were required. In USTR's April 1999 Special 301 announcement, progress in Bulgaria was noted, and in recognition of its "firm commitment to effective enforcement" of its IPR laws and its roles as serving as "a model for other economies which are at risk of developing unwanted production capacity of pirated optical media," Bulgaria was removed from all Special 301 lists.

In 2000, \$15.3 million of goods from Bulgaria entered the United States under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 6.6% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$18.6 million of Bulgarian goods (or 5.8% of Bulgaria's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 33.5% increase over the same time period last year.

CHILE

Chile has been on USTR's Watch List throughout the 1990s. In 2001, the IIPA recommended that Chile be placed on the Watch List due to continued high piracy levels. USTR placed Chile on the Watch List in 2001, noting in its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement that "Chile's intellectual property laws are not fully consistent with its international obligations." The announcement pointed specifically to Chile's failure to enact TRIPS compliant legislation. As well, USTR noted that "[i]nadequate enforcement against piracy and counterfeiting also remains a serious problem."

Chile currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a trade program that offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. An important part of the GSP discretionary criteria is that Chile provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$419.3 million in Chilean imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 12.9% of Chile's total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$451.9 million in Chilean imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, or 15.1% of Chile's total imports to the U.S. between January and November.

COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES (CIS)

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In both 1998 and 1999, IIPA made individual filings focusing on concerns in Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, the countries with the most serious IPR problems (although problems persist in other former republics) in addition to the filing made for Russia. In 1998, both Belarus and Kazakhstan were placed on the Other Observations list, and Ukraine was on the Watch List. The next year, Belarus was elevated to the Watch List, Kazakhstan was removed from Special 301 list, and the Ukraine was elevated to the Priority Watch List. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Belarus and Kazakhstan are also on the Special 301 Watch List in 2000. Russia and the Ukraine remained on the Priority Watch List. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR announced that on March 12, 2001 it had designated Ukraine as a Priority Foreign Country, noting that it made the decision "due to its persistent failure to take effective action against significant levels of optical media piracy and to implement intellectual property laws that provide adequate and effective protection."

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In February 2000, the administration announced that it

accepted IIPA's petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. On May 12, 2000, the U.S. government held public hearings on the GSP petitions regarding these five countries. On October 23, 2000, the IIPA requested that its petition on Moldova be withdrawn, as a result of cooperation with that government on legal reforms following the filing of the petition. The U.S. government accepted that action and the GSP review of Moldova ended. The U.S. government has not yet decided on whether to withdraw or suspend GSP benefits in Armenia, Kazakhstan, or Uzbekistan. GSP benefits have been withdrawn from Belarus, but for reasons unrelated to intellectual property matters. GSP benefits were withdrawn from Ukraine in 2001.

COLOMBIA

Colombia has been on the Special 301 Watch List since 1989 for problems involving copyright enforcement and inadequate patent and trademark legislation. In 1997, the USTR noted that "[p]iracy continues to be a significant problem and that the Television Broadcast Law discriminated against foreign content." Because of the need for the Colombian government to license pay-TV operators and improve enforcement efforts, IIPA recommended that Colombia be elevated to the Priority Watch List in 1998. In 1998, the USTR kept Colombia on the Watch List, and added an out-of-cycle review in December 1998. In October 1998, President Clinton met with President Pastrana and they initiated consultations on a bilateral investment treaty. One of the key elements of the 1998 out-of-cycle review was whether or not the Colombian government would issue licenses to cable TV operators. In February 1999, the CNDeTV reported to the Minister of Communications that its new team of investigators had visited 219 community cable services and clandestine cable operators, documenting violations and initiating administrative actions against 160 of them.

In 1999, the USTR kept Colombia on the Watch List, noting that although the Colombian Attorney General had initiated legal action against 108 television operators, "Colombia has still to resolve the major issue USTR highlighted in its December [1998] out-of-cycle review – failure to license legitimate pay television operators and pursue pirate operators." USTR also added a September 1999 out-of-cycle review to measure Colombia's progress. Progress was made on issuing these licenses and on December 17, 1999, USTR announced its decision to keep Colombia on the Watch List as a result of the September 1999 out-of-cycle review. Colombia remained on the Watch List in 2000 in large part because of insufficient enforcement of copyright laws and high piracy levels. USTR's April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement notes that "current enforcement efforts and penalties have not proven to be a significant deterrent."

Colombia currently participates in both the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program and the Andean Trade Preferences Act (ATPA), U.S. trade programs that offer preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of these programs is that the country provide "adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights." In 2000, \$66.2 million of Colombian goods entered the United States under the GSP program, accounting for 1% of its total imports to the U.S. \$826.6 million of Colombian goods entered the U.S. under the ATPA program, accounting for 12% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$53.9 million of Colombian goods (or 1% of Colombia's total imports to the U.S.

from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 13.6% decrease over the same time period last year. \$707.5 million of Colombian goods entered the U.S. under the ATPA program for the same period, accounting for a 7.8% decrease over last year.

COSTA RICA

Costa Rica was placed on the Special 301 Watch List in 1995, for problems associated with inadequate patent protection and inadequate copyright enforcement. In its May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that despite the enactment of TRIPS-compliant legislation in 1999, "a number of problems remain on the enforcement side, particularly with respect to criminal prosecutions, as evidenced by high levels of piracy." In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, Costa Rica was placed on the Priority Watch List. The USTR noted that "there is growing concern regarding the lack of effective enforcement activity by the Government of Costa Rica." The United States "urge[d] Costa Rica to improve coordination of enforcement activities between public prosecutors and investigators; appoint special prosecutors to take on intellectual property cases; create a coordinated nationwide plan for defending and enforcing IP rights; and improve enforcement-related training at all levels of government." In addition, the announcement noted that "[t]he United States will conduct an OCR in the fall to assess Costa Rica's legislative enforcement." On October 31, 2001, USTR announced its decision regarding the out-of-cycle review. Because "little progress has been made on the four-point list of enforcement-related actions in USTR's April 30 announcement," Costa Rica remains on the Priority Watch List.

In 2000, \$55.3 million of Costa Rican goods entered the U.S. under the GSP, accounting for 1.6% of its total imports to the U.S. Under the CBI, Costa Rica had \$601.4 million worth of goods enter the U.S. in 2000, accounting for 17% of its total imports to the U.S. In 2000, \$15.6 million of Costa Rican goods entered the U.S. under the CBTPA. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$388 million of Costa Rican goods entered the U.S. under the CBTPA. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$54.9 million of Costa Rican goods (or 2% of Costa Rica's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing an 8.5% increase over the same time period last year. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$542.3 million of Costa Rican goods entered the U.S. under the CBI, representing a decrease of 1.9% from the same period last year.

CYPRUS

Cyprus was on the Special 301 Watch List from 1991 through 1994. In 1993, because of widespread piracy and an untenable delay in the effective date of amendments to the Cypriot copyright law, IIPA filed a petition with USTR, requesting that Cyprus lose its beneficiary country status under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. On September 21, 1993, USTR announced that it would conduct an "expedited review" against Cyprus; at that time, Ambassador Kantor warned that "[s]uspending criminal copyright penalties is unprecedented, and we view it with utmost seriousness." Three months later, on December 22, 1993, Ambassador Kantor announced his decision to suspend GSP benefits to Cyprus, but he deferred the suspension because Cyprus intended to implement amendments to its copyright law on January 1, 1994. On June 30, 1994, USTR terminated the GSP review because there was a significant improvement in

enforcement efforts which resulted in increases in sales of legitimate product and a decrease in piracy after the criminal penalties entered into effect.

In April 1995, Cyprus was placed on the Special Mention list, primarily due to improvements in copyright enforcement. In the April 1996 Special 301 announcements, the USTR acknowledged that while Cyprus had made progress in its copyright enforcement efforts, the administration would be monitoring efforts by the Cypriot government to continue to act aggressively against piracy of software and of video and audio recordings. In keeping Cyprus on the Special Mention list in 1997, the USTR notified Cyprus that USTR expects that the Government of Cyprus will act expeditiously to implement fully its TRIPS obligations. In 1998, IIPA recommended the placement of Cyprus on the Other Observations list (formerly known as the "Special Mention list"). Cyprus was not placed on any list by USTR in 1998, 1999, 2000, or 2001.

CZECH REPUBLIC

In April 1990, the former state of Czechoslovakia was one of the first Eastern European countries to sign a bilateral trade agreement with the U.S. which incorporated intellectual property rights commitments. Revisions to the 1965 Copyright Act were adopted effective June 1, 1990, adding protection for computer programs and increasing the term of protection for audiovisual works and sound recordings. When the Czech Republic split from the former Czechoslovakia on January 1, 1993, it acknowledged its successor interest to the trade agreement, as well as to the text and effect of the copyright law and its treaty relations.

In early 1996, further amendments to the law were made which improved protection, in particular, for computer programs and sound recordings. The Czech Republic appeared on the Special 301 Special Mention list for the first time in 1997, after IIPA recommended that the Czech Republic be placed on the Watch List because of its poor enforcement record. Since 1998, IIPA has recommended that the Czech Republic be placed on the Watch List. USTR has agreed, and the Czech Republic was on the Watch List in 1998, 1999 and 2000. USTR also noted in its May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against the Czech Republic for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations. The Czech Republic currently does not appear on any 301 list.

The Czech Republic currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$280.4 million of Czech goods entered the United States under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 26.2% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$330 million of Czech goods (or 32% of the Czech Republic's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 29.9% increase over the same time period last year.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Special 301 is not the only trade forum in which the copyright industries have engaged the Dominican Republic. In 1983, problems in the Dominican Republic and other Caribbean nations prompted the copyright industries to unite under the umbrella of the then newly founded IIPA and press for the inclusion of intellectual property rights criteria in the Caribbean Basin Initiative trade legislation, which was the first piece of U.S. legislation linking IPR with trade law. In June 1992, the Motion Picture Association (MPA) filed a petition under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program against the Dominican Republic for its failure to afford adequate and effective copyright protection to U.S. copyright owners of motion pictures due to the unauthorized retransmission of U.S. films and television programming by broadcasters and cable system operators. That petition was accepted by USTR, and in 1993, the Dominican Republic took a number of initial steps to address those serious problems. Although piracy remained a serious concern, promises for improvement were made by the Dominican government and MPA withdrew its GSP petition in September 1994.

USTR placed the Dominican Republic on Special 301 Other Observations in 1996 to encourage it to address the shortcomings in its intellectual property regime. In its 1997 Special 301 decisions, USTR elevated the Dominican Republic to the Watch List because of persistent piracy problems, especially involving broadcast and cable piracy. In February 1998, IIPA recommended elevating the Dominican Republic to the Priority Watch List for its continued and persistent failure to improve enforcement to address widespread piracy and engage in legal reform.

In 1998, the USTR followed IIPA's recommendation, and elevated the Dominican Republic to the Priority Watch List. The Dominican Republic remained on the Priority Watch List in 1999, 2000, and 2001. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 Announcement, the USTR noted that "[d]espite some reductions in video piracy, piracy of videos, sound recordings, computer software, books, and satellite and cable piracy remain widespread." USTR also noted the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against the Dominican Republic for noncompliance with its TRIPS obligations. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that "[t]here have been substantial improvements in the copyright area, especially with the passage of TRIPS-conforming law and the impressive efforts on the part of the National Copyright Office (ONDA). Nonetheless, there continues to be concern with respect to the enforcement of the new copyright law, and enforcement coordination between ONDA and the police remains poor."

In June 1999, IIPA filed a GSP/CBI petition against the Dominican Republic for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement to U.S. copyright owners, a key criteria of both programs. IIPA's petition was accepted by USTR in February 2000 and hearings were held shortly thereafter. The review remains ongoing. In 2000, \$48.6 million of Dominican goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 1.1% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$33.6 million of Dominican goods (or 0.9% of the Dominican Republic's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 21% decrease over the same time period last year. In 2000, \$805.3 million entered under the CBI, accounting for 18.4% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$747 million of Dominican goods entered under the CBI, representing a

%1.2 increase over the same period last year. In 2000, \$47 million of Dominican goods entered under the CBTPA. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$1.4 billion of Dominican goods entered under the CBTPA.

ECUADOR

Ecuador appeared on the Special 301 Watch Lists in 1992 and 1993, before being removed from the list in 1993 when it signed a bilateral intellectual property rights agreement with the U.S., which was negotiated in conjunction with a bilateral investment treaty. Ecuador reappeared on the Watch List in 1996. In February 1997, IIPA recommended that USTR commence a World Trade Organization dispute settlement case against Ecuador for its failure to fully implement the terms of its WTO accession protocol by July 31, 1996. In April 1997, the USTR stated that it would initiate a WTO case against Ecuador, and elevated Ecuador to the Priority Watch List with an out-of-cycle review later in 1997. By the time of that out-of-cycle review, Ecuador had reversed its previous position regarding its accession, which was encouraging to the U.S.

In February 1998, IIPA recommended that USTR keep Ecuador on the Priority Watch List to monitor its implementation and enforcement of then-pending copyright legislation in fulfillment of its multilateral and bilateral obligations. USTR agreed, scheduled an out-of-cycle review, and kept Ecuador on the same list in February 1999. Ecuador remained on the Watch List in 1999 and 2000. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that “serious enforcement problems remain, with piracy levels still high, difficulty getting court orders enforced by the national police and the customs service...” Currently, Ecuador does not appear on any list.

In 2000, \$28.6 million of goods from Ecuador entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 1.3% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$24.7 million of Ecuadorian goods (or 1.4% of Ecuador’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 1% increase over the same time period last year. In 2000, \$247.6 million of goods entered under ATPA, accounting for 11% of its total imports to the U.S. In the first eleven months of 2001, \$213.5 million entered under the ATPA, representing a 3.2% decrease over the same period last year.

EGYPT

As early as 1985, IIPA targeted Egypt as a major copyright offender, and because of its leadership role in the Middle East, pressed it to adopt a model law for the region. Seven years later, after long and frustrating delays, USTR placed Egypt on the Priority Watch List (in April 1992) and Egypt finally passed amendments to its law (in June 1992). These amendments fell short of internationally accepted standards. In April 1993, Egypt was kept on the Priority Watch List and an out-of-cycle review (OCR) was scheduled for December 1993. In June 1993, because Egypt had not made corrective amendments to its law, IIPA filed a petition, which was accepted by USTR in October 1993, to remove Egypt as a beneficiary of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. As a result of 1994 amendments, Egypt was moved to the Watch List on April 30, 1994, and another OCR was scheduled for October 1994. On July 1, 1994, the GSP investigation was

successfully concluded, but Egypt was retained on the Watch List as a result of the OCR in October 1994. Egypt remained on the Watch List in 1995 and 1996 as a result of inadequacies in its patent regime, and in 1997, largely because of patent concerns, Egypt was elevated to the Priority Watch List. In 1998, IIPA recommended that Egypt be placed on the Watch List because of wavering copyright enforcement and the imposition of low, nondeterrent penalties for infringement.

From 1998 through 2001, USTR kept Egypt on the Priority Watch List, noting inadequate protection for pharmaceutical patents, lax enforcement on unchecked copyright piracy, and unclear protection for pre-existing sound recordings. USTR also noted in its May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against Egypt for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 Announcement, USTR noted insufficiencies in Egypt's copyright law which appeared inconsistent with the country's TRIPS obligations. In addition, the USTR voiced concern regarding "Egypt's approval of fraudulent licenses to distributors of pirated copyright works, which facilitated pirate operations while hampering legitimate producers."

Egypt currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$26.3 million of Egyptian goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 2.8% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$20.6 million of Egyptian goods (or 2.5% of Egypt's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code.

EL SALVADOR

El Salvador was first placed on the Special 301 Watch List in 1992, where it remained for several years. While legal reform of the copyright law and various criminal codes was achieved, effective copyright enforcement was not achieved (in contrast, there was some progress on trademark matters). In 1996, IIPA recommended to USTR that El Salvador be elevated to the Priority Watch List; USTR chose to keep El Salvador on the Watch List. In 1997, El Salvador was removed from all Special 301 lists. In March 1999, El Salvador signed a bilateral investment treaty with the United States, which the U.S. Senate ratified in late 2000. In April 2000, USTR did not place El Salvador on any of the 301 lists but did conduct an out-of-cycle review to assess that government's efforts to improve enforcement procedures and promote the use of authorized software in all government industries. Based on some progress made at that time, El Salvador remained off all 301 lists. El Salvador was not placed on any list in 2001.

Years ago, the copyright industries also attempted to invoke other trade remedies to resolve the problems of high levels of piracy and poor enforcement in El Salvador. IIPA filed a June 1993 petition with USTR, requesting it to initiate an investigation of El Salvador's copyright practices under the statutory provisions of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA or CBI), both of which include discretionary criteria that the country provide "adequate and effective means under its laws for foreign nations to

secure, to exercise, and to enforce exclusive rights in intellectual property, including . . . copyrights." The IIPA's 1993 GSP/CBI petition was not accepted.

In 2000, \$20.8 million of Salvadoran goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 1.1% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$10.7 million of Salvadoran goods (or 0.6% of El Salvador's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 46.2% decrease over the same time period last year. In 2000, \$41.9 million of goods entered the U.S. under the CBI. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$52 million entered under the CBI, representing a 23.9% increase over the same period last year. In 2000, \$26 million goods entered under the CBTPA. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$852 million entered under the CBTPA.

ESTONIA

In 1998, Estonia appeared on the USTR Special 301 list for the first time when USTR placed it on the Other Observations list. In both 1999 and 2000, IIPA recommended placement of Estonia on the Watch List because of significant deficiencies in the Estonian legal regime, the significant enforcement problems (particularly at street markets and the border) and the growing piracy problem across many industries (and the disruption it has caused in other countries). Estonia was not placed on any USTR list in 1999, 2000, or 2001.

Estonia currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$11.1 million of Estonian imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 2% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$13 million of Estonian goods (or 5.8% of Estonia's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 24.9% increase over the same time period last year.

GEORGIA

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Georgia, the agreement was signed on March 1, 1993 and entered into force on August 13, 1993.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because almost none of the CIS countries had met their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time, but not Georgia. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that it would conduct an out-of-cycle review of Georgia in December of 2001. On

February 12, 2002, announced the result of its out-of-cycle review of Georgia. Though USTR decided not to place Georgia on any list, it noted continued deficiencies in copyright protection and enforcement "such as the lack of *ex officio* authority. . . for customs and criminal authorities, as well as the lack of civil *ex parte* search and seizure procedures conducted without notice to the alleged infringers."

Georgia began participating in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program that offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries, in 2001. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$2 million of Georgian goods (or 7.3% of Georgia's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code.

GERMANY

Germany was placed on the Special 301 Watch List from 1991-1992. Though it was removed from any list in 1993, Germany was placed on the Other Observations list from 1994 to 1998, primarily due to heavy U.S. trade losses attributable to business software and audiovisual piracy. In those years, IIPA's Special 301 submissions focused on the problems with Germany's enforcement against end-user software piracy and its inadequate legal framework, especially the discriminatory failure to prohibit the unauthorized fixation, and subsequent reproduction and distribution, of live performances of U.S. artists (the "bootlegging" issue). The latter set of issues was resolved by the enactment of copyright law amendments in 1995.

In 1998, IIPA recommended the placement of Germany on the Watch List because of serious problems in the audiovisual industry (namely, the manufacturing and distribution throughout Europe of "smart cards" and "descrambling" devices) and in the software industries, where some jurisdictions were still denying *ex parte* search orders. In keeping Germany on the Other Observations list in 1998, Ambassador Barshefsky noted progress made in 1997 with respect to the availability of civil *ex parte* search orders, but shared the Alliance's concerns "regarding a major audiovisual piracy problem and the role of German firms in the manufacturing and/or exporting throughout Europe of pirated 'smart cards' and other 'de-scrambling' devices used to steal encrypted satellite, cable and broadcast transmissions, particularly of U.S. motion pictures." The IIPA recommended in our 1999 Special 301 Report that Germany be kept on the Other Observations list. Germany did not appear on any USTR list in 1999, 2000, or 2001.

GREECE

Greece was on the Watch List from 1989 to 1994 and was elevated to the Priority Watch List in 1995. Despite passage of a modern copyright law in March 1993 and a broadcast law in July 1995, there has been little change in levels of piracy and trade losses to U.S. copyright owners have continued to increase. Though the 1993 copyright law contained modern levels of protection, stiff minimum and maximum penalties, only isolated and sporadic progress has been achieved.

The United States filed a TRIPS case against Greece in 1997. In May 1998, Greece passed an amendment to the Broadcast Law that finally began to improve the longstanding problem of TV piracy. The same month, USTR announced the commencement of WTO dispute settlement consultations. In 2000, Greece remains on the Priority Watch List for the sixth consecutive year. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted, "Greece has passed new legislation providing for the immediate closure of television stations that infringe upon intellectual property rights, and estimated levels of television piracy in Greece have fallen significantly as a result." However, the announcement points out that "[p]iracy rates for audio-visual works, video games and business software. . . remain high." Greece was removed from the Priority Watch List and placed on the Watch List in 2001.

GUATEMALA

After seven years on the Special 301 Watch List (1992-1998), USTR elevated Guatemala to the Priority Watch List in 1999 and 2000. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR outlined several IPR problems, specifically: "Guatemala's Criminal Procedures Code requires that all criminal enforcement be brought as 'private actions,' making criminal penalties difficult to obtain in cases of copyright infringement. Piracy, including by government agencies, is widespread, and the Government of Guatemala has failed to take effective enforcement action." Although new legislation enacted in September 2000 addresses some of these concerns (in particular, making infringements as "public" action), the law cut back on the levels of criminal penalties and civil damages. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 Announcement, the USTR noted that despite amendments to the 1998 Copyright Act, "criminal penalties in cases of infringement of intellectual property, and the provision providing for statutory damages was removed." Guatemala remained on the Watch List in 2001.

In addition to Special 301 scrutiny, Guatemala has been the subject of other U.S. trade investigations. In June 1991, the Motion Picture Association (MPA) filed a petition to deny Guatemala preferential trade benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program because of that country's failure to provide adequate and effective protection to U.S. copyrighted films and television programming, which resulted in the widespread unauthorized interception and retransmission of U.S. programming by Guatemalan cable operators. USTR accepted this petition, and twice extended the investigation. Guatemala passed a cable law in June 1992 and issued implementing regulations in late 1993. After some progress was made in the licensing of programming by Guatemala City cable operators and the implementation of the cable law in the interior of the country, MPA withdrew its GSP petition on June 13, 1994.

Because of continuing problems with enforcement and the deficiencies in the 2000 copyright legislation, IIPA filed a GSP/CBI petition in August 2000, requesting a review of its IPR practices because of its failure to provide adequate and effective protection of U.S. copyrighted works. Unfortunately, the U.S. government rejected IIPA's petition, no doubt in part, to be consistent as it extended new trade benefits to Costa Rica under the U.S.-Caribbean Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA), which requires eligible countries to have very high levels of IPR protection. In 2000, \$30.5 million of Guatemalan goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP

code, accounting for 1.2% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$30.5 million of Guatemalan goods (or 1.3% of Guatemala's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 6.1% increase over the same time period last year. In 2000, \$250 million of Guatemalan goods entered the U.S. under the CBI, accounting for 12.2% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$217 million of Guatemalan entered under the CBI, representing a 3.4% decrease (or 9% of Guatemala's total imports to the U.S. from January to November). In 2000, \$14.7 million entered under the CBTPA, accounting for .6% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$458 million entered under the CBTPA, representing 19% of Guatemala's total imports to the U.S. for the same period.

HONG KONG

Hong Kong first appeared in IIPA's Special 301 recommendations in 1995, when we called for Special Mention status (equivalent to USTR's Other Observations category) in order to focus attention on the increased flow of pirated materials from China into Hong Kong, and to encourage enactment of tougher penalties for commercial piracy operations. By 1996, as this pirate flow across the Chinese border became a flood, IIPA recommended placement on the Watch List to encourage Hong Kong to devote more resources to copyright enforcement and to aggressively deploy new legal tools against piracy. USTR decided to list Hong Kong in the Other Observations category, and maintained it there after an out-of-cycle review that concluded in December 1996. In its 1997 filing, citing a flood of digital piracy in the Hong Kong market, and increasing evidence that some of it was originating within the territory, IIPA urged USTR to elevate Hong Kong to the Priority Watch List.

Because of the then-worsening piracy situation, the USTR placed Hong Kong on the Watch List on April 30, 1997, and maintained it there in a January 16, 1998 out-of-cycle review announcement, concluding that "the piracy situation in Hong Kong has not improved." In 1998, IIPA noted that despite Hong Kong's efforts, the digital piracy problem was out of control; the territory had changed from being an importer of pirate optical media product to being a major producer and exporter, trends that justified keeping Hong Kong on the Watch List. USTR, calling for full implementation of new antipiracy legislation, effective enforcement, and a significant reduction in piracy rates, kept Hong Kong on the Watch List. Hong Kong was removed from the Watch List after a February 1999 out-of-cycle review, but Ambassador Barshefsky added a September 1999 out-of-cycle review to assess Hong Kong's intellectual property progress.

On December 17, 1999, USTR announced that as a result of the September out-of-cycle review, Hong Kong would remain off the Special 301 Watch List because "Hong Kong has undertaken significant enforcement actions since April [1999] to address the problem of piracy, but significant follow-up efforts are needed as piracy problems continue. The USTR will monitor action by Hong Kong authorities to reclassify piracy as an organized and serious crime, to extend the mandate of the special anti-piracy task force beyond December 1999, and to prosecute corporate policy and the illegal loading of software by dealers onto computer hard drives." Hong Kong did not appear on any Special 301 lists in 2000 or 2001.

HUNGARY

On September 24, 1993, the U.S. and Hungary entered into a comprehensive bilateral Intellectual Property Rights Agreement, which obligated Hungary to make significant improvements in its copyright laws. In 1994 and again in 1997, Hungary adopted amendments to update its copyright law and to make it compatible with the TRIPS Agreement. In 1994, 1995 and 1996, Hungary did not appear on any Special 301 lists. In 1997, IIPA recommended that Hungary be placed on the Special Mention list because of its enforcement and legal framework deficiencies. USTR did place Hungary on the Special Mention list in 1997 and 1998 at the urging of copyright owners because of the lack of effective enforcement.

Hungary implemented extensive changes to its copyright law in June 1999; these changes became effective on September 1, 1999. The amendments are intended to bring the Hungarian law into compliance with the TRIPS Agreement as well as the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and to comply with several of the European Union Directives, such as the Term Directive.

In both 1999 and 2000, IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, that Hungary be placed on the Watch List. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that despite the recent revision of copyright laws, "questions remain whether sufficient legal authority exists as required by the TRIPS Agreement for civil *ex parte* search procedures...[V]ideo and cable television piracy is widespread, and local television and cable companies regularly transmit programs without authorization." In 2001, USTR elevated Hungary to the Priority Watch List, largely as a result of its failure to provide adequate protection of "confidential test data submitted by pharmaceutical companies seeking marketing approval."

Hungary currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program that offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$318.4 million of Hungarian goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 11.7% of its total U.S. imports. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$343.5 million of Hungarian goods (or 13% of Hungary's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 17.3% increase over the same time period last year.

INDIA

India was placed on the Priority Watch List in 1989 and was named a Priority Foreign Country in 1991. Its practices in the patent, trademark and copyright area, as well as market access for motion pictures, were declared by USTR as "unfair" on March 4, 1992, and a Section 301 investigation was launched against India at that time. The motion picture market access problems were substantially resolved by the end of 1992, but patent and copyright enforcement problems persisted. These kept India a Priority Foreign Country until June 30, 1994, when it was moved to the Priority Watch List after it adopted significant amendments to its copyright law. USTR subjected India to a special out-of-cycle review (OCR) in January 1995 and its position on the

Priority Watch List was retained. In 1996, IIPA recommended that India remain on the Priority Watch List as its enforcement program began to take shape; USTR agreed.

In 1997, IIPA recommended that India be moved to the Watch List as a result of continued encouraging raiding activity. However, USTR disagreed and in April 1997 kept India on the Priority Watch List, in part because of copyright issues, but also because of serious patent protection shortcomings. In 1997, USTR initiated a WTO dispute settlement case against India on patent protection matters. In September 1997, the WTO panel agreed with the U.S. claim that India failed to implement its obligation under TRIPS to establish a “mailbox” system to receive patent applications, and on related matters. This case was the first intellectual property rights dispute to go through the WTO panel process. India appealed the case, lost, and in April 1999 enacted legislation to address the WTO settlement.

In our 1999 and 2000 Special 301 filing, IIPA again recommended that India be placed on the Watch List in light of the progress on copyright issues. In both years the USTR elevated India to the Priority Watch List. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted continued shortcomings in India’s patent laws, concern over 1999 amendments which undermine TRIPS requirements for protection of computer programs, and lack of enforcement against cable piracy and imports of pirated products from Southeast Asia. The USTR also noted in the same announcement the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against India for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations. In the 2001 Special 301 filing, IIPA recommended that India be placed on the Watch List. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR kept India on the Priority Watch List, largely for failures in its patent system. The announcement noted that India’s copyright law was “generally strong,” though “poor enforcement allows rampant piracy.” Further, “piracy of motion pictures, music, software, books and video games is widespread; videos and VCDs are often available on the street before titles even open in cinemas.”

India currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide “adequate and effective” copyright protection. In 2000, \$1.1 billion of Indian goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 10.7% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$1.2 billion of Indian goods (or 13.4% of India’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 15.2% increase over the same time period last year.

INDONESIA

IIPA has closely monitored developments in Indonesia since 1985, when, in its first submission to USTR on piracy, IIPA named Indonesia as Asia’s second worst pirate country. In 1987, following a petition by IIPA to revoke Indonesia's GSP benefits, Indonesia adopted an improved copyright law and, in 1989, entered into a bilateral copyright agreement whereby U.S. works and sound recordings acquired protection under Indonesian law. Although government initiatives virtually wiped out audio piracy in 1988 and made great progress against videocassette piracy in 1991-92, Indonesia remained on the Watch List continuously from 1989 through 1995,

because piracy of U.S. books and computer software soared over the years, and extensive market access barriers hampered the entry of U.S. companies into the Indonesian market. These continuing problems led USTR, on IIPA's recommendation, to elevate Indonesia to the Priority Watch List in 1996, where it remained until 1999.

In 2000, IIPA recommended that Indonesia be upgraded to the Watch List "[i]n recognition of the adverse conditions under which market liberalization, antipiracy, and copyright law reform efforts must proceed in Indonesia." The USTR agreed, and Indonesia appeared on the Watch List in 2000. In 2001, IIPA recommended that Indonesia be elevated to the Priority Watch List, due to the continuing domination of piracy in the market. The USTR agreed, noting in its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement that "[p]iracy levels in Indonesia's enormous market for copyright and trademark goods are among the highest in the world." The announcement points out that "[i]t is becoming increasingly apparent that, as other countries in the region intensify their fight against copyright infringement, audio and video pirates are finding refuge in Indonesia."

Indonesia currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective protection for intellectual property rights." In 2000, \$1.4 billion of Indonesian goods entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for 13.3% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$1.2 billion of Indonesian goods (or 13.2% of Indonesia's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 2.7% decrease over the same time period last year.

IRELAND

Ireland first appeared on a Special 301 list in 1996 when USTR accorded it Special Mention status for patent law deficiencies. IIPA recommended Ireland for the Watch List in its February 1997 filing and highlighted at that time its significant enforcement deficiencies and high levels of piracy, particularly in the software and video areas. IIPA also included Ireland in its Priority Practices section in that February 1997 submission because its outmoded law (and its enforcement regime) were hopelessly out of compliance with its TRIPS obligations, which became effective in Ireland on January 1, 1996. USTR agreed with IIPA's recommendation and placed Ireland on the Watch List in April 1997. Simultaneously, Ambassador Barshefsky announced that USTR would commence a TRIPS case in the near future. During 1997, following a series of bilateral negotiations with Ireland, it became clear that the Irish government had no intention of introducing and adopting a TRIPS-compatible law within any reasonable time. As a result, USTR commenced the TRIPS case on January 9, 1998.

In early February 1998, following the commitment of the Irish government to "accelerate its implementation of comprehensive copyright reform legislation," USTR decided not to bring the case before a dispute settlement panel, though it reserved the right to do so if the timetables were not met. Ireland remained on the Watch List in 1998, 1999 and 2000, noting in the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement that "Ireland's commitment to enact comprehensive copyright legislation has not been met. We understand recent progress has been made toward finalizing this

legislation and expect it will be enacted by Parliament before its summer recess.” Ireland enacted new IPR legislation in June 2000. The Alliance made no recommendation concerning Ireland in its 2001 Special 301 submission. Consequently, the USTR did not place Ireland on any list during 2001.

ISRAEL

IIPA first reported serious piracy problems in Israel in 1993. At that time, IIPA noted the need for copyright law modernization and urged USTR to place Israel on the Special 301 Watch List. No action was taken by USTR until 1994, when Israel was placed on USTR’s Special Mention status, where it remained in 1995 and 1996. In 1997, USTR elevated Israel to the Watch List, noting the “rapidly growing rate of audio CD piracy for export” and the lack of a strong legal framework or effective enforcement to combat piracy.

In 1998, because of an antiquated copyright law, large-volume pirate CD production, lack of cooperation of Israeli government authorities in raids and enforcement, and the increasing influence of organized criminal elements in the manufacturing, distribution and export of pirated CDs, videos and software, IIPA recommended that USTR place Israel on the Priority Watch List. USTR agreed, and Israel has remained on the Priority Watch List since 1998. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted “[the US remains] very concerned about the unacceptably high rate of piracy of all forms of optical media in Israel. Israel remains a key distribution hub in a multi-country network (including Western Europe and Russia) for pirated optical media product, much of which is still manufactured in Israel.” The USTR also noted the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against Israel for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that “[w]hile the United States is gratified by reports that illicit commercial-sale production of optical media in Israel may have fallen substantially, Israel’s domestic market for copyright goods remains dominated by pirated music, video and software CDs.” In addition, “Israel is part of an enormous transshipment network for pirated versions of Russian-language software, as well as audio and video CDs and cassettes.”

ITALY

Italy has been on the USTR Watch List since the 1989 inception of the Special 301 program, primarily due to enforcement shortcomings that allowed piracy, especially of U.S. motion pictures, sound recordings/music and computer software to reach levels unmatched in any other Western European country. In 1993, when IIPA estimated trade losses in Italy due to inadequate enforcement to be the highest in the world, we recommended that Italy be designated as a Priority Foreign Country. Following bilateral consultations with the U.S., Italian authorities took action to improve and strengthen antipiracy efforts in certain areas. It also became the first European Union member country to implement the EU Software Directive. Nonetheless, despite an increased volume of investigations and raids, piracy levels remained extraordinarily high, due in great part to the inadequate penalties authorized under Italian law, and the reluctance of many magistrates to impose even those penalties on commercial piracy operations. In April 1994, USTR kept Italy on the Watch List and conducted an informal out-of-cycle review with regard to its copyright

enforcement. In 1995 alone, losses due to piracy in Italy were estimated at over \$900 million and USTR maintained Italy's position on the Watch List in 1995, 1996 and 1997. By February 1998, Italy had still not passed the Anti-Piracy Bill and IIPA recommended its elevation to the Priority Watch List. The USTR agreed, and Italy was on the Priority Watch List in 1998 and 1999. In February 2000, the USTR kept Italy on the Priority Watch List, and added a September out-of-cycle review (OCR). The USTR also noted the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against Italy for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations.

In recognition of the July 2000 passage of the Anti-Piracy Bill, the USTR announced in November 2000 that Italy would be moved from the Priority Watch List to the Watch List. In the November 8, 2000 OCR press release, the USTR noted that “[p]assage of this tough new legislation sends an important message that Italy will severely penalize piracy...We expect the Italian Government to strictly enforce this new law in a manner that reduces availability of pirate and counterfeit goods.” In the 2001 Special 301 submission, the IIPA recommended that Italy be placed on the Watch List with an out-of-cycle review based on concerns that Italian authorities may not adequately implement the new Anti-Piracy law. The USTR kept Italy on the Watch List in 2001, noting in its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement its own concern about full implementation of Italy's Anti-Piracy law.

JORDAN

USTR first placed Jordan on the Special Mention list in 1995, where it remained in 1996 due to its inadequate intellectual property laws. USTR elevated Jordan to the Watch List in 1997, noting a law that “falls far short of international standards in most respects” and rampant piracy due to a lack of “effective enforcement mechanisms.” In 1998, IIPA recommended that Jordan be elevated to the Priority Watch List because of the “glacial pace” of Jordan's efforts to pass the draft copyright law amendments and Jordan's total failure to implement and enforce the copyright law. USTR decided to keep Jordan on the Watch List, in part because of Jordan's April 1998 “Action Plan” designed to bring it into conformity with TRIPS within two years.

Despite passing the long-awaited copyright amendments in late 1998, in April 1999, Jordan remained on the Watch List because of what USTR described as limited progress in the implementation of the 1998 Action Plan and patent protection deficiencies. After Jordan took the initiative of passing further amendments, thereby bringing its law very close to TRIPS compliance, and joining the Berne Convention, Jordan was removed from the Watch List on December 10, 1999 after an out-of-cycle review. USTR described its reasoning as follows:

[the passing] of a number of strong intellectual property laws lay the legal foundation for an effective intellectual property regime consistent with the TRIPS Agreement. The Government of Jordan also has demonstrated its determination to ensure effective enforcement of the laws comprising Jordan's improved regime for protection of intellectual property.

On April 11, 2000, Jordan joined the World Trade Organization, thereby making itself bound by the provisions of the TRIPS agreement. Six months later, Jordan signed a historic Free Trade Agreement with the United States. Jordan did not appear on any Special 301 list in 2000 or 2001.

Jordan currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights." In 2000, \$10.3 million of Jordan's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 14.2% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$8.3 million of Jordanian goods (or 4% of Jordan's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a decrease of 11.4% over the same time period last year.

KAZAKHSTAN

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. Kazakhstan signed its bilateral trade agreement with the United States on May 19, 1992; it entered into force on February 18, 1993.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because almost none of the CIS countries had met their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In both 1998 and 1999, IIPA made individual filings focusing on concerns in Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, the countries with the most serious IPR problems (although problems persist in other former republics) in addition to the filing made for Russia. In 1998 Kazakhstan was placed on the Other Observations list, and the next year, Kazakhstan was removed from the Special 301 list. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR placed Kazakhstan on the Special 301 Watch List in 2000.

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In February 2000, the administration announced that it accepted IIPA's petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. On May 12, 2000, the U.S. government held public hearings on the GSP petitions regarding these five countries. The U.S. government has not yet decided whether to withdraw or suspend GSP benefits in Kazakhstan. In 2000, \$325.6 million of Kazakhstan's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 75.5% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$198 million of Kazakh goods (or 61% of Kazakhstan's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, accounting for a 36% decrease over last year.

In 2001, IIPA recommended and USTR agreed to keep Kazakhstan on the Watch List. In the 2001 Special 301 submission, IIPA regrouped 10 of the 12 CIS countries (excluding Russia and Ukraine for much more serious piracy problems) due to the similarity of copyright concerns each country faces. These deficiencies include the lack of legislative implementation of the bilateral trade agreements, failure to comply with the WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the failure to adopt optical media production and distribution controls. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that Kazakhstan “does not clearly provide retroactive protection for works or sound recordings under its copyright law. In addition there is weak enforcement of intellectual property rights in Kazakhstan.”

KUWAIT

USTR first placed Kuwait on the Special 301 Special Mention list in 1995. In April 1996, USTR elevated Kuwait to the Watch List, where it remained through 1997, noting that Kuwait had been slow in adopting copyright legislation and that unauthorized duplication of software, particularly in government agencies, remained a major problem. In IIPA’s 1998 Special 301 filing on Kuwait, we recommended that USTR elevate Kuwait to the Priority Watch List because of growing losses due to piracy and the Kuwaiti government’s continued failure to enact a copyright law that fully satisfies Kuwait’s TRIPS obligations. USTR agreed, elevating Kuwait to the Priority Watch List as a result of “heightened concern at the tardiness of Kuwait’s action,” and noting that while Kuwait claimed the developing-country transition period for complying with TRIPS, “the pace of work thus far has not been sufficient to complete the needed steps by January 1, 2000.”

In 1999, IIPA recommended that Kuwait remain on the Priority Watch List but that Kuwait be designated as a Priority Foreign Country if it failed to pass a new copyright law. USTR kept Kuwait on the Priority Watch List in 1999, agreeing to conduct a December out-of-cycle review to decide whether to designate Kuwait. As a result of the enactment of a new copyright law in late 1999, USTR moved Kuwait from the Priority Watch List to the Watch List in 2000. Kuwait remained on the Watch List in 2001. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted deficiencies in Kuwait’s copyright law making it inconsistent with TRIPS requirements along with inadequate enforcement and high piracy levels.

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Armenia, the agreement was signed on April 2, 1992 and entered into force on April 7, 1992.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because almost none of the CIS countries had met their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30,

2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR did not put the Kyrgyz Republic on any list. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that it would conduct an out-of-cycle review on the Kyrgyz Republic. On February 12, 2002, announced the result of its out-of-cycle review of the Kyrgyz Republic. Though USTR decided not to place the Kyrgyz Republic on any list, it noted continued deficiencies in copyright protection and enforcement "such as the lack of *ex officio* authority. . . for customs and criminal authorities, as well as the lack of civil *ex parte* search and seizure procedures conducted without notice to the alleged infringers."

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In late 1999, the Kyrgyz Republic acceded to the World Trade Organization. In February 2000, the Administration announced that it accepted IIPA's petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan and rejected the petition for review of the Kyrgyz Republic. In 2000, \$133,000 in Kyrgyz imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for nearly 6.8% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, roughly \$179,000 of Kyrgyz goods (or 5.6% of the Kyrgyz Republic's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the GSP duty-free code, representing a 34.6% increase over the same time period last year.

LATVIA

IIPA first filed a Special 301 report on Latvia in 2000, when we recommended that Latvia be added to the Watch List for serious deficiencies in the copyright law, criminal code and implementation of the new customs code. The USTR accepted our recommendation, and placed Latvia on the Watch List for the first time in 2000. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that "[a]lthough pirate optical media production currently is not a problem, there exists a pervasive transshipment problem in Latvia, not only in optical media but in other copyrighted products as well, with much of Latvia's pirated business software flowing over the border from Russia." Since then, Latvia has adopted a new copyright law, though it does not include a provision for civil *ex parte* searches, and there is no right of remuneration for the public performance of sound recordings. The IIPA remains concerned about Latvia's inefficient copyright enforcement regime. Latvia remained on the Watch List in 2001. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that "[l]arge volumes of pirated products are transshipped through Latvia from Russia and Ukraine." Local enforcement is poor and "[l]egislation is needed to improve the ability of law enforcement and judicial authorities to combat this piracy, such as providing for adequate civil *ex parte* search remedies."

Latvia currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection. In 2000, \$10.4 million of Latvia's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 3.5% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$7.9 million of Latvian goods (or 5.6% of Latvia's total imports to the U.S. from January to November)

entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 21.3% decrease over the same time period last year.

LEBANON

Isolated from normal world trade patterns due to years of civil strife, Lebanon did not appear in IIPA reports until 1995, when IIPA first recommended placement on the Special Mention list because of its high levels of piracy and outmoded copyright law. IIPA's 1996 filing stressed pervasive TV piracy, an ineffective judicial system, and lack of any progress toward copyright and broadcast law reform; we recommended that Lebanon be placed on the Watch List. In 1997, IIPA recommended once again that Lebanon be placed on the Special 301 Watch List, noting a video market dominated by piracy, increasing book and software piracy, an immobilized copyright reform process, and backlogged and inefficient courts that continued to pose major impediments to effective enforcement of copyright infringement across the board.

In 1998, IIPA again called on USTR to place Lebanon on the Watch List for failure to pass a new copyright law, and for uncertainty over whether the law would include a Berne- and TRIPS-incompatible "compulsory license" on computer software. USTR agreed for the first time to place Lebanon in its Other Observations category, noting "widespread copyright piracy and an inadequate law," and that "[u]nauthorized use of software is pervasive among private firms and government ministries." USTR's Ambassador Barshefsky called on the Lebanese government "to pass a TRIPS-consistent copyright law, to take effective measures to eliminate use of unauthorized copies of software in Government offices, and reduce the rate of video piracy."

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with USTR to review Lebanon's GSP benefits for its failure to protect the intellectual property rights of U.S. copyright owners, because of the Lebanese Parliament's attempt to suspend provisions in the new copyright law to enforce against rampant cable piracy in Lebanon, inadequacies in the law and lax enforcement. The President of Lebanon refused to sign the bill to suspend the enforcement provisions. The GSP petition was not accepted by USTR in February 2000.

Lebanon was elevated to the Watch List in 1999 and kept there in 2000 largely because of the continued international deficiencies in the copyright law, pervasive piracy and inefficient enforcement against piracy. In the May 1, 2000 announcement, USTR noted that "optical media production facilities are reportedly being set up, with the potential for Lebanon to become an exporter of pirated product." In the 2001 Special 301 submission, the IIPA recommended that Lebanon be elevated to the Priority Watch List due to a lack of enforcement against copyright piracy, despite passage of the copyright law in 1999. USTR agreed, and elevated Lebanon to the Priority Watch List in 2001, citing continuing piracy problems, particularly cable piracy. In June of 2001, the IIPA filed a request for review of the intellectual property practices of Lebanon. USTR has not yet decided whether to accept the request.

Lebanon currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program that offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide "adequate and effective

protection of intellectual property rights.” In 2000, \$29.5 million of Lebanon’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 39% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$34.2 million of Lebanese goods (or 41.3% of Lebanon’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 27.3% increase over the same time period last year.

LITHUANIA

IIPA first filed a Special 301 report on Lithuania in 2000, when we recommended that Lithuania be added to the Watch List because of serious concerns over copyright enforcement at all levels, including criminal, civil, administrative and border measures. USTR agreed, and Lithuania was placed on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time in 2000. In the May 1, 2000 announcement, the USTR noted that a “pernicious transshipment problem” exists in Lithuania, “with many pirated products moving from Russia and Ukraine to Western Europe via Lithuania.” In the 2001 Special 301 submission, the IIPA recommended that Lithuania be added to the Priority Watch List due to a lack of on-the-ground enforcement and exploitation of this weakness by pirates to the detriment of other markets in Latvia, Estonia, and Poland, for example. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed Lithuania on the Watch List and announced that it would conduct an out-of-cycle review “to assess Lithuania’s enforcement efforts.” On October 31, 2001 the USTR announced the outcome of its out-of-cycle review of Lithuania. USTR kept Lithuania on the Watch List “because of serious on-the-ground enforcement failures.” The announcement notes that “[t]he copyright industries worked for many years to ensure the passage of proper criminal penalties in May 2000; now, after just over one year and only one case, there are factions in Lithuania that want to weaken this law.”

Lithuania currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide “adequate and effective means under its laws for foreign nations to secure, to exercise, and to enforce exclusive rights in intellectual property, including . . . copyrights.” In 2000, \$3.2 million of Lithuania’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 2.5% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$11.3 million of Lithuanian goods (or 7.2% of Lithuania’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 342.2% increase over the same period last year.

MACAU

Macau did not appear on a Special 301 list until 1998. IIPA’s 1998 filing described it as one of the world’s leading sources of digital copyright piracy for export, thanks to a proliferation of pirate optical media production facilities, and recommended placement on the Priority Watch List. USTR agreed, citing an “explosion of illegal CD, CD-ROM and VCD manufacturing,” and calling for better copyright enforcement and implementation of import and export licensing of optical media production equipment and finished product. Macau remained on the Priority Watch List in 1999.

In May 2000, in recognition of what the USTR described as “reasonable progress in attacking the piracy problems that led to its placement on the Special 301 Priority Watch List,” Macau was lowered to the Watch List and USTR added an out-of-cycle review. In December 2000, USTR announced that Macau would remain on the Watch List, despite concerns that the “enforcement of the strong new intellectual property laws is not as vigorous as it needs to be.” In the 2001 Special 301 submission, the IIPA recommended that Macau be kept on the Watch List and an out-of-cycle review (OCR) be conducted, “to evaluate Macau’s enforcement progress.” In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR kept Macau on the Watch List, noting a concern with “Macau’s failure to convict and sentence manufacturers of infringing intellectual property products.”

MALAYSIA

IIPA first identified Malaysia in 1985 as a country with a serious piracy problem, and supported the bilateral negotiations that led to Malaysia’s adopting a comprehensive copyright law in 1987, and joining the Berne Convention in 1990, thus extending protection to U.S. works.

In 1994, IIPA filed a “Special Comment” on Malaysia calling for judicial reforms so that deterrent sentences could be imposed on copyright pirates. In 1999, IIPA filed an “Open Recommendation” report on Malaysia focusing on optical media piracy and calling for the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive regulatory system for the import, export and operation of optical media production equipment and materials; sustained and consistent antipiracy enforcement policies; and the prompt and consistent imposition of deterrent penalties on commercial pirates by Malaysian courts. In the April 30, 1999 Special 301 announcement, the USTR announced that an out-of-cycle review (OCR) of Malaysia would be conducted in September 1999. As a result of the OCR, USTR announced in December 1999 that Malaysia would not appear on any Special 301 lists but would be monitored for both TRIPS compliance and the passage of a comprehensive optical disk law. Because Malaysia has been slow to enact and implement legislation to deal with the optical media piracy problem, and to carry out effective enforcement, the USTR placed Malaysia on the Special 301 Priority Watch List for the first time in 2000.

Despite legislative changes in 2000, the IIPA recommended in its 2001 Special 301 submission that Malaysia remain on the Priority Watch List due to a lack of effective enforcement against pirates. The USTR noted in its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement that it had kept Malaysia on the Priority Watch List and would conduct an OCR to assess Malaysia’s enforcement efforts and implementation of its new Optical Disc Act. On October 31, 2001, the USTR announced that it would keep Malaysia on the Priority Watch List as a result of the out-of-cycle review. Though Malaysia has taken significant legislative steps to combat piracy, serious enforcement problems remain, particularly in the courts where “there has been virtually no progress in obtaining prompt convictions and deterrent sentencing of pirates.”

MEXICO

Mexico was first named to the Priority Watch List by USTR in 1989 as a result of its patent regime. In January 1990, USTR dropped Mexico from the list altogether following commitments to improve patent protection. Meanwhile the copyright industries were suffering high levels of piracy. In its 1991 Special 301 submission, IIPA recommended that Mexico be placed on the Priority Watch List as a result of Mexico's failure to adopt a new law protecting sound recordings and computer programs, and its failure to increase criminal penalties above the then-maximum of \$4. While IIPA believed that the massive piracy problem in Mexico warranted Priority Foreign Country status for Mexico, it did not make this recommendation, preferring to rely on the leverage created by Mexico's desire to join NAFTA. In June 1991, Mexico adopted a new copyright law as a condition precedent to the opening of NAFTA negotiations, which concluded in December 1992.

Following the adoption of NAFTA and completion of the implementing process in both the United States and Mexico, IIPA and its members focused their attention on the virtually nonexistent enforcement regime in Mexico, and by 1994 threatened to ask the U.S. to commence a NAFTA dispute settlement case. IIPA made no recommendation for Special 301 placement, however. IIPA pressed for Special Mention placement in its 1995 Special 301 submission, relying on the leverage of the NAFTA enforcement obligations. USTR again left Mexico off the list altogether. In 1996, IIPA still considered the staggering enforcement problem as best viewed as apart of Mexico's NAFTA implementation, and USTR placed Mexico back on the Special 301 list in the category of Special Mention. By this time, Mexico had become one of the largest pirate markets in the world. While IIPA and its members also pressed for legislative reform as an adjunct to the more critical need for Mexico to focus on enforcement, Mexico again chose to ignore the enforcement area, and to place its energy on other more marginal legislative reforms which were adopted in December 1996 (effective March 1997). Those amendments, while positive in certain respects, were close to disastrous in the enforcement area (e.g., they provided for decriminalization of sound recording and end-user software piracy), and under extreme U.S. government pressure, Mexico made corrective amendments which became effective in May 1997. Various meetings of the U.S.-Mexico IPR Working Group, set up in the NAFTA Agreement, proved to be of little utility, with the Mexican government evincing little interest in participating in this forum with any serious intent to improve the still-crippled enforcement system. The new law resulted in little improvement in the enforcement system.

In 1998 and 1999, IIPA urged that Mexico be placed on the Priority Watch List but the U.S., against the recommendations of USTR, kept Mexico on the Other Observations list despite Mexico's failure to resolve any of the identified problems. In 1999, Mexico was finally placed on the Watch List. In its April 30, 1999 announcement, USTR noted that "piracy and counterfeiting remain problems [despite Mexico's commitment] to implement and enforce high levels of intellectual property protection consistent with its international obligations."

Mexico has not appeared on any Special 301 lists since 2000. For the last two years, the U.S. and Mexican governments have engaged in a series of periodic bilateral meetings to engage on intellectual property rights issues ranging from criminal enforcement (raids and prosecutions), administrative enforcement (with IMPI), judicial reform, tax inspections, border enforcement,

governmental legalization of business software, further copyright law reform, to other relevant matters. High-level government engagement, by both governments, on copyright matters is required with our trade partner, Mexico.

MOLDOVA

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Moldova, the agreement was signed on June 19, 1992 and entered into force on July 2, 1992.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List, including Moldova.

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In February 2000, the administration announced that it accepted IIPA's petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. On May 12, 2000, the U.S. government held public hearings on the GSP petitions regarding these five countries. On October 23, 2000, the IIPA requested that its petition on Moldova be withdrawn, as a result of cooperation with that government on legal reforms following the filing of the petition. The U.S. government accepted that action and the GSP review of Moldova ended. In 2000, \$257,000 in Moldavian imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, representing 0.2% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$141,000 of Moldavian goods (or 0.2% of Moldova's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the GSP duty-free code, representing a decrease of 37.8% over the same period last year.

NEW ZEALAND

Until 1998, New Zealand had never appeared on any Special 301 list. In 1998, at the urging of IIPA, the USTR initiated an out-of-cycle review in response to New Zealand's sudden decision to abolish the importation right for all copyright owners. This erosion of intellectual property protection, combined with what the USTR described as an "enforcement regime [that] does not effectively deter piracy," led the USTR to follow IIPA's 1999 recommendation and place New Zealand on the 1999 Watch List. New Zealand did not appear on any Special 301 lists in 2000. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted it had placed New

Zealand on the Watch List for a failure to introduce promised legislation banning parallel imports on “newly-released copyright products.”

NICARAGUA

In February 1995, IIPA recommended to USTR that Nicaragua be placed on the Watch List for its failure to afford adequate copyright protection and effective enforcement. At the same time, IIPA filed a petition with USTR, requesting that the President withdraw Nicaragua’s beneficiary country status under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA or CBI) because it failed to meet the intellectual property rights eligibility criteria of that trade law. Neither the petition nor the 301 recommendation was accepted by USTR.

Two years later, in April 1997, USTR added Nicaragua to the Special 301 Other Observations list. In January 1998, Nicaragua and the U.S. signed a bilateral intellectual property rights agreement obligating Nicaragua to provide a higher level of protection than the TRIPS Agreement by July 1999. In her May 1, 1998 announcement keeping Nicaragua on the Other Observations list, Ambassador Barshefsky noted, “piracy of video recordings, unauthorized video and sound recordings, and U.S. satellite signals by local cable television operators remains widespread. The copyright law does not explicitly protect computer software. . . .We look to Nicaragua to update its legal structure, to reduce piracy rates affecting all forms of intellectual property, and to bring its IP regime into compliance with the obligations of the IPR agreement quickly.”

One of the CBI discretionary criteria requires that Nicaragua provide “adequate and effective means under its laws for foreign nations to secure, to exercise, and to enforce exclusive rights in intellectual property, including . . . copyrights.” In 2000, \$57.2 million of Nicaraguan imports to the United States benefited from the CBI program, accounting for 9.6% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$60 million of Nicaraguan goods entered the U.S. under the CBI, representing a 14.1% increase from the same period last year. Nicaragua also receives benefits under the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act. One of the CBTPA discretionary criteria requires that Nicaragua provide “protection of intellectual property rights consistent with or greater than the protection afforded under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights described in Section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.” In 2000, \$274,000 of Nicaraguan goods benefited from the CBTPA program, accounting for less than one half of 1% of Nicaragua’s total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$75 million of Nicaraguan goods benefited from the CBTPA program.

Nicaragua did not appear on any Special 301 list in 2000 or 2001.

OMAN

IIPA reported on Oman for the first time in 1995, urging that Oman be placed on the Special Mention list (equivalent to USTR’s Other Observations category) because it had no copyright law and was a potential haven for piracy in the Persian Gulf region. USTR agreed, and thereafter raised Oman to the Watch List in 1996, describing the intellectual property protection

regime there as “minimal and stagnant.” In 1997, USTR decided to keep Oman on the Watch List, noting that efforts to modernize Oman’s copyright law were “progressing slowly.”

In 1998 and 1999, IIPA recommended that Oman be kept on the USTR Watch List, as Oman's market was “dominated by piracy,” and was “a haven for pirates fleeing less hospitable neighboring states.” In 2000, IIPA recommended keeping Oman on the Watch List primarily for failure to stop piracy of business software. USTR agreed, keeping Oman on the USTR Watch List all three years. On May 21, 2000, Oman enacted copyright legislation as one of the final pieces in Oman’s WTO accession process. In November 2000, Oman became the 139th member of WTO and is bound to protect copyright in line with the obligations contained in the WTO TRIPS Agreement. In the 2001 Special 301 submission, the IIPA recommended that Oman be placed on the Watch List. USTR did not place Oman on any list in 2001.

Oman currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide “adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights.” In 2000, \$49.7 million of Oman’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 19.4% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$36.7 million of Oman’s goods (or 8.8% of Oman’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a decrease of 18.7% from the same period last year.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan has been on the Special 301 Watch List since 1989. While it amended its copyright law in 1992, further revisions need to be made to bring it up to international standards. No significant progress against pervasive copyright piracy was made until 1994, when raids against video piracy began, and intensified in 1995. USTR engaged the Pakistani government on patent issues, initiating a WTO case; the Pakistani government then amended its patent law and regulations to comply with certain TRIPS patent provisions. In 1997 and 1998, USTR kept Pakistan on the Watch List, noting that piracy of computer software, videos, and books remained widespread. In 1999, IIPA recommended that Pakistan remain on the Watch List, and noted for the first time the sudden arrival of CD manufacturing capability. USTR kept Pakistan on the Watch List, noting the CD plants and Pakistan’s TRIPS-incompatible law.

In 2000, IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, to keep Pakistan on the Watch List, again noting the increasing pirate CD production problem. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that “insufficient measures are being taken to curb illicit production of optical media” in Pakistan, and also noted the slow court system and the imposition of “nondeterrent penalties.” In 2001, IIPA recommended and again USTR agreed to keep Pakistan on the Watch List. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that despite new legislation, “[t]he sharp growth in optical media piracy, however, offsets the promising developments in legal infrastructure.” In June of 2001, the IIPA filed a request for review of the intellectual property practices of Pakistan. USTR has not yet decided whether to accept the request.

Pakistan currently participates in the U.S. GSP program offering duty-free imports of certain products into the U.S. from developing countries. In order to qualify for such unilaterally granted trade preferences, USTR must be satisfied that Pakistan meets certain discretionary criteria, including whether it provides “adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights.” At the same time as Pakistan caused losses to the U.S. due to piracy and kept its law in violation of international treaty obligations, Pakistan imported \$93.3 million of products into the United States without duty in 2000 (4.3% of its total imports to the U.S.), and \$98.6 million of products (or 4.7% of Pakistan’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) into the United States without duty during the first 11 months of 2001.

PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

IIPA filed its first Special 301 comments on the Palestinian Authority in 1999, over concerns about the rapid growth of optical media and video piracy in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. IIPA recommended that USTR signal its engagement with the Palestinian Authority by placing it on the Watch List. In addition to recommending a Watch List designation again in 1999, IIPA also recommended that USTR conduct an out-of-cycle review to monitor the antipiracy and legal measures undertaken by the Authority. The Palestinian Authority did not appear on any Special 301 lists in 1999. In 2000, raising increasing concerns over pirate production for export, IIPA recommended that the Palestinian Authority be placed on the Priority Watch List. On May 1, 2000, USTR announced that it would conduct an out-of-cycle review of the Palestinian Authority. The scheduled review has not yet occurred, due to unrest in the area. In 2001, noting continuing unrest, the IIPA recommended that USTR conduct an out-of-cycle review of the area when conditions permit. USTR did not place the Palestinian Authority on any list in 2001.

In 2000, \$181,000 of products imported from the West Bank benefited from the GSP program, representing 3.9% of the Palestinian Authority's total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$38,000 of products (or 24.7% of the Palestinian Authority's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) imported from the West Bank benefited from the GSP program, representing 96.6% decrease over the same period last year.

PANAMA

Panama was placed on the Special 301 Special Mention list (now known as Other Observations) in 1994 and again in 1996. In October 1996, USTR initiated a review of Panama’s intellectual property rights regime under the Generalized System of Preference (GSP) program. IIPA participated in the GSP hearings in November 1996, during which the Panamanian Government acknowledged that its system for protecting intellectual property had not been fully implemented, although some enforcement actions were beginning to be taken.

On April 30, 1997, USTR elevated Panama to the Watch List and scheduled an out-of-cycle review (OCR) to assess Panama’s efforts to “improv[e] its intellectual property laws and their enforcement.” As a result of this out-of-cycle review in October 1997, USTR decided to remove Panama from the Watch List, given “visible progress” made since its placement on that list.

In 1998, Panama was elevated to the Other Observations list amidst USTR's concerns that "inadequate enforcement continues to be a major problem." Ambassador Barshefsky noted that she looked for the authorities "to devote sufficient resources to IP protection and to continue to fulfill their action plan devised [in 1997]." Because of progress made in Panama during that year, USTR terminated the GSP review on October 26, 1998. IIPA recommended that Panama remain on the Other Observations list in 1999 to monitor progress there; however, Panama did not appear on any Special 301 list in 1999 or 2000. IIPA made no recommendation on Panama in 2001 and USTR did not place Panama on any list in 2001.

In 2000, \$1.8 million in Panamanian imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 0.6% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$3.4 million of Panamanian goods (or 1.3% of Panama's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 95% increase over the same period last year. Under the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI), which has similar IPR criteria, \$42.6 million of Panamanian goods entered the U.S., accounting for nearly 14.4% of total imports to the U.S. in 2000. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$32.2 million of Panamanian goods (or 12.1% of Panama's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered under the CBI, representing a 19.7% decrease over the same period last year. Under the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA), which has IPR criteria similar to CBI and GSP, \$6,000 of Panamanian goods entered the U.S. in 2000. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$5.5 million of Panamanian goods (or 2.1% of Panama's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the CBTPA.

PARAGUAY

The bilateral history of engagement between the U.S. and Paraguay has been a lengthy and intricate one. Back in 1992, IIPA reported that Paraguay was the central point for the production, export and transshipment of pirate audiocassettes throughout South America. By that time, the recording industry had already spent several years working to improve the on-the-ground enforcement situation in Paraguay. In April 1992, USTR placed Paraguay on the Watch List. In early 1993, Paraguayan officials made a political commitment to end the widespread piracy of sound recordings. By April 1993, because Paraguay had substantially reduced the level of piracy of sound recordings and music, Ambassador Kantor removed Paraguay from the Watch List. In early 1994, despite some positive enforcement efforts made by Paraguayan authorities, the recording industry reported a recurrence of the pre-1993 problems involving the export of pirated product at the Brazilian border. In 1994 and 1995, USTR kept Paraguay on the Special Mention list for both years, despite industry recommendations to raise back to the Watch List. In 1996, IIPA recommended a Priority Watch List placement because of increasing piracy problems in Paraguay, especially at the border. USTR elevated Paraguay to the Watch List on April 30, 1996. During an out-of-cycle review in October 1996, USTR kept Paraguay on the Special 301 Watch List, noting "the Government of Paraguay must take strong, coordinated, government-wide action to institute effective enforcement systems."

In early 1997, IIPA recommended that USTR designate Paraguay as a Priority Foreign Country because of the longstanding problems of piracy, ineffective enforcement and an

inadequate copyright law. In March 1997, member associations of the IIPA, along with U.S. trademark and patent industry representatives, traveled to Paraguay to meet with Paraguayan officials to discuss both enforcement and legislative concerns. In April 1997, USTR elevated Paraguay to the Priority Watch List, noting that "despite efforts of concerned Government officials, piracy and counterfeiting in Paraguay have reached alarming levels and much more needs to be done." On May 5, 1997, President Wasmosy announced a national antipiracy campaign, but this campaign turned out to be little more than a public relations effort, which lasted over a year, through the rest of his administration.

In late 1997, USTR conducted an out-of-cycle review of Paraguay's Special 301 status. Because Paraguay simply failed to meet the standards laid out in that review, USTR designated Paraguay as a Priority Foreign Country on January 16, 1998. A Section 301 investigation commenced on February 17, 1998. During the investigation, U.S. and Paraguayan officials met several times for consultations. The U.S. had hoped for dramatic progress in many areas by July 1998, but this did not happen. Some accomplishments were achieved, however. On April 23, 1998, the Attorney General (Fiscal General) issued a circular to his prosecutors, urging them to apply the maximum penalties in cases of piracy, and requesting that they report on pending IPR proceedings. While this is a useful instruction, no copyright cases have reached the sentencing stage in Paraguay.

In terms of border enforcement, while Paraguay did not undertake the needed major overhaul of its entire customs regime, some measures were implemented to improve inspections of suspect product at the borders. For example, an agreement was signed between Paraguay and Taiwan on May 28, 1998, promising to exchange information regarding the flow of goods suspected of being used in piracy. For all intents and purposes, this agreement has not been used, and several reports point to Taiwan as having failed to comply with its end of the agreement to exchange information on suspect shipments going to Paraguay.

Because of the need to gear up IPR negotiations with the new administration of President Grau and because some marginal progress had been made (primarily the passage of a trademark law), USTR extended the Section 301 investigation. Ambassador Barshefsky noted that "insufficient progress" had been made in the first six months of the investigation, and she urged "the new administration to use this short extension of the 301 investigation period to take swift enforcement actions to reduce piracy and bring into force adequate and effective intellectual property laws without further delay."

In August and September 1998, several major seizures were conducted, led by industry investigatory efforts. Public destruction ceremonies of infringing products were held, aimed at improving public awareness. Paraguayan Customs circulated a resolution targeting certain items for its agents to check on border entry. The new copyright law was passed in mid-October, 1998. In late October, the Public Ministry assigned two prosecutors to work on IPR investigations. While industry was hopeful at the onset that these prosecutors would be useful, we understand that they too had minimal effect on forwarding copyright enforcement, given the fact that the current criminal code requires public complaints for copyright (but not trademark) actions. While these raids did represent progress, the copyright industries remained gravely concerned that, at the foundation, not much had changed in terms of governmental efforts to conduct effective copyright

enforcement actions. Piracy levels were unchanged, and imports of infringing product continued to flow through the porous Paraguayan borders.

On November 17, 1998, USTR announced that a comprehensive bilateral intellectual property agreement with Paraguay was concluded which “will significantly improve intellectual property protection for copyrights, patents and trademarks and ensure continued progress in the fight against piracy and counterfeiting in Paraguay.” By signing the Memorandum of Understanding and Enforcement Action Plan, USTR decided not to take further trade action at that time and terminated both the Section 301 investigation as well as its review of Paraguay’s IPR practices under the Generalized System of Preference, which had commenced in October 1996 as part of the 1995 GSP Annual Review.

In IIPA’s 1999 and 2000 Special 301 filings, IIPA supported USTR’s continued Section 306 monitoring despite concerns that Paraguay had already missed most of the interim deadlines of the November 1998 MOU/Action Plan, and that Paraguayan courts had not yet issued a sentence in a copyright infringement case. In a May 1, 2000 announcement, the USTR said that the U.S. Government is seriously concerned that

“Paraguay continues to be a regional center for piracy, especially of optical media, as well as for counterfeiting, and continues to serve as a transshipment point for an alarming volume of infringing products from Asia to the larger markets bordering Paraguay, particularly Brazil. In addition, Paraguay has failed to implement its obligation under the WTO TRIPS Agreement and the bilateral MOU to enact a modern patent law, among other reforms.”

In 2001, IIPA continued to support the USTR’s Section 306 monitoring of Paraguay. USTR’s April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement echoes the 2000 announcement, noting inadequate implementation of the MOU and that “Paraguay continues to be a regional center for piracy and counterfeiting and a transshipment point to the larger markets bordering Paraguay, particularly Brazil, where the sales of pirated copyright products in optical media and other formats have been of particular concern.” In 2000, \$18.9 million in Paraguayan imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 45% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$9.6 million of Paraguayan goods (or 33% of Paraguay’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP program, representing a 47.5% decrease from the same period last year.

PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

After USTR placed China on the Priority Watch List in both 1989 and 1990 to encourage it to commence a law reform process, China passed a new copyright law in September 1990 (effective June 1, 1991). That law was incompatible with the Berne Convention and had numerous other defects, and as a result of these inadequacies as well as high and growing losses due to copyright piracy, USTR named China a Priority Foreign Country in April 1991. In January 1992, China and the U.S. settled the resulting Section 301 action by entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This MOU committed China to adopt Berne-compatible regulations to its

copyright law and to join the Berne Convention (which China did, effective October 15, 1992) and the Geneva Phonograms Convention (which it also did, effective June 1, 1993). U.S. works became fully eligible for protection in April 1992 under the 1992 MOU, and China was consequently placed on the Watch List in April 1992.

On September 30, 1992, China's Berne-compatible regulations went into effect (but only applied to foreign works, leaving domestic Chinese copyright and related rights owners with less protection for their works, performances and sound recordings than that enjoyed by foreign right holders). China remained on the Watch List in 1993 with IIPA and USTR pushing for passage of legislation to make copyright piracy a criminal offense, as well as to beef up enforcement measures. On November 30, 1993, Ambassador Kantor elevated China to the Priority Watch List due to China's failure to enforce its laws. In February 1994, IIPA reported significantly increased trade losses, up to \$823 million for 1993. Due to the absence of criminal penalties and a total lack of enforcement, USTR once again named China as a Priority Foreign Country in June 1994. Though the National People's Congress, through a "Decision" of the Standing Committee, adopted criminal penalties for copyright piracy in July 1994. It was not until 1995 that the Decision was implemented by a set of "Interpretations" issued by the Supreme People's Court. However, because the "Decision" appeared not to have the full effect of a "Law" (which was not adopted until March 1997, effective October 1997), the criminal provisions were rarely used and deterrence suffered accordingly. Meanwhile, U.S. trade losses continued to mount. On February 4, 1995, the U.S. government announced \$1.08 billion in retaliatory tariffs to compensate for trade losses due to copyright piracy in China. The imposition of these tariffs was narrowly averted by the U.S.-China IPR Agreement on February 26, 1995. As a result of this agreement, the second Section 301 case against China was terminated, China was made subject to monitoring under Section 306, and, on April 30, 1995, USTR moved China to the Watch List.

While some progress was made during 1995 to set up the enforcement infrastructure promised in the 1995 agreement, its principal provisions (those dealing with CD factories, with imposing deterrent penalties and with eliminating onerous market access barriers) remained largely unfulfilled. This led IIPA, in February 1996, once again to urge that China be named a Priority Foreign Country and that the previously terminated Special 301 investigation be reopened. USTR took these actions on April 30, 1996 and a retaliation list, comprising over \$2 billion worth of products, was published on May 15, 1996. This was followed by protracted and often heated discussions, which led to the closure of 15 CD factories, other enforcement actions by Chinese authorities, and the announcement of certain market-opening measures. Finally, on June 17, 1996, the U.S. and China agreed on a set of announcements which averted the imposition of trade sanctions, and which led to the Section 301 action once more being terminated. This left China subject to monitoring of its compliance with the 1995 and 1996 agreements under Section 306 of the U.S. Trade Act as it remains today. The U.S. government, led by USTR, has continued since then to meet regularly with Chinese authorities to monitor compliance with China's agreements.

Since 1998, IIPA has continued to recommend, and the USTR has agreed, that China continue to be subject to Section 306 Monitoring to ensure its compliance with the 1995 IPR Agreement and the 1996 Action Plan.

PERU

USTR placed Peru on the Special 301 Watch List in 1992, where it remained for seven years. In February 1995, IIPA was greatly concerned about the inadequate copyright law and poor enforcement efforts in Peru and filed a petition to deny preferential trade benefits under both the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program and the Andean Trade Preferences Act (ATPA). Peru amended its copyright law in 1996 and established an administrative agency to handle copyright enforcement. As a result of such progress, these petitions were not accepted by USTR. USTR's April 1996 Special 301 announcement noted that some progress had been taken by INDECOPI (a quasi-governmental agency), but urged the government "to intensify its anti-piracy efforts, particularly to combat sound recordings and book piracy." USTR kept Peru on the Watch List in both 1997 and 1998. Ambassador Barshefsky noted in her May 1, 1998 Special 301 announcement that, "[w]hile enforcement actions have been brought, the INDECOPI Appellate Tribunal's pattern of reducing fines it initially assessed seriously hinders enforcement efforts against piracy and counterfeiting. Piracy also continues due to problems with lax border enforcement and a cumbersome and slow judicial process. We will continue to monitor progress in these areas."

In both 1999 and 2000, IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, that Peru should be elevated to the Priority Watch List.

In 2001, IIPA recommended that Peru be put on the Watch List in recognition of noticeable progress INDECOPI has made on copyright issues. The USTR agreed, placing Peru on the Watch List for 2001. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted that "the Government of Peru took several positive steps in cooperating with U.S. industry on intellectual property protection." The announcement points out that "[d]espite these efforts, however, criminal enforcement remains a problem."

In June 1999, IIPA filed a GSP/ATPA petition for review of the intellectual property practices of Peru for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection for U.S. copyright owners. However, when Peru developed a plan of action for IPR issues in early 2000, IIPA withdrew its GSP/ATPA petition (on February 7, 2000). In 2000, \$45.1 million in Peru's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for nearly 2.3% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$61.7 million of Peruvian goods (or 3.7% of Peru's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing an increase of 52.2% over the same period last year. An additional \$846 million of Peruvian products benefited from the Andean Trade Preferences Act ("ATPA") in 2000, accounting for 42.6% of total imports to the United States. In the first 11 months of 2001, an additional \$677.6 million of Peruvian goods entered the U.S. under ATPA, representing a 12.7% decrease in ATPA benefits over the same time period last year.

PHILIPPINES

In our Special 301 filings in 1992 and 1993, IIPA recommended that USTR identify the Philippines as a Priority Foreign Country, given the almost complete lack of attention by the Philippine government toward enacting copyright reform and improving enforcement. On April 6,

1993, the Philippine government exchanged letters with the U.S. government, committing the Philippines to provide strong intellectual property rights protection and improved enforcement. As a result of this agreement, USTR dropped the Philippines from the Priority Watch List to the Watch List in 1993, where it remains. Subsequent IIPA filings raised concerns about the Philippines' continued failure to fulfill its commitments under the 1993 exchange of letters, especially bringing its laws into compliance with Berne Convention standards, and increasing penalties to deterrent levels in order to fight piracy. In June 1995, IIPA filed a petition to request that USTR review the eligibility of the Philippines to participate in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, of which one criterion is the "adequate and effective" protection of intellectual property rights. USTR deferred any action on this petition, but in the end, this petition was not accepted.

In June 1997, the Philippines finally enacted a comprehensive modernization of its copyright law, which took effect January 1, 1998. In its 1998 filing, IIPA commended the Philippines on this long-awaited achievement, but noted ongoing problems with enforcement and the need to clarify omissions and ambiguities in the new law. For these reasons, IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, that the Philippines stay on the Watch List in 1998 and 1999. In 2000, IIPA called for the Philippines to be moved back to the Priority Watch List, noting that optical media piracy had taken root in the country and that fundamental improvements in the investigative, prosecutorial and judicial systems were needed to meet this challenge. In its May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR maintained the Philippines on the Watch List, but also noted the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against the Philippines for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations.

Noting increased pirate production and cross-border distribution, the IIPA recommended in 2001 that the Philippines be placed on the Priority Watch List "to underscore U.S. insistence that these long-standing and serious problems be effectively tackled." USTR agreed and placed the Philippines on the Priority Watch List in 2001. In the April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted concern that "the Philippines has the potential of becoming a center of pirate optical media production in Asia."

In 2000, \$745.4 million of Philippine imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 5.3% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$627.2 million of Philippine goods (or 6% of the Philippine's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a decrease of 8.8% over the same period last year.

POLAND

In 1992 and 1993, Poland was placed on the Priority Watch List in order to encourage the copyright reform and enforcement progress envisioned under the 1990 U.S.-Poland Business and Economic Relations Agreement. That 1990 agreement required that Poland "provide adequate and effective enforcement of intellectual property rights"; protection for U.S. sound recordings was clearly included within this obligation. In that agreement, Poland committed to adopt a Berne-compatible copyright law and to adhere to the substantive provisions of the 1971 text of the Berne Convention by January 1, 1991; the U.S. and Poland ratified the agreement in August 1994. In

1994, with enactment of a new copyright law, Poland was placed on the Watch List to monitor the progress of the implementation of that law; it remained on the Watch List from 1994 to 1999.

In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR elevated Poland to the Priority Watch List for its failure to bring its copyright regime in line with TRIPS obligations and Business Economic Relations Agreement, and noted the possibility of the initiation of a TRIPS case against Poland. In June 2000, Poland finally enacted TRIPS-compliant amendments to the copyright law. The USTR responded by moving Poland to the Watch List in a November out-of-cycle review, noting that “it is critical that Poland also addresses remaining intellectual property problems, including weak enforcement against piracy and counterfeiting.”

In 2001, IIPA recommended that Poland remain on the Watch List, but that USTR conduct an out-of-cycle review “to ensure that progress continues in Poland on both enforcement and legislative reform.” IIPA recommended that the out-of-cycle review “focus on distinct and tangible improvements made in halting the activities involved in the sale and distribution of piratical materials at the Warsaw Stadium.” Though USTR did not conduct an out-of-cycle review, in the October 31, 2001 Special 301 “out of cycle” decision announcement, continued concern over the large amounts of pirate products in the Warsaw Stadium was noted by USTR. The announcement urged Polish authorities to act immediately to halt the sale of pirated products in and through the stadium.

In addition to Special 301 oversight, Poland’s intellectual property rights practices have also been the subject of a review under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. IIPA filed a petition with USTR on June 1, 1993, asking that Poland lose its eligibility to receive preferential trade benefits under the GSP program. On July 24, 1995, Ambassador Kantor announced that he was extending Poland’s GSP review until February 1996 “in the expectation that, by that time, Poland will have taken the steps required to provide adequate protection to U.S. sound recordings.” Although this issue was not satisfactorily resolved, USTR terminated its GSP review of Poland on October 4, 1996. Given continuing legal deficiencies in Poland’s copyright law, IIPA filed a GSP petition with USTR to do a review of Poland for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection for U.S. copyright owners. The administration did not accept IIPA’s petition. In 2000, \$316.6 million of Poland’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for nearly 30.4% of its total imports. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$264.7 million of Polish goods (or 31% of Poland’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a decrease of 8.6% from the same period last year.

QATAR

IIPA first reported on Qatar in 1995, when it recommended that Qatar be placed on Other Observations because of its lack of any copyright law or enforcement effort. USTR agreed, and placed it there in 1995 and 1996, noting that it expected Qatar to take steps to address shortcomings in its intellectual property regime. In 1997, USTR once again kept Qatar on the Other Observations list, noting that no enforcement had yet taken place. In 1998, IIPA recommended that Qatar be elevated to the Watch List, so that USTR could signal its engagement

with Qatar over high piracy levels for all kinds of copyrighted products and an inadequate law, making Qatar a potential “haven of piracy.” USTR agreed, and in raising Qatar to the Watch List in 1998, Ambassador Barshefsky called upon Qatar to legalize the software used in government offices, improve copyright enforcement [and] implement its TRIPS obligations. As recommended by IIPA, Qatar remained on the Watch List in 1999 and 2000 because of its failure to enact TRIPS-consistent legislation and serious enforcement problems. IIPA recommended that Qatar remain on the Watch List in 2001 for failure to adequately address the piracy of business software and other copyrighted products. USTR did not place Qatar on any list in 2001.

ROMANIA

In a Side Letter to the 1992 trade agreement with the U.S., the Romanian government committed to take several actions to improve intellectual property rights, including adhering to the Berne Convention (1971 text) and the Geneva Phonograms Convention. Romania agreed to submit for enactment, no later than December 31, 1993, legislation necessary to carry out its obligations and to make “best efforts” to implement legislation by that date. In 1995, after Romania failed to meet these goals and deadlines, IIPA recommended that Romania be added to the Watch List, and USTR agreed. In 1996, USTR moved Romania to Special Mention following adoption of its new copyright law in February 1996. Romania remained as a Special Mention country in the USTR designations in 1997 and 1998 because of its lax enforcement and the bilateral agreement shortcomings.

In our 1999, 2000, and 2001 filings, IIPA recommended that Romania be elevated to the Watch List as a result of unacceptable piracy rates, its non-TRIPS-compliant regime, and to encourage the commitment of resources to effective (and TRIPS required) enforcement of the copyright law. The USTR agreed, and Romania has been on Watch List since 1999. Despite these concerns, Romania is making legal reform. In February, 2001, Romania deposited with the WTO its instruments of ratification to the new digital treaties, the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performance and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT).

Romania currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide “adequate and effective” copyright protection. In 2000, \$77.1 million of Romania’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 16.4% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$93.4 million of Romanian goods (or 19% of Romania’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 32.8% increase over the same period last year.

RUSSIA

In 1992, IIPA first recommended that Russia be placed on the Watch List in order to encourage its progress toward a modern and market-driven copyright regime (in 1991, IIPA made the same recommendation with regard to the U.S.S.R.). That progress, although delayed by events surrounding the breakup of the Soviet Union, culminated in the 1993 enactment of a new law on

“Copyright and Neighboring Rights,” and the October 1992 enactment of the “Law on the Legal Protection of Computer Programs and Databases.” These laws, drafted and lobbied effectively by a small group of Russian legislators, led by Yuri Rhyzov, were generally Berne-compatible (with the major exception that the law’s implementing decree failed to afford protection to pre-existing foreign sound recordings and pre-1973 “works” such as films, books, music, et cetera). The Copyright Law of 1993 enabled Russia to move toward adherence to the 1971 text of Berne and to the Geneva Phonograms Convention in 1995. In the 1992 U.S.-Russia bilateral trade agreement, Russia promised to join both these conventions by the end of 1992.¹ In December 1994, Russia deposited its instruments of accession to Berne and Geneva, which both became effective on March 13, 1995. Throughout 1994 and 1995, IIPA and its members worked to secure amendments to the Criminal Code and other related civil and criminal procedural codes which would turn copyright piracy into a serious criminal offense and thus clear the way for commencement of enforcement programs by both U.S. and Russian industries. Some of these procedural changes were approved in July 1995, but the effective date of the Administrative Code amendments was dependent on adoption of the Criminal Code. President Yeltsin vetoed the Criminal Case amendment in December 1995; it was finally approved in June 1996. From the time the laws were passed in 1992 and 1993 until January 1997 when the Criminal Code amendments making piracy a crime took effect, Russia was completely without meaningful enforcement machinery. In that four-year period, hardcore criminal elements infiltrated copyright markets, and losses to copyright owners skyrocketed.

In its 1995 submission, frustrated by the lack of progress in criminalizing piracy, IIPA recommended Russia for the Priority Watch List. USTR moved Russia from the Special Mention category in 1994 to the Watch List for 1995. Also in 1995, IIPA petitioned to remove Russia's status as a “beneficiary developing country” under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. The GSP program expired on July 31, 1995 and was not renewed again until October 1996. During this hiatus, IIPA’s petition was, in effect, not accepted. In February 1996, IIPA urged that Russia be named a Priority Foreign Country. USTR kept it on the Watch List, subject to an out-of-cycle review (OCR), which occurred in December 1996. While USTR again decided to keep Russia on the Watch List at that time (because of the expected passage of the criminal law amendments), Ambassador Barshefsky highlighted the need to significantly increase enforcement actions under the existing law, to pass the laws necessary to make piracy a full crime, to provide retroactive protection, and to dismantle market access barriers.

In our February 1997 submission, IIPA again pressed for a Priority Foreign Country designation if by April 1997 Russia had not taken a series of steps, including commencement of major enforcement actions, and the introduction of legislation providing full retroactive protection for both pre-1995 sound recordings and pre-1973 works. Some more aggressive enforcement actions were undertaken during this period, but there was no movement on even drafting a bill (or decree) on retroactive protection and little optimism that this would soon occur. Shortly following

¹ This agreement, originally concluded with the Soviet Union in May 1990, was re-signed on behalf of the Russian Federation by President Yeltsin in June 1992 and put into force at that time by granting MFN treatment to Russia. The agreement was also the model for trade agreements signed with all the other countries of the CIS during the next two years.

its submission, IIPA again petitioned USTR to deny Russia duty free trade benefits under the GSP program, for its clear failure to provide “adequate and effective” protection for U.S.–copyrighted works. USTR moved Russia up to the Priority Watch List in its April 1997 announcement and later again denied IIPA’s GSP petition.

During the first year (1997) following adoption of the new criminal provisions making piracy a crime with real penalties, there was some progress in the enforcement area. In particular, raids commenced and some administrative actions were concluded; two criminal convictions with very low penalties were reported, only later to be voided by a government amnesty at the beginning of 1998. There was no progress at all with the legislative agenda concerning retroactivity or correcting other enforcement deficiencies.

From 1998 through 2000, IIPA recommended that Russia remain on the Priority Watch List because of massive piracy losses, a rapidly growing optical media piracy problem, virtually no enforcement or deterrent system, and some deficiencies in the IPR regime, particularly around retroactive protection for sound recordings. The USTR has followed our recommendation, and Russia has remained on the Priority Watch List ever since 1997.

In August 2000, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Russia under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In January 2001, the Administration announced that it accepted IIPA’s petition. The U.S. government has not yet decided on whether to withdraw or suspend GSP benefits in Russia. In its April 30, 2001, Special 301 announcement, USTR noted certain deficiencies in Russia’s copyright law making it incompatible with 1991 bilateral trade agreement and TRIPS: “[a]mong the deficiencies are: the lack of full retroactive protection for works and sound recordings, the lack of civil *ex parte* search procedures and other enforcement-related deficiencies.” In 2000, \$514.7 million of Russia’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 6.6% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$359.2 million of Russian goods (or 6.2% of Russia’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 26.1% decrease over the same period last year.

SAUDI ARABIA

Saudi Arabia was on the Priority Watch List from 1993 to 1995, after having been reduced from this status to the Watch List in 1990 following passage in that year of the Kingdom’s first copyright law. Effective July 1, 1994, Saudi Arabia adhered to the Universal Copyright Convention (UCC), which for the first time effectively extended the protection of the 1990 copyright law to foreign copyrighted works, including sound recordings.

Former Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown made intellectual property protection the centerpiece of talks at the January 1994 U.S.–Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Economic Dialogue. Later in November 1994, the U.S. government and IIPA cooperated to sponsor a U.S.–Saudi Arabia–GCC Enforcement Seminar in Riyadh. The seminar was successful and, we believe, resulted in the

issuance of several circulars aimed at cracking down on shops dealing in unauthorized product. In April 1995, USTR kept Saudi Arabia on the Priority Watch List and added an out-of-cycle review (OCR) for October 1995. On November 13, 1995, USTR decided to keep Saudi Arabia on this list, and looked to the Saudi government to “increase its enforcement actions against pirate activity and to take action against the illegal use of computer software, particularly by large end-users in Saudi Arabia.” In April 1996, Saudi Arabia was moved to the Watch List in recognition of end-of-1995 enforcement actions taken by the Ministry of Information. It remained on the Watch List in 1997.

IIPA and its members, in conjunction with the Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry, held a three-day enforcement-training seminar in Riyadh in October 1997 to train police and other enforcement officials in copyright enforcement matters. IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, that Saudi Arabia remain on the Watch List in 1998 and 1999, noting that copyright enforcement efforts by the Saudi Government had improved over 1997, but raising several concerns, including lack of “transparency” and failure to impose “strong deterrent penalties.”

In 2000, IIPA recommended that Saudi Arabia be re-elevated to the Priority Watch List, for its failure to commit adequate resources to enforcement against burgeoning retail piracy, provide transparency in the copyright enforcement system, legalize software usage within the government, and amend its copyright laws and regulations to bring them into line with international standards. USTR kept Saudi Arabia on the Watch List in 2000. In 2001, IIPA again recommended that Saudi Arabia be placed on the Priority Watch List, for continued piracy, lack of effective and deterrent enforcement actions, and a TRIPS-incompatible copyright law. In 2001, USTR kept Saudi Arabia on the Watch List.

SINGAPORE

Singapore, notorious as the “world capital of piracy” until the late 1980's, changed course and rigorously enforced its 1987 copyright law for several years thereafter. In 1994, IIPA recommended that Singapore be placed on the Watch List, reporting that Singapore had become a major transshipment point for pirated copyrighted works, and that its government virtually refused to pursue criminal prosecutions against flagrant software piracy. USTR decided to place Singapore in its Other Observations category. In 1995, USTR elevated Singapore to the Watch List, citing weakened patent protection, and it remained there in 1996 and 1997, primarily because of its failure to bring its copyright laws up to the standards of the TRIPS Agreement. In 1998, IIPA called for Singapore to be elevated to the Priority Watch List, stressing that Singapore's unique “self-policing” system was inadequate to deal with rising levels of digital piracy, and that further legislative improvements, and better regulation of optical media production facilities, were urgently needed. Agreeing that the “self-policing” policy was “outdated and ineffective,” USTR decided to keep Singapore on the Watch List for 1998, citing evidence of more active government enforcement against piracy, as well as the progress made toward achieving TRIPS-consistent copyright law.

In 1999 and 2000, IIPA recommended and USTR agreed that Singapore remain on the Watch List. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that while “[o]verall piracy rates in Singapore decreased slightly during 1999 the open retail availability of pirated CDs,

VCDs and CD-ROMs in notorious shopping malls and at stalls continues to be a serious problem.” IIPA made no recommendation regarding Singapore in 2001 and USTR did not place Singapore on any list in 2001.

SOUTH AFRICA

USTR placed South Africa on the Special 301 Watch List in 1995. After South Africa made progress on trademark issues, USTR provisionally removed it from the Watch List in April 1996, placing it in USTR’s Other Observations category. USTR conducted an out-of-cycle review (OCR) in September 1996 to confirm that legislative changes that South Africa had committed to implement were being carried out, and that other measures had been taken to resolve outstanding concerns regarding trademarks. As a result of this review, South Africa was taken off the Special 301 list. In 1997, IIPA recommended that South Africa be placed on the Other Observations list because of resurgent book piracy and TRIPS deficiencies in South Africa’s copyright law. USTR included South Africa in the 1997 National Trade Estimate (NTE) release, noting “substantial software losses, book piracy, and satellite signal piracy.” In addition, USTR recognized that “[e]nforcement remains a problem in part because of a lack of availability of enforcement resources.”

In 1998, USTR placed South Africa on the Watch List because of continuing problems in the patent system, “TRIPS deficiencies,” and U.S. copyright industry estimates that losses to copyright piracy increased by 26% between 1996 and 1997. In 1999, IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, that South Africa remain on the Watch List. In her April 30, 1999 announcement, Ambassador Barshefsky added a September 1999 out-of-cycle review, noting that “the U.S. copyright industry estimates that trade losses due to piracy of copyrighted works increased more than 35 percent between 1997 and 1998.” As a result of a health initiative related to pharmaceutical patents, USTR decided to remove South Africa from the Special 301 lists in late 1999, and despite an IIPA recommendation in 2000 and 2001, South Africa did not appear on any Special 301 list in 2000 or 2001.

South Africa currently participates in the U.S. GSP program offering duty-free imports of certain products into the U.S. from developing countries. In order to qualify for such unilaterally granted trade preferences, USTR must be satisfied that South Africa meets certain discretionary criteria, including whether it provides “adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights.” In 2000, \$583.2 million of South Africa’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 13.9% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$ 475.8 million of South Africa’s imports into the United States (or 11.4% of South Africa’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) benefited from the GSP program, representing a decrease of 10.9% over the same period last year.

SOUTH KOREA

South Korea made its first appearance on the Priority Watch List in 1989, and remained there, except for 1990 and 1991, until 1997, when it was moved down to the Watch List. South Korea made considerable progress in bringing enforcement in the video, audio and book areas up

to commendable levels after 1993, but software piracy remained a serious concern, and the book piracy situation deteriorated. IIPA's reports in the mid-1990s also focused on TRIPS compliance issues, and market access barriers affecting the motion picture and computer software industries. USTR's decision in 1996 to maintain South Korea on the Priority Watch List noted software end-user piracy and the "failure to provide full retroactive protection for pre-1957 works as required under the TRIPS Agreement" as major problems. In 1997, USTR lowered South Korea to the Watch List because of its continued progress in the fight against piracy. In 1998 and 1999, IIPA recommended that South Korea remain on the Watch List, highlighting the persistence of software piracy, the lack of full protection for pre-1957 works, and a lack of transparency in some aspects of the enforcement system. USTR kept South Korea on the Watch List both years.

In 2000, IIPA recommended that South Korea again be elevated to the Priority Watch List because of unacceptable enforcement policies against institutional end-user software pirates, legislative action weakening the protection for computer programs, and an increase in piracy of audiovisual products, sound recordings, and books. The USTR agreed, and placed South Korea on the Priority Watch List in May 2000. After a December out-of-cycle review, South Korea remained on the Priority Watch List.

In 2001, IIPA recommended that South Korea remain on the Priority Watch List due to continued business software and increasingly sophisticated book piracy, ineffective administrative and criminal enforcement, as well as a lack of any deterrent value for enforcement actions. USTR kept South Korea on the Priority Watch List in 2001, noting that despite increased copyright enforcement programs, it was still too early to determine whether or not they had any effect.

SPAIN

Spain appeared on USTR's Special 301 Watch List from 1989 through 1994. In IIPA's 1994 Special 301 filing, the business software industry hoped that Spain's implementation of the E.U. Software Directive would improve enforcement efforts. After some initial success in obtaining raids on end-users after that legislation was enacted, action by the courts had slowed to the point where it became clear that renewed attention to the problem was required.

In 1998, IIPA recommended that Spain be placed on the Special 301 Watch List, primarily due to continuing high levels of piracy and losses experienced by the software industries. On May 1, 1998, Ambassador Barshefsky placed Spain on the Special 301 list of Other Observations. While noting the high levels of business software piracy in Spain, the Ambassador added, "The United States is concerned that judicial proceedings are frequently delayed and that penalties assessed against infringers are inadequate to serve as a deterrent against piracy." However, in 1999 IIPA recommended that Spain be placed on the Special 301 Watch List due to one of the highest levels of piracy of business software in Europe. USTR agreed and elevated Spain to the Watch List for the first time since 1994. In 2000, IIPA again recommended that Spain remain on the Watch List for one of the highest levels of piracy for business software in the European Union. The USTR agreed, and kept Spain on the Watch List in 2000. IIPA did not make any recommendation regarding Spain in 2001. USTR did not place Spain on any list during 2001.

TAIWAN

Taiwan was the subject of the IIPA's first report on worldwide piracy in 1985. U.S. efforts to reduce the massive levels of piracy in Taiwan began in earnest in 1988-89 with the negotiation of a new bilateral treaty governing copyright protection. Concerns surged in the early 1990s over new pirate CD manufacture and export from Taiwan, escalating cable piracy, and mushrooming export levels of pirated software. U.S. trade losses reached an unprecedented \$370.0 million in 1991, and almost doubled in 1992, when Taiwan was named by USTR as a Priority Foreign Country. However, under the threat of retaliation, Taiwan adopted a new copyright law in May 1992, and finally signed a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) containing specific and wide-ranging commitments to improve copyright protection.

While some steps had been taken by April 1993 to implement the MOU, numerous commitments remained unfulfilled such that USTR decided to keep Taiwan on the Priority Watch List pending compliance with an "immediate action plan" that included a requirement that it finally adopt its long-pending cable law, legitimize the cable industry and reduce piracy. In 1993, Taiwan passed its cable law, implemented an export control system to block the export of counterfeit software and pirated CDs, and finally began to mete out serious fines and jail terms to convicted pirates. These improvements, and sharp reductions in piracy losses, led IIPA to recommend that Taiwan be moved to the Watch List in 1994. USTR agreed, and kept Taiwan in the same position in 1995.

In 1996, IIPA pointed to the prominent Taiwanese role in massive software piracy networks encompassing "Greater China" as a growing problem that Taiwan needed to address. Just before USTR's Special 301 announcement in April 1996, Taiwan adopted an 18-point "Action Plan" that pledged improvements in tackling the "Greater China" piracy problem as well as other enforcement issues, including reform of the Export Monitoring System (EMS). Because this plan had the potential for continuing the "significant strides" Taiwan had made in improving IPR enforcement, USTR decided that Taiwan should be moved from the Watch List to Special Mention, with an out-of-cycle review (OCR) to be conducted in October 1996. On November 12, 1996, the USTR announced that Taiwan's "considerable success" in implementing the Action Plan justified removing it from Special 301 lists. In 1997, IIPA noted that some issues addressed in the April 1996 Action Plan, such as bootleg audio products and the Export Monitoring System, had yet to be fully resolved, while other issues, such as the ongoing cross-straits networks for production and worldwide export of pirated videogames, were not adequately addressed by the Action Plan. While USTR decided to keep Taiwan off the Special 301 list, it continued to monitor the situation in Taiwan, reporting on Taiwan in the 1997 National Trade Estimate (NTE) release.

In 1998, IIPA recommended that Taiwan be placed on the Watch List, noting that Taiwan remained a "node" in a web of "Greater China" piracy of entertainment videogames; CD, CD-ROM, CD-R and audio bootleg piracy remained problems, as did various structural deficiencies including the failure of the EMS to curtail exports of pirate videogames and components, and unreasonable documentary requirements imposed on plaintiffs by the Taiwanese courts (including the requirement that powers of attorney be signed by the CEO of a corporation). The USTR, in specially mentioning Taiwan, stated that Taiwan had made "recent assurances" and that USTR

would “closely monitor implementation of the specific measures over the next several months.” The result of that monitoring was to place Taiwan on the Watch List on August 11, 1998, because of “continuing concerns about enforcement of intellectual property rights in Taiwan.”

In 1999, IIPA recommended, and USTR agreed, to keep Taiwan on the Watch List. In her April 30, 1999 statement, Ambassador Barshefsky, noting that the Taiwanese “enforcement system is time consuming and cumbersome,” said,

[t]here has been little evidence to suggest that existing legal requirements and enforcement actions are reducing the extent to which Taiwan is a source of pirate optical media production [and] pirated material from Taiwan continues to surface in the United States, Central and South America.

In 2000, IIPA recommended that Taiwan remain on the Special 301 Watch List, with an out-of-cycle review to monitor the country. With trade losses growing to over \$314 million by 1999, doubling video piracy levels and rapidly increasing piracy rates for sound recordings, musical works, business and entertainment software, the Alliance voiced its concern for the worsening situation that would affect the entire Greater China region. USTR agreed, and placed Taiwan on the Watch List in 2000.

In 2001, IIPA recommended that Taiwan be elevated to the Special 301 Priority Watch List due to the failure to enact and effectively implement comprehensive regulations to control and curtail the illegal manufacture of optical media goods in Taiwan, and the failure of the Taiwan government authorities to shut down known commercial pirates and curtail growing online piracy. USTR agreed, placing Taiwan on the Priority Watch List in 2001. On October 31, 2001, Taiwan passed the Optical Media Management Statute. It brings under the control of the Ministry of Economic Affairs (MOEA) a system of: granting permits to persons/entities engaged in the production of “prerecorded optical discs”; otherwise regulating production of stampers/masters (through SID Code and other requirements); and requiring transparency (i.e., a reporting requirement) with respect to production of “blank” media.

TAJIKISTAN

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Tajikistan, the agreement was signed on July 1, 1993 and entered into force on November 24, 1993.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30,

2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries, including Tajikistan, on the Special 301 Watch List.

In 2001, USTR kept Tajikistan on the Watch List. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted Tajikistan's failure "to fulfill all of its intellectual property commitments under the 1993 U.S.-Tajikistan Trade Agreement," citing failure to adhere to the Geneva Phonograms Convention as well as "weak enforcement of intellectual property rights" and failure to implement criminal provisions for IPR violations as required by the bilateral agreement.

THAILAND

IIPA first identified Thailand in 1985 as one of the countries with the worst piracy records. In January 1989, following a petition filed by IIPA in 1987, President Reagan revoked Thailand's preferential trade benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program for its failure to provide "adequate and effective" copyright protection and enforcement. In April 1992, Thailand was named a Priority Foreign Country under Special 301. In Spring 1993, under the threat of trade retaliation, the Thai government initiated strong enforcement actions and raids, primarily in the audio and video areas. The Thai government also began drafting a revised copyright law, and in August 1993, Thailand pledged to the U.S. to continue aggressive raiding, amend the copyright law to bring it up to Berne and TRIPS standards, and create a specialized intellectual property rights (IPR) court empowered to give improved remedies. On the basis of these commitments, USTR removed Thailand from its status as a Priority Foreign Country and placed it on the Priority Watch List. In November 1994, after Thailand enacted its new copyright law, USTR moved Thailand from the Priority Watch List to the Watch List, where it has remained ever since.

GSP benefits were partially restored in August 1995, and the specialized IPR Court was authorized in 1996, although it did not begin operations until December 1997. 1998's IIPA filing focused on lack of progress in reducing persistently high piracy rates since the enactment of the new copyright law, but noted the potential for the new court to advance this goal by imposing deterrent penalties on commercial pirates, and recommended that Thailand remain on the Watch List. USTR agreed, pledging to monitor the activities of the new court to see if tough sentencing would reduce piracy rates. Subsequently, in June 1998, the U.S. restored virtually all Thailand's GSP benefits, as the Thai government committed to an ambitious action plan for better enforcement against piracy. IIPA's 1999, 2000, and 2001 filings stressed the growing role of Thailand as a source of pirate optical media production and export, and the need for the IPR court to impose deterrent penalties on commercial pirates. In June 2001, six copyright-based associations - Association of American Publishers, Inc. (AAP), AFMA, Interactive Digital Software Association (IDSA), Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (MPAA), National Music Publishers' Association, Inc. (NMPA), and Recording Industry Association of America, Inc. (RIAA) - submitted a request that the eligibility of Thailand as a GSP beneficiary country be reviewed, and that its benefits be suspended or withdrawn if Thailand fails to remedy the deficiencies which adversely affect U.S. copyright owners.

In 2001, \$2.2 billion in Thailand's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 13.5% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$2.1

billion of Thai goods (or 15.1% of Thailand's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing an increase of 0.7% over the same period last year.

TURKEY

Turkey has been a regular on the Special 301 lists, and its intellectual property rights legislation and practices are currently under scrutiny as part of an ongoing investigation under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. On June 1, 1993, IIPA filed a petition urging the President to withdraw Turkey's eligible beneficiary status under the GSP program for its failure to provide "adequate and effective protection" to U.S. copyrights. USTR accepted IIPA's petition, and the case remains open. The investigation now enters its eighth year.

Despite such trade pressure, there has been only minimal and sporadic progress on copyright issues during this engagement. Turkey has been on the Special 301 Priority Watch List every year since 1992 and before that, it was on the Watch List for three years. In IIPA's 1993, 1995 and 1996 Special 301 submissions, IIPA recommended that Turkey be designated a Priority Foreign Country for its failure to enact copyright reform and its lack of enforcement efforts to combat high levels of piracy.

In 1997 USTR outlined six benchmarks for progress in Turkey, which included: taking effective enforcement actions to their conclusions to address widespread piracy; passing copyright and patent law amendments to bring Turkey into compliance with its TRIPS and Berne obligations; amending the Cinema, Video and Music Works Law to include higher, nonsuspendable fines and jail terms; issuing a directive to all government agencies to legalize software, starting a public antipiracy campaign about the software end-use problem and continuing training of enforcement officials so that the levels of piracy decline; and equalizing taxes on the showing of foreign and domestic films. To date, the first three of these copyright-related goals have not been met.

As a result of the 1997 Special 301 out-of-cycle review on Turkey, the USTR announced on January 16, 1998, that USTR would not consider any requests to expand the scope of preferential trade benefits Turkey receives under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program. Although the USTR noted in 1998 that "Turkey's future benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) will depend on progress on the remaining benchmarks," in 2000, \$435 million in Turkey's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 14.4% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$407.7 million of Turkish goods (or 14.3% of Turkey's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP program.

In 1999 and 2000, IIPA recommended, and the USTR agreed, that Turkey should remain on the Priority Watch List. In the May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR noted that "Turkey has not yet addressed all of the benchmarks set out in the 1997 review," and that enforcement efforts remain ineffective. In 2001, IIPA recommended that Turkey remain on the Priority Watch List. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR downgraded Turkey to

the Watch List, noting that “[i]n February 2001, the Turkish Parliament passed amendments to the Copyright Law designed to bring Turkey into compliance with its TRIPS obligations.”

TURKMENISTAN

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Turkmenistan, the agreement was signed on March 23, 1993 and entered into force on October 25, 1993.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time, including Turkmenistan.

In 2001, USTR kept Turkmenistan on the Watch List. In the 2001 Special 301 submission, IIPA regrouped 10 of the 12 CIS countries (excluding Russia and Ukraine for much more serious piracy problems) due to the similarity of copyright concerns each country faces. These deficiencies include the lack of legislative implementation of the bilateral trade agreements, failure to comply with the WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the failure to adopt optical media production and distribution controls. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted Turkmenistan’s failure to provide “protection for U.S. and other foreign sound recordings, nor does it provide protection of pre-existing works or sound recordings under its copyright law.”

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

The UAE has been on the USTR Watch List since 1991, after being named by IIPA as a major pirate exporter of audiocassettes in the Gulf Region. Although the UAE passed a copyright law in 1992, piracy losses continued to rise until September 1, 1994, when the Ministry of Information and Culture (MOIC) began its enforcement campaign following a moratorium to permit shops and manufacturers to sell off existing pirate stock. By early 1995, audio piracy had been virtually wiped out, and video piracy sharply reduced, but little had been done to clear pirate software from the market. Because of software piracy and the continuing need for the UAE to bring its copyright law into compliance with international standards, USTR kept the UAE on the Watch List after an OCR in November 1995. In April 1996, Ambassador Barshefsky maintained the UAE on the Watch List, noting continued deficiencies in the copyright law. In 1997, the UAE was kept on the Watch List by USTR, who noted that efforts to reduce software piracy had “not been sufficient to reduce the level of illegal activity.”

In 1998, IIPA, in recommending that the UAE be kept on the Watch List, noted that the UAE authorities had taken sufficient enforcement actions to reduce piracy rates for nearly all the

copyright industries, but that a court decision (Shama Delux) potentially jeopardized the protection of all foreign works in the UAE. Ambassador Barshefsky, in announcing USTR's 1998 decision to keep the UAE on the Watch List, called upon the government "to clarify that U.S. copyrighted works are protected," and to ensure that the copyright law is "TRIPS-consistent before the end of the transition period for developing countries."

In 1999, IIPA recommended that USTR drop the UAE to the Other Observations listing, to acknowledge the progress of the UAE government in "fighting piracy through a sustained enforcement campaign." Ambassador Barshefsky kept the U.A.E. on the Watch List for certain deficiencies in the patent area, but dropped the UAE because of significant progress in eradicating piracy in 2000. USTR placed UAE on the Watch List in 2001 for concerns over adequate and effective intellectual property protection unrelated to copyright.

UKRAINE

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Ukraine, it signed its bilateral trade agreement with the United States on May 6, 1992 and put that Agreement into force on June 23, 1992.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because nearly all of the CIS countries had failed to meet their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In both 1998 and 1999, IIPA made individual filings focusing on concerns in Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, the countries with the most serious IPR problems (although problems persist in other former republics) in addition to the filing made for Russia. In 1998, both Belarus and Kazakhstan were placed on the Other Observations list, and Ukraine was on the Watch List. The next year, Belarus was elevated to the Watch List, Kazakhstan was removed from Special 301 list, and Ukraine was elevated to the Priority Watch List. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List for the first time: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Belarus and Kazakhstan are also on the Special 301 Watch List in 2000. Russia and the Ukraine are on the Priority Watch List.

In 2000, Ukraine became Central and Eastern Europe's number one pirate CD-producing country. Fueled by serious reform and on-the-ground enforcement deficiencies, IIPA recommended that the USTR designate the Ukraine as a Priority Foreign Country. The USTR placed Ukraine on the Priority Watch List, with the caveat that it was prepared to designate the Ukraine as a Priority Foreign Country if sufficient action were not taken to curb pirate production by August 1, 2000. When Presidents Clinton and Kuchma endorsed a Joint Action Plan to address the piracy problem in June 2000, the USTR announced that it would defer a decision on whether to identify Ukraine as a Priority Foreign Country.

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for its failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In February 2000, the administration announced that it accepted IIPA's petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. On May 12, 2000, the U.S. government held public hearings on the GSP petitions regarding these five countries. On October 23, 2000, the IIPA requested that its petition on Moldova be withdrawn, as a result of cooperation with the government of Moldova on legal reforms following the filing of the petition. The U.S. government accepted that action and the GSP review of Moldova ended. The U.S. government has not yet decided whether to withdraw or suspend GSP benefits in Armenia, Kazakhstan, or Uzbekistan. GSP benefits have been withdrawn from Belarus, but for reasons unrelated to intellectual property matters.

In 2001, IIPA recommended that USTR designate Ukraine as a Priority Foreign Country, due to its continued position as the largest producer and exporter of illegal optical media disks in Central and Eastern Europe. USTR agreed, designating Ukraine as a Priority Foreign Country, on March 12, 2001 for its failure to implement the Joint Action Plan agreed to by then-President Clinton and President Kuchma in Kiev on June 1, 2000. The designation in March commenced a formal investigation of the IPR protection and enforcement failures in Ukraine, consistent with Special 301 legal requirements. On December 20, 2001 that investigation formally ended and the U.S. government announced the imposition of trade sanctions amounting to \$75 million, effective on January 23, 2002 as the result of the continued failure on the part of the government of Ukraine to meet its obligations under the Joint Action Plan, namely to properly regulate optical media production.

The imposition of sanctions in January were in addition to the complete withdrawal of trade benefits to Ukraine under the General System of Preferences program; that suspension was announced on August 10, 2001, effective September 24, 2001.

In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted Ukraine's "persistent failure to take effective action against significant levels of optical media piracy and to implement intellectual property laws that provide adequate and effective protection." In January of 2002, Ukraine passed a deficient law intended to regulate optical media production and distribution (Optical Disc Licensing Bill #8278-1), hoping to avoid sizable, looming trade sanctions. The U.S. government properly reacted to that bill, calling it an insufficient measure and refusing to forestall the trade sanctions or to re-institute the GSP benefits. On January 17, 2002, USTR announced that it would begin implementing trade sanctions against Ukraine on January 23.

In 2000, \$40 million in Ukrainian imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for nearly 4.6% of its total imports to the U.S. There are no GSP figures for Ukraine in 2001, as the benefits were withdrawn due to Ukraine's continued failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection.

URUGUAY

USTR placed Uruguay on the Other Observations list in 1996 and again in 1997 to encourage Uruguay to “accelerate its efforts to enact TRIPS-consistent legislation and to continue its IPR enforcement efforts.” In July 1998, the President of Uruguay, Dr. Julio Marie Sanguinetti, met with Ambassador Barshefsky to discuss regional issues and intellectual property issues in his country. Reportedly the President responded positively to the Ambassador’s entreaties to press for passage of the long-pending copyright bill, indicating that he will work with the Uruguayan legislature to pass a good law. Unfortunately, passage of this bill has not yet been achieved and the most current draft legislation is still problematic, and not TRIPS compliant. USTR kept Uruguay on the Watch List in 1999 and 2000. The USTR noted in its May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement the possible initiation of a future WTO dispute settlement case against Uruguay for noncompliance with TRIPS obligations.

In 2001, IIPA recommended that Uruguay be elevated to the Priority Watch List due to the long delay in passing much-needed copyright legislation, the continued high levels of piracy, and inadequate enforcement. IIPA also recommended that USTR conduct an out-of-cycle review to monitor Uruguay’s advances on these copyright issues. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR elevated Uruguay to the Priority Watch List, noting Uruguay’s failure to update its copyright law: “Uruguay’s draft copyright legislation has become entangled in legislative wrangling and currently contains numerous shortcomings even in its draft form, most notably the separation from the comprehensive copyright bill of software protection into a stand-alone bill.” In June 2001, the IIPA filed a request for review of the intellectual property practices of Uruguay. USTR has not yet decided whether to accept the request.

Uruguay currently participates in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, a U.S. trade program which offers preferential trade benefits to eligible beneficiary countries. One of the discretionary criteria of this program is that the country provide “adequate and effective” copyright protection. In August 2000, IIPA filed a petition to review Uruguay’s eligibility to maintain GSP benefits. Unfortunately, the petition was rejected. However, IIPA filed again in 2001. In 2000, \$84.5 million in Uruguay’s imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for nearly 27.3% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$72.9 million of Uruguayan goods (or 35% of Uruguay’s total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 4.2% decrease over the same period last year.

UZBEKISTAN

In 1992, the U.S. government put into force identical wide-ranging bilateral IPR trade agreements with Russia and each of the other 11 republics of the former Soviet Union. These bilateral agreements contained very specific IPR legal and enforcement obligations for each of the former Soviet republics. In the case of Armenia, the agreement was signed on April 2, 1992 and entered into force on April 7, 1992.

In 1995 and 1997, IIPA requested that the USTR add the nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) collectively, excluding the Russian Federation, to the Special 301 Watch List because almost none of the CIS countries had met their bilateral IPR obligations, piracy was rampant, enforcement inadequate, and copyright law reform urgently needed. In 2000, IIPA recommended that all of the CIS countries be placed on the Special 301 Watch List. In the May 30, 2000 Special 301 announcement, the USTR placed seven CIS countries on the Special 301 Watch List, including Uzbekistan.

In June 1999, IIPA filed a petition with the USTR requesting that the country eligibility of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) trade program be reviewed for failure to provide adequate and effective copyright protection and enforcement for U.S. copyright owners, as required under the GSP. In February 2000, the administration announced that it accepted IIPA's petition for review of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. On May 12, 2000, the U.S. government held public hearings on the GSP petitions regarding these five countries. The U.S. government has not yet decided on whether to withdraw or suspend GSP benefits in Uzbekistan.

In 2001, IIPA recommended and USTR agreed to place Uzbekistan on the Watch List. In the 2001 Special 301 submission, IIPA regrouped 10 of the 12 CIS countries (excluding Russia and Ukraine for much more serious piracy problems) due to the similarity of copyright concerns each country faces. These deficiencies include the lack of legislative implementation of the bilateral trade agreements, failure to comply with the WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the failure to adopt optical media production and distribution controls. In its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement, USTR noted Uzbekistan's failure to provide "protection for U.S. and other foreign sound recordings, [and its failure to] provide protection of pre-existing works or sound recording" among the defects in need of remedy for Uzbekistan to be in compliance with the 1994 U.S.-Uzbekistan Trade Agreement.

In 2000, US\$166,000 in Uzbek's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for nearly 0.5% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, \$1.8 million in Uzbek imports to the United States (or 3.6% of Uzbekistan's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) benefited from the GSP program, representing an increase of 1,102.6% from the same period last year.

VENEZUELA

Venezuela has been on the Special 301 Watch List continuously since 1989. In an effort to spur government action to take copyright reform and reduce the high levels of piracy, IIPA filed a petition on June 1, 1993 asking that Venezuela's eligibility to receive preferential trade benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program be reviewed. After the Venezuelan Congress passed the new copyright law in August 1993, USTR accepted IIPA's request to withdraw the petition, and no formal GSP review was initiated. In 2000, US\$744.8 million in Venezuela's imports to the United States benefited from the GSP program, accounting for 4.3% of its total imports to the U.S. For the first 11 months of 2001, US\$595.2 million of Venezuelan goods (or

4.5% of Venezuela's total imports to the U.S. from January to November) entered the U.S. under the duty-free GSP code, representing a 13.1% decrease over the same time period last year.

In 1999 and 2000, Venezuela remained on the Watch List, as recommended by IIPA. In her May 1, 2000 Special 301 announcement, USTR Barshefsky noted, Venezuela's protection of intellectual property rights has not improved significantly during this past year, with piracy remaining at about the same level. Copyright piracy also remains rampant, and COMANPI enforcement has been minimal. In 2001, IIPA recommended that Venezuela remain on the Watch List. USTR agreed, noting in its April 30, 2001 Special 301 announcement that "Venezuela continues to present a mixed record of success with respect to its protection of intellectual property rights, although in some respects it is gradually moving in the right direction."

VIETNAM

Vietnam first appeared on the Special 301 list in 1995 in the Other Observations category, after IIPA reported that its market was completely dominated by piracy. In 1997, IIPA renewed its call for Priority Watch List status, citing the troubling trend of government involvement in audiovisual piracy, and the failure to take any meaningful steps toward protection of U.S. works in Vietnam. On the eve of USTR's 1997 Special 301 decision, the U.S. and Vietnam announced the conclusion of a bilateral copyright agreement providing such a point of legal attachment. Ambassador Barshefsky called this "an important step in bringing Vietnam's copyright system into line with international standards," but because of the serious and growing piracy problem in Vietnam, she placed the country on the Special 301 Watch List. IIPA renewed its Priority Watch List recommendation in 1998, because the bilateral copyright agreement had not been implemented, piracy levels remained at or near 100 percent, and the Vietnamese government appeared to be consolidating its role in audio-visual piracy. USTR decided to keep Vietnam on the Watch List, calling copyright piracy "the most pressing problem" to be faced, and scheduling an out-of-cycle review (OCR) for December 1998. That OCR was subsequently postponed, and on December 27, 1998, the U.S.- Vietnam Bilateral Copyright Agreement went into force.

In 1999, IIPA recommended that Vietnam remain on the Watch List so that USTR could effectively monitor and support government efforts to implement the commitments of the Bilateral Copyright Agreement. USTR agreed, and Vietnam maintained its position on the Watch List. In 2000 and 2001, the USTR agreed with IIPA's assessment of continuing IPR problems in Vietnam, and retained Vietnam on the Watch List in both years.