

International Copyright Law

CHEN Wenling^{[a],*}

^[a]School of English for International Business, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China.

*Corresponding author.

Received 25 January 2020; accepted 10 April 2020

Published online 26 May 2020

Abstract

This article examines the extent to which the international treaties have created an international copyright law and whether they are universally applicable and enforceable. For this purpose, it first looks at the two different approaches to copyright law (utilitarian approach and authors' rights approach), then it examines the development of the international copyright law by focusing on the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, WIPO Copyright Treaty and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty. Furthermore, the article presents the main differences in domestic copyright laws in the aspects of subject matter and the scope of rights and exceptions, and concludes that a uniform international copyright law binding all nation states does not exist.

Key words: International copyright law; Utilitarian approach; Authors' rights approach; The Berne Convention; Harmonization

Chen, W. L. (2020). International Copyright Law. *Canadian Social Science*, 16(5), 33-38. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/11724> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/11724>

INTRODUCTION

Copyright protection is becoming more and more important, for it influences the creation and distribution of knowledge and culture and goes to the heart of a nation's information and cultural policy. (Jackson, 2003) Yet

unlike traditional forms of tangible property, copyright--as an intellectual property--is difficult to control and protect, for it is neither physical nor tangible. (Gin, 2004) While intangible works can easily cross national borders and be infringed in other countries, copyrights accorded to authors and creators are bound by the territorial limits of the nation state that grants them.

Recognition of the need to protect the rights of copyright owners outside the territories of their home states has led to the formation of a number of international agreements. (Fitzpatrick, 2003) The efforts of harmonization through international agreements and treaties have been made by such multilateral organizations as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Under the auspices of these two organizations, countries have worked out a body of treaties to address the changing environment of intellectual property rights. (Gin, 2004)

This article, therefore, will consider the extent to which these treaties have created an international copyright law and whether they are universally applicable and enforceable. To this end, Part II will deal with the two different approaches to copyright law; Part III will examine the development of the international copyright law, focusing particularly on the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (the Berne Convention), the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), WIPO Copyright Treaty and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT); Part IV will briefly discuss the main differences in domestic copyright laws concerning the subject matter and the scope of rights and exceptions; the last part will draw a conclusion.

1. MAJOR APPROACHES TO COPYRIGHT LAW

All nations' domestic laws reflect their respective values, mores and social conditions. Copyright laws are no

exception. Different nations have different ideas about the purpose of intellectual property protection. (Jackson, 2003) The most difficult issue that the internationalization of copyright has been faced with is the tension between two different approaches to copyright law, namely the utilitarian approach and the authors' rights approach. (Goldstein, 2001b) The former takes copyright as a social policy instrument which can provide incentives for authors to produce works while balancing consumers' interests in having access to a rich public domain. The latter focuses on the rights of authors to receive the fruits of their intellectual effort, and attaches less significance to the interests of the consuming public. (Fitzpatrick, 2003)

1.1 The Utilitarian Approach

Generally speaking, countries following the English common law system, such as the U.S., employ the utilitarian perspective (Fitzpatrick, 2003). For these nations the paramount purpose of copyright is to create an economic incentive to encourage content creation. According to this utilitarian view, society as a whole benefits from an author's creative effort. Thus, the author should be given control over his work, but only to the extent that such control provides the author with the necessary incentive to create the work. This view assumes that there will be more creation and dissemination of expression and therefore more benefit to the society if the author can recoup the investment in his work. (Jackson, 2003)

Copyright is susceptible to free-riders since a disproportionate part of the expense involved in creating the works goes to the creation of the first copy. These first-copy costs cannot be recouped unless the creator can control the distribution of successive copies. (Jackson, 2003) So it is important to remember that only covering the first-copy costs is not adequate when determining the proper level of incentives necessary to encourage the creation of new copyrighted works. Risk should not be ignored because the demand for any given work is unknown. Thus the revenue must cover both the cost of the work and the risk of failure. In essence, uncertainty leads to an additional disincentive to create new works. (Landes & Posner, 1989)

Apparently, the difficulty for copyright from a utilitarian perspective is how to create an appropriate level of incentives. (Jackson, 2003) If too much protection is given, access to the work is unnecessarily restricted. If too little protection is provided, the optimum amount of works might not be produced.

1.2 The Authors' Rights Approach

The authors' rights approach considers the close link that an author has with his work, notwithstanding economic concerns. One of the most important components of the authors' rights framework is moral rights. (Gin, 2004)

It is believed that an author has a moral right to control his creative output. This idea is often found in countries

that follow the civil law tradition. France and Germany developed the concept of moral rights for authors in the nineteenth century and place great emphasis on the moral rights of authors. (Jackson, 2003) Moral rights have been rejected by common law countries, particularly the U.S. (Hansmann & Santilit, 1997)

Moral rights recognize that the author creates works not only to make a profit, but also to express the unique personality of the author. (Gin, 2004) It is based in part on a moral theory of labor. It is held that since authors invest their labor in the work, they have a moral right to control the expression they create. (Jackson, 2003)

Moral rights usually include the rights of integrity, paternity, disclosure and retraction. (Gin, 2004) The right of integrity includes two related interests: maintaining the integrity of the work and maintaining the author's reputation as it relates to the work. (Gunlicks, 2001) The artist has a right to prevent the mutilation or destruction of the work to protect both the work and his reputation. The right of paternity gives the author the right to be acknowledged as the creator of the work and to control the association of his name with his work. The right of disclosure gives the author the right to determine if, when, and in what manner the work will be published. (Jackson, 2003) The right of retraction allows the author to withdraw the work from the public. (Gin, 2004) The author enjoys these moral rights even after the copyright has been transferred to another party. (Jackson, 2003)

Besides the attitude to moral rights, the authors' rights approach also differs from the utilitarian approach in the legal scope of originality and duration. The level of originality needed in civil law countries is higher than that in common law countries, because there must be a degree of creativity to demonstrate the author's personality. In contrast, the originality standard in common law countries is lower and only requires that the work originates with the author with no copying. The originality standard in common law countries requires a sufficient level of independent skill, labor or judgment to justify such copyright protection. Apart from this, because of its emphasis on authors' rights, the civil law countries usually provide longer copyright terms than common law countries, with some of the rights (such as moral rights) lasting forever. Under the utilitarian theory, copyright is a monopoly with a limited term and thus is generally shorter than that under the author's rights framework. The length of the monopoly term should be long enough to allow the author to recoup his investment and profit from his work, but not too long to stifle others' creativity by unnecessarily taking expressions out of the public domain. (Gin, 2004)

Goldstein (2001a) sums up the differences between the utilitarian approach and the authors' rights approach. In common law countries that follow the utilitarian approach, copyright laws are employed to stimulate production of the widest variety at the lowest price, and lawmakers

will grant copyright protection only when “necessary to stimulate the creation of new works.” In civil law countries that follow the authors’ rights approach, copyright is a matter of right and justice, so lawmakers will extend rights and reject new legislation “only if the extended protection would materially hamper socially valuable uses of protected works.”

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT LAW

Since different approaches to copyright law exist in different countries, attempts have been made to harmonize copyright law on international level. Important international treaties include the Berne Convention, the TRIPS Agreement, the WIPO Copyright Treaty and WPPT.

2.1 Berne Convention

By the late 1800s improvements in communication and transportation made copyrighted goods more significant to international trade. Many European countries had signed bilateral copyright treaties. Saunders (1992) points out that these agreements were “cumbersome and uncertain. The content of bilateral accords was variable, with no common set of criteria to harmonize the whole.” Toward the latter half of the 1800s, there was a movement toward developing a comprehensive multilateral copyright treaty. (Jackson, 2003)

In 1886, international copyright relations began with the conclusion of the Berne Convention. (Dinwoodie, 2001) Countries participating in the discussions that led to the Convention sought to establish copyright protection internationally for the works of their nationals. That objective could be achieved in several ways. A comprehensive universal copyright law, establishing uniform standards to be applied in all adherent countries, was advocated by some countries. (Ginsburg, 2000b) Agreement on a comprehensive code would, however, have required substantial compromise by most nations; even in the late nineteenth century, the copyright laws of several European countries were so developed that differences existed between them. (Dinwoodie, 2001)

Consequently, instead of adopting universally binding legislation, the participants left to the individual countries decisions as to the nature and the scope of copyright protection for foreign authors. (Ginsburg, 2000a) The Berne Convention represents a compromise among its various signatory states. (Jackson, 2003) Eight nations signed the treaty in 1886; today more than 170 nations are signatories to it. States that agree to the Convention become members of the Berne Union. Now, the Convention is administered by WIPO, which is one of the 16 specialized agencies of the United Nations system of organizations.

The Berne Convention has been revised six times, the most recent revision being the Paris Act of 1971. Yet the basic structure—national treatment plus minimum standards—has remained relatively unchanged throughout each of its revisions. (Ginsburg, 2000a)

The Berne Convention created minimum standards, such as granting copyright protection for the life of the author plus fifty years,¹ rather than detailing the precise level of protection that each country must enforce. The minimum standards are contained in the first twenty articles of the Convention. As Dinwoodie (2001) notes: (M)ember states retained significant license to implement those standards in ways that were tailored to their own social, cultural, or economic priorities. This held true even as the content of the minimum standards became more significant during successive revisions of the Berne Convention. The license for national autonomy flowed in part from the decision to employ truly minimum standards, allowing different states to provide varying levels of higher protection.

The Berne Convention harmonizes international copyright law to some extent by setting certain minimum standards such as a comprehensive definition of the subject matter of copyright and the length of the copyright term. Members have to comply with these standards in order to join the Convention, thus ensuring greater similarity across legal systems. (Fitzpatrick, 2003)

The other central principle of the Berne Convention is the concept of national treatment. Although the Preamble to the Convention states that its purpose is “to protect, in as effective and uniform a manner as possible, the rights of authors in their literary and artistic works”, the provisions of the Convention only require each state to extend national treatment to authors of other members of the Berne Union, subject to the establishment of some minimum standards. (Porter, 1991) Therefore, each nation is allowed to retain many features of its national law, while being part of an international copyright framework. (Fitzpatrick, 2003) In spite of this, national treatment is essential in ensuring that copyright owners can seek legal remedies in foreign nations, (Jackson, 2003) for national treatment means that foreigners (of nations that are signatories to the Berne Union) and nationals are treated equally under the law.²

Under the influence of the Berne Convention, there has been a strong trend among the common law countries to accept many features of the civil law’s authors’ rights framework. (Gin, 2004) For instance, Britain, a founding member of the Berne Union, has incorporated many features of the authors’ rights approach into its copyright laws, such as the moral rights.

Nonetheless, the Convention is limited in the extent to which it can achieve uniformity because of the unresolved

¹ Berne Convention, Article 7(1)

² Berne Convention, Article 5(1)

clash between the two different approaches to copyright law. The issue had been sidestepped to allow for an international copyright system without international consensus on specific rules. (Long, 1996) Anyway, The rationale of the Convention was that a flexible international treaty would appeal to more countries, thus increasing membership. The adoption of a comprehensive and universal copyright law was therefore sacrificed for a narrower body of rules accepted by a wider range of countries. (Ginsburg, 2000a)

Another defect of the Convention is that it lacks tough enforcement mechanisms. (Jackson, 2003) Under Article 33 of the Berne Convention, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has been empowered to adjudicate copyrights disputes. But to date, no conflicts have been adjudicated at the ICJ. The adjudication process is considered to be too long, complex and difficult to enforce, and as a result, countries have not been willing to utilize the ICJ for copyright disputes. (Gin, 2004) The ICJ has not been used also because the decisions are not binding and there are no sanctions linked to these proceedings.³

2.2 TRIPS Agreement

Due to the ineffective enforcement mechanisms of the Berne Convention, developed countries, particularly the U.S., tried to bring the TRIPS Agreement in as part of the Uruguay Rounds of WTO. TRIPS is important to international copyright protection for two reasons: first, it builds on the Berne Convention and sets substantive and procedural minimum standard that all countries must comply to; second, it includes a dispute resolution mechanism. (Gin, 2004)

The adoption of the TRIPS Agreement by members of the WTO further extends the Berne Convention's minimum standards to countries beyond the Berne Union who are members of the WTO. (Ginsburg, 2000a) It imposes new substantive minima, with respect to subject matter (computer programs and original compilations of data) and to rights protected (authors' rental right).⁴ Yet it narrows the scope of Berne protection stating that the members of TRIPS do not have to abide by Article 6bis, which requires moral rights.⁵

In addition, the TRIPS Agreement links the substantive requirements of the Berne Convention with the enforcement and dispute resolution mechanisms of the WTO. (Jackson, 2003) As Perlmutter (2001) notes:

The most important aspect of TRIPS, however, is that it supplies the elements lacking in Berne. The Agreement sets out a long list of detailed enforcement mechanisms that countries must make available to right holders. And last, but surely not least, it

³ Berne Convention, Article 33(2) reads: "Each country may, at the time it signs this Act or deposits its instrument of ratification or accession, declare that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1). With regard to any dispute between such country and any other country of the Union, the provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply."

⁴ TRIPS, Articles 10 & 11.

⁵ TRIPS, Article 9(1).

utilizes the WTO dispute resolution system, giving teeth to the treaty's requirements.

To put it short, while TRIPS still leaves to national legislation many details of copyright scope and enforcement, the uniform mandatory measures have become increasingly explicit and the place of national law shrinks accordingly. (Ginsburg, 2000a)

2.3 WIPO Copyright Treaty and WPPT

Besides TRIPS, which gives the WTO power over copyright enforcement, WIPO adopted two new treaties dealing with copyright law in 1996. They are WIPO Copyright Treaty and WPPT. The treaties were created to address the arrival of the digital age, which has made information a key business asset, expanded international commerce, and enabled faster and easier copying of copyrighted work. (Sheinblatt, 1998)

The Copyright Treaty was formed to harmonize global copyright law as well as to extend that law into the digital domain. (Cunard, 1997) It builds on the Berne Convention and keeps the trend of increased specification of the minimum international standard of copyright subject matter and rights. Besides, the Copyright Treaty creates new obligations to protect against the circumvention of technological protection measures, and against the removal or tampering with copyright management information.⁶

When the Copyright Treaty was concluded there was some confidence that it was a significant step forward, and it was hoped that although it left much to be decided by nation states, the advantages of a uniform approach would not be overlooked. (Mason, 1997) However, the harmonizing effect is limited. First, the vagueness of some of the provisions (e.g. provision of "adequate legal protection and effective legal remedies"⁷) allows nation states to make their own decisions about what rules and penalties to impose. Second, the Treaty expressly gives countries a lot of freedom as to the final form of their domestic laws. (Fitzpatrick, 2003) To be specific, the key enforcement provision reads: "Contracting Parties undertake to adopt, in accordance with their legal systems, the measures necessary to ensure the application of this Treaty"⁸.

With respect to the enforcement provision, the Copyright Treaty merely requires that each signatory adopt necessary measures to ensure the treaty's application and prevent infringement. This seems to be inconsistent with TRIPS enforcement guidelines, since domestic standards in each country can be different. (O'Sullivan, 2000)

The other treaty, WPPT, updated protection for digital performances and sound recordings. (Jackson, 2003) It took effect in 2002 and recognized the importance of

⁶ WIPO Copyright Treaty, Articles 11 & 12.

⁷ WIPO Copyright Treaty, Articles 11.

⁸ WIPO Copyright Treaty, Article 14(1).

protecting sound recordings in the Internet era. Previously, no major international agreement protected phonographic rights beyond that of reproduction. (O'Sullivan, 2000)

WPPT deals with the protection of performers and producers of phonograms. It is also based on the principles of national treatment and minimum standard of rights. (Walter, 1999) As far as both performers and phonogram producers are concerned, the Treaty requires—subject to various exceptions and limitations—each Contracting Party to accord to nationals of the other Parties with regard to the rights granted in the Treaty the treatment it accords to its own nationals (“national treatment”).⁹ The term of protection must be at least 50 years.¹⁰

Because of WPPT, protected rights have been extended to include the right of public distribution, rental right, and the right to make works available to the public.¹¹ For instance, a record company needs an artist's permission to distribute his CD to the public, rent it to the public, or transmit the sound recording to the public over the Internet. (O'Sullivan, 2000) In addition, WPPT protects a performer's moral rights, economic right in unfixed performances, and the right to make fixed performances available.¹²

3. MAJOR DIFFERENCES IN DOMESTIC COPYRIGHT LAWS

Part III shows that the treaties and conventions that make up the international copyright law become more comprehensive in the subject matter of protection and scope of rights. Nevertheless, they have limited harmonizing impact: significant differences still exist in each nation's copyright law. According to Jackson (2003), some of the differences arise from the two different approaches discussed in Part II; other differences result from the unique political, cultural, and economic environment of each country.

3.1 Differences in the Subject Matter

With regard to the subject matter of copyright, the Berne Convention does not stipulate a standard of originality. Thus national variation is possible. (Ginsburg, 1994) TRIPS and the WIPO Copyright Treaty, however, impose an “intellectual creation” standard for computer software and databases. (Ginsburg, 2000a) Yet whether databases should be included in the subject matter of copyright protection is still a heated debate in many countries. The European Union has adopted a database protection measure granting *sui generis* protection. The U.S. does not incorporate a similar measure into its copyright law because of its Supreme Court decision in

Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co. (Jackson, 2003) In this case, the Supreme Court held that “original” means that the work was independently created by the author and that it possesses at least some minimal degree of creativity. “Originality is a constitutional requirement” for copyright protection and facts in themselves are not original. Accordingly, a compilation of facts is not copyrightable unless such compilation reflects a minimum level of creativity.¹³

The TRIPS and the Copyright Treaty also specify that “copyright protection extends to expressions, and not to ideas, procedures, methods of operation or mathematical concepts as such,”¹⁴ but courts may differ in their understanding about what constitutes an “idea” or “method of operation.” It is likely that member states of TRIPS or the Copyright Treaty so diverge in their interpretation that the same work may be copyrightable in one country, but not in another. (Ginsburg, 2000a)

3.2 Difference in the Scope of Rights and Exceptions

With regard to the scope of rights and of exceptions, the 1971 Berne Convention text tended to address specific issues instead of synthesizing rights and exceptions. TRIPS and WIPO Copyright Treaty, however, have undertaken the synthesis and filled the gaps left by the Berne Convention. (Ginsburg, 2000a) But two significant gaps remain. First, Article 6bis of the Berne Convention requires members to protect authors' rights, but TRIPS excludes Article 6bis from its incorporation of Berne Convention norms.¹⁵ This leaves a gap because failure to implement unincorporated Berne Convention norms carries no meaningful sanction, but noncompliance with TRIPS obligations can result in trade sanctions. (Ginsburg, 2000a) Second, while the Berne Convention does not specify a right to distribute copies, both TRIPS and the Copyright Treaty do; yet both of them leave it to member states to determine under what circumstances that right will be deemed exhausted.¹⁶

Finally, it should be pointed out that the rights concerned in these treaties are just minimum rights: signatory states may provide for greater rights than those required, so long as they accord national treatment.¹⁷ Likewise, the treaties set forth maximum exceptions: signatory countries can restrict the scope of protection to the extent allowed by the treaties, but members are not obliged to impose all the limitations that the treaties authorize. This means that the treaties set a floor, but no

⁹ See http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/wppt/trtdocs_wo034.html.

¹⁰ WPPT, Article 17.

¹¹ WPPT, Articles 8, 9, 10.

¹² WPPT, Articles 5, 10, 14.

¹³ *FEIST PUBLICATIONS, INC. v. RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE CO.*, 499 U.S. 340 (1991) http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/499_US_340.htm.

¹⁴ TRIPS, Article 9.2; WIPO Copyright Treaty, Article 2.

¹⁵ TRIPS, Article 9.1.

¹⁶ TRIPS, Article 6; WIPO Copyright Treaty, Article 6.2.

¹⁷ Berne Convention, Articles 7 and 19; TRIPS, Articles 3 and 12; WPPT Articles 4 and 17.

ceiling, for the scope of protection. National copyright laws can set the upper limits of copyright, either by affording greater rights or by selecting which permitted exceptions to impose. (Ginsburg, 2000a) For example, Argentina has an extremely limited and rigid fair dealing exception in its copyright law, while India allows for a much broader exception. (Jackson, 2003)

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that international copyright in the sense of a uniform international copyright law binding all nation states does not exist. Depending on the different approaches to copyright law that each nation adopts (utilitarian approach or authors' rights approach), copyright laws vary from country to country. Even within the same general perspective, there may be noticeable differences due to each nation's unique political, cultural and economic environment. Although various international treaties, agreements and conventions have attempted to harmonize the differences of copyright law in the international arena, uniform standards of protection and enforcement remain problematic. Substantial differences still exist in the subject matter to be protected and the scope of rights and exceptions. The ideal state of having one system of copyright laws universally applicable and enforceable is not a reality yet.

REFERENCES

- Berne Convention. Retrieved from <http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/berne/index.html> (last accessed on 15/04/2020)
- Dinwoodie, G. B. (2001). The Development and Incorporation of International Norms in the Formation of Copyright Law. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 62.
- Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co., 499 U.S. 340 (1991) http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/499_US_340.htm (last accessed (15/04/2020)
- Fitzpatrick, S. (2003). Prospects of further copyright Harmonisation. *E.I.P.R.* 25(5), 215-223.
- Gin, E. B. (2004). International copyright law: Beyond the WIPO & TRIPS debate. *J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y*, 86, 763.
- Ginsburg J. C. (2000a). International copyright: From a "bundle" of national copyright laws to a supranational code?. *J. Copyright Soc'y U.S.A.*, 47, 265.
- Ginsburg, J. C. (1994). Surveying the borders of copyright. *J. Copyr. Soc'y*, 41, 322.
- Ginsburg, J. C. (2000b). The role of national copyright in an era of international copyright. In Deitz (Ed.), *The role of national legislation in copyright law* (pp.211&213.
- Goldstein, P. (2001b). *International intellectual property--Cases and materials* (p.142). Foundation Press.
- Goldstein. P. (2001a). *International copyright* (p.4). Oxford University Press.
- Gunlicks, M. B. (2001). A balance of interests: The concordance of copyright law and moral rights in the worldwide economy. *Media & Ent. L. J.*, 601. 11 Fordham Intell. Prop..
- Hansmann, H., & Santilit, M. (1997). Authors' and Artists' moral rights: A comparative legal and economic analysis. *J. Legal Stud.*, 26, 95.
- Jackson, M. (2003). Harmony or discord? The pressure toward conformity in international copyright. *Idea: The Journal of Law and Technology*, 43, 607.
- Landes, W. M., & Posner, R. A. (1989). An economic Analysis of copyright law. *J. Legal Studies*, 18, 325.
- Long, D. E. (1996). Harmonisation. In A. D'Amato & D. E. Long (Eds.), *Intellectual Property Anthology*, 71.
- Mason, A. (1997). Developments in the law of copyright and public access to information. *E.I.P.R.*, 636.
- O'Sullivan, M. J. (2000). International copyright: protection for copyright holders in the internet age. *N.Y. Int'l L. Rev.*, 13, 1.
- Perlmutter S. (2001). Future Directions in International Copyright. *Cardozo Arts & Ent. L. J.*, 16, 375.
- Porter, V. (1991). *Beyond the berne convention: Copyright, broadcasting and the single european market* (p.3). London: John Libbey & Co..
- Saunders, D. (1992). *Authorship and copyright* (p.173). London: Routledge.
- Sheinblatt, J. S. (1998). The WIPO Copyright Treaty. *Berkeley Tech. L.J.*, 13, 535
- TRIPS Agreement. http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_01_e.htm (last accessed on 15/04/2020)
- Walter, M. M. (1999). *The relationship of, and comparison between, the rome convention, the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) and the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement); the evolution and possible improvement of the protection of the neighboring rights recognized by the Rome convention*. Prepared for the seventeenth ordinary session of the intergovernmental committee of the Rome convention held in Geneva from 5 to 7 July 1999.
- WIPO copyright treaty. Retrieved from http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/wct/trtdocs_wo033.html (last accessed on 15/04/2020).
- WIPO performances and phonograms treaty. Retrieved from <http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/wppt/> (last accessed on 15/03/2020).
- Cunard, P. J., et al. (1997, Mar. 10). 'WIPO Treaties Raise International Copyright Norms'. *N.Y. L. J.*, S4.