Deliberations on the Copyright Amendment Bill: Issues referred to the sub-committee

Clause/Sections	Issues	Response	Decision
Clause 2: Section	The question was raised	The department responded that interfaces are	It was explained in the PC that
2A(1)(b)	why copyright does not	made available for free, and accordingly it cannot	the introductory sentence must
	subsist in computer	be made subject to copyright. Further explained	be read with paragraph (b),
	programmes.	that interfaces are not inventions, they are rather	which then makes it clear that
		reformatting of already existing programmes	only "interface specifications"
Clause 2: (4)(h)(ii)	Clarity was sought on the	therefore cannot be treated as original works.	are excluded.
Clause 2: (4)(b)(ii)	Clarity was sought on the remedial actions when a	The department responded that a person who feel strongly that they been misquoted should direct the	
	person is misquoted.	concerns to the relevant bodies, for example, if a	
	person is misquoted.	person has been misquoted in the newspaper the	
		relevant body is the press ombud.	
		·	
Clause 3: section 5	On this clause the	The department highlighted that this clause was	The sub-committee unanimously
	department in the past	highly contested during the public hearing process	agreed that the whole close be
	indicated that "funded by" must be removed.	and confirmed that the clause must be removed.	removed and that section 5 of
	must be removed.		the principal Act should be retained.
			retained.
Clause 5: Section 6A	The concern in this clause	Transfer - The department explained that the	Transfer – the sub-committee
	relate to the words	word this clause on "transfer" presupposes indicate	decided that the department will
	"transfer" and "half", and	that the rights of the author related to royalties	propose another term/wording
	the concern is in respect	stops when that the moment a person handed	to be used instead of "transfer"
	of contractual freedom.	over the copyright to his/her work the right is gone.	because the term suggests that
		Because of this seeming anomaly in this case	a person gives away all his/her
		according to the department proposed that there is	right therefore would have no
		a need to relook at the term transfer "transfer"	claim on the work after they
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		should be relooked at and the contractual freedom.	have transferred it.

Clause 7 – Section 7B	There is a concern about whether the resale royalty right was not restricting contractual freedom.	should be the requirement of an agreement between the parties. If they cannot agree on the percentage share, the fall-back position should be 50%. The sub-committee indicated that there must be provision for a template in respect of the contract in the Bill. The sub-committee agreed with this proposal and agreed that provision must be made for a contract template in the Bill. Adv van der Merwe raised a concern that the solution of a fall-back percentage might result in no contract being concluded rather than being a measure to protect authors. The department proposed that the right should not be regarding all artistic works, but only visual arts such as paintings and sculptures. Adv van der Merwe alerted the sub-committee to the fact that	method to protect authors. The sub-committee also requested feedback on the value chain involved here – ie. who will be receiving the 50% share. The parliamentary legal advisor, Adv van der Merwe and the department were tasked to look on the constitutionality of a
		•	<u>'</u>

٠.

		and will thus only apply to sales after the Act is operational.	
Section 7B(3)(a)(i)	A question was raised as to whether a person eligible for the resale royalty right even if that person is not legally residing legally in the country.	The department responded that an illegal activity cannot entitle a person to this right a person should first correct their status in order to be accommodated. A member cautioned on the importance of complying with the international law as well and take into consideration that some people are here in the country as refugees. There may be need to narrow exclusion.	ı
Section 7C(2) (b)	Clarity given that IPPLA is not operational – possibly propose a transitional provision		The sub-committee agreed on the need for a transitional provision indicating that the terms and phrases used in this Bill that refer to the Intellectual Property Laws Amendment Act, 2013 (Act No. 28 of 2013) are subject to commencement of this Amendment Act.
Clause 11: Section 9A((10)(aA)(i)	This clause relate to the royalties regarding sound recordings. The concern raised here was in respect of the cumbersome process and rights given to broadcasters specifically to propose terms and conditions in		A proposal was made that standard terms & conditions should be effected and section should be worded properly. However, given that the whole process is so cumbersome, and as the real mischief here is the fact that broadcasters avoid paying royalties by not keeping

٠,

respect of payment of	proper records, the sub-
royalties.	committee agreement that the
	experts should be asked to
	assist on a better process. The
	sub-committee requested
	feedback during the sub-
	committee meeting on 8 May
	2018.

٠,