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INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON IP ENFORCEMENT OECD
París, 12 - 13 June 2019
The International Forum on IP Enforcement 2019, co-organised by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), the European Commission and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) took place on 12 and 13 June 2019 in Paris. It gathered participants from industry, enforcement, policy makers, and civil society with the aim of promoting evidence-based policy making in the area of intellectual property rights (IPRs) and reinforcing cooperation between international actors to resolve governance gaps both within the EU and at the global level. The event offered a two-day forum of strategic and practical panels and discussions on international enforcement issues, with breakout sessions to share best practices on specific topics, following up on the format and approach from the IP Enforcement Summits in London 2014 and Berlin 2017.
1. OPENING ADDRESSES

In his opening address, Jeffrey Schlagenhauf, Deputy Secretary-General, OECD, welcomed the participants to the OECD premises for the International Forum on IP Enforcement 2019, the result of the successful and longstanding cooperation between the OECD and EUIPO. The rule of law and IPR enforcement are at the heart of what the OECD stands for, as they are the foundations of good economic systems and necessary conditions for social goals, innovation and productivity growth in a market economy, as shown by the studies carried out by the OECD. New technologies and globalisation are facilitating IPR infringement, especially linked to organised crime groups (OCGs) who use the profits of IP crime to fund other infringing activities, such as drug, arms, or human trafficking, highlighting the importance in such an interconnected world of collaboration between law enforcement authorities (LEAs) and with other actors. Mr Schlagenhauf also underlined the role the OECD could play, by formulating recommendations such as the one on free trade zones.

Rupert Schlegelmilch, Head of the EU Delegation to the OECD and UNESCO, started by commending the fruitful collaboration between the organising institutions and their efforts to follow a fact-finding and evidence-based approach to the continuing problem of IPR infringement. The role of awareness of the importance of IP for the economy was underlined: as 42 % of the EU’s GDP is IP-based, infringement not only undermines creativity and poses health and safety risks for citizens, but also endangers jobs. In the current digital environment, existing alliances are necessary, but new ways to involve important players such as intermediaries and e-platforms must be considered. The Commission’s Action Plan on IPR enforcement starts with
awareness building and education, followed by cooperation with these intermediaries. It also encourages discussions and sharing best practices.

Christian Archambeau, Executive Director, EUIPO, highlighted that enforcement of IPRs is central to any IP system that seeks to support innovation, creativity, competitiveness and high-quality jobs. The EUIPO, through the Observatory, works tirelessly to improve education, awareness and IPR enforcement, fostering a better understanding of the IP economic environment and citizens’ attitudes regarding piracy and counterfeiting to ensure policy makers’ awareness of the relevance of the issue. Despite these efforts, the scale of the problem is growing, as illustrated by the Observatory-OECD reports: the global trade in counterfeit goods has grown by 30% in three years. The removal of IP crime from the EMPACT priorities is especially worrying when considering the organised crime dimension of IPR infringement and its links to other crimes such as money laundering or drug and human trafficking. This global phenomenon cannot be tackled by any single international organisation; communication, collaboration and cooperation between all relevant actors are essential. The EUIPO’s Executive Director called for IPR enforcement to be prioritised urgently. The EUIPO will continue to develop tools and studies to support the fight, exploring all possibilities including disruptive technologies such as Blockchain and artificial intelligence (AI), and to foster contacts between law enforcement authorities, rights holders, intermediaries and EU and international organisations involved in trade and IP. Furthermore, tools are being provided to education authorities and organisations so as to reach the consumers of the future. The EUIPO’s intention is to cover the whole life span of IPRs, from registration to enforcement, by adopting a wider perspective and a more integrated approach. It is also changing the focus of its activities to place greater importance on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), in line with the Commission’s plans. The EUIPO is already tackling IPR infringements through collaboration with third countries and implementing for the European Commission IP Key in ASEAN, China, Latin America, the Caribbean and Africa, as attention needs to be paid to both sides of the supply chain.
2. INDUSTRY’S POINT OF VIEW

David Lossignol, President, International Trademark Association (INTA), shared the experiences and views of rights holders and companies on the handling of IP enforcement. Mr Lossignol underlined counterfeiting as one of the major issues currently facing rights holders and stressed the need to coordinate legislators, LEAs, the judiciary and consumers worldwide to counter it. INTA advocates toughening sentences for IPR crimes, as part of the wide range of infringing pursuits by organised crime groups. He stressed his views that revenue from counterfeiting goes to finance other crime areas. Other proposals include the creation of an IP High Level Coordinator position within the Commission and gathering, spreading and supporting best practices, in a similar manner to the United States’ National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Centre. Recent trends such as the rise in small parcel commerce must be assessed and processes updated to avoid draining customs’ resources. INTA is collaborating through memoranda of understanding (MoUs) and by arranging platforms for rights holders to network with LEAs. Another pillar of INTA’s activities is consumer education and awareness, highlighting the dangers counterfeiting poses not only directly to citizens’ health and safety, but also to the economy in terms of losses to jobs and tax revenue, and addressing the moral concerns of the younger generations about where and how products are produced, in order to combat both supply and demand for counterfeiting.
3. THE VIEW OF THE ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES
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The LEAs’ perspective on IP infringement was provided by Rodolphe Gintz, Director General of Customs, France. In a changing commercial environment, collaboration between LEAs is more relevant than ever and high standards must be maintained by reviewing processes and controls. New tools, data mining technologies and innovative strategies are needed, including standardising investigative actions such as test purchases, strengthening ties with the judiciary and developing plans focusing on deterrence, awareness raising, cooperation with lawful internet actors and hard sanctions against infringers. France recognises that the fight against counterfeiting is an international issue, and French customs participate in international anti-counterfeiting and anti-fraud initiatives by the EU, the OECD and the World Customs Organisation (WCO). The country has partnership agreements and joint action plans with China and Hong Kong to address issues in the source countries and foster better enforcement and knowledge sharing. Mr Gintz proposed seeking partnerships in new places and with new actors, following the example of France’s partnership with FIFA to strengthen controls during the Women’s World Cup. Criminals are not limited by borders and the battle against counterfeiting cannot be won without worldwide cooperation involving diverse actors.
4. STRATEGIC OVERVIEWS

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF IPR ENFORCEMENT

Jacki Davis moderated the session on new opportunities and challenges at EU and international levels regarding the governance of IPR enforcement by drawing on intelligence established from joint OECD-EUIPO research.

Vishal Amin, U.S. Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator (IPEC), opened the panel by highlighting the relevance of IPR protection in the United States’ debates about national and economic security and its recognition in the Constitution, due to the high value the country ascribes to art, science and technology. To promote innovation, creativity, new industries and quality jobs, the United States fosters an environment where IPRs are protected both at the national level and through collaboration with like-minded trading partners. The IPEC has submitted two IP reports to Congress which are available online, laying out a four-part approach to IP: 1) engaging with trade partners; 2) making effective use of all the authorities; 3) supporting LEA cooperation; and 4) engaging with the private sector and other stakeholders.

Technological changes bring new opportunities, but also challenges that cannot be ignored. The United States Government is working to strengthen cybersecurity, and has recently implemented a Cybersecurity Strategy focusing on fighting the illicit appropriation of public and private sector technology and technical knowledge by protecting trade secrets, which is often difficult when it involves foreign companies and individuals. Action is being taken to enforce legislation and foreign policies, especially with regards to producer countries such as China.
Physical markets remain the primary distribution channel for counterfeits, but customs face an overwhelming number of parcels coming from e-commerce, so intelligence is needed to identify the right parcels and seize infringing goods. To protect United States customs and businesses, the government has decided to withdraw from the Universal Postal Union (UPU), as its treaties and rules are being exploited for the distribution of counterfeits. An Executive Order has also been signed to combat counterfeits in online marketplaces. A report analysing those marketplaces will be delivered by October to identify good practices to tackle the problem. The role of platforms was underlined, as data and information have become paramount. Sharing that information and increasing platform accountability are necessary to address the issue. Exchanging information between different governments and with the private sector should become a priority.

Paul Maier, Director, European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights, EUIPO, brought attention to the Observatory’s actions and plans currently in motion to combat IPR infringement. Studies and reports, including the Threat assessment report prepared with Europol, are shedding light on the different actors, new trends and the economic dimension of the issue and the particularities of countries involved. Consequently, tangible results are being achieved in areas such as free trade zones (FTZs). However, work remains to be done in terms of policies and information exchange for better targeting and implementation of measures. LEAs still lack the necessary resources to tackle the issue.

Technology is part of the problem but can also become part of the solution. The Observatory is devoting efforts to the development and integration of tools and databases: the IP Enforcement Platform, a Blockchain pilot on an anti-counterfeiting infrastructure, solutions for LEAs and businesses, etc. Support from the private sector is paramount for these projects.

Regarding consumer education, awareness and attitudes towards IPRs, the results show reasons for hope, including the fact that 97 % of European citizens consider that creators and innovators must be rewarded for their work. Education at all levels is necessary and some steps have been taken, especially since the Education, Youth, Culture and Sports Council recognised the importance of IP and adopted, in May 2018, conclusions on key competences for lifelong learning in the next decade which include a focus on the value of IP. Materials and activities for schools and education programmes are being prepared and shared by institutions and Member States. Furthermore, demand can be tackled by promoting and supporting digital legal alternatives. However, tough and up to date legislation is still needed, so raising awareness among policy-makers is a pressing concern.

The greatest opportunities for cooperation are the interconnection of databases to locate the real actors in the countries of origin and identify goods before they reach the EU’s borders; and in education, highlighting the links between IP and creativity and innovation. The Observatory highlights the need to capitalise on advances in technology to eliminate artificial borders and become a global force in the fight against counterfeiting.
Marcos Bonturi, Director for Public Governance, OECD, underlined the value of the work performed with the EUIPO in providing facts, which could later be used by policy-makers to create effective policies and address the weak spots identified. Complementary OECD studies show the scale of the problem and its impact in terms of tax revenue and jobs lost, with the studies conducted at a country level in Italy and Sweden being especially relevant.

Achievements include the work in relation to FTZs. Gaps in governance and oversights in the supervision of those zones that were fostering illicit trade have been identified and the OECD is working on recommendations and a Code of Conduct to increase accountability and transparency. Once those instruments are in place, the OECD will develop a mechanism to encourage implementation, such as a certification procedure or a peer review process.

The second area under investigation is the issue of small parcels, which has become a global challenge for LEAs due to the marked increase in small parcel shipping. The OECD has established a task force to identify policies and mechanisms to tackle the problem, such as information sharing systems or tools for collaboration between jurisdictions. This is directly linked to the rise in e-commerce, which has tripled in value in the last five years.

The OECD is ready to leverage the leadership of some countries to push for an international approach considering the multilateral aspect of the problems identified by the task force on combating illicit trade, which was recently created and brings together all OECD countries. More options on how the OECD could be used as a platform for cooperation with the private sector could be explored, following the successful example of the FTZs. The use of technology should be a priority for the future.

Peter Kovacs, Head of the Intellectual Property and Public Procurement Unit, DG TRADE, European Commission, commended the cooperation between the OECD, the EUIPO and the Commission as like-minded institutions with common objectives to address the issue of IPR protection. The main challenges identified by DG TRADE to the protection of IPR in third countries are online trade, IP misappropriation, theft of trade secrets and patents or forced technology transfers, FTZs and the limited capacity of third countries to enforce IPRs, due to the lack of both political will and resources. DG TRADE uses the information gathered by the EUIPO and the OECD to identify priority countries and issues and to develop tools such as the Counterfeit and Piracy Watch List 2018. Once problems are identified, the Commission addresses them through trade agreements with comprehensive IP chapters, the implementation of which is monitored. The Commission tries to help third countries establish proper legislative frameworks and build on their capacity through projects such as IP Key, dialogues with user associations, voluntary cooperation with rights holders such as payment services or advertisers, and with other EU services and agencies, including OLAF, Eurojust, Europol and the EUIPO, and international organisations such as the World Trade Organisation and WCO.

Next steps should focus on raising awareness of the new EU leadership on the importance of IP and the need to step up efforts to solve the issue once and for all, and taking advantage of the momentum on the collaboration with China, which is showing the political will to engage. However, the different capacities, mindsets and economic developments of the countries involved must also be taken into consideration.
5. PANEL I
HOW TO ENHANCE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN IPR ENFORCEMENT?
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The first panel gathered experts to identify and explore how international actors can align strategies and collectively improve IPR enforcement governance at a global level.

Ana B. Hinojosa, Director, Compliance and Facilitation, WCO, briefly presented the organisation, which aims to harmonise customs procedures. IP plays an important role in the world of customs, so the organisation is collaborating with most stakeholders present to discuss how to achieve better protection of IPRs. She highlighted the improved political and legislative situation, including a will to develop inter-agency and inter-ministerial cooperation at national and regional levels to translate legal provisions into practice, and collaboration with the private sector. Data is central to risk assessment when facing new trends such as individual containers and small parcels. Priorities are aligned, but the level of engagement of each actor is different. Citizens and politicians, in general, need to take counterfeiting more seriously if real change is to be achieved. The WCO advocates increased harmonisation of enforcement practices at the national level and is preparing a report on disruptive technologies, which will take into account differing capabilities and how they affect how countries approach IP enforcement. The safety and security of citizens should be the first concern.
Jari Liukku, Head of the European Serious Organised Crime Centre, Europol, underlined the link between IP crime and organised crime groups (OCGs), which are the most significant risk to the internal security of the Member States. Due to its operations, Europol has witnessed the diversification of OCGs into all areas of crime, from corruption, drugs, arms and human trafficking to IP crime, causing social and economic harm to the EU. Europol provides Member States with a platform for secure data exchange (SIENA), as well as technical, financial and operational support. The EUIPO supports a unit focusing on IP crime, the Intellectual Property Crime Coordinated Coalition (IPC3). IPC3 provides support through information sharing and coordinating investigations to help identify suspects. The role of sustainable cooperation with third countries was underlined; projects in third countries, such as IP Key, could assist in moving from a more passive capacity to engaging in operational activities and signing operational agreements. To re-establish IP crime as one of Europol’s priorities, health and safety risks and the organised crime aspect should be emphasised. Europol operations are already identifying and targeting OCGs involved in counterfeiting.

Minelik Alemu Getahun, Assistant Director General, World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), started by explaining that building respect for IP is one of the strategic goals of the organisation, encompassing three parts: 1) information exchange and policy dialogue, providing opportunities for cooperation, mainly through the policy organ called the Advisory Committee on Enforcement; 2) provision of capacity building and legislative assistance, for which WIPO collaborates with other international organisations to provide countries and other actors with training and other services; and 3) cooperation with international actors. WIPO produces tools such as case law collections, software and consumer surveys, and covers topics in its meetings such as the role of social media, involving platforms and intermediaries and steps being taken by companies. WIPO will maintain its focus on capacity building going forward.

Amedeo Teti, Director General for the Fight against Counterfeiting, Ministry of Economic Development, Italy, explained the country’s strategy to protect Italian goods both nationally and internationally, based on cooperation with all stakeholders and awareness-raising in schools through education and projects involving influencers, and also emphasised the link between IP crime and OCGs. He discussed aligning national legislation with the latest developments in technology and engaging in dialogues with third countries where EU rights holders’ IPRs are being infringed, as well as the need for a more comprehensive global IP enforcement policy nurtured by international organisations, while stressing the relevance of inter-agency cooperation at the national level. The involvement of intermediaries in marketplaces, banking systems and logistics companies was also mentioned. Mr Teti suggested that the next step should be to focus on awareness among young people and the incoming government of the EU.

Laurent Marcadier, Director of Assets and Persons Protection, LVMH, underlined the involvement of OCGs in IP crime, with counterfeiters following a structured industrial model often relying
on e-commerce platforms and social media. As no actor can counter this alone, rights holders are cooperating with LEAs through agreements to create files, exchange information, promote reliability and provide education at the international level. However, rules and legislation should be adapted to the digital era in terms of regulating domain names and social networks, making major international platforms reliable and responsible, and introducing protection and screening tools. Counterfeiting should be included in the wider discussion on illicit trade and illicit or harmful digital content, and no difference should be made between digital and physical illicit goods and services. The key will be to reach the new EU leadership.

After the panel discussion, the floor was opened for questions and comments by the attendees.

A private sector representative suggested dedicating awareness-raising activities to the role of the consumer in bringing infringing goods into the EU. WIPO shared the experience of some countries that prepare materials and campaigns to warn travellers of the dangers of buying illicit goods in third countries. The WCO added that the environmental impact of counterfeiting could be used as an argument in campaigns.

Another intervention drew attention to the role of financial institutions. Europol replied that the EU has the proper legal framework to deal with asset tracking and confiscation in the anti-money laundering Directive (1), but that quicker mechanisms for information exchange with financial institutions should be developed. The WCO already engages with financial intelligence units.

Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (UK) highlighted the need to inform governments of the convergence between IPR crime and other types of crime, and commended the work done in relation to FTZs. The WCO replied that it was also working on an extensive report on FTZs from an operational point of view based on its cooperation with the OECD. WIPO asserted that the organised crime element needed to be emphasised to convince decision makers to treat IPR crime like other crimes.

The session was chaired by Bruno Delaye, President, Entreprise et Diplomatie, and explored the challenges raised by FTZs for IPR Enforcement and the opportunities for action. Philippe Dauvergne, CEO, LE FREEPORt, Luxembourg, Jack Radisch, Senior Project Manager, Public Governance Directorate, OECD, Samir Hamrouni, Chief Executive Officer, World Free Zones Organization (World FZO), and Peter Kovacs, Head of Unit, DG TRADE, European Commission, were the members of the panel.

FTZs have an important role in the global economy, but their particularities have also helped foster illicit trade and other infringements such as money laundering. The group discussed the two instruments prepared by the OECD pursuant to the work of the Task Force on Countering Illicit Trade: the recommendations and the Code of Conduct setting the standards for FTZs. Suggestions are welcomed on how to implement those instruments. The involvement of the World Free Zones Organization was commended. However, some problems were identified, such as the appointment of a person or institution to assess FTZ compliance. Compliant FTZs will be rewarded by the economic system itself, as compliance will be a guarantee of transparency and reliability. A number of FTZs have already demonstrated their willingness to implement the instruments. Regarding IP crime, an improvement was seen in the way it was considered and prioritised.

The next step after adoption by OECD Member countries is to work on the toolkit for certification assessment, in collaboration with the FTZ operators themselves.
The session was chaired by Richard Yung, Senator and President of the French National Anticounterfeiting Committee, and sought to address challenges raised by counterfeit goods that are harmful to consumers’ health and safety, and how to strengthen enforcement. The panel brought together Laura Cigolot, Secretariat, European Alliance for Access to Safe Medicines (EAASM), Daoming Zhang, Assistant Director Illicit Markets Sub-Directorate, Interpol, Frank Imbescheid, Public Relations Director Duracell Europe & Africa, Duracell, and Jacky Marteau, Head of Unit, OLAF, European Commission.

The increase in imports of counterfeit medicines through the internet was considered a prime concern. To tackle the issue, the panel proposed an education project focusing on the general public and enforcement actors, from customs to judges and prosecutors, in combination with actions in source countries. The main challenges were identified as being the lack of effective tools at the EU-level to deal with infringing websites which are put back online as fast as they can be taken down; and the need for better tools to enforce the follow-the-money approach.

The focus for future actions should be on education, as consumers trust internet sites blindly, and could involve NGOs and civil society groups.
Blanca Arteche, Head of Service, European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights, EUIPO, chaired a session on how to better facilitate information exchanges and cooperation among LEAs. Chris Vansteenkiste, Cluster Manager Counterfeiting, Europol, Valérie Ledure, Head of Unit, DG TAXUD, European Commission, Piotr Stryzowski, Senior Economist, Public Governance Directorate, OECD, and Joeri Mombers, Senior IP counsel, Signify, were the speakers.

The group highlighted the differences between all the actors involved in IP enforcement in terms of mandates, actions, capabilities and prioritisation of IP. The improvement of the interoperability between the available tools and technologies was identified as one of the main challenges. Data protection legislation was also identified as an issue creating a challenge impeding the effective exchange of data. A proposal was made to examine the relevant legislation to identify how to get the most out of exchanges of data to help jointly identify problems and targets. Exploring new opportunities through national cooperation with Member States’ customs, intermediaries, etc. was also suggested. It was also noted that parties in an exchange should explain and understand the purpose of the data being exchanged.

The priority for action should be to effectively utilise the data exchanged for risk or intelligence analysis and to work on interoperability of enforcement-related databases at the EU and national level.

Interpol highlighted the need to focus on the whole supply chain, not only the source countries, as the markets were being controlled by international OCGs.
Pascal Faure, Director General, Intellectual Property Office (INPI), France, commended the work performed by the EUIPO and the OECD in gathering data and developing studies needed to comprehend the IPR infringement landscape. INPI collaborates closely with the French National Anticounterfeiting Committee and recommends fostering this kind of cooperation at the national level. The INPI's work was presented, which goes beyond the registration of trade marks and designs and covers awareness raising, showcasing the impact of IP infringement in society as a whole, and collaboration with LEAs in order to generally strengthen the IPR system in the country. Cybercrime and the changing technological environment were identified as two of the main challenges to IPR enforcement, which could only be fought by leveraging all the different tools available to government bodies, national and international agencies and other relevant organisations. Some best practices were shared, such as the French network of IP attachés in third countries, who help French business protect their rights when operating abroad. Mr Faure stated that since IPR infringement knows no borders, only by creating networks and cooperating can counterfeiting be stopped.
Sławomir Tokarski, Director, DG GROW, European Commission, underlined the dangers that counterfeiting and piracy pose to consumers, the negative impact they have on jobs, the risks faced by SMEs as a consequence, and the barriers they create for innovation and creativity. The illicit trade and piracy environment is constantly evolving and growing more sophisticated, so cooperation between all actors is paramount to counter its advances. The Commission is working actively to improve the framework within which those actors can act, through new legislation such as the Copyright Directive (1), the revision of existing instruments such as IPRED (2) and developing and promoting other mechanisms, such as the Guidance on IPRED (3), the MoUs on the Sale of Counterfeit Goods Via the Internet or on Advertisement, and the Infringing Marketplaces Watch List, which have proved to be effective. Online intermediaries and platforms are being engaged and the Commission is also supporting industry-led initiatives, such as the projects BASCAP has initiated with freight and shipping companies. Regarding the work with third countries in order to fight counterfeiting and piracy worldwide, the Commission has an agreement with China and Hong Kong for customs cooperation and has boosted the IP Key projects with China, ASEAN and Latin America. Furthermore, the Commission is supporting and investing in projects to take advantage of technological developments such as Blockchain and AI. The new EU policy cycle is about to begin, and it is the time to bring IP back into the discussions at the highest political level.

Christian Peugeot, President, UNIFAB, started by presenting the association's history of IPR protection following its foundation at the end of the 19th century. He highlighted the importance of organised crime, stating that a 2016 report conducted by UNIFAB has shown IPR infringement to be the world's second source of criminal revenue and one that is being used to fund terrorist activities by large networks who take advantage of the low risks. To solve the problem, all stakeholders must engage together, including new actors such as platforms, who have buyer and seller information and could easily reach consumers to raise awareness and inform of fraudulent transactions, and whom he encouraged to take measures to remove illicit listings. On the other hand, policy-makers have the power to adapt legislation to the changing online environment, as the e-Commerce Directive is almost 20 years old. MoUs and voluntary measures are positive, but systems must be in place so that intermediaries who take direct actions are not put at a disadvantage against those who take no measures. IPR protection is paramount to defend citizens and companies and to foster growth worldwide. Therefore, LEAs must have the necessary resources and citizens must be provided with information to make the right decisions. The tools already developed, such as the Watch List, must be strengthened to reinforce partnerships with third countries to tackle the problem. Only by working together can IP be put at the highest level of priority where it belongs.
Marie Sellier, Vice-President Public Affairs, Vivendi, put the spotlight on online piracy, as innovative new technologies allow illicit options to exist and compete directly with legal services in the same environment, reaching consumers through all kinds of devices and greatly impacting the economy. To solve the problem a wide array of measures is necessary, as the digital world evolves quickly. Intermediaries must be tackled, and approaches such as follow-the-money or de-listing and blocking actions can be combined. Legislative measures must be put in place in order to prompt procedural efforts and update and adapt the remedies when dealing with illegal streaming sites, taking into consideration that actions must be dynamic, quick and reactive. Creativity is needed as well, as the diverse legal and cultural landscape of Europe makes it difficult to implement a one-size-fits-all solution. Article 8(3) of the InfoSoc Directive ( ) can be used as an instrument all around the EU, but collaboration between Member States is paramount once an injunction is in place. The example of Denmark was brought up, where decisions against an ISP are complemented by an MoU. Based on the Danish practice, a court decision against one ISP regarding infringing websites is automatically also applied by all ISPs part of the MoU. If the infringing contact appears with a different website address or domain, these new websites can be blocked on the basis of the previous court ruling that had already ordered the original website blocking.

Christa Brzozowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department for Homeland Security, United States, presented both the point of view of the United States and of the OECD’s Task Force on Illicit Trade. The President of the United States issued an order on 3 April 2019 for the entire government, other agencies and the private sector to work in coordination to develop a set of recommendations by October on how to tackle the global problem of counterfeiting. The United States is as well relying on the work of the OECD, WCO and EUIPO to comprehend the scope and magnitude of the problem, always emphasising the risks to citizens’ health and safety and national security. The aim is to design concrete actions and strategies to improve the country’s ability to cooperate and prosecute, including new legislation where necessary. Voluntary collaboration from the private sector will be expected. Regarding the work of the Task Force on Illicit Trade, it focuses on governance frameworks to hinder counterfeiting. Other important topics have been FTZs and small parcels. Key priorities moving forward are the need to provide governments with advanced postal data and developing criteria to identify trusted trading partners.
Evdokia Moïsé, Senior Trade Policy Analyst, Directorate for Trade and Agriculture, OECD, focused mainly on parcel trade and movement across borders, which is a growing trend in the world of e-commerce. Trends are changing, as consumers become interested in the product diversity and price range found abroad through online marketplaces. This environment is positive for SMEs, which take advantage of the opportunity to trade abroad. Consequently, governments have taken steps to support those businesses by removing procedural burdens and establishing specific procedures for small parcels. However, counterfeiters have also taken advantage of the changes and as a consequence small parcels are hindering LEAs’ capability to act at the border and properly target illicit goods or identify fraud. However, significantly tightening the rules for border action could damage the activities of many legitimate businesses, so potential measures have to be considered carefully. Better targeting of shipments should be the goal, for which big data analysis, advance information, post-clearance audits and risk assessment are required. Measures could differentiate between low and high-value parcels, identify trusted traders and harness cross-country cooperation including the use of digital technologies in order to stop counterfeiting, smuggling and undervaluation without having to increase the number of physical inspections. The role of OECD countries in bringing IPR discussions to the forefront and supporting actions through cooperation was highlighted, as smaller countries and companies often lack the means to act.

Jan de Visser, Global IP Manager, Philips, started by briefly introducing the company. Most of their IPR issues are related to male grooming products: the company’s shavers and packaging are copied and used with the same brand or under other brands. Most items seized were found in traditional large freight containers. The main challenge is the impossibility of tracing the origin of the goods due to the lack of cooperation with source countries and along the supply chain. Regarding postal trade, traceability is also non-existent. Deterrents are necessary, especially criminal actions at the national and international level. He suggested providing rights holders with a way to support the initiation of criminal procedures against infringers when identified.
10. PANEL II - THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY AND INTERMEDIARIES WHEN COUNTERING TRADE IN COUNTERFEITS

The panel discussion sought to identify ways to strengthen the role of technology and intermediaries in fighting IP infringements, improving due diligence and using a follow the money approach.

Kester Meijer, Director Operational Integrity, Compliance & Safety, KLM Cargo, underlined the role of new technologies such as Blockchain in tackling the issue of counterfeiting, as it poses significant health and safety risks. Events and projects such as the Blockathon and the subsequent Blockathon Forum were commended, as they bring together different stakeholders and facilitate dialogue. The model for border actions has to be rethought to focus on the available data and the technology, which has to be connected and interoperable. Blockchain solutions should be looked into, implementing pilots to see what works in the field. Regarding privacy, Blockchain could be used to create open source protocols, where information could be used for risk analysis without being shared. One worrying trend is the separate shipping of products and labels. To tackle it, reports on source country and risk assessment are necessary to develop whitelists. For KLM, future steps should include building an effective enforcement capacity for collaboration with facilitators. All participants were encouraged to join the Anti-Counterfeiting Blockathon Forum.

Charles Wright, Associate General Counsel, Amazon, explained that the platform takes IP very seriously, as a consumer-centric company which relies on the trust of both buyers and sellers. Amazon invests in proactive measures to take down illicit listings even before they are published, through the use of AI, machine learning and data science, and provides tools for sellers to provide information and report irregularities. Other issues are seller and consumer fraud, payment fraud, return fraud or ‘brushing’. One key action moving forward will be further developing tools to create a feedback loop between platforms and brand owners, such as the Brand Registry, where rights holders can provide information about distribution, procedures
and IP in general for Amazon to use in building specific proactive measures. Other tools are Transparency (item-level serialisation to allow track and trace through the whole supply chain) and Project Zero, which allows rights holders to take down infringing goods. Cooperation in the private sector is key, even if issues such as trade secrets and privacy rules complicate this. The value of the Commission’s MoUs in providing feedback on how to improve systems was underlined. Amazon can also refer criminal cases through the IPR Centre in the United States. As a next step, Amazon will continue to develop tools. However, legal instruments such as criminal procedures should be used to actually make criminals pay.

Sophie Peresson, Director Innovation for All – BASCAP, BASIS, Digital Economy, shared the association's experience in working with intermediaries. The main point identified during a first project with the maritime sector was to get people around the same table in order to openly discuss and develop solutions. However, the new project with online platforms is being conducted on a bilateral basis, as there are many diverse business models, which are being recorded and updated in a scorecard. Building a common narrative for stakeholders to engage was highlighted as a good practice. Time has to be dedicated to building trust among the actors for them to collaborate with each other in a flexible and agile manner. More people could be brought to the table to cover uncommon topics such as landlord liability. Ms Peresson commended the examples of practical collaboration presented through the meeting, stating that the scale of the problem was such that no single actor can provide a single solution to fix it. The work of the Commission is central to the solution, but those actions need to be adaptable to the industry and be supported by frank discussions. Industry-led initiatives can make a difference and can support what the Commission is doing. BASCAP invited all the entities in the room to join the discussions as a next step.

Annabelle DanielVarda, Legal Director–Head of Trademark team, Google, detailed the role of technology in Google’s products and services, as well as the company’s strategy to fight bad actors on its platforms, including combating illicit advertisements. Google relies on machine learning and AI to terminate accounts before the ads are even published. Google maintains that these models are reliable and proportionate, as they rely on content-neutral criteria in order to identify the accounts to be terminated. The role of rights holders in notifying Google of any infringing ads they identify was underlined, as well as in sharing new trends in infringing activities on any of the Google platforms, such as YouTube. This information is needed for proactive action when facing a problem of such magnitude. Google supports smart regulation focusing on identifying bad behaviour and supporting innovation, as infringing actors are moving towards platforms with less enforcement. Google has a zero-tolerance policy and
uses all possible measures to stop its products from being used to monetise illegal actions. It has signed an MoU facilitated by Commission on advertising. The next steps should focus on technology and machine learning as methods to fight infringement.

Matthew Bassiur, Vice President, Head of Global Intellectual Property Enforcement, Alibaba Group, mentioned the need to move towards enhanced collaboration to complement enforcement and legislation. Alibaba Group’s strategy is based around three pillars: notice and takedown, proactive measures and offline actions, all relying on technology. Rights holders can notify the platform of infringing listings to have them removed. Offline, Alibaba Group collaborates with LEAs by referring cases and providing information, which has already led to tangible results. To stay ahead of the game, Alibaba Group relies on advanced technology and data analytics to remove bad actors. Furthermore, it has created an alliance of over 130 rights holders, the Alibaba Anti-Counterfeiting Alliance, bringing together companies heavily engaged in brand protection to discuss how to deal with online and offline IP infringements proactively. Trying to legislate on platforms could have a negative effect, as most actors would do the bare minimum required by law and there would still always be infringing platforms. Alibaba Group already cooperates with LEAs, for instance with the City of London Police. Payment services should be brought into the discussions, together with other marketplaces such as social media platforms. Alibaba Group supports the work of the Commission’s MoUs, as their purpose and objectives are clear. Going forward, it will continue to improve its technology, promote collaborative efforts with external stakeholders and advocate for harsher penalties.

The floor was opened for comments.

The Alliance for Intellectual Property in the UK supported the idea of platforms sharing information. The United Kingdom has a Code of Practice currently under review for removal of links to infringing content from the first page of search results and the participants of the panel were encouraged to sign it.

Clear Sky Initiative raised the point that intermediaries are rights holders themselves and have to protect their IPR. KLM agreed and added that technology can be leveraged for that purpose. Amazon showed interest in future developments in Blockchain technologies.

The point was raised from the floor that a worldwide standard for platforms could be implemented to require sellers to provide identification so as to ensure transparency. Amazon already requests identification from sellers, and the information is available on its EU sites. Alibaba Group noted that the information provided by sellers is sometimes false, and that they provide identification data upon reception of take-down notices.

The International AntiCounterfeiting Coalition explained that it has a platform allowing private entities to discuss privacy concerns and request more information. Amazon replied that privacy is a real issue, but that the challenge can be met. Alibaba Group supported the idea, stating that there are ways to cooperate while respecting the law.
Alexandra Poch, Deputy Director, European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights, EUIPO, chaired the session on copyright infringements, in particular in the digital context and on opportunities to enhance IP enforcement in the online environment. The panel was formed by Elena Blobel, Director of Litigation, IFPI; Pauline Blassel, Secretary General, Supreme Authority for the Distribution and Protection of Intellectual Property on the Internet, (HADOPI), France; Marco Giorello, Head of Unit, DG CONNECT, European Commission; and Marco Pancini, Director of Public Policy, YouTube.

The group focused on the development of new business models and the challenges that arise when many different stakeholders with diverse models and motivations are involved in copyright discussions. The new Directive ( ) provides an important step in further harmonisation. However, there are still important differences between Member States when enforcing copyright and litigation and proceedings are costly. Fragmentation should be avoided wherever possible when implementing the Directive at national level, and opportunities to provide harmonised legal certainty and promote cooperation should be sought. Discussions between the Commission and Member States and other stakeholders have been launched, to allow all voices to be heard. Cooperation has already begun, and not just at the legislative level, but this is considered to be a continual long-term effort that will further improve the situation in the future. More actors should be engaged, for example there are still intermediaries that are not yet involved in cooperation. However, it needs to be also borne in mind that enforcing IPR is resource-intensive and some smaller actors might not have access to the necessary technology. These smaller actors should not be forgotten. The priority moving forward should be to look at existing legal rules and action plans and maximise the coherent implementation of existing rules. Moreover, raising awareness should remain a core element, especially through initiatives to make younger generations understand the importance of IP.
11.2. SESSION V — NEW PRACTICES AND THE ROLE OF ONLINE INTERMEDIARIES

This session explored options to combat counterfeiting and piracy online, and was chaired by Harrie Temmink, Deputy Head of Unit, DG GROW, European Commission. The panel members were Joanna Gęga, Intellectual Property Team Manager, Allegro; Probir Mehta, Head of Global IP Policy, Facebook; Måns Sjöstrand, Head of IP and Brand Protection, Daniel Wellington; and Olivier de Combret, Legal Counsel — IP / Brand Protection, Chanel.

The group continued the discussion initiated in the morning panels about online marketplaces about the growing issue of illegal offers and how to tackle it. The focus should be on the smaller platforms not present at the Forum, as these are the ones counterfeiters are turning to when the larger actors implement anti-counterfeiting measures. Information on the source of the illicit goods should be shared, taking into consideration data protection legislation. Preventive and proactive measures could be legislated for, since the e-Commerce Directive has not been updated in 20 years. However, some participants raised concerns that legislative procedures take too long and the environment is changing too fast. To ease communication between marketplaces and rights holders, the latter could appoint single points of contact to liaise with platforms and provide them with information needed to take down listings. New technologies are required to stay ahead of the criminals. It was pointed out that rights holders can also have difficulty identifying fakes. One area for improvement identified is the need to make platforms’ brand protection programmes more attractive to SMEs and smaller companies. Companies not participating in the programmes should not be punished, as they may not have the means to do so. The next step could be to identify what information each actor has and requires. The IP Enforcement Portal could be developed further to support interoperability.
The sixth session was chaired by Caroline Malcolm, Head, Blockchain Policy Centre, OECD, and covered means to combat IP infringements in cooperation with the payment industry. Lara Miller, Counsel, Vice President — Corporate Strategy at the International AntiCounterfeiting Coalition (IACC); Barry Elliott, Criminal Analyst at the Canadian Anti-Fraud Centre, Royal Canadian Mounted Police; Álvaro Ortega, Head of Law Enforcement Outreach and Investigations, Western Union; and Michael Gates, Director Brand, Risk Management, PayPal were the panel members.

The session underlined how all the actors in the payment ecosystem have information that could be shared, although with due account of privacy and data protection issues. Links between all actors can be found, including payment facilitators, taking into consideration that technology enables easy international payments but also benefits counterfeiters in doing so. However, data in itself is not sufficient — it must be used effectively. Technology can be part of the solution by helping LEAs and stakeholders manage, analyse and leverage this data. Progress could be made in the parts of the ecosystem that are not yet regulated, bringing smaller actors into the discussions. Future steps should include addressing cryptocurrencies and how they will change the nature of the environment in terms of tracking and tracing assets and payments, and figuring out how to better use the existing data.
12. PANEL III — NEW ALLIANCES AND PARTNERSHIPS FOR BETTER IP ENFORCEMENT

The third panel shared experiences and best practices regarding engagement with consumer groups and other non-governmental organisations in relation to IP protection and enforcement.

Karen Ghysels, Director, European Consumer Centre, Belgium, started by presenting the network of European Consumer Centres (ECCs), funded by the EU to increase consumer trust in the market. It provides free legal advice to consumers, covering everything from delivery issues to misleading practices. Consumers need to be educated and empowered for them to make the right decisions and avoid buying counterfeits, both on- and offline. Young people are engaged through dialogue underlining the health and safety dangers of illicit goods and the direct effect counterfeiting has on the economy. However, these activities require a high investment, which is not always possible. An online campaign was launched by the ECC in Belgium. Another project is a tool for consumers to check whether a marketplace or seller is legitimate. The centre offers tips to empower costumers to defend themselves and collaborates with other ECCs, LEAs, trade associations and the Belgian foundation against counterfeiting and piracy NANAC, as well as with the Commission and legislators. The exchange of best practices is considered especially valuable, both at the national and international level. IP should be introduced into education in a more structured and institutionalised way.

Maciej Dydo, Deputy Director, Department of Intellectual Property and Media, Ministry of Culture and National Heritage/Legalna Kultura, Poland, presented a Polish foundation created to change the perception and attitudes towards copyright by creating a narrative people could connect with, highlighting the value of copyright through education and promoting legal offers. The campaign was first launched in 2012 and focuses on positive messages based on universal ethics regarding the consumption of culture. It targets all generations and professional groups through multiple projects. When dealing with copyright, the approach taken is to highlight the rewards for the people who produced the content and to share a positive message about
originals, rather than focusing on the negative impact of piracy. People from creative industries such as authors, actors and journalists are engaged to reach generations X, Y and Z. Some successful actions include playing videos before each film in the cinema where people involved in the film thanked the audience for accessing the content legally, and a series of book reading sessions where actors visited bookstores to read for an audience. Some projects and workshops are dedicated to specific groups with particular needs, such as farmers. A database of legal offers with hundreds of sources has been created, including popular commercial sources such as Netflix, but also digital libraries, archives, etc. It has been promoted for seven years and about 2 000 people use it daily.

For campaigns to be successful, the latest trends in technology and consumer culture need to be followed. The group collaborates with LEAs and many national institutions, including schools, libraries and cultural groups. The private sector and the EUIPO have also provided funding for specific campaigns. Mr Dydo agreed that IP materials should be formally included in school curricula.

Gavin Terry, Lead officer (Intellectual Property) Chartered Trading Standards Institute, UK, presented the Institute, which initially focused on consumer protection but now covers brand protection as well. The United Kingdom has a National Markets Group that acts as a forum bringing together rights holders and government officials, where IP is discussed among other topics. The role of enforcement in the national markets, through police and market surveillance authorities, was highlighted. The market surveillance situation in other Member States is unknown and actors do not always know who to contact in other countries. On copyright, the concept could be easily explained in schools, as small children understand the idea of copying and why it is wrong, but reaching adults, especially SMEs and entrepreneurs, is still necessary. Regarding consumers, it is necessary to put an end to the idea that IP infringement is a crime without a victim, as consumers and companies are indeed defrauded. The importance of working at the street-level was highlighted, as online
and offline worlds require different solutions: technologies to check whether something is genuine are a step forward but are not always accessible in the physical world. Campaigns are being run in the physical space to inform consumers, as most of them are being misled into buying counterfeits. The National Markets Group, created pursuant to the National IP Crime Strategy, develops awareness campaigns on topics such as the role of intermediaries or the liability of physical market operators.

After the panel discussion, the floor was opened for comments.

The Association Against Movie and Video Piracy mentioned that sometimes consumer protection agencies see copyright rights holders as the enemy, instead of focusing on protecting the consumer from illegal offers. Legal offers should be promoted and the dangers of copyright infringement to creators and consumers alike (for instance, malware) need to be emphasised.

The Ukraine Alliance Against Counterfeiting and Piracy raised the point that legal offers are not always affordable and copyright holders could connect and create some common platform to make content accessible, rather than promoting the creation of many different platforms. The Alliance for Intellectual Property in the United Kingdom replied that copyright owners are entitled to use their content and share it as they see fit, which does not give anyone the right to steal it and profit from it. Pricing should never be an argument for infringement.
Chris Martin, Assistant Director, Her Majesty’s Revenue & Customs, Fraud Investigation Service, explained that the most common topics during the Forum had been awareness raising and improving communication. A plan could be defined despite the existing barriers to cooperation. In order to engage political forces, the role of IP crime in the landscape of serious organised crime should be emphasised, focusing on the economic impact in terms of lost jobs and lost tax revenue, without forgetting health and safety concerns, the link to other types of infringements such as drug trafficking, and corruption and exploitation along the supply chain. Quoting the RUSI report Expanding the Capability of Financial Information-Sharing Partnerships, ‘achieving ambitious growth in partnership activity will require active participation and moving from being extracurricular to being recognised and supported as a mainstream component’. The example of the United States National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center could be followed. Regarding barriers to cooperation, customs and tax collection agencies have many responsibilities beyond IPR enforcement and gather a lot of confidential information that cannot be shared due to legal hurdles. It is necessary to be clear and open about the kind of information needed and the purpose of that information. It is always positive to recognise a job well done, but another benefit would be simply seeing the progress made. In the case of the FTZ Code of Conduct, a reward would be to be recognised as a compliant FTZ. Mr Martin considered it of utmost importance to engage all stakeholders in the fight against counterfeiting to achieve results, and stated that those results should be measurable through goals and targets. Global enforcement responses are needed along the entire supply chain, paying attention to technology. Finally, legislation has to be carefully assessed so as to ensure relevant stakeholders can share the necessary information.
Shira Perlmutter, Chief Policy Officer and Director for International Affairs, Policy and External Affairs, USPTO, added that the issues must be raised to the highest political level, which is why the work being carried out by the Commission, the EUIPO and the OECD in organising the event is extremely important, as it brings together people from all around the globe, from different backgrounds, even though there was still potential for the Forum to include more countries. More involvement from high level people in companies such as CEOs could be helpful as well. A key element for the discussions is interagency collaboration at the national level. The discussion should be broadened to include all IPRs, especially trade secrets. Experiences and resources from other areas such as cybersecurity could be of use. More data on the impact of IPR infringement on the consumer has been gathered and can be used to reinforce arguments that IP infringement is not solely an issue of economic damage, but a societal issue dealing with ethics, respect for creators, and health and safety. The benefits of the various recent private initiatives were underlined, as they are often more open than governments to technological changes, but it is critical to develop trust among the players. Governments can provide more support for these initiatives and put in place structures to help them. In terms of rewards and incentives, initiatives can bring recognition and public relations, improved public perception or more traffic for intermediaries. This can be linked to consumer education, as the more aware citizens are, the more they will value the efforts companies make. If companies work well voluntarily, there will be no pressure to introduce legislation to impose obligations. Besides, best practices can become norms that may influence courts and negatively affect those who do not follow them. International coordination is needed at all levels, including awareness raising. Finally, a way to inject action into the process should be identified, so that it does not stop at just meeting every two years: a call for action is needed and some deadlines should be set.

Amaryllis Verhoeven, Head of the Intellectual Property Unit, DG GROW, European Commission, emphasised the importance of political prioritisation to receive the necessary resources. The newly elected European Parliament should be addressed and IP should be tackled from the organised crime and danger to society angle, but concrete joint proposals have to be presented to engage political audiences. Data is paramount to showcase the scale of the problem; the work of the Observatory and the OECD in developing studies is therefore commended. Stakeholders should also be aware of new types of IP crime and new trends, such as industrial espionage. The Commission is working through the MoUs to create an environment where
people can engage with each other and find win-win solutions, which takes time and effort; its role is to work as a facilitator, but also to assess and evaluate results. The sense of achievement as a reward was underlined, so elements such as KPIs were considered valuable in measuring progress. The Commission is undertaking several activities to broaden the net and bring more players on board, such as involving social media. At the end of 2019, a collection of best practices from the MoUs will be published, which is expected to attract more rights holders by proving business can be done in a rewarding manner. Legislative measures alone will not solve the issue, as more flexible elements such as MoUs are also needed, but the current legislation is nuanced in terms of duty of care and monitoring, which can be exploited to make the most of the good initiatives that currently exist. Action plan targets with clear objectives, evaluation measures and deadlines are necessary to move forward. As a next step, the IP Enforcement Portal could be expanded and used to improve data sharing, maybe involving platforms as well, as they have information LEAs may use. New technologies such as Blockchain should be explored, for instance, to develop supply chain protection. Finally, the copyright reform presents a good opportunity to tackle piracy at the international level.
14. CLOSING

The speakers, panellists and chairs of the sessions brought valuable contributions and suggestions to the table in an event organised by the EUIPO, the OECD and the Commission, which is a commendable example of the collaboration, cooperation and commitment needed to tackle the growing issue of counterfeiting and piracy.

The job of the interpreters and the logistics team was praised. The attendees were thanked for their participation and the meeting was closed.