UNCITRAL Second International Colloquium on Secured Transactions – 18-19 Jan., 2007

Panel Discussion: Third-Party Effectiveness and Priority for Copyright Financing

Outline

- Conceptual Framework
- A Practical Example
- Efforts By IP Community
- Conclusion

I. Conceptual Framework

Reasons for Filing and Priority

- FILING is not an end in itself but a means to an end effective disclosure to third parties who make later searches.
- PRIORITY is not an end in itself but a means to an end obtaining a debtor's rights in collateral free of competing claims on default.
- Intellectual property law is necessarily *different* from tangible goods property law.
- Hence, IP rules for effective filing and for obtaining priority must necessarily differ from those for tangible property.

Comparison of Filing Principles Copyright (IP) Tangibles Policy Goal **Free Alienability New Creations Policy Framework** Title Possession Ownership as to 3P Apparent Actual Chain of Title Yes No **Fractionalized Interests** Yes No Statutory Model (if any) **Recording Act Registry Act Filing Principle** Transaction filing Notice filing **Ownership & security Security only Covered Transfers** Indexing Method Property (work) Party (debtor)

II. A Practical Example

Motion Picture Financing

- Example: Fund production of Terminator 4
- Production loan: \$175,000,000
- Due Diligence requires searching entire Chain of Title as termination / foreclosure of prior transfer or security right could defeat rights in T4
- 100 prior parties to search
- Assume in U.S. separate searches required for IP transfers (Copyright Office) and security rights (local state offices)

U.S. 3	Search Cost	Cor	npariso	n for	Hy	/po	
		Copyright		Secu	Security		
		Docs Cost (est.)		Docs	Cost (est.)		
Full Copy	right Search	1	\$ 250 (Free)) 1	\$	250	
Locate D	ebtor Searches			100	\$	50,000	
sulsivilarl	I Debtor Searches			100	\$	5,000	
Copies o	f Documents			@3,000	\$	3,000	
Review D	ocuments				\$	5,000	
Judgmer	nt Searches			@600,000	\$30	,000,000	
	Total	1	\$ 250	@603,201	\$30),063,250	

Alternative Filing Approaches

1. Separate Approach (IP Ownership; Local Security)

- Exponential searching problems
- Inadequate disclosure of Security Rights
- > Which system prevails if the creditor forecloses?

2. Mixed Approach (File Security in both IP and Local)

- Same searching problems as separate approach
- Increases filing costs to no apparent benefit
- Impossible to reconcile different priority rules

3. Unitary Approach (File Ownership and Security in IP)

- Consistent priority rule
- Cost effective filing and searching
- > What about after-acquired?
- What about floating liens?

III. Efforts by IP Community

International AV Register

Specially Made for Financing

Based on Relational Data Model

Allowed Filing in Work Register and Person Register

Allowed Filing against Person ("floating lien")

Allowed Future Assignments ("after-acquired")

International AV Register - Concerns

Piracy – False Filings

Limited Challenge Rule

Arbitration concerns

Other International Initiatives

ICANN / WIPO – international arbitration for domain names

ISAN / UNESCO – international identification for AV works and claimants

Comparison to UNCITRAL approach

Other National Influences

- US Copyright Office & PTO
- EU Community Trademark
- Patent Law Treaty (use national PTOs for security)
- US Eximbank

Other export credit enhancement

Conclusion

Ultimately, the goal of a security interest is to *transfer* the debtor's *right*s in collateral on default and proper foreclosure

- Thus, the acid test is determining rights on foreclosure; filing is a means to this end, not an end in itself
- A transfer on foreclosure must fit in with the priority rules for all transfers of the asset, including competing ownership transfers
- As the priority and transfer rules for IP necessarily differ from those for tangible property, the filing system must differ as well.