

**COMMENTS ON THE
PROPOSED WIPO TREATY ON THE PROTECTION OF BROADCASTING
ORGANIZATIONS**

by

THE CENTRE FOR INTERNET AND SOCIETY, BANGALORE, INDIA.

I. PRELIMINARY

1. This submission presents preliminary clause-by-clause comments by the Centre for Internet and Society (“CIS”) on the Proposed WIPO Treaty on the Protection of Broadcasting Organizations (“**Broadcast Treaty**”).
2. This submission is based on the Working Document for a Treaty on the Protection of Broadcasting Organizations adopted by the Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights¹ at its Twenty-fourth Session, Geneva, July 16 to 25, 2012 (“**Working Document**”). This Working Document was received via email from the Office of Shri G.R. Raghavender, the Registrar of Copyrights and Director (BP&CR), Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India on the 14th of November, 2013.
3. CIS commends the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India for its efforts at seeking inputs from various stakeholders prior to the framing of India’s response to the Broadcast Treaty. CIS is thankful for the opportunity to have been a part of the Stakeholders Meeting on the proposed WIPO treaty on the Protection of Broadcasting Organizations on the 27th of November, 2013, at New Delhi, India; and to provide this clause-by-clause submission, in furtherance of the feedback process continuing from the aforesaid Meeting.

II. OVERVIEW

Governing Principles

4. The Centre for Internet and Society is a non-governmental organization engaged in research and policy work in the areas of, *inter alia*, access to knowledge and openness.² CIS values the fundamental principles of justice, equality, freedom and economic

¹Hereafter referred to as the SCCR.

²See www.cis-india.org (last accessed 04 December, 2013) for details about CIS’ work.

development. This clause-by-clause submission is consistent with CIS' commitment to these values, the safeguarding of general public interest, and the protection of India's national interest at the international level. Accordingly, the comments in this submission aim to further these principles and are limited to those clauses that most directly have an impact on these values.

The Need for a Broadcast Treaty

5. It is submitted that the very need for a Broadcast Treaty has not been clearly established. As we have indicated earlier³, the three kinds of investments made by broadcasters, namely in broadcasting infrastructure, licensing of copyrighted works and the creation of copyrighted works are already protected under existing legal systems.⁴ While the licensing and creation of copyrighted works are protected under copyright law, the investment in broadcasting infrastructure might be construed to be a "broadcast right", but this right is protected⁵ under the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations, 1961.⁶
6. CIS believes that the need for this treaty has not been established, and in the absence of an identified need, this treaty is uncalled for. Without prejudice to this belief however, CIS offers these comments to the proposed Broadcast Treaty.

The Adoption of a Signals Based Approach

7. CIS has consistently recommended the adoption of a Broadcast Treaty consistent with the signals based approach⁷, in consonance with the 2007 mandate of the WIPO General

³See for instance CIS' Statement at SCCR 24 on the WIPO Broadcast Treaty, available at <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/cis-statement-sccr24-broadcast-treaty> (last accessed 06 December, 2013).

⁴*Id.*

⁵*Id.*

⁶Hereafter referred to as the Rome Convention. See specifically Article 3(f) : Definition of Broadcasting; Article 3(g) : Definition of Rebroadcasting; Article 6 : Protected Broadcasts; Article 13 : Minimum Rights for Broadcasting Organizations. Also see generally. Available at http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/rome/trtdocs_wo024.html#P119_11307 (last accessed 06 December, 2013).

⁷See for instance <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/comments-on-broadcast-treaty-and-exceptions-and-limitations-for-libraries-and-archives> (last accessed 02 December, 2013); <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/cis-statement-sccr24-broadcast-treaty> (last accessed 02 December, 2013); <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/sccr-22-broadcast-cis-statement> (last accessed 02 December, 2013); <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/sccr19-broadcast-treaty> (last accessed 02 December, 2013); <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/wipo-broadcast-treaty-comments-march-2011> (last accessed 02 December, 2013); <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/wipo-broadcast-treaty-and-webcasting> (last accessed 02 December, 2013).

Assembly, binding on the SCCR. In this submission as well, we re-iterate our commitment to the same.

III. CLAUSE-BY-CLAUSE COMMENTS AND ANALYSIS

The Preamble

8. The Working Document on the Broadcast Treaty indicates that the Preamble remains to be determined.
9. The importance of the Preamble in the interpretation of treaties finds a reflection in Article 31(2) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969,⁸ which indicates that the Preamble shall be a part of the context of a treaty for the purposes of interpretation. Further, the Preamble has been recognised by the International Court of Justice as part of the ‘object and purpose’ of a treaty for the purposes of interpretation.⁹
10. Therefore, it is proposed that the Preamble to the Broadcast Treaty be introduced to incorporate *inter alia*, a declaration on the scope and intention; the restriction of the Broadcast Treaty to a signal based approach; a commitment to the protection of national interest and the freedom of parties to determine the manner of adoption of the Broadcast Treaty.

Article 1- Relation to Other Conventions and Treaties

11. Article 1 of the proposed Broadcast Treaty makes a specific reference to leaving intact the protection of copyright and related rights in subject matter carried by broadcast

⁸Article 31: *General Rule of Interpretation*- (1) A treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in the light of its object and purpose. (2) The context for the purpose of the interpretation of a treaty shall comprise, in addition to the text, including its preamble and annexes:

- (a) any agreement relating to the treaty which was made between all the parties in connection with the conclusion of the treaty;
 - (b) any instrument which was made by one or more parties in connection with the conclusion of the treaty and accepted by the other parties as an instrument related to the treaty.
- (3) There shall be taken into account, together with the context:
- (a) any subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or the application of its provisions;
 - (b) any subsequent practice in the application of the treaty which establishes the agreement of the parties regarding its interpretation;
 - (c) any relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties.
- (4) A special meaning shall be given to a term if it is established that the parties so intended

⁹See for instance *Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment*, (France v. U.S.), 1952 I.C.J. 176 (Aug. 27), p. 196.; *Territorial Dispute, (Libya v. Chad)*, 1994 I.C.J. 7 (Feb. 3), ¶ 52; *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (Advisory Opinion) [2004] ICJ Rep 136, ¶ 118.

signals.¹⁰ Further, it has also been stated that no provision of this proposed treaty is to be interpreted in a manner that would prejudice such protection. This provision, employing the use of “shall” is mandatory in nature.

12. It is submitted that in excluding subject matter of copyright and related rights protection from the ambit of the proposed treaty, Article 1 is a necessary provision. CIS recommends the inclusion of this Article.

Article 2- General Principles

13. CIS strongly supports the inclusion of Article 2 in the proposed Broadcast Treaty and the inclusion of, *inter alia*, access to knowledge and information and the freedom to take any action for the promotion of public interest in sectors of vital importance.
14. It is submitted that as stated in CIS’ Comments to the MHRD on the WIPO Broadcast Treaty (March 2013)¹¹ (“**our earlier submission**”), the Development Agenda under TRIPS should be declared a general principle under this Treaty. This would further the balance sought to be struck between the larger public interest and the rights of broadcasting organizations.

Article 3- The Protection and Promotion of Cultural Diversity

15. CIS strongly supports the inclusion of Article 3 in the proposed Broadcast Treaty.
16. It is submitted that the inclusion of this Article would be in India’s national interest, and would enable the safeguard of our diverse cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and cultural expressions.

Article 4- Defense of Competition

17. CIS strongly supports the inclusion of Article 4 in the proposed Broadcast Treaty.
18. The provision on defense of competition rightly seeks to prevent the abuse of intellectual property rights. This provision would be critical from the perspective of India’s national interest, and our efforts to foster a healthy competitive market and prevent any abuse of dominant position by persons or organizations, as reflected in (India’s) Competition Act, 2002.

¹⁰See specifically Article 1(2).

¹¹See <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/comments-on-wipo-broadcast-treaty> (last accessed 06 December, 2013).

Article 5- Definitions

Article 5(a) : “signal”

19. The Working Document proposes in Article 5(a) a definition of “signal” and an alternative to the same.
20. The alternative definition to “signal” as stated in the Working Document, in discussing the *capability* of the carrier to transmit cablecasts or broadcasts seemingly does not confine the definition to one where the carrier *actually* contains sounds or/and images or any other representation.
21. Therefore, it is proposed that in order to have a clearly defined and restricted application of the Broadcast Treaty, the definition proposed in the Working Document in Article 5(a) be adopted, as opposed to the alternative proposed.

Article 5(b) : “broadcast”

22. The Working Document proposes in Article 5(b) a definition of “broadcast” and an alternative to the same.
23. The alternative definition to “broadcast” as stated in the Working Document contains a specific statement that excludes transmission over a computer network from the definition of “broadcast”.
24. Therefore, it is proposed that the alternative to the definition of “broadcast” as proposed in the Working Document be adopted. The alternative so proposed contains a specific exclusion for transmission over a computer network, which would also include transmission over the internet, one of the characteristics of which (as understood broadly) is that it is a set of networked computers. Therefore, the adoption of this alternative would be in furtherance of the mandate to confine the Broadcast Treaty to a signals based approach.

Article 5(d) : “retransmission”/ “rebroadcast”

25. The Working Document details two alternatives for Article 5(d), i.e., a definition for retransmission and alternatively, a definition for rebroadcast.
26. It is submitted that the definition for “rebroadcast” be adopted in place of the definition for “retransmission”. “Retransmission” as defined in this treaty encompasses within it online transmission as well, in using the phrase *transmission by any means by any person*. “Rebroadcast” is the simultaneous transmission of a broadcast or a cablecast. CIS has suggested in the aforesaid section that that definition of broadcast which

excludes transmission over computer networks be adopted. A similar suggestion has been made later in these submissions for the adoption of a definition of cablecast.

27. Therefore, it is submitted that the definition of “rebroadcast” be adopted, since it excludes transmission over a computer network.

28. It is further submitted that “retransmission” as used in other subsequent Articles of this treaty be replaced with “rebroadcast” wherever applicable, particularly in Articles 6, 9 and 13 of this treaty.

Article 5(f) in Alternative A and Article 5(e) in Alternative B : “communication to the public”

29. The Working Document specifies two alternatives for the definition of “communication to the public”, namely Article 5(f) in Alternative A¹² and Article 5(e) in Alternative B.¹³

30. Article 5(f) envisages a situation where “communication to the public” may be by any means whatsoever, and Article 5(e) includes within the meaning of “communication to the public” making transmissions audible or visible in *places accessible to the public*.

31. It is submitted that “communication to the public” governs the *content* layer and not the broadcast signal itself. As noted by CIS in its statement at the 22nd SCCR, this formulation is *an element of copyright* and is distinct from broadcast rights, which are related rights.¹⁴ A signal may only be *broadcast/transmitted* to the public, and the very utilization of the word “communication” implies stepping into the realm of copyright. Therefore, the adoption of a definition of “communication to the public” and the attempts to regulate “communication to the public” would be inconsistent with a signal based approach. It is therefore submitted that neither of the proposed definitions of “communication to the public” ought to be introduced in this treaty.

32. Without prejudice to the aforesaid view, it is further submitted that both of these definitions are broadly worded and that there is a need to narrow their applicability to one encompassing a set of limitations and exceptions.

¹²Hereafter referred to as Article 5(f). This states as follows: “*communication to the public*” means any transmission or retransmission to the public of a broadcast signal, or a fixation thereof, by any medium or platform.

¹³Hereafter referred to as Article 5(e). This states as follows: “*communication to the public*” means making the transmissions referred to in provisions (a), (b) or (d) of this Article audible or visible, or audible and visible, in places accessible to the public

¹⁴See Statement of CIS, India on the WIPO Broadcast Treaty at the 22nd SCCR, available at <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/sccr-22-broadcast-cis-statement> (last accessed 06 December, 2013).

33. By way of illustration, reference may be made to Section 52(1)(k)¹⁵ and Section 52(1)(l)¹⁶ of the Indian Copyright Act, 1957, acts which are deemed to not be instances of copyright infringement in Indian law. It is submitted that *inter alia*, these instances might be reasonably construed to qualify as “communication to the public” under either of the definitions proposed in the Working Document. Further, these situations do not find an explicit mention under the proposed Limitations and Exceptions provision under Article 10 as stated in the Working Document. Instances of shared television watching or shared listening of the radio, are, among others, established cultural practices in India, and are also likely outcomes arising out of an economic necessity, wherein affordability or access to televisions and/or the radio might not be a reality. In this regard, it would be prudent for the law to envisage a set of exceptions wherein engaging in these activities would not be a violation of the right of the broadcast organizations.
34. Without prejudice to the earlier submission suggesting the non inclusion of “communication to the public”, it is suggested that by way of abundant caution, the definition of “communication to the public” contain an explicit clause that makes the said communication subject to a set of strong limitations and exceptions, which would be determinable by the parties in the national law.

Article 5(j) : ‘other’

35. The Working Document provides two alternatives that may be adopted for this Article.
36. It is proposed that the definition of “program” and the definition of “cablecast” as laid out in the alternatives to Article 5(j) be adopted.

Article 6 : “Scope of Application”

37. Article 6 of the Working Document proposes two alternatives to the provision on the Scope of Application, i.e., “Alternative A” and “Alternative B”.

¹⁵Section 52(1)(k) : *the causing of a recording to be heard in public by utilising it,--*
(i) *in an enclosed room or hall meant for the common use of residents in any residential premises (not being a hotel or similar commercial establishment) as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents therein; or*
(ii) *as part of the activities of a club or similar organisation which is not established or conducted for profit*

¹⁶Section 52(1)(l) : *the performance of a literary, dramatic or musical work by an amateur club or society, if the performance is given to a non-paying audience, or for the benefit of a religious institution*

38. It is proposed that “Alternative A” be adopted, and in the adoption of “Alternative A”, the alternative to Article 6(1) as has been suggested¹⁷ be adopted.
39. The wording of Alternative A categorically excludes broadcasting organizations from having additional rights over copyrighted works, through rights claimed under the Broadcast Treaty. This intention is clearly manifested in the statement that protection under the Broadcast Treaty shall be provided to broadcasting organizations *to enable them to enjoy the rights to the extent owned or acquired by them from the owners of copyrights or related rights*. Consequently, broadcasting organizations would *not* be protected in those instances when they had *not* acquired/*do not have* ownership over copyrights or related rights. This, therefore, would be in furtherance of protecting works already available in the public domain, or those works in whom copyright did not vest.
40. It is submitted that Article 6(3) allows for the protection of transmissions over computer networks. CIS strongly suggests that this clause be deleted.

Article 9 : “Protection for Broadcasting Organizations”

41. The Working Document proposes two alternatives to the provision on “Protection for Broadcasting Organizations”, namely “Alternative A” and “Alternative B”.
42. With reference to Alternative A of Article 9, it is submitted that the reservations expressed in the section of these comments dealing with “communication to the public”¹⁸ would be reiterated.
43. It is submitted that public performance governs the *content* layer and not the broadcast signal itself. As noted by CIS in its statement at the 22nd SCCR, this formulation is *an element of copyright* and is distinct from broadcast rights, which are related rights.¹⁹ Therefore, it is submitted that public performance of broadcast signals should not be covered within the ambit of the Broadcast Treaty.
44. Without prejudice to the aforesaid submission, it is proposed that at the very least, the scope of *places accessible to the public* be narrowed, on the basis of the submissions made earlier in these comments,²⁰ and certain activities be excluded from the

¹⁷This states as follows: *The provisions of this Treaty shall provide protection to the broadcasting organizations for their broadcasts on traditional broadcasting and cablecasting media to enable them to enjoy the rights to the extent owned or acquired by them from the owners of copyrights or related rights.*

¹⁸See pages 4 and 5, *infra*, of this submission.

¹⁹See *Statement of CIS, India on the WIPO Broadcast Treaty at the 22nd SCCR*, available at <http://cis-india.org/a2k/blog/sccr-22-broadcast-cis-statement> (last accessed 06 December, 2013).

²⁰*Id.*

understanding of public performance. *Places accessible to the public* could also be those such as clubs or places of education, for which (India's) Copyright Act, 1957 recognizes limitations/exceptions.²¹ Therefore, it would be fallacious to grant to broadcasting organizations the right to authorize performance of their broadcast signal in all *places accessible to the public*.

45. Without prejudice to any of the above, it is further proposed that at the very least, the restriction dealing with *very large screens* should be deleted for two reasons: *firstly*, that such screens could be used for the performance of a broadcast for non commercial purposes; and *secondly*, that the determination of what constitutes a *large screen* would be entirely subjective.
46. Without prejudice to any of the above, it is further submitted that in granting broadcasting organizations the exclusive right to authorise the use/performance/retransmission of their broadcast signal, Article 9 does not envision scenarios of free-to-air television and radio channels or state sponsored television and radio channels, that might depend on other forms of income besides subscriber payments. Therefore, as stated by us in our earlier submission, there seems to be no cogent reason for the inclusion of a wide definition/understanding of "communication to the public" and *places accessible to the public* in this treaty.
47. Without prejudice to any of the above, with reference to Alternative B to Article 9, we strongly reiterate the position adopted in our earlier submission. We strongly suggest the deletion of Alternative B to Article 9. The envisagement of fixation or post fixation rights to be given to broadcasting organizations is in contravention of the mandate of the WIPO General Assembly to adopt a signal based approach for the development of the text of the proposed Broadcast Treaty.

Article 10 : "Limitations and Exceptions"

48. The Working Document proposes three alternatives to Article 10, namely, Alternative A, Alternative B and Alternative C.
49. It is interesting to note that all three proposed alternatives employ the use of "may", rendering them directory. It is therefore proposed that "may" be replaced with "shall" in order to raise a presumption of imperativeness. This would also be in furtherance of Article 2 of this treaty and the Development Agenda under TRIPS.

²¹*Id.* See also *supra* note 15 and *supra* note 16.

50. It is submitted that as stated in our earlier submission, on the proposed Broadcast Treaty, if the provision on Limitations and Exceptions was to be directory instead of mandatory, it would be in violation of Article 3 of this treaty. It is reiterated that the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression recognizes the principles of equitable access and openness and balance. As per Article 6 of this Convention, parties may adopt measures protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions within its territory including those aimed at enhancing the diversity of the media, including through public service broadcasting.²²
51. Alternatives A, B and C as proposed in Article 10, all employ the “three step test” as used in granting limitations and exceptions in copyright law.²³ It is submitted that the nature of a broadcast right as envisaged in the proposed Treaty is different from the nature of a copyright. Consequently, the basis of the limitations and exceptions of the former cannot be the same as the latter. Broadcast rights may enjoy certain unique limitations and exceptions. Illustratively, reference may be made to Sports Broadcasting Signals (Mandatory Sharing with Prasar Bharati) Act, 2007, which makes an exception to signal protection for cases such as the broadcast of a national sport. Further, as stated in our earlier submission, 2013, countries may also want to limit broadcast rights available to national broadcasters or any others, funded by the government (taxpayers), but might be unable to do so were the ‘three-step test’ employed.

²²Article 6: *Rights of Parties at the National Level: (1) Within the framework of its cultural policies and measures as defined in Article 4.6 and taking into account its own particular circumstances and needs, each Party may adopt measures aimed at protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions within its territory.*

(2) Such measures may include the following:

(a) regulatory measures aimed at protecting and promoting diversity of cultural expressions;
(b) measures that, in an appropriate manner, provide opportunities for domestic cultural activities, goods and services among all those available within the national territory for the creation, production, dissemination, distribution and enjoyment of such domestic cultural activities, goods and services, including provisions relating to the language used for such activities, goods and services;

(c) measures aimed at providing domestic independent cultural industries and activities in the informal sector effective access to the means of production, dissemination and distribution of cultural activities, goods and services;

(d) measures aimed at providing public financial assistance;

(e) measures aimed at encouraging non-profit organizations, as well as public and private institutions and artists and other cultural professionals, to develop and promote the free exchange and circulation of ideas, cultural expressions and cultural activities, goods and services, and to stimulate both the creative and entrepreneurial spirit in their activities;

(f) measures aimed at establishing and supporting public institutions, as appropriate;

(g) measures aimed at nurturing and supporting artists and others involved in the creation of cultural expressions;

(h) measures aimed at enhancing diversity of the media, including through public service broadcasting.

²³See Article 10(2) in Alternatives A, B and C, each.

52. Therefore, it is proposed that Article 10(2) across all alternatives be deleted, and member states be given the right to formulate limitations and exceptions based on their determination of what constituted their national interest.

Article 11 : “Term of Protection”

53. The Working Document proposes three alternatives for the provision dealing with “Term of Protection”, namely Alternative A, Alternative B and Alternative C.

54. It is submitted that the provision of a term of protection is inconsistent with a signal based approach. In a signal based approach, where the focus is on the protection of the signal against un-authorised use, the duration of the protection granted to the signal must be linked to the life of the signal itself. Consequently, the adoption of a term of protection, either one mandated by the proposed Broadcast Treaty, or one in the national law of parties would be a deviation from the mandate of the 2007 WIPO General Assembly to confine the proposed Broadcast Treaty to a signal based approach.

55. Therefore, it is proposed that Alternative C which states that there ought to be no such provision in this treaty be adopted.

Article 12 : “Protection of Encryption and Rights Management Information”

56. The Working Document effectively specifies four alternatives for Article 12, namely A1, A2, B1 and B2 respectively.

57. It is observed that all Alternatives referred to aforesaid are mandatory in nature, employing the use of “shall”; imposing in effect a compulsory obligation on parties to the proposed Broadcast Treaty. It is submitted that this would be in contravention of Articles 2, 3 and 4 of this treaty.

58. It is submitted that the introduction of a provision requiring the compulsory enforcement and recognition of technological protection measures in favour of broadcast organizations is very likely to have a negative impact on access to knowledge and information. Further, such a provision is likely to restrict limitations and exceptions granted in copyright law across national jurisdictions, and hinder access to lawfully acquired content by the general public, and even works already available in the public domain.²⁴ Additionally, this provision would also require governments to mandate the production and use of devices that are compatible with the enforcement of technological protection measures.

²⁴See generally Timothy Vollmer, *WIPO’s Broadcasting Treaty : Still Harmful, Still Unnecessary*, available at <http://creativecommons.org/weblog/entry/35199> (last accessed 05 December, 2013).

59. Based on our earlier submission, it is reiterated that a separate right to prevent *unauthorised decryption* would be redundant, given that signal theft is already a crime. Further, the adoption of such a provision would cover a scenario where the decryption is of an unauthorised re-transmission without authorization from the re-transmitter. This would therefore, in effect create and grant rights in favour of the unauthorised re-transmitter where no right to retransmit exists, giving rise to an absurdity.
60. It is therefore proposed that the proposed Broadcast Treaty not contain provisions relating to technological protection measures.

IV. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

61. The Centre for Internet and Society welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed Broadcast Treaty and commends the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India for its initiative in seeking inputs from Stakeholders.
62. To that end, reiterating its commitment to the values of access to knowledge, freedom of information, equality, justice, protection of general public interest and safeguarding India's national interest at the international level, the Centre for Internet and Society presents the following concluding observations:
- a. That the proposed Broadcast Treaty be restricted entirely to a signal based approach, in consonance with the mandate of the 2007 WIPO General Assembly.
 - b. That a Preamble be inserted forthwith to clearly lay out the intention of the parties and the scope, objectives and application of this treaty.
 - c. That certain definitions be suitably modified, as discussed in the preceding sections of these comments.
 - d. That the rights of broadcasting organizations be suitably modified so as to not curtail access to information.
 - e. That the limitations and exceptions be made mandatory and not subject to the same tests as those understood in copyright law.
 - f. That technological protection measures be deleted, so as to ensure the protection of the public domain.
63. The Centre for Internet and Society would be willing discuss these submissions with the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India; supplement these with further submissions if necessary and offer any other assistance towards the efforts

at developing a Broadcast Treaty that would be most beneficial to the protection and promotion of access to knowledge and India's national interests.

On behalf of the Centre for Internet and Society,

Nehaa Chaudhari

06 December, 2013

Bangalore, India.