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ABSTRACT

This paper analyses how creativity and inventions during the digital era have influenced the Nigerian film industry. Although, the Nigerian copyright jurisprudence has not significantly adapted to digital interventions, the global nature of audio-visual-cinematographic business practices will quicken such adaptation. Nollywood represents the Nigerian film industry, which mostly consists of the audio-visual production systems. Nollywood is now the third largest film industry globally by production metrics. Digital era cinematic productions are changing the Nigerian film industry’s creative structures in significant ways under a weak copyright enforcement regime. Digital technology has become part of Nollywood’s strategic method of eradicating film piracy. Digital era interventions influenced the Nigerian film industry to adapt its distribution systems of creations after technology interrupted the former global intellectual property (IP) regulatory Order. In this instance, this old Order recognized only non-technological creative works. This new distribution system carries tremendous advantages beyond combating piracy, including overcoming the negative impact of a pandemic. This paper explores how the disruptions of digital technology, laws, local economic inequities, and film piracy created the enabling environment for Nollywood’s emergence while setting it on an ingenious growth. It analyses the tension between digital technology’s normative trends and copyright ownership regimes created by the Beijing Treaty on Audio-visual Performances (Beijing Treaty). It concludes with certain prescriptions towards a sustainable film industry.

Keywords: Nollywood, intellectual property, digital copyright, African films, creative disruption, fourth industrial revolution, artificial intelligence.

1. INTRODUCTION

The core legal regime for protecting the film and audio-visual industries are copyright and related neighbouring rights, for example, performers of live music, dances and broadcasting of creations within platforms that are not tangible.1 However, other intellectual property (IP) regimes like patent, trademark, and unfair competition laws still play significant legal protective roles in the audio-visual industries.2 The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) led the charge in the late 1990s to reconceptualize global copyright regimes to recognize technological enhanced and supported creations.3 The changes in copyright laws by most developed economies encourage new businesses, which these new laws fundamentally support.4 For example, in the music industry, the iTunes business model from Apple Corporation was one of the early businesses that

---

1 Okediji RG, ‘Copyright and Public Welfare in Global Perspective’ (1999) 7 Ind J Global Legal Stud 117, 118-19; The Copyright Act (Laws of the Federation of Nigeria) (2004), Cap 28, § 26 (describing neighbouring rights as performer’s rights, which include performing, recording, broadcasting live, dramatic performance, dance, mime, musical performance and reading/recitation of literary act as far as it is a live performance given by one or more individuals).

2 Ibid.


leveraged the new 1990s copyright regime. In the film and audio-visual industry, video on demand business enterprises represent the new model of consuming visual contents enhanced by digital technology and jurisprudence. Nollywood in its original and current format, as this paper will analyze later, is a direct outcome of the digital era enhanced productive capabilities. Copyright ownership is loosening due to new distribution channels powered by digital technology. Therefore, the digital era creative jurisprudence will impact its production ecosystem.

The contemporary digital legal regimes have further liberalized and democratized copyright ownership exclusivity. Copyright sustains international trade through regimes like the Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) guidance. Members of these Treaties have made efforts to comply with the unobstructed trade goals and multilateral engagements of these instruments. Nollywood’s creative ownership and performance rights’ regime has evolved from its checked history to present day technology-enhanced creations. Its growth continues with the body of astounding works available for public consumption.

Nollywood has grown to be Africa’s most successful film industry and the third largest, globally after Hollywood and Bollywood. By 2013, most economists considered Nollywood as a formal sector in Nigeria’s developmental growth. In 2014, Nollywood was a USD 5.1 billion industry and added more than 5% value to Nigeria’s GDP. At the turn of the 20th century, digital technologies enabled creative industries with humongous internal revenue and income generation capacity. Digital technologies changed the methods by which audio-visual content and creative works reached the public. Therefore, digital creations are disruptive technologies.

A disruptive technology is one that displaces an established creative orthodoxy and builds a new business method in an industry. Often, technological disruptions influence industrial legal regimes. The existing legal regime lags behind the trending technology, leaving the courts to perform gatekeeping functions of husbanding the new technologies. For example, in the United States (US), Sony Corp. of America v Universal City

3 Haynes J, et al., ‘Evolving Popular Media’ in Nigerian Video Films (2000) 51 (Nollywood emerged from the new inventions of digital technology. At that time, VHS cassettes became the main source of contents production and distribution in the films or audio-visual industry. In its later years, Nollywood depends principally on digital streaming, an invention of the digital era to produce, distribute and even fight illegal use of its contents-films).
6 Reidenberg (n 9).
8 Carroll (n 9).
15 Ku (n 18).
16 Spar DL, Ruling Waves: From the Compass to The Internet, A History of Business and Politics Along the Technological Frontiers (2001) 15.
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Studies, Inc., illustrates how a new technology enabled the practice of ‘time shifting,’ which is recording of television shows for private viewing later.\(^{22}\) The video cassette recorder (VCR) created by Sony Corporation disrupted the ways in which movie studios distributed movies to its consumers.\(^{23}\) Movie studios in the lawsuit claimed that the VCR contributed to the infringement of their copyright by allowing unauthorized recording of the contents.\(^{24}\) The US Supreme Court held that ‘time shifting’ was a permissible fair use and that the VCR system was legal because the technology was capable of ‘substantial non-infringing uses.’\(^{25}\) This US Supreme Court decision validated disruptive technology like VCR.\(^{26}\) It set a precedent for US courts, affirming that new technologies could balance the objectives of copyright with their utilitarian purposes.\(^{27}\) However, so far the Nigerian courts have not given guidance on the digital era IP jurisprudences in a fundamental way.

2. ARTICLE ROAD MAP

This article evolves in three Parts. Part one examines the historical factors that influenced the emergence of a new film ecosystem and Nollywood. It critically examines the intersections of culture and a new technology in the birth of the contemporary Nigerian film industry. Part two analyzes how the digital era laws like the Beijng Treaty have expanded the moral and economic rights of cinematic creatives, especially actors and performers, and its legal impact on Nollywood. Part three further explores the devolution of the new rights for creatives in Nollywood, especially ownership, authorship and the responsibilities of their collective societies. It concludes with the postscript of the legal landscape of Nollywood.

A. PART ONE: DIGITAL INTERVENTION AND THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW FILM INDUSTRY

The Birth of Nollywood

At the beginning of the 1990s, the Nigerian film creatives introduced a new genre of film production, which solely depended on audio-visual production systems.\(^{28}\) Other African countries copied the Nollywood genre and production system, which was more economically feasible than celluloid film production.\(^{29}\) The audio-visual mode of film production was popularized by a Nigerian filmmaker, Kenneth Nnebeue, in the early 1990s. As opposed to the celluloid type films, it captured the yearning taste for cinematic entertainment and filled the gap that cinema theatres left open.\(^{30}\)

In the early 1990s, Kenneth Nnebeue, Chris Obi Rapu and Okechukwu Ogunjiofor scripted, produced, and directed ‘Living in Bondage’, the film that began the Nollywood era in Nigeria.\(^{31}\) Kenneth Nnebeue imported empty caches of video home system (VHS) tapes from Asia for purposes unrelated to filmmaking but creatively changed the purposes of the goods by recording Living in Bondage on them.\(^{32}\) He took advantage of the digital technology available at that time to primarily make an income during a period of dire national economic meltdown.\(^{33}\) He has stated that his primary reason for engaging in filmmaking was commercial.\(^{34}\) Apart from starting a new creative

---

\(^{23}\) Id 441-442.
\(^{24}\) Id.
\(^{25}\) Id 441-442.
\(^{32}\) Esonwanne (n 31) at 24.
\(^{33}\) Ibid at 26-27.
\(^{34}\) Ibid.
industry, Nnebue deliberately set the stage for Nigerian creatives to become artistic and literary entrepreneurs that would later change the income earning power of Nollywood actors.\textsuperscript{35} This singular innovation of Nnebue created a film genre peculiar to Sub-Saharan Africa.\textsuperscript{36} The history of Nollywood has been widely recorded in legal and non-legal literature.\textsuperscript{37} Therefore, this paper would not expand on the historical background of the industry.

The seamy side of the VCR devices, which is a typology of the digital era technology, was that it enabled easy duplication of audio-visual content leading to widespread film piracy.\textsuperscript{38} The straight to video (STV) production system became the weak link in the Nollywood distribution chain because the digital versatile disc (DVD), videotapes, and VHS cassettes had no protection against illegal duplication. Nollywood lost around USD two million yearly during its early years to film piracy and artists earned less income for their creative works.\textsuperscript{39} Film piracy became Nollywood’s Achilles’ heel because digital technology that enabled the rapid production of films by authentic filmmakers, had become the method of replicating illicit copies of Nollywood films.\textsuperscript{40} The illicit film replication continues in large volumes and is unregulated.\textsuperscript{41} A quarter century after the first Nollywood films emerged, the industry is now at a crossroad that requires enhanced copyright protection.\textsuperscript{42}

The digital era technology has made the production of non-celluloid films less expensive.\textsuperscript{43} For example, a STV content using a VHS, compact disc (CD), or DVD in Nollywood can take a period between one week to two months for less than a two-hour movie.\textsuperscript{44} Film production on celluloid systems takes much longer and costs more to deliver compared to digitally produced movies.\textsuperscript{45} Nollywood had no formal distribution system for its films, but resorted to street vendors and the existing market distribution hubs of Onitsha, Alaba, and Idumota markets.\textsuperscript{46} These commercial centers were renowned markets for electronics and general merchandise.\textsuperscript{47} Without regulation of the distribution of Nollywood films, it was easy for filmmakers and non-filmmakers to seize the opportunity and create an informal distribution network.\textsuperscript{48}

B. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF A CREATIVE SPACE

Digital technologies democratized the cinematic creative and productive space with its attendant changes to laws.\textsuperscript{49} Filmmakers did not require big budgets or expensive sophisticated equipment to make movies anymore.\textsuperscript{50} The pre-existing Nigerian film industry processes and practices followed the traditional studio formalized production systems.\textsuperscript{51} Few filmmakers and
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Nigerian filmmakers to use digital era production systems and techniques coupled with the revival of film showings in multiplexes and cinema theatres makes up the ‘New Nollywood’.\(^{60}\)

The phrase ‘New Nollywood’ distinguishes the creative texture and business model of the Nigerian indigenous film industry that evolved in the early 1990s (the classic Nollywood) and the production systems that began in the latter half of 2000.\(^{61}\) In the COVID-19 pandemic era, Nollywood filmmakers were able to stay afloat during the restrictions associated with the pandemic by relying on income streams from the digital distribution of their content.\(^{62}\) Digital technology enhanced the home entertainment experience during the lockdown and other restrictions put in place to safeguard public health.\(^{63}\)

C. PART TWO: DISRUPTIVE AND CREATIVE JURISPRUDENCE

a) Nollywood and Digital Copyright

Legal scholars introduced the concept of ‘digital copyright’ at the beginning of this millennium to emphasize the recognition of the interface of digital technology and copyright laws in the protection of creative rights.\(^{64}\) The consequence of the Internet Treaties of the mid 1990s initiated by WIPO, was the
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\(^{53}\) Ibid.

\(^{54}\) Ibid at 141 (Amadi the first Igbo language film was produced in 1975; It is a story of a man who could not cope with city life in Lagos. He had to move back to his village to restart his life. While in the village he used the skills learnt in the city to develop an agricultural entrepreneurial business).


\(^{56}\) Ryan (n 51).

\(^{57}\) Ibid.


\(^{59}\) Jedlowski (n 30) at 37-38 (In 2006, Jeta Amata, was one of the early Nigerian filmmakers to use digital era production systems and techniques


\(^{63}\) The Economist (n 63).

global recognition of new copyright laws that recognized protecting creativity with technological means.65 The WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT), WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) and other Internet Treaties were outcomes of the digital era jurisprudence.66 The digital regimes of the Internet era included the right to protect one’s copyright with technical protection measures.67 It also included regimes like the rights of making available and publicly communicating protected works, Takedown, Putback and moderating rights for works, Internet Service Providers’ rights, safe harbor protection and copyright management organizations’ (CMO) enhanced rights to protect members’ work.68

As an extension of the Internet Treaties, further changes to the copyright regimes included the Beijing Treaty on Audio-visual Performance (Beijing Treaty) and the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled (Marrakesh Treaty).69 The Beijing Treaty is the most relevant regime for the theme of this paper being the laws that would directly affect the audio-visual creativity of the Nollywood industry.

The Nollywood industry has experienced three phases of technological disruption that significantly influenced its mode of production.70 The first phase was the digital duplication of visual content, which created a movie industry entirely on VHS, CD-ROM, VCD, and later DVD.71 Kenneth Nnebe’s ‘Living in Bondage’ film is a product of the first phase of technological disruption with his then novel idea of using empty VHS cassettes he imported from Japan for duplicating his film and marketing them in that format.72

The second phase was the User Generated Content (UGC) phase where third parties either created original contents or derivatively created contents from pre-existing original works.73 Social media like YouTube distributes most of these UGC. The third phase of technology disruption is the practice of uploading and streaming Nollywood films on the Internet.74 For example, YouTube, IROKOtv, Netflix and other VOD platforms enable uploading of copyrighted video films.75 Most of the time, these social media platforms are channels for uploading unauthorized films.76 Such new distribution methods for Nollywood films implicate a creator’s copyright and other IP rights.77

Innovators on new platforms like the Internet and software-driven sites began to rely on new legal regimes to protect their creative content both online and offline.78 The Nigerian legal systems have not yet recognized regimes like licenses, torts and contracts. The Nigerian copyright law and policies, especially in the distribution

68 ibid.
72 Esonwanne (n 31).
of audio-visual content, lags behind technology. However, in 2015, the Nigerian Copyright Commission (NCC) began the process of amending its copyright laws to include the digital means of film production. The NCC proposed law covered creative rights associated with emerging new technologies. In the global IP space, WIPO and other international creatives are working to adapt cinematographic industries to effective legal and policy outcomes of the digital era.

b) The Beijing Treaty Regime and the Nigerian Film Industry

The Beijing Treaty grants a Nollywood actor the economic rights of reproduction, distribution, rent and making available her work. Nollywood actors invariably would have the right to authorize the fixation and communication of their performances on an audio-visual format and on the Internet. The Treaty grants contracting State parties the option of stipulating in their national laws that actors may exchange the right of authorization for equitable entitlements. The equitable entitlements are for the direct or indirect use of their works in audio-visual format made available to the public. The Beijing Treaty jurisprudence may democratize creative right ownership of performers and actors the same way digital era technologies did for cinematic productions.

Contracting Parties may also stipulate in their national laws that once an actor consents to the audio-visual fixation of a performance, the exclusive rights of authorization transfers to the producer of the film. This right of transfer would not deny the actor any right to royalty or equitable remuneration in the performance. For Nollywood actors to enjoy the benefits of the equitable remuneration provision of the Beijing Treaty, Nigeria must domesticate it in its laws. Comparatively, the US’ protection of performances under the Beijing Treaty has raised questions about the legality of granting copyright protection to audio-visual performers. The Beijing Treaty has granted performers and actors codified moral and economic rights with a global scope.

Some US legal scholars claim that the Beijing Treaty would introduce moral rights concepts into the US through a back door and affect the public domain exception for copyright works. These scholars have raised concerns about the broad ramifications of the Beijing Treaty provisions as having a chilling effect on fair use of copyrighted works. They assert that performers
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82 Beijing Treaty, Article 12(3) (‘(1) A Contracting Party may provide in its national laws or individual, collective or other agreements may provide the performer with the right to receive royalties or equitable remuneration for any use of the performance, as provided in this Treaty including as regards Articles 10 and 11’); Beijing Treaty, Articles 7-11 (setting out exclusive rights of authorization for performers, exclusive rights of making available fixed performances and exclusive rights to establish remuneration for secondary uses of fixed audio-visual performances); WIPO, ‘The Beijing Treaty’ <https://www.wipo.int/beijing_treaty/en/> accessed 18 April 2021 (emphasis the economic and moral rights of performers like actors in the digital era).
83 Beijing Treaty, Article 12 (‘(1) A Contracting Party may provide in its national law that once a performer has consented to fixation of his or her performance in an audio-visual fixation, the exclusive rights of authorization provided for in Articles 7 to 11 of this Treaty shall be owned or exercised by or transferred to the producer of such audio-visual fixation subject to any contract to the contrary between the performer and the producer of the audio-visual fixation as determined by the national law.’); Copyright Act (Laws of the Federation of Nigeria) (2004), Cap. 28 § 10(4) (‘in the case of a cinematograph film or sound recording the author shall be obliged to conclude, prior to making of the work, contracts in writing with all those whose works are to be used in the making of the work’).
84 Beijing Treaty (n 83 and 84).
85 ibid.
86 ibid.
87 ibid.
89 WIPO (n 82).
90 Travis (n 89) at 61-67.
91 Rossini (n 89).
may abuse the exclusive powers granted by the Treaty to prevent others from benefiting from their works even when its use is within fair use.\textsuperscript{92} However, this paper avers that Member States may use the legal exceptions of fair use or fair dealing within its national legislations to check a performer’s overbearing use of her exclusive rights (performer’s rights abuse).\textsuperscript{93} For example, in Nigeria the proposed Copyright Amendment Bill has certain exceptions or exemption provisions that may allay the fears of industry stakeholders on performer’s rights abuse.\textsuperscript{94}

c) Amending the Laws Regulating Nollywood

The digital era cinematic production systems have significantly shifted copyright ownership and authorship holdings from its nuclear control to a diverse holding system.\textsuperscript{95} In response to the changing legal regimes of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century digital era, the NCC completed the Nigerian Copyright Act amendment project in 2015.\textsuperscript{96} The NCC submitted the proposed law to the Federal Government of Nigeria for further legislative and executive processes needed to give Nigeria a new copyright law that fulfils the exigencies of the digital era productive methods.\textsuperscript{97} Unfortunately, the process of amending the Nigerian copyright law is suffering delay, without official reasons from the Nigerian regulatory authorities.

d) Defining Nollywood Actor’s Copyright

The current Nigerian Copyright Law and the proposed amendment does not explicitly define a movie actor’s copyright. However, the current Copyright Law and the proposed amendments have given direction on the scope of Nollywood filmmakers’ and actors’ copyright.\textsuperscript{98} Films, including audio-visual works like Nollywood creations are literary works.\textsuperscript{99} The current Nigerian Copyright Law assigns screenplay and the screenwriter with protection because this category of creation belongs to the traditional class of authors.\textsuperscript{100} The director of a film generally derives copyright protection from their artistry and creative application of skills.\textsuperscript{101} These directing skills and their application in the filmmaking process should be original.\textsuperscript{102} For example, originality may emerge from how a film director manoeuvres the angle of a camera and applies lighting techniques in making a movie, which would attract copyright protection.\textsuperscript{103} However, for producers of Nollywood films, copyright arises mostly from industry traditions, contractual arrangement and the existing Copyright Law.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{92} Travis (n 89) at 80-81.


\textsuperscript{94} The Copyright Act (Laws of the Federation of Nigeria) (2004), Cap. 28, §§ 6, 7, and 8, Second Schedule (Repeal & Re-enactment) Bill (2021) (SB. 688) (This Law is sponsored by Senator Tokunbo Abiru. It finally got its first Reading on 4 May 2021 and has now gone through the second legislative reading).


\textsuperscript{97} ibid.

\textsuperscript{98} Draft Copyright Bill (2015) § 55(2) (Nigeria) (stating, ‘In this part, – performers – includes actors, singers, musicians, dancers, and other persons who act, sing, deliver, declaim, play in, interpret, or otherwise perform literary or artistic works or expressions of folklore irrespective of whether the work was fixed or only fixed during performance’); The Copyright Act (Laws of the Federation of Nigeria) (LFN) (2004), Cap. 28 § 10(4) (‘in the case of a cinematograph film or sound recording the author shall be obliged to conclude, prior to making of the work, contracts in writing with all those whose works are to be used in the making of the work’ (meaning that the author, the one who makes, financial, logistic and fundamental investments and arrangements for the making of the film is mandatorily required to enter a written contract with all those creatives whose work, including performances, are to be used in the making of the film); The Copyright Act (LFN) (2004), §§ 26-28 (Nigeria).


\textsuperscript{102} Hughes (n 101); Dougherty (n 102).

\textsuperscript{103} Dougherty (n 102).

\textsuperscript{104} The Copyright Act (LFN) (2004), Cap. 28 § 10(1) (copyright conferred by sections 2 and 3 of this Act, shall vest initially in the author), § 51(f) (‘author’ in the case of a cinematograph film, means the person by whom the arrangement for making of the film were made, unless the parties to the making of the film provide otherwise by contract between
e) **Copyright Owner or Author? Which is which in Nollywood?**

The current Nigerian Copyright Law joins other common law jurisdictions like the US and Canada in emphasizing a single author as one creative genius and the central pillar of creativity.\(^{105}\) An author in the Nollywood industry would be ‘...the person by whom the arrangements for making of the film were made...’\(^{106}\) The ‘making-arrangement’ definition seems suited for the corporate or deep pocket financiers of cinematographic works.\(^{107}\)

Unfortunately, the definition of a film author under the current law is not helpful and inclusive of the audio-visual collaborative process. The first two sections of the law indicate the preference for an author as the foundation of creativity.\(^{108}\) These two sections use the word ‘author’ to refer to creators of copyright works.\(^{109}\) However, it grants ownership of copyright during assignment and licensing to the assignee or licensee.\(^{110}\) If the Nigerian law had intended a copyright author and owner to have the same meaning, the law should have expressly stipulated the need to seek license or authorization from the author of a film, as it had done all along in cases of written contracts.\(^{111}\) The Nigerian Copyright Law perhaps intended a copyright author and owner to possess the capacity of exercising non-exclusive rights despite its clear provisions in Section 6.\(^{112}\) The convoluted scenario of copyright authorship and ownership regime seems a case of poor legislative drafting which the impending amendment has attempted to cure.\(^{113}\)

f) **Copyright Author and Owner under the Impending Nigerian Copyright Law**

Section 24 of the Draft Copyright Bill (2015) vests copyright ownership initially in an author.\(^{114}\) The use of the word ‘initially’ connotes the transferable nature of copyright ownership.\(^{115}\) The drafting language of the Draft Copyright Bill uses the words ‘copyright owner’ and ‘author’ interchangeability.\(^{116}\) However, the same law has shown that one must first become a copyright author before ownership of the same.\(^{117}\) The Draft Copyright Bill has shown that you can be a copyright owner but not an author.\(^{118}\) The signalling phrase showing this distinction in the impending law states that:

> [...] an author or other owner.\(^{119}\)

The proposed amendment to the copyright law further attempts to differentiate the incidents of ownership, stating that owning a material that embodies a copyrighted work does not transfer or assign such copyright, nor does owning a copyright that is embedded in a material, confer ownership of the material.\(^{120}\)
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\(^{105}\) Ibid, § 24(1); Bond Emeruwa (n 104).

\(^{106}\) Ibid; Draft Copyright Bill (Nigeria) (2015), § 26(7) (8) (9) (‘(7) (‘[sic]...

\(^{107}\) The proposed amendment to the copyright law further attempts to differentiate the incidents of ownership, stating that owning a material that embodies a copyrighted work does not transfer or assign such copyright, nor does owning a copyright that is embedded in a material, confer ownership of the material.\(^{120}\)
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\(^{108}\) The Copyright Act (LFN) (2004), Cap. 28 §§ 6 & 15.

\(^{109}\) Draft Copyright Bill (Nigeria) (2015), §§ 4(1); 24(1).

\(^{110}\) The Copyright Act (n 105).

\(^{111}\) Ibid.

\(^{112}\) Ibid.

\(^{113}\) Ibid § 26(9) (‘Unless otherwise provided by agreement, an author or other owner of copyright who has transferred his copyright or granted a license for the exploitation of a work shall not be deemed to have transferred the right of ownership in the material object in which the work is embodied’).

\(^{114}\) Ibid.

\(^{115}\) Ibid.

\(^{116}\) Ibid § 26(9) (‘[sic] Owner of the material object in which a work is embodied shall not infer ownership of copyright in that work. (8) ...Where an owner of copyright transfers the right of ownership of the material object in which the work is embodied, he shall not be deemed to have transferred his
D. PART THREE: THE FORMAL NOLLYWOOD

In a filmmaking project, traditionally, creativity spreads across various stages of film production. Proprietary creation begins from the conceptualization of the film story to the screenplay stage of filmmaking and continues to the editing of the finished shoot. The allocation of the Nigerian copyright focuses on rewarding the source of funding a film project. Establishing Nollywood formal internal norms and culture could set standards for efficient creative practices.

i) Effectuating Institutions

Creating institutions in the Nollywood industry through idea-submissions, recognition of electronic contracts and metrics systems may reduce creative and legal conflicts. The Nollywood industry continues to rely on outdated and inadequate data, which does not impel development. A survey recently published in November 2020 concluded that ‘Nollywood film production generates between USD 500 million and USD 800 million annually. The industry directly employs 300,000 people and indirectly more than a million’ which repeats information already available in the public domain since 2013. The fact that the Nigerian film industry would be relying on these old metrics in a fast evolving economic sector, shows a significant deficit in a critical growth tool. The lack of current data on Nollywood creativity stalls planning and investment confidence in an industry that is still struggling to attract practical government support. It also defeats the process of collateralization of Nollywood creative rights as tangible assets for valuations.
In the Nigerian music industry, a CMO called the Musical Copyright Society of Nigeria (MCSN) has led the charge in aggregating creative data, controlling its member’s creative rights and royalties online.\textsuperscript{130} The MCSN’s GoCreate Apps for monitoring the distribution and publication to the public of musical works of its members within Nigeria indicates its adaptability to digital era tools.\textsuperscript{131} Perhaps, this technology will also create data for the music industry’s planning and production purposes. The Chairman of the Audio-visual Rights Society of Nigeria (AVRSN), the only recognized CMO for the Nigerian film industry, lamented recently in a presentation that the industry has limited capacity to capture royalties from the digital platforms.\textsuperscript{132} The AVRSN should tap into the digital era technological advantages, which is long overdue for an industry that is more than two decades old. The ubiquitous nature of downstream uses of streamed cinematic contents especially within cyberspace and other remote places make relying entirely on human monitoring an impossible task. Therefore, digital management assets eases royalty management and license enforcement.


\textsuperscript{131} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{133} Draft Copyright Bill (2015), §§ 44-54 (Nigeria) (stating as used in this section – RMI means information which identifies the work, the author of the work, the owner of any right in the work, or information about the terms and conditions of use of the work, and any numbers or codes that represent such information, when any of these items of information is attached to a copy of a work or appears in connection with the communication of a work to the public).

\textsuperscript{134} 17 USC § 1202 (US) (stating that ‘No person shall knowingly and with the intent to induce, enable, facilitate, or conceal infringement’ and defining CMI as used in this section, to mean any of the following information conveyed in connection with copies or phonorecords of a work or performances or displays of a work, including in digital form, except that such term does not include any personally identifying information about a user of a work or of a copy, phonorecord, performance, or display of a work: The title and other information identifying the work, including the information set forth on a notice of copyright; The name of, and other identifying information about, the author of a work; The name of, and other identifying information about, the copyright owner of the work, including the information set forth in a notice of copyright; With the exception of public performances of works by radio and television broadcast stations, the name of, and other identifying information about, a performer whose performance is fixed in a work other than an audio-visual work; With the exception of public performances of works by radio and television broadcast stations, in the case of an audio-visual work, the name of, and other identifying information about, a writer, performer, or director who is credited in the audio-visual work; Terms and conditions for use of the work; Identifying numbers or symbols referring to such information or links to such information; Such other information as the Register of Copyright may prescribe by regulation, except that the Register of Copyright may not require the provision of any information concerning the user of a copyrighted work).

\textsuperscript{135} Microsoft Corporation v Franke Associate Limited (2012) 3 NWLR (Pt. 1287) 301 (Nigeria); Copyright Act (LFN) (2004), Cap. 28 §§ 11(1)(a); 51(1)(f).


\textsuperscript{137} Draft Copyright Bill (2015), §§ 44-54 (Nigeria) (highlighting the digital copyright provisions, which stipulates how technological measures and law regulates creativity).


\textsuperscript{139} Draft Copyright Bill (2015), § 44(3)(a) (b) (‘As used in this section – (a) Circumvent a technological protection measure] means avoiding, bypassing, removing, deactivating, decrypting or otherwise impairing a digital era copyright regimes like Technical Protection Measures (TPM), Rights Management Information (RMI), and Copyright Management Information (CMI) which looks like the equivalent of the Nigerian RMI,\textsuperscript{133} would be available to Nollywood if the Copyright Bill of 2015 becomes law.\textsuperscript{134} The current Nigerian Copyright Law has no provisions for digital copyright legal issues except the recognition of computer programs as literary works.\textsuperscript{135} Computer software and programs form the foundation of the digital era creations in the film and the entertainment industry at large.\textsuperscript{136} The Draft Copyright Bill recognizes the significance of the intersection of digital technology and copyright management.\textsuperscript{137} Some of the legally acceptable technical protection measures in the digital content spaces are geolocks, checkers (by Google) and passwords as keys for access to content.\textsuperscript{138} These TPMs are software or programs, which copyright protects as long as they ‘… prevents, restricts, or otherwise limits access to the work.’\textsuperscript{139}
iii) Moderating Copyright with Takedowns and Putbacks

In the Draft Copyright Bill, one of the vital tools now available to the Nollywood copyright owner is the ability to moderate the online performance and display of her films. The law regulates the Takedown of unauthorized films on any digital platform. However, the fair use or fair dealing defence under the Draft Copyright Bill triggers a ‘Putback’ of any film taken down. The NCC on its own could cause the takedown of offending or infringing films on a digital platform. Worrisome is the NCC’s unilateral power to block an online user accused of uploading infringing content access to an Internet site without due process. This uncheck power of the NCC ought to be subjected to judicial review before becoming effective. The Putback provisions moderates the excesses that may occur on the part of copyright owners in their attempt to abuse their rights. This paper recommends the application of the fair use doctrine in adjudicating takedown notices before the Nigerian courts and the NCC. The impending law frowns consequentially at online copyright infringement as shown in the severe penalty applied to repeat offenders whose suspension from Internet activities is ‘[…] at least one month.’

iv) Standardizing Idea-Submissions

Legal literature has inundated the IP field with the theory that copyright does not protect ideas but expressions of ideas. In Nollywood like most cinematographic industries, films start with someone conceiving an idea of a story for interpretative performance on the big screen or digital platform, an idea purveyor. The owner of this idea either puts it down in the form of a screenplay or conveys this idea to an established professional. IP scholars refer to this phase of film creation as the ‘idea-submission’ phase. Copyright seems the improper regime to protect an idea-purveyor. However, like in the US, contract law looks like the proper regime to resolve disputes arising from these transactions. Some screenwriters may not be the owners of the idea of the film which becomes a screenplay. The idea-submission process often creates litigation, especially where business culture and norms are non-existent. In Nigeria, copyright does not pre-empt contract law even where creative regimes are operational. The federal
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and state law dichotomy in the Nigerian legal system, unlike the U.S.\textsuperscript{157}

The Draft Copyright Bill has recognized the concept of implied contract in resolving copyright ownership issues.\textsuperscript{158} Although the Nigerian Copyright Law recognizes the contractual intent of parties generally in assigning and licensing copyright cases, the court should adopt the general doctrine of contract formation in resolving idea-submission disputes when it arises in Nollywood.\textsuperscript{159} The central issues should be the breach of contract or breach of implied contract of passing off a film idea.\textsuperscript{160} Additionally, trade secrets, non-disclosure agreements (NDA), and unfair competition laws are regimes that Nollywood could deploy especially at the conceptual stages of literary and artistic works.

Apart from the adverse publicity created by a pre- and post-production litigious tensions for the Nollywood investment environment, it could inflate the cost of film production.\textsuperscript{161} In addition to the high cost of hiring professionals to conduct due diligence of creative authorships in a film, aspiring collaborators may demand oppressive financial indemnities and copyright clearance schemes before taking on creative projects from budding Nigerian film creatives. Most budding Nollywood filmmakers lack the knowledge of digital era jurisprudence. On the other hand, the wealthy film producers or investors have the advantages of retaining professional advisors who will most often give them a head-start in pre-production negotiations. For example, Netflix would have access to the best lawyers, business analysts and advisors because they can pay for their services during license-contract negotiations. This paper does not conclude that an efficient idea-submission system in Nollywood will eradicate copyright infringement disputes and lawsuits. However, having a standardized and robust creative system at this developmental stage would establish certain levels of business certainty. Certainty in business norms commands investors’ confidence, especially those seeking good returns on their investment rather than engaging in distractions like lawsuits.\textsuperscript{162} Therefore, an industry promoted idea-submission system will set norms that will guide all parties.

b) Nigerian Film Industry Online Piracy Issues

We have earlier discussed in Part two how New Nollywood distribution systems, which includes streaming and uploading of contents by VODs or independent filmmakers on the Internet, fundamentally changed the Nigerian movie consumption experience. Technological advancement particularly in this millennium has created an intriguing online film piracy problem.\textsuperscript{163} Existing Nigerian Copyright Law is incapable of redressing the evolving online film piracy systems.\textsuperscript{164} Nollywood already had an acute film piracy problem before the advent of streaming technology.\textsuperscript{165} The borderless nature of cyberspace and increased anonymity for rapid illicit distribution of audiovisual contents confounded creative right enforcement.

\textsuperscript{157} The Copyright Act (LFN) (2004), Cap. 28 §§ 10 & 11.
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The current Nigerian Copyright Law stipulates the use of traditional remedies to restrain film pirates, which includes classic forms of injunctions like Mareva, Anton pillar, interim, perpetual and ex parte injunctions.\textsuperscript{166} Unfortunately, these forms of reliefs fail to cater to the fast pace of content infringements on platforms with streaming capacities.\textsuperscript{167} The copyright owner would have suffered irreparable damages beyond restoration for injury in situations that a film pirate streamed her content illegally.\textsuperscript{168} The multiplier nature of digital contents and the economic advantages that arise immediately from their consumption means that the actual copyright owner would lose humongous financial returns in the work.\textsuperscript{169} To redress this problem, in France, sports broadcast copyright owners use a special injunction known as ‘dynamic injunction’ to block the streaming of illegal sports broadcasts in real time.\textsuperscript{170} Dynamic injunction is platform specific injunction that stops the broadcasting of sport activities on the motion of the copyright owner without recourse to traditional eligibility rule of ex parte injunctions.\textsuperscript{171}

The French law recently recognized the innovative nature of streaming technology and grants a copyright owner this unique relief adapted to the digital nature of the infringement.\textsuperscript{172} Nollywood stakeholders should advocate for amending injunctive reliefs to suit exigencies of the online digital infringement. Nigeria currently has a robust application of criminal law to enforce copyright infringement.\textsuperscript{173} It may have to reinvigorate its criminal legal capacities to fight online piracy and prohibit illicit digital transmission of Nollywood copyrighted contents. Even the US Congress recently amended its copyright laws to enhance the prohibition of illicit digital transmission of copyrighted works with enhanced criminal prosecution.\textsuperscript{174}
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3. **CONCLUSIONS**

Nollywood is an industry that emerged as an economic reality but has metamorphosed into a global creative and impactful presence. Digital technology disrupted the methods and means of filmmaking particularly its distribution and quick turnaround processes in production. This disruption has national and international significance because copyright subject matter is highly transnational. The creative industries like film, music, traditional culture, audio-visual content creations and performances have adapted to the ecosystem evolving from the intervention of the digital era. Nigeria is in the process of updating its Copyright Law to recognize the emerging digital copyright and innovative legal rights. Although the Nigerian political legislative processes seem lethargic and lags behind, the NCC continues to spur the Nigerian creative stakeholders to keep the process afloat. In amending its laws, Nigeria has proposed to recognize new copyright regimes particularly in the neighbouring rights sector of performer’s rights, where there seems to be a possibility of the economic benefits of copyright may cater for actors in the film industry, unlike the current tradition where a single corporate executive producer or producer holds copyright to a film and most of the economic benefits inuring to a film project.

The disruptive nature of digital technology impacts the conceptualization of copyright regimes. In Nigeria, the impending law should clarify and simplify the concepts of copyright originality, ownership, and authorship. The law should clarify or discontinue the introduction of copyright registrations as evidence of authorship and ownership. The NCC is spearheading the introduction of copyright registration regime into Nigeria, which may muddy the judicial and practical enforcement of creativity.

The transformation of Nollywood from a pedestrian low budget industry to its status of global recognition involved creative and legal evolution powered by digital technology. Currently, Nigeria lacks laws that recognize the creative disruptive capacities of technology, digital copyright, contract and other regimes for protection of the film industry creativity. Nollywood stakeholders like the CMOs and film producers should rethink the current unfair revenue sharing arrangement through transactional dialogue. I have suggested elsewhere that Nollywood stakeholders must have a better understanding of the digital era transactional regimes especially as it concerns copyrighted contents online. A formalized creative environment for Nollywood with institutions capable of implementing best business practices will spur a sustainable growth path.

The Beijing Treaty makes a performer’s (Nollywood actors’) right a personal right that is inseparable from the performer. The international recognition of audio-visual performance right supports Nollywood’s growth objectives. It will translate in practical terms to increase revenue for the Nigerian film industry. Beijing Treaty has created personal economic rights for Nollywood actors and creatives. Nollywood perhaps will continue to produce more socially and economically upward mobile Nigerians. Socially, a new class of Nigerians, whose talents can be monetized and now gainfully employed with reward of authorial rights for creativity will join the upwardly mobile economic cadre of society. Digital era creative disruptions birthed Nollywood and most likely more genres will evolve from it in the entertainment industry.

---
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