Public consultation on the role of publishers in the copyright value chain and on the 'panorama exception'

General information about you

The views expressed in this public consultation document may not be interpreted as stating an official position of the European Commission. All definitions provided in this document are strictly for the purposes of this public consultation and are without prejudice to differing definitions the Commission may use under current or future EU law, including any revision of the definitions by the Commission concerning the same subject matters.

I'm responding as:

- An individual in my personal capacity
- A representative of an organisation/company/institution

*Please provide your first name:
Rebecca

*Please provide your last name:
Tushnet
Please indicate your preference for the publication of your response on the Commission’s website:

- Under the name given: I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication.
- Anonymously: I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication.
- Please keep my contribution confidential. (it will not be published, but will be used internally within the Commission)

(Please note that regardless the option chosen, your contribution may be subject to a request for access to documents under Regulation 1049/2001 on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents. In this case the request will be assessed against the conditions set out in the Regulation and in accordance with applicable data protection rules.)

*Please enter the name of your institution/organisation/business.

Organization for Transformative Works

What is your institution/organisation/business website, etc.?

transformativeworks.org
*What is the primary place of establishment of the entity you represent?

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Italy
- Ireland
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other

*If other please specify:

United States
* My institution/organisation/business operates in: *(Multiple selections possible)*

- [ ] Austria
- [ ] Belgium
- [ ] Bulgaria
- [ ] Croatia
- [ ] Cyprus
- [ ] Czech Republic
- [ ] Denmark
- [ ] Estonia
- [ ] Finland
- [ ] France
- [ ] Germany
- [ ] Greece
- [ ] Hungary
- [ ] Italy
- [ ] Ireland
- [ ] Latvia
- [ ] Lithuania
- [ ] Luxembourg
- [ ] Malta
- [ ] Netherlands
- [ ] Poland
- [ ] Portugal
- [ ] Romania
- [ ] Slovakia
- [ ] Slovenia
- [ ] Spain
- [ ] Sweden
- [ ] United Kingdom
- [x] Other

* If other, please specify

United States
Is your organisation registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission and the European Parliament?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate your organisation’s registration number in the Transparency Register.

215153212771-05

The role of publishers in the copyright value chain

In its Communication Towards a modern, more European copyright framework of 9 December 2015, the Commission has set the objective of achieving a well-functioning market place for copyright, which implies, in particular, “the possibility for right holders to license and be paid for the use of their content, including content distributed online.”[1]

Further to the Communication and the related stakeholders’ reactions, the Commission wants to gather views as to whether publishers of newspapers, magazines, books and scientific journals are facing problems in the digital environment as a result of the current copyright legal framework with regard notably to their ability to licence and be paid for online uses of their content. This subject was not specifically covered by other public consultations on copyright issues the Commission has carried out over the last years. In particular the Commission wants to consult all stakeholders as regards the impact that a possible change in EU law to grant publishers a new neighbouring right would have on them, on the whole publishing value chain, on consumers/citizens and creative industries. The Commission invites all stakeholders to back up their replies, whenever possible, with market data and other economic evidence. It also wants to gather views as to whether the need (or not) for intervention is different in the press publishing sector as compared to the book/scientific publishing sectors. In doing so, the Commission will ensure the coherence of any possible intervention with other EU policies and in particular its policy on open access to scientific publications.[3]

Selection

Do you wish to respond to the questionnaire “The role of publishers in the copyright value chain”?

- Yes (Please allow for a few moments while questions are loaded below)
- No
Neighbouring rights are rights similar to copyright but do not reward an authors’ original creation (a work). They reward either the performance of a work (e.g. by a musician, a singer, an actor) or an organisational or financial effort (for example by a producer) which may also include a participation in the creative process. EU law only grants neighbouring rights to performers, film producers, record producers and broadcasting organisations. Rights enjoyed by neighbouring rightholders under EU law generally include (except in specific cases) the rights of reproduction, distribution, and communication to the public/making available.


Category of respondents
*Please choose the category that applies to your organisation and sector.

- Member State
- Public authority
- Library/Cultural heritage institution (or representative thereof)
- Educational or research institution (or representative thereof)
- End user/consumer/citizen (or representative thereof)
- Researcher (or representative thereof)
- Professional photographer (or representative thereof)
- Writer (or representative thereof)
- Journalist (or representative thereof)
- Other author (or representative thereof)
- Collective management organisation (or representative thereof)
- Press publisher (or representative thereof)
- Book publisher (or representative thereof)
- Scientific publisher (or representative thereof)
- Film/audiovisual producer (or representative thereof)
- Broadcaster (or representative thereof)
- Phonogram producer (or representative thereof)
- Performer (or representative thereof)
- Advertising service provider (or representative thereof)
- Content aggregator (e.g. news aggregators, images banks or representative thereof)
- Search engine (or representative thereof)
- Social network (or representative thereof)
- Hosting service provider (or representative thereof)
- Other service provider (or representative thereof)
- Other

Questions

1. On which grounds do you obtain rights for the purposes of publishing your press or other print content and licensing it? *(Multiple selections possible)*

- [ ] transfer of rights from authors
- [x] licensing of rights from authors (exclusive or non-exclusive)
- [ ] self-standing right under national law (e.g. author of a collective work)
- [ ] rights over works created by an employee in the course of employment
- [ ] not relevant
- [x] other
2. Have you faced problems when licensing online uses of your press or other print content due to the fact that you were licensing or seeking to do so on the basis of rights transferred or licensed to you by authors?
   - yes, often
   - yes, occasionally
   - hardly ever
   - never
   - no opinion
   - not relevant

   If so, please explain what problems and provide examples indicating in particular the Member State, the uses you were licensing, the type of work and licensee.

3. Have you faced problems enforcing rights related to press or other print content online due to the fact that you were taking action or seeking to do so on the basis of rights transferred or licenced to you by authors?
   - yes, often
   - yes, occasionally
   - hardly ever
   - never
   - no opinion
   - not relevant

   If so, please explain what problems and provide examples indicating in particular the Member State, the type of use and the alleged infringement to your rights.
4. What would be the impact on publishers of the creation of a new neighbouring right in EU law (in particular on their ability to license and protect their content from infringements and to receive compensation for uses made under an exception)?

○ strong positive impact
○ modest positive impact
○ no impact
○ modest negative impact
○ strong negative impact
○ no opinion

Please explain

We fully agree with NewsNow that a neighboring right would increase uncertainty, deter discovery of new works, and decrease resources in the publishing sector overall:
http://www.newsnow.co.uk/eu-copyright-consultation-2016/position-statement.htm

5. Would the creation of a new neighbouring right covering publishers in all sectors have an impact on authors in the publishing sector such as journalists, writers, photographers, researchers (in particular on authors’ contractual relationship with publishers, remuneration and the compensation they may be receiving for uses made under an exception)?

○ strong positive impact
○ modest positive impact
○ no impact
○ modest negative impact
○ strong negative impact
○ no opinion

Please explain

As above, we fully agree with NewsNow that any such right would increase uncertainty, diminishing the value of any given article because the conditions under which it could be shared would be unclear, and the natural response would be to decrease compensation.
http://www.newsnow.co.uk/eu-copyright-consultation-2016/position-statement.htm
6. Would the creation of a neighbouring right limited to the press publishers have an impact on authors in the publishing sector (as above)?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

As above, we fully agree with NewsNow that any such limitation would worsen the problem of uncertainty as well as creating new unfairness.
http://www.newsnw.co.uk/eu-copyright-consultation-2016/position-statement.htm

7. Would the creation of a new neighbouring right covering publishers in all sectors have an impact on right holders other than authors in the publishing sector?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

See above.

8. Would the creation of a neighbouring right limited to the press publishers have an impact on rightholders other than authors in the publishing sector?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

See above.
9. Would the creation of a new neighbouring right covering publishers in all sectors have an impact on researchers and educational or research institutions?
- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

See above; the constrained resources of researchers and educational institutions, and the unpredictability of the new right, would lead risk-averse institutions to avoid ordinary and productive conduct.

10. Would the creation of a neighbouring right limited to press publishers have an impact on researchers and educational or research institutions?
- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

See above.

11. Would the creation of new neighbouring right covering publishers in all sectors have an impact on online service providers (in particular on their ability to use or to obtain a licence to use press or other print content)?
- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion
Please explain

See above: the inevitable problems of discrimination (both in terms of unfairness and in terms of the difficulty of figuring out which entities were subject to which rules) would vastly increase uncertainty and operating costs, leading OSPs to avoid the EU as much as possible.

12. Would the creation of such a neighbouring right limited to press publishers have an impact on online service providers (in particular on their ability to use or to obtain a licence to use press content)?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

See above.

13. Would the creation of new neighbouring right covering publishers in all sectors have an impact on consumers/end-users/EU citizens?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain

See above. Access and interconnection, allowing citizens to find out new information, would decrease, to their great detriment.

14. Would the creation of new neighbouring right limited to press publishers have an impact on consumers/end-users/EU citizens?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion
Please explain

See above.

15. In those cases where publishers have been granted rights over or compensation for specific types of online uses of their content (often referred to as “ancillary rights”) under Member States’ law, has there been any impact on you/your activity, and if so, what?

- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion

Please explain, indicating in particular the Member State.

The OTW does not believe that its activities or those of its users trigger any existing ancillary rights.

16. Is there any other issue that should be considered as regards the role of publishers in the copyright value chain and the need for and/or the impact of the possible creation of a neighbouring right for publishers in EU copyright law?

- Yes
- No

If so, please explain and whenever possible, please back up your replies with market data and other economic evidence.

The current experience with ancillary rights for publishers in Spain and Germany indicates that they are not beneficial for publishers, and serve instead to reduce access to information and discovery for the publishers themselves. See http://hipertextual.com/2014/12/medios-digitales-pierden-trafico-google-news-espana (Spanish reporting on reduction in traffic); http://www.aeepp.com/pdf/151204_Statement_on_Digital_Single_Market_FINAL.pdf (publisher statement on dangers of ancillary rights).

Use of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places (the 'panorama exception')
EU copyright law provides that Member States may lay down exceptions or limitations to copyright concerning the use of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places (the ‘panorama exception’) [1]. This exception has been implemented in most Member States within the margin of manoeuvre left to them by EU law.

In its Communication Towards a modern, more European copyright framework, the Commission has indicated that it is assessing options and will consider legislative proposals on EU copyright exceptions, among others in order to "clarify the current EU exception permitting the use of works that were made to be permanently located in the public space (the ‘panorama exception’), to take into account new dissemination channels."[2]

This subject was not specifically covered by other public consultations on copyright issues the Commission has carried out over the last years. Further to the Communication and the related stakeholder reactions, the Commission wants to seek views as to whether the current legislative framework on the “panorama” exception gives rise to specific problems in the context of the Digital Single Market. The Commission invites all stakeholders to back up their replies, whenever possible, with market data and other economic evidence.

* 

Selection

Do you wish to respond to this questionnaire "Use of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places (the 'panorama exception')?"

- Yes *(Please allow for a few moments while questions are loaded below)*
- No

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------


Category of respondents
Please choose the category that applies to your organisation and sector.

- Member State
- Public authority
- Owner or manager of works made to be located permanently in public places (or representative thereof)
- Library or Cultural heritage institution (or representative thereof)
- Educational or research institution (or representative thereof)
- End user/consumer/citizen (or representative thereof)
- Visual artist (e.g. painter, sculptor or representative thereof)
- Architect (or representative thereof)
- Professional photographer (or representative thereof)
- Other authors (or representative thereof)
- Collective management organisation (or representative thereof)
- Publisher (or representative thereof)
- Film/audiovisual producer (or representative thereof)
- Broadcaster (or representative thereof)
- Phonogram producer (or representative thereof)
- Performer (or representative thereof)
- Advertising service provider (or representative thereof)
- Content aggregator (e.g. news aggregators, images banks or representative thereof)
- Search engine (or representative thereof)
- Social network (or representative thereof)
- Hosting service provider (or representative thereof)
- Other service provider (or representative thereof)
- Other

Questions

1. When uploading your images of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places on the internet, have you faced problems related to the fact that such works were protected by copyright?
   - Yes, often
   - Yes, occasionally
   - Hardly ever
   - Never
   - No opinion
   - Not relevant
If so, please explain what problems and provide examples indicating in particular the Member State and the type of work concerned.

The OTW does not presently host images.

2. When providing online access to images of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places, have you faced problems related to the fact that such works were protected by copyright?

- Yes, often
- Yes, occasionally
- Hardly ever
- Never
- No opinion
- Not relevant

If so, please explain what problems and provide examples indicating in particular the Member State and the type of work concerned

The OTW does allow links to images, but because it is covered by the U.S. notice and takedown regime, and because it supports exceptions and limitations such as fair use/fair dealing, it has not encountered a valid complaint about uses of images of works in public places.

3. Have you been using images of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places, in the context of your business/activity, such as publications, audiovisual works or advertising?

- Yes, on the basis of a licence
- Yes, on the basis of an exception
- Never
- Not relevant

If so, please explain, indicating in particular the Member State and what business/activity, and provide examples.

The OTW does not pre-screen content; it is possible that users do include links to such works in their posts, and they have no reason to think that exceptions and limitations would not apply.
4. Do you license/offer licences for the use of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not relevant

If so, please provide information about your licensing agreements (Member State, licensees, type of uses covered, revenues generated, etc.).

5. What would be the impact on you/your activity of introducing an exception at the EU level covering non-commercial uses of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places?
   - strong positive impact
   - modest positive impact
   - no impact
   - modest negative impact
   - strong negative impact
   - no opinion

Please explain

An exception for non-commercial uses would be welcome, as long as the definition of non-commercial tracked ordinary citizens' understanding, and did not treat the commercial goals of the service provider, if any, as commercial for these purposes. If the citizen sharing the image lacks a commercial motivation, then her use should be treated as non-commercial. Just as it's irrelevant that the company that sold her a camera made money when her use of the resulting photo is personal and noncommercial, the commercial aspirations of other infrastructure components should not bear on the determination of commerciality.

6. What would be the impact on you/your activity introducing an exception at the EU level covering both commercial and non-commercial uses of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places?
   - strong positive impact
   - modest positive impact
   - no impact
   - modest negative impact
   - strong negative impact
   - no opinion
Please explain

A broader exception would avoid difficult problems of assessing commerciality, and accord with ordinary citizens' understanding of their freedom to depict the world around them. It would also recognize the ordinary function of such works, which is to be public, and allow entities such as Wikipedia to disseminate knowledge both in the EU and outside.

7. Is there any other issue that should be considered as regards the 'panorama exception' and the copyright framework applicable to the use of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be permanently located in public places?

○ Yes
○ No

If so, please explain and whenever possible, please back up your replies with market data and other economic evidence.

In many other circumstances, such as music, special characteristics of works or types of works are relevant. Freedom of panorama is similar: the types of works at issue are part of the fabric of life, and should be treated as such.

Submission of questionnaire

End of survey. Please submit your contribution below.

Useful links


Background Documents

Privacy Statement DE (/eusurvey/files/08c163a2-8983-4d3b-ae3e-21f69b5957cd)
Privacy Statement EN (/eusurvey/files/217d6300-2bbe-4a51-aba4-0371c246dc9d)
Privacy Statement FR (/eusurvey/files/43cedbae-8123-4596-94ce-b526019329e5)
Webtext DE (/eusurvey/files/3abc4c0f-c0e6-4ece-99a3-2bebba8c65d3)
Webtext FR (/eusurvey/files/df02a573-838f-45e7-912d-8231ee8cddb0)

Contact

CNECT-CONSULTATION-COPYRIGHT@ec.europa.eu