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.

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

* I'm responding as:

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

* Please provide your first name:

Nick

* Please provide your last name:

Dunmur
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 (It will not be published, but will be used internally within the Commission)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.

Association of Photographers

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

http://www.the-aop.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
* 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
- [x] United Kingdom
- [ ] Other

* Is your organisation registered in the [Transparency Register](https://transparencyregister.eu) of the European Commission and the European Parliament?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
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

[2] 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
- 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
- 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

Currently there does not seem to be any impediment in the ability of publishers to license and protect their content, so the creation of a new neighbouring right would only seem to dilute the value attributed to the primary rights holders, in particular, visual creators.

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

Authors already license their work to publishers under terms that allow publishers rights to do what they need to, in order to monetise that content appropriately. A new neighbouring right granted to publishers would create a tension between authors as defined in your question, and publishers, who would now have, effectively, greater control over the primary rights-holders' original material.
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 previously stated, existing licensing arrangements between the author and the publisher would cover the uses required. Press publishers are no different to web-publishers in this context.

7. Would the creation of a new neighbouring right covering publishers in all sectors have an impact on rights 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

Because a neighbouring right carries similar weight to copyright, the creation of any additional rights in the copyright value chain would create tension and competition between any existing rights-holders, whether they are authors or other than.

8. Would the creation of a neighbouring right limited to the press publishers have an impact on rights holders other than authors in the publishing sector?
- strong positive impact
- modest positive impact
- no impact
- modest negative impact
- strong negative impact
- no opinion
Press publishers manage the publication of their content under existing copyright frameworks, mainly through licensing but also through contractual arrangements. It is hard to see why the creation of a neighbouring right for press publishers would be in the interests of any rights-holders.

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

The more rights in place, the more rights need to be cleared for researchers and educational institutions, unless these rights would also fall under existing exceptions, however it is unclear from this consultation, what the Commission intends.

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

It is hard to make the case for differences between press publishers and other types of publisher - see answer to Q9.
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:
If the creation of new neighbouring rights means that online service providers have a simpler task of obtaining the necessary licences, then obviously the impact will be positive. If, however, the creation of additional rights, means more rights now need to be cleared, then the impact will be negative.

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:
As above: If the creation of new neighbouring rights means that online service providers have a simpler task of obtaining the necessary licences, then obviously the impact will be positive. If, however, the creation of additional rights, means more rights now need to be cleared, then the impact will be negative.

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

The creation of a new neighbouring right allows the potential for additional levels of control and rights management, which can only impact negatively upon the end-user.

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

As above: The creation of a new neighbouring right allows the potential for additional levels of control and rights management, which can only impact negatively upon the end-user.

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.

Invariably, creators' rights in the United Kingdom are distilled and eroded through the business chain, despite the copyright value chain theoretically being able to manage and remunerate appropriately, those creators, whose content and material is depended upon by others, such as publishers.

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
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.

Currently, in the United Kingdom, there exists an exception to copyright detailed under §62 of the CDPA 1988, which caters for and implements Article 5(3)h of the InfoSoc Directive. Q1 appears loaded in favour of replies from those member states where such exceptions (or permitted acts) already exist. The provisions set out in §62 of the CDPA 1988 work well and we see little reason to change the situation. The absence of UK case law would substantiate this point of view.

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

As previously stated, an exception already exists under United Kingdom law, §62 of the CDPA 1988, which caters for any copyright protection of works such as architecture and sculpture, made to be located in a public place.

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.

Answers provided from the perspective of the United Kingdom-based creator, not the end-user, and images created, featuring any works of architecture or sculpture, are made under the exception in UK law as previously detailed.
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.).

N/a.

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

This exception already exists under §62 of the CDPA 1988 UK law. However, the change from an optional to a mandatory exception is a different matter entirely and is seemingly outside the scope of this consultation, which is unfortunate.

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

This question is impossible to answer in the absence of a suitable definition of 'commercial' and 'non-commercial' use. Arguing for an exception for both commercial and non-commercial could make life easier for professional photographers, but only if solid definitions of 'commercial use' exist - historically, this has always been an area where legislators have failed to deliver. There are legitimate reasons why allowing for commercial advertising uses of such copyright-protected works would not necessarily be in the interests of creators and copyright-holders overall, but again, the absence of case law in the UK makes this question, like Q5 before, seem superfluous.

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.

The need for a substantive definition of 'commercial' and non-commercial'...Any attempt at legislating for mandatory exceptions, without addressing this point will result in greater, not less, confusion.

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-99a3-2beba8c65d3)
Webtext FR (/eusurvey/files/df02a573-838f-45e7-912d-8231ee8cdbc5)
Contact
CNECT-CONSULTATION-COPYRIGHT@ec.europa.eu