

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

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

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:

Ms Barbara Kalumenos
Director Public Affairs
Kalumenos@Stm-assoc.org
International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers

*Please provide your last name:

Kalumenos

*

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 (it will not be published, but will be used internally within the Commission)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

International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers
(STM)

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

STM is the leading global trade association for academic and professional publishers. It has over 120 members in 21 countries who each year collectively publish nearly 66% of all journal articles and tens of thousands of monographs and reference works. STM members include learned societies, university presses, private companies, new starts and established players. Website at: <http://www.stm-assoc.org/about-stm/about-the-association/>

*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
- United Kingdom
- Other

*

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.

98356852465-08

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

[1] [COM\(2015\)626 final](#).

[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.

[3] See Communication [COM\(2012\) 401](#), Towards better access to scientific information: Boosting the benefits of public investments in research, and Recommendation [C\(2012\) 4890](#) on access to and preservation of scientific information.

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

Please explain

Publishers generally receive a transfer of, or a licence for, their exclusive rights from authors via a contract, which sees the author receive remuneration in exchange for the right to undertake a permanent and continuous exploitation of the work.

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.

STM is an association and not in itself a rightsholder. However, we observe from our members that licensing does not pose problems. Licensing is in fact the solution, particularly where digital content and the single digital market are concerned. Problems may in rare cases arise where laws are unclear, including the scope of exceptions and limitations or where freedom of contract is unduly limited.

STM's position is that four distinct problems hamper the full development of a licensing market directly, and indirectly, and recognising a publisher's related right, (a term STM prefers to "neighbouring" or "ancillary" right, and henceforth referred to as a PRR) would, if adequately crafted, go a long way towards solving these present shortcomings rather elegantly:

- Consistently recognising and rewarding the unique value that lies in quality trusted periodicals and multi-author academic and educational publications; Publishers generate an authoritative "ensemble" of creative works and contributions. They do so by combining investment, identification of talent, responsibility, commitment to authors, personal passion and energy. This effort results in several layers of value that are concentrated and combined in a "published edition" that can be versioned for re-use in commercial content products. Today's published edition is much more than a work on a piece of paper; it is an actionable and often dynamic digital object that is worth disseminating, worth reading, worth citing, worth networking and worth preserving for generations to come.

- Problems of enforcement in case of mass infringements and claiming damages for mass infringements. A PRR would greatly reduce the burden that falls on publishers as rightholders and custodians of the published works to protect them from mass infringement.

- Problems of unfair competition where third-party aggregators try to source or build upon the considerable value added by publishers without reward or permissions. For online uses, online platforms use our members' protected content but claim they are hosting providers under Art 14 of the E-Commerce Directive, in order to evade negotiating and taking up licences. These platforms, in the absence of a valid licence agreement, have no authorization to make copyright-protected content available. We posit that a PRR could create greater legal certainty that will create a greater propensity and willingness to agree to the need for a licence by platforms and aggregators. The opportunity for platforms to ignore licensing offers and "hold out" in the face of reasonable licensing offers would diminish.

- Problems resulting from recent interpretations of the EU copyright framework that would deny the harm and prejudice publishers suffer from fairly extended uses taking place under exceptions and limitations. STM would argue that some of these exceptions are no longer compliant with the EU's international obligations if the harm publishers are exposed to is not mitigated by some form of compensation at EU or member state level. It follows that for STM, the determinant of success of a PRR must be assessed to the extent that it is a solution to the above four significant problems and shortcomings. The balance of STM's answers will illustrate the above points.

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.

In many copyright enforcement actions the most vulnerable aspect is the ability to prove standing and ownership, or that the plaintiff is the holder of exclusive rights in relation to not only a literary work, but an ensemble of literary and artistic works embedded in one edition or publication. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that many infringement actions involve mass infringements of a great number of different published works, and there is a need to prove standing in each. Frequently a defendant escapes an appropriate damages claim (apart from claims for injunctions) because the proof of ownership of copyright is prohibitively expensive and publishers have to select which published works are put forward to substantiate symbolic damages. The defendant(s) rarely dispute(s) using the publications, and find it more convenient to cast doubt on ownership of rights. With a publisher's related right, the proof of ownership of that related right would be much simpler and the deterrence factor of infringement of a civil law suit for injunction or damages would be more adequate and effective - some would argue first time in line with TRIPS requirements.

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

STM posits that a PRR would have a strong positive impact on publishers of periodicals, short works and “look-up” type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multi-media publications with embedded content. For trade/single author works, STM refers to the answers of the Federation of European Publishers. In this context, the PRR would for publishers of periodicals, in addition to the publisher’s investment, be recognized for:

- In multi-author works: publishers efforts to aggregate contributions of co-authors and other creative contributors as well as adding the publishers own enhancements through selection and organising of content, which may include introductions, conclusions, illustrations, explanations, revisions, comments, forewords, afterwords, pictorial illustrations, maps, charts, tables, editorial notes, appendices and indexes;
- For periodicals, short works, “look-up” type works and multi-media publications with embedded content: the publisher’s efforts to enhance and enrich the content, i.e. ensuring discoverability, indexing, referencing, static and dynamic links to related data, illustrations, navigation and auto-updating tools and alerts to newly published or re-edited information.

Finally, the publisher’s activities also comprise selecting an article to be part of the publisher’s wider imprimatur, organising the periodical or reference work where the author’s contribution appears, selecting of editors-in-chief and editorial teams with publishing and domain-specific knowledge, operating a platform, organising journals by subject, enabling searching across platforms, enabling download, storage and indexing, updating and dynamic referencing.

The author-publisher relationship for periodical publishers, as opposed to trade/single author publishers of fiction, non-fiction trade or monographs, is of a significantly shorter duration and/or intensity, in comparison. For periodical publishers, there are no subsequent contracts, option contracts and future negotiating possibilities to account for publishers’ initial investment in the author or project. To put it bluntly, a trade publisher builds not only a “list” of titles, but a “list of authors” and in many cases “builds” the published author’s persona. As a result, in the trade/single author publishing sector, often previously signed contract clauses are renegotiated in new agreements pertaining to revised/subsequent editions or second books which may account for a previous imbalance in investment input. The nature of the periodical publishing sector, as disseminators of high quality scientific discoveries, knowledge and findings, is not conducive of later negotiations with the same author, or author researcher team, and periodical publishers have mostly only one occasion to negotiate and agree terms with their authors.

Also, in the 21st Century, when publishers of STM materials act effectively as developers of content and producers of a wide variety of multimedia information products, the recognition of a PRR is overdue. The equal treatment with film producers and sound recording producers is entirely warranted. While cases such as Luksan, dealing with the transferability of claims for equitable compensation and remuneration by artist to film producers, produced adequate results - a share of 50%-50% of collective licensing fees in film and

audio-visual productions – the same Luksan and other more recent decisions have an inequitable consequence for publishers as they are excluded from all fair compensation even though they stand on the same rock as other investors in the creative information chain. The positive impact of a PRR would be secured investment and recognition, resulting in renewed investment which would have a significant positive impact on the creative sector. The symbolic act of conferring these rights cannot be over-emphasized. The practical effect of better protecting the value created by publishers will be considerable too, both in the field of licensing, enforcement and collection of equitable remuneration.

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

Firstly, the PRR originates in the hands of the publisher; the right exists without prejudice and without interfering or limiting the rights of authors and does not interfere with contractual relations, which remain subject to the laws protecting authors and subject to contractual negotiation.

While some may argue that the recognition of a PRR and publishers' claim to equitable compensation under exceptions would prejudice authors, we are convinced that this need not be the case. Moreover, we believe that publishers and authors, who are destined to work together, both benefit and, in fact, maximise the value of copyright if their interests are aligned. If publishers rely solely on an exclusive licence transfer from authors, the incentive to collaborate in the management of collective licensing schemes would diminish. Also, the licensing of complex works as a bundle would suffer if interests are not aligned.

Where publications pursue an open access business model, it is clear that the rights of the publishers acquired from the author and the PRR originating in the hands of the publisher will be licensed along the same principles to enable users freely to access and use the open access publications. Suggestions that a PRR would adversely influence Open Access are ill-founded and misleading. Where a publisher agrees with the author to issue an open access publication, the PRR would be licensed accordingly along the same principles, *mutatis mutandis*.

We posit that the likely impact on authors of a PRR would be positive. As an example, if publishers are awarded the necessary recognition by way of a PRR, it would alleviate difficulty in proving rights and standing in enforcement actions against infringing activity, and would result in better protection of author and publisher rights; it would ensure that the value chain with aggregators and intermediaries can be effectively negotiated to establish a level playing field; and it would secure publisher investment and thereby guarantee renewed investment in research projects, ensuring the widest possible dissemination and in enhancing and enriching research results, including discoverability, indexing, referencing, static and dynamic links to related data, illustrations, navigation and auto-updating tools and alerts to newly published or re-edited information. Finally, the positive impact of a PRR on publishers would positively spill over to authors and result in authors having more choice on where to publish. In essence, the author's right to choice, as granted in terms of Article 3(1) and 4 of the Infosoc Directive would be respected, protected and guaranteed

.

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

It would skew the incentive to invest in press publishing as opposed to publishing in longer-range literary and information products. Overall, the recognition of a press publisher right, perhaps to be defined as a periodical publisher right, might benefit, as mentioned above, at least those publishers who produce look-up type content that is often updated. We thus reiterate the above position that PRR should be legally recognized not only for press publishers, but also for publishers of periodicals, short works and “look-up” type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multi-media publications with embedded content. As for the impact of a PRR on authors in the publishing sector, we refer to the answer as provided above and regard the term ‘press publishers’ as meaning periodical publishers.

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

It would have no impact on other rightsholders and a positive impact on authors and illustrators who would find their ability to find a publisher willing to invest increased and their rights better protected. We reiterate that the PRR originates in the hands of the publisher; the right exists without prejudice and without interfering or limiting the rights of other rightsholders and does not interfere with contractual relations. The right is fully transferable by contract.

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

STM posits that a Publisher's Related Right (PRR) should be legally recognized not only for press publishers, but also for publishers of periodicals, short works and "look-up" type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multi-media publications with embedded content. As for the impact of a PRR on rightholders other than authors, we refer to the answer as provided above and regard the term 'press publishers' as meaning periodical publishers.

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

Research and Education are best served by innovation in new educational and research information products with those sectors in mind. Contrary to some voices that claim a spurious relationship between weaker copyright protection and Silicon Valley investors, the positive impact of making the market for educational and research products more attractive cannot be over-emphasised. The legally recognised creative input and secured investment of publishers would be beneficial to researchers and educational or research institutions as they would benefit from renewed publisher investment, publishers' continual effort in developing content, in exploring and implementing wider dissemination opportunities, as well as ensuring research quality by keeping the 'minutes of science' accurate, updated and legitimate as the stewards of publications.

Furthermore, publishers now also build, integrate, migrate, manage, monitor and constantly upgrade technical systems, platforms and online databases. It is this application of technology and content curation that enables the business that publishing has become; an online business focussed on communicating research and educational results, including through abstracts, summaries, recommendations, augmentations, search engine optimisation and various "post publication" services. In this sense, authors, researchers, educational or research institutions as well as consumers and end-users would benefit from the PRR as it would provide the necessary recognition, legal backing and security to publishers to proceed and invest in the unique contributions of publishers in the cycle of creating content.

We reiterate that where publications pursue an open access business model, it is clear that the rights of the publishers acquired from the author and the PRR originating in the hands of the publisher will be licensed along the same principles to enable users freely to access and use the open access publications. Suggestions that a PRR would get in the way of Open Access are ill-founded and misleading. Where a publisher agrees with the author to issue an open access publication, the PRR would be licensed accordingly along the same principles, mutatis mutandis.

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

STM posits that a Publisher's Related Right (PRR) should be legally recognized not only for press publishers, but also for publishers of periodicals, short works and "look-up" type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multi-media publications with embedded content. As for the impact of a PRR on research and educational or research institutions, we refer to the answer as provided above and regard the term 'press publishers' as meaning periodical publishers.

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

In many ways the recognition of a PRR would be a success to the extent that it can remedy some of the dysfunctionalities in an existing potential licensing market of intermediaries and platforms. Where a level playing field is established and the value of those who produce valuable content for dissemination is respected, a sustainable value chain may arise that would otherwise find it difficult to take root. Practically, the impact of a PRR would be to protect the publisher's investment by making enforcement against infringing activity easier and to ensure that the value chain with aggregators and intermediaries can be effectively negotiated to establish a level playing field. This would not have an impact on online service providers save for creating legal certainty and establishing a level playing field for both online service providers and content providers when it comes to enforcing rights as well as negotiating licensing terms.

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

STM posits that a Publisher's Related Right (PRR) should be legally recognized not only for press publishers, but also for publishers of periodicals, short works and "look-up" type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multi-media publications with embedded content. As for the impact of a PRR on research and educational or research institutions, we refer to the answer as provided above and regard the term 'press publishers' as meaning periodical publishers.

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

Consumers/end-users/EU citizens would benefit from a PRR as it would result in better enforcement and renewed investment in periodicals and the dissemination thereof. Better enforcement would facilitate online periodical legitimacy as a result of efficient action against piracy.

Furthermore, the legally recognised creative input and secured investment would be beneficial to consumers as they would benefit from renewed and possibly increased publisher investment in exploring and implementing wider dissemination opportunities. Specifically, publishers now also build, integrate, migrate, manage, monitor and constantly upgrade technical systems, platforms and online databases. It is this application of technology and content curation that enables the business that publishing has become; an online business focussed on communicating research and educational results, including through abstracts, summaries, recommendations, augmentations, search engine optimisation and various "post publication" services. Finally, legally recognized, secured publisher investment would facilitate ongoing efforts and investment to enable searching across platforms, downloading, storage and indexing, updating and dynamic referencing, all of which would benefit consumers.

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

STM posits that a Publisher's Related Right (PRR) should be legally recognized not only for press publishers, but also for publishers of periodicals, short works and "look-up" type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multimedia publications with embedded content. As for the likely impact on consumers/end-users/EU citizens, STM refers to the answer above and regard the term 'press publishers' as meaning periodical publishers.

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.

STM as an association of Scientific, Technical and Medical publishers is not in a position to account for specific incidences of impact of ancillary rights on publisher activity.

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.

STM favours the recognition of a distinct Publishers' Related Right and a clarification of the rights publishers may rely on regarding the works they publish to receive fair compensation under legitimate exceptions and limitations, where denial of fair compensation would render the exceptions and limitations harmful, imbalanced and unjust.

Therefore:

- STM posits that a Publishers Related Right (PRR) should be legally recognized for publishers of periodicals, short works and "look-up" type works such as dictionaries, reference works, as well as for multi-author works and for multi-media publications with embedded content. Thus, STM supports the position of press publishers in favour of a broad exclusive publisher's right (see: <http://www.publishersright.eu/>); and
- STM seeks clarification and confirmation that publishers of all publications - including single author and monograph books - are rightholders and able to receive a share of statutory licensing fees jointly with their authors by virtue of the rights as transferred or licenced from authors. In this regard, STM supports the position as posited by the Federation of European Publishers (FEP).

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

[1] Article 5(3)(h) of [Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society](#).

[2] [COM\(2015\) 626 final](#).

Submission of questionnaire

End of survey. Please submit your contribution below.

Useful links

[Webtext EN \(https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/news-redirect/29674\)](https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/news-redirect/29674)

Background Documents

[Privacy Statement DE \(/eusurvey/files/08c163a2-8983-4d3b-ae3e-21f69b5957cd\)](/eusurvey/files/08c163a2-8983-4d3b-ae3e-21f69b5957cd)

[Privacy Statement EN \(/eusurvey/files/217d6300-2bbe-4a51-aba4-0371c246dc9d\)](/eusurvey/files/217d6300-2bbe-4a51-aba4-0371c246dc9d)

[Privacy Statement FR \(/eusurvey/files/43cedbae-8123-4596-94ce-b526019329e5\)](/eusurvey/files/43cedbae-8123-4596-94ce-b526019329e5)

[Webtext DE \(/eusurvey/files/3abc4c0f-c0e6-4ece-99a3-2bebba8c65d3\)](/eusurvey/files/3abc4c0f-c0e6-4ece-99a3-2bebba8c65d3)

[Webtext FR \(/eusurvey/files/df02a573-838f-45e7-912d-8231ee8cdbcd\)](/eusurvey/files/df02a573-838f-45e7-912d-8231ee8cdbcd)

Contact

CNECT-CONSULTATION-COPYRIGHT@ec.europa.eu