

Rights Clearance for Online Music

Legal and Practical Problems from the Perspective
of a Content Provider and
Alternative Models

Prof. Dr. Andreas Wiebe (Editor)

Authors:

Dr. Leonhard Reis

Dr. Martin Schaefer

Sophie Soubelet-Caroit

Prof. Dr. Gerald Spindler

Prof. Dr. Elizabeth Traple

Prof. Dr. Guido Westkamp

Prof. Dr. Andreas Wiebe

Vienna/Austria 2014

Medien und Recht Publishing

www.medien-recht.com

Preface

The internet has taken the world by storm. It changed the habits of consumers in many areas fundamentally. However, the development of the legal framework can hardly keep pace, hence thwarting the roll-out of new, innovative and customer-oriented business models. This is particularly true for the field of copyright regulation.

In order to highlight the extent of the challenges the companies are facing – both in terms of time as well as money – and to identify possible solutions, ISPA in 2012 assigned this study to a group of legal experts from different European countries. Its goal is to analyze the legal environment as well as the obstacles a content provider is confronted with when offering an on-demand streaming service for music in several EU countries simultaneously. The very diverse legal provisions in each member state together with a lack of transparency make it even more difficult to comply with the complex system of copyright regulations for those who want to provide online services.

ISPA would like to thank the experts who have elaborated the reports on the economic and legal environments in selected European countries, as well as Prof. Dr. Wiebe, who put the national reports together and combined them with the analysis of current EU regulatory developments. Special thanks go to the publishing house “Medien und Recht” for making this study available to a broader audience.

Vienna, november 2014

ISPA Internet Service Providers Austria

Table of contents

Part A: Analysis of current situation	1
I. Introduction: problem and methodology	1
II. Business framework: The market(s) for online music	3
III. Legal framework	5
1. General framework by country	5
a) Germany	5
aa) General Licensing Requirements	5
bb) Costs of establishment	6
b) Austria	6
aa) General licensing requirements	6
bb) Costs of establishment	8
c) Poland	9
aa) General licensing requirements	9
bb) Costs of establishment	9
d) United Kingdom	10
aa) General licensing requirements	10
bb) Costs of establishment	11
e) France	11
aa) General licensing requirements	11
bb) Costs of establishment	13
f) Comparative Analysis	13
2. Copyright	14
a) Germany	14
b) Austria	16
c) Poland	17
d) UK	18
e) France	20
f) Comparative Analysis	21
3. Situation of ISP for user-generated content by country	22
a) Germany	23
b) Austria	24
c) Poland	24
d) UK	25
e) France	26
f) Comparative Analysis	27
4. Comparative analysis summary – impediments to using digital works	28

IV. Rights' management.....	30
1. Outset: multiple rights, multiple rightholders.....	30
2. Administration of authors', publishers', and performers' rights/licensing models.....	31
3. European efforts to achieve multi-territorial licensing and the results.....	32
4. Practices by country.....	35
a) Germany.....	35
aa) CMO's and rights administered.....	35
bb) Repertoires.....	37
cc) Reciprocal Agreements.....	37
dd) Other rightholders to be addressed.....	38
ee) Defining or limiting criteria applied by licensors.....	39
ff) Obligation to enter into contract.....	40
gg) Sample case "DJ Mix".....	41
b) Austria.....	42
aa) CMO's and rights administered.....	42
bb) Repertoires.....	43
cc) Other rightholders to be addressed.....	45
dd) Sample case "DJ Mix".....	45
c) Poland.....	46
aa) CMO's and repertoires.....	46
bb) Reciprocal Agreements.....	47
cc) Other rightholders to be addressed.....	50
dd) Defining or limiting criteria applied by licensors.....	51
ee) Obligation to enter into contract.....	51
ff) Sample Case "DJ Mix".....	52
d) UK.....	52
aa) CMO's and repertoires.....	52
bb) Reciprocal Agreements.....	53
cc) Other rightholders to be addressed.....	53
dd) Defining or limiting criteria applied by licensors.....	54
ee) Obligation to enter into contract.....	55
ff) Sample Case "DJ Mix".....	55
e) France.....	56
aa) CMO's and rights administered.....	56
bb) Repertoires.....	59
cc) Reciprocal Agreements.....	59
dd) Other rightholders to be addressed.....	59
ee) Defining or limiting criteria applied by licensors.....	59

ff) Sample case “DJ Mix”	60
5. Comparative analysis and summary	61
V. The costs of licensing	67
1. Methodological framework: Transaction costs	67
a) General	67
b) Music online market	68
2. Country-specific analysis of licensing costs	72
a) Germany	72
aa) Transaction costs	72
bb) Licensing fees	75
cc) Time frame and costs of obtaining licenses	77
b) Austria	78
aa) Transaction costs	78
bb) Licensing fees	78
cc) Time Frame and costs of obtaining licenses	79
c) Poland	80
aa) Transaction costs	80
bb) Licensing fees	82
cc) Time Frame and costs of obtaining licenses	84
d) UK	84
aa) Transaction costs	84
bb) Licensing fees	85
cc) Time Frame and costs of obtaining licenses	86
e) France	88
aa) Transaction costs	88
bb) Licensing fees	89
cc) Time frame and costs of obtaining licenses	89
3. Comparative analysis of costs and factors	90
a) Transactions costs	90
aa) Information about repertoire for service provider	90
bb) Information needed for payment to rightholders	90
cc) Audits	91
dd) End-user agreements	91
b) Licensing fees	91
c) Time frame and costs of obtaining licenses	91
4. Conclusions	94
Part B: Discussion of alternative models	97
I. Alternative Models for Licensing and Assignment of Rights	97
1. Current situation and crucial deficits	97

Table of contents

2. Alternative models.....	99
a) Leave it to the markets?	99
b) Reduction of identification and bargaining costs:	
ID-models.....	101
aa) Establishing ID-Systems	101
bb) Establishing Databases	102
cc) Establishing interoperable standards for identifying rights and right holders	103
c) Overcoming the fragmentation problem.....	103
aa) Rights fragmentation – vertical dimension.....	104
bb) Rights fragmentation – horizontal dimension.....	107
cc) Territorial fragmentation	109
d) Lowering bargaining costs.....	117
3. Conclusion	118
Part C: Conclusions and Recommendations	121
I. Conclusions	121
1. Main Problems	121
2. Possible Solutions.....	122
a) Information problem	122
b) Fragmentation problem.....	123
aa) Rights fragmentation – vertical.....	123
bb) Rights fragmentation – horizontal.....	124
cc) Territorial fragmentation	124
c) Innovative Services	126
3. Summary	126
II. Recommendations.....	128
Executive Summary.....	131
I. Analysis.....	131
1. Problem identification and objective	131
2. Comparative Analysis.....	131
a) General licensing requirements.....	131
b) Type of service	132
c) Different levels of fragmentation	132
d) Costs of identification, negotiations and licensing of rights	133
II. Solutions	135
1. Installation of databases and standardisation.....	135
2. Reduction of fragmentation.....	136

a) Vertical fragmentation.....	136
b) Horizontal fragmentation.....	137
c) Territorial fragmentation.....	138
3. Dual Licensing.....	140
4. Innovative Services	140
Zusammenfassung	143
I. Analyse	143
1. Problem und Zielsetzung	143
2. Rechtsvergleichende Analyse	144
a) Allgemeine Lizenzpflichten	144
b) Art des Musikdienstes	144
c) Verschiedene Ebenen der Fragmentierung.....	145
d) Kosten für Identifizierung, Verhandlungen und Lizenzierung von Rechten	147
II. Lösungsmöglichkeiten.....	150
1. Einrichtung von Datenbanken und Standardisierung	151
2. Reduzierung der Fragmentierung.....	151
a) Vertikale Fragmentierung	151
b) Horizontale Fragmentierung	153
c) Territoriale Fragmentierung.....	153
3. Dual Licensing.....	156
4. Innovative Dienste.....	156
Appendix	
Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the council of 26 February 2014 on collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market (excerpt).....	159

Authors

Part A: Prof. Dr. Andreas Wiebe, based on country reports:

Austria – Dr. Leonhard Reis

Germany – Dr. Martin Schaefer

France – Sophie Soubelet-Caroit

Poland – Prof. Dr. Elizabeth Traple

United Kingdom – Prof. Dr. Guido Westkamp

Part B: Prof. Dr. Gerald Spindler

Part C: Prof. Dr. Andreas Wiebe

Exekutive Summary/Zusammenfassung: Prof. Dr. Andreas Wiebe