

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF IP AND GROWTH

Blog

↘ [Main Site](#)

Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth May 18th, 2011

Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth



A busy day. Arrival of a car sent by the BBC at 6:15am, to take me to White City for a round of radio interviews brought back fond memories of my days working there in the late 1980s.

Interviews on the [BBC Radio 4 Today Show](#), [Five Live](#) and the [Media Show](#) all seemed to go OK. Making the connection between copyright and the wider economy is the hardest thing to get across.

Reaction to the review is splattered across the blogosphere as well as other media. Most of those talking seem ready to give the review's main ideas a fair wind, whilst reserving positions on important detail. I was pleased to see such strong support from the [Wellcome Trust](#), who know all about the way that copyright is obstructing the work of scientific researchers.

Getting momentum behind the proposed digital copyright exchange will be crucial. Thanks to [Pearson](#) – an early volunteer to roll up their sleeves.

The ministers' detailed response to the review should emerge in about one month's time. Comments so far, in public and in private, are positive and encouraging, from the western seaboard of [DCMS](#) to the eastern seaboard of [BIS](#) and the [Treasury](#).

My own role now is to catch up on my work at [Cardiff University](#). But I will be keeping my ear tuned to the IP frequency.

Ian Hargreaves

IP Review Team

Follow us on Twitter! – [@IP_Review_UK](#)

Download the Independent Review of IP and Growth [here](#)

Tags: [BBC](#), [bis](#), [blog](#), [blogging](#), [business](#), [call for evidence](#), [cardiff university](#), [comments](#), [copyright](#), [dcms](#), [delivered](#), [digital copyright exchange](#), [download](#), [evidence](#), [government](#), [growth](#), [ian hargreaves](#), [independent review](#), [innovation](#), [intellectual property](#), [intellectual property office](#), [interviews](#), [ip](#), [ip review](#), [ip system](#), [ipo](#), [panel](#), [patent](#), [pearson](#), [publication](#), [radio](#), [review](#), [today show](#), [trade mark](#), [trademark](#), [treasury](#), [wellcome trust](#)

This entry was posted on Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 2:55 pm and is filed under [Ian Hargreaves](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#) feed. You can [leave a response](#), or [trackback](#) from your own site.

35 Responses

Recent Posts

- » [Thank you...](#)
- » [Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth](#)
- » [Nearly there: IP & Growth Review update...](#)
- » [The CR8 conference & submission stats...](#)
- » [Budgets, Plans for Growth & IP Review...](#)

Recent Comments

- » [T. Swarbrick](#) on
- » [Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth](#)
- » [Gillian Spraggs](#) on
- » [Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth](#)
- [Simon Crofts](#) on » [Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth](#)
- [Simon Brown](#) on » [Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth](#)
- » [Paul Ellis](#) on » [Delivered: The Independent Review of IP and Growth](#)

My World

- » [My Profile](#)
- » [Terms and Conditions](#)



May 18th, 2011 at 5:47 pm
Charles Oppenheim Says:

Congratulations on an excellent report!



May 18th, 2011 at 11:22 pm
Paul Ellis Says:

@ Charles Oppenheim: I said: "You appear to advocate no commercial exploitation of orphan works, as would have been enabled by DEB Clause 43; a licensing scheme for OW other than graphic works and photographs; the automatic, unwaivable Moral Right of Attribution; removing exceptions to MR provisions; and that there is "a problem with sanctions". Am I right?" To which you replied: "Paul Ellis has summarised my views nicely."

You also said: "If [CDPA1988] Section 42 were extended to cover all types of work, whether orphan or not and in any medium, but these use restrictions continued, libraries and archives should be content."

And you said: "Andrew Wiard thanks me for agreeing with him on exceptions to Moral Rights for newspapers. I thank him for agreeing with me! I've been consistent in these criticisms of the UK's moral rights regime over the last 20+ years. Paul Ellis - I don't approve of any PPP deal which involves commercial exploitation of works without rightsholder permission. I'm consistent on that too."

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-13388167>

Why, then, are you congratulating Professor Hargreaves and the IPO for producing "an excellent report" which flatly contradicts your stated positions, makes no mention of strengthened Moral Rights provisions and baldly advocates the commercial use of orphan works?



May 18th, 2011 at 11:42 pm
Rich Dennett Says:

A brave and positive forward thinking report. Having already developed an innovative and 'enabling' digital copyright system for creative artists and the creative industries sector, Future Copyright supports the Digital Copyright Exchange as a potential baseline component and as an intended active player.



May 19th, 2011 at 5:09 am
John Walker Says:

Is there an executive summary available on line? And if so, could you point me to it.



May 19th, 2011 at 7:01 am
Simon Brown Says:

The sole reason Clause 43 was removed from the Digital Economy Bill was on the grounds of commercial exploitation of orphan works. It was deemed unacceptable by many and objections raised.

What has changed in the 12 months since? Nothing. The same objections remain and nothing has been done to address enforced moral rights, the right of attribution, one of the causes of new orphan works today.



May 19th, 2011 at 7:16 am
Alan Gallery Says:

I as a primary producer of IP was not all that impressed by the report. Now I find that the digital copyright exchange (DCE) is going to be run by a cabal of publishers is am very alarmed. Fox and hen house. Privatisation of all content by the looks of it.

The DCE looks like a moral rights bypass and it cannot be reconciled with the requirements of the Berne Convention.

In order to get a return on my IP I have to sell it in different parts of the market and therefor restrict how it can be used in each part by conditions of contract. If this makes my IP incompatible with the DCE then it effectively becomes second class. Whereas the IP registered with the DCE is effectively no better protected than IP is now. This is also incompatible with Bearn.

If someone is able to use my IP for free because of a parody fair dealing exemption and in so doing destroys the potential market for the IP I would have no recourse. Ironically I would be better served by the US Fair Use system.



May 19th, 2011 at 7:42 am
Jonathan Webb Says:

I earn my living by hiring a helicopter, taking aerial photographs and then selling them through my website. Under your orphan works scheme my "customers" will be able to save an image from my website, crop off my name and then licence it as an orphan work for a nominal sum.

To pay for my 25 grand a year flying cost I charge 150 pounds per picture, if an orphan works licence costs say a pound then I am not going to have many customers.

I paid for my work, I created it why should the government take over and sell it?



May 19th, 2011 at 9:43 am
Bob Croxford Says:

So. Hargreaves suggests that the UK have a DCE which is against the spirit of Berne. What will he do with the billions of photographs on the web from members of the public on sites like Flickr. Will these be fair game for infringers with 'reduced' rights of damages?

Lets just imagine a photographer in the USA considers his US registration to protect him from having his pictures 'orphaned'. Along comes the UK government and effectively gives his images away to UK publishers and broadcasters like the BBC. When one of those UK publishers, like the Daily Mail or BBC, has an office in the USA the US photographer can then sue for statutory damages. Will Professor Hargreaves's DCE compensate the Daily Mail for using UK orphans which are not orphans anywhere else?



May 19th, 2011 at 1:29 pm
Paul Ellis Says:

@ Bob Croxford: And if the infringing UK publisher is the BBC, which strips metadata, or the Daily Mail, which strips some and falsifies the ©, your US-based photographer will be able to have them under the DCMA, too. LOADS of money.

BTW the DCE will breach Berne and EU competition law if it sets prices, and probably Human Rights legislation if one can only enjoy the full protection of the law by paying submission fees to the DCE; and the ECL and commercial OW recommendations totally breach Berne 9 and TRIPS 13.

Whoops a daisy.



May 19th, 2011 at 8:10 pm
PeterD Says:

I'd dearly love to see what research Hargreaves actually did before compiling this report. He seems to have concluded that the effects of copyright infringement are not that great, and seems to have failed completely to evaluate the effects of his proposals on the wider market as a whole. There is no review of creators average incomes and how these have changed in the last few years. Nor is there a clear assessment of the impact on demand for photography licencing after the introduction of the proposals for licencing of orphan works.

He doesn't appear to have any concept of the state that copyright holders are already in as a result of the internet, and infact plans to make matters worse. One wonders if, had he been forced to forgo his (*moderation edit*) academic paid for lifestyle for a month and exchange it for a creator's, he would take such a cavalier and downright negligent attitude towards other people's means of income. Looking at this now I am afraid that personally, I will have to chuck in the towel as it simply will no longer be possible to make a living from photography if these proposals are enacted. Shame on you. (*Moderation edit*)



May 20th, 2011 at 8:28 am
Bob Croxford Says:

Dear Mr Hargreaves

Lets suppose your crazy DCE happens. Then all 129 countries in the UN follow suit. Do you really expect small one person creators to register their work in 129 countries?

Surely Berne is simple and easy. If its mine I can licence it or not as I see fit. If its not yours you can't without asking for permission and a licence.



May 20th, 2011 at 2:15 pm
IP Review Team Says:

Thanks to everybody who has read the report and given their reactions to it. I'm grateful for supportive words and thoughts from many people. I also recognise that there will be important differences on particular points, some of which may be resolved as discussion goes forward on the review's recommendations.

It's not feasible for me to take on every point, but I'm particularly concerned to correct misunderstanding of the kind which is evident in part of Paul Ellis's post below.

Paul says the Digital Copyright Exchange will breach the law if it sets prices. But the report makes it quite clear the exchange won't do that. It says that pricing is a judgement for licensors. He thinks that it will breach the Berne Convention by making copyright protection conditional on participation. The report is clear that rights holders should have all the protections they have now, whether participating in the DCE or not. As a benefit it suggests that DCE participation should bring ADDITIONAL entitlements for rights holders, as well as the greater access to, and thus potential to license, their works. For the same reason it is incorrect to suggest it will somehow breach human rights legislation if there is a small user charge.

I appreciate that there are other differences between us on Orphan Works and Extended Collective Licensing, but to suggest that what the review proposes breaches international law is not a point I'm able to follow.

Paul has also suggested in the Stop 43 response that anything not registered with the DCE will become orphan. That's the opposite of what the review says. I have proposed a means of guaranteeing against orphaning. Nobody would be obliged to take it up, but it's simply perverse to construe this as Paul does. Paul rightly notes that the Stop43 submission influenced my thinking on the Exchange. So did submissions from a range of organisations. Many different parties told the Review that we need to use all available digital opportunities to support markets. That process will need the constructive engagement of many organisations and individuals to get to the right answers and the right detailed design of the copyright exchange.

Ian Hargreaves



May 21st, 2011 at 12:40 am
Simon Crofts Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves

Your report envisages that orphan works, which are to be works where the author is unknown that can't be found via a search of the Digital Copyright Exchange, will be licensed out by a licensing authority for a "nominal" amount.

Article 9(1) of the Berne Convention states: "Authors of literary and artistic works protected by this Convention shall have the exclusive right of authorizing the reproduction of these works, in any manner or form."

There are "special case" exceptions permitted by Article 9(2), which are listed in Articles 10 and 11. The orphan works licensing scheme would not fall within any of these exceptions.

It would also not satisfy the words in Article 9(2) with regards to any such exception that "such reproduction does not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work and does not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author". Having the author's work licensed out without his knowledge for a nominal sum clearly conflicts with normal exploitation of the work and clearly prejudices the legitimate interest of the author.

The orphan works proposals would therefore be a clear breach of the Berne Convention.

Simon Crofts



May 21st, 2011 at 2:24 pm
Paul Ellis Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves

While we are composing our reply to your blog post above, with reference to Simon Croft's post, Stop43 would be most grateful if you would explain exactly why, with reference to its text, your commercial orphan works and extended collective licensing proposals do not breach the Berne Convention. Thank you.



May 21st, 2011 at 6:54 pm
Paul Hayes Says:

Dear Berne Convention literalists,

1) maybe Prof. H. and his team know more about the legal implications of their proposals w.r.t. what "the book" says than you do.

2) maybe "the book" contains archaic, unsophisticated and (now) inappropriate nonsense anyway.

Just a thought.



May 21st, 2011 at 8:00 pm

Simon Crofts Says:

"1) maybe...

2) maybe..."

Maybe Paul, maybe. But having worked for so many years as an international lawyer, international law rather interests me. So please humour me a little.

And Paul, maybe there is a reason why the Berne Convention says what it says. Some grain of common sense. Just maybe.



May 22nd, 2011 at 10:02 am

Simon Crofts Says:

I have posted a review of the orphan works proposals, and why they would be impossible in their currently proposed form, here:

<http://simoncroftphoto.com/blog/?p=917>

May 22nd, 2011 at 8:04 pm

Hargreaves And UK Orphan Works: If At First You Don't Succeed, Try, Try To Steal Again » The Russian Photos Blog Says:

[...] Copyright Convention in particular, was cruelly exposed when he tried to defend his report in the comments section of his blog. [Irony alert! Hargreaves' blog is headed by - you guessed - a genuine metadata-free orphan [...]



May 23rd, 2011 at 3:55 am

Jeremy Nicholl Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves,

I needed a photo of you for my blog <http://bit.ly/kLBmGH>. Since the image you have on this page is an entirely metadata-free orphan work, lacking even the most basic contact information or copyright details, I've taken that.

Please send me a nominal fee for use if you ever get your system working.



May 23rd, 2011 at 6:31 am

Paul Hayes Says:

@Simon Crofts

Okay but I'm afraid I can't see anything in your review post which addresses Prof. H.'s response that "The report is clear that rights holders should have all the protections they have now, whether participating in the DCE or not. As a benefit it suggests that DCE participation should bring ADDITIONAL entitlements for rights holders". The contention that his proposals are legally impossible - never mind the hyperbolic predictions of economic "final collapse" - still seem... eccentric to me.



May 23rd, 2011 at 8:41 am

Simon Crofts Says:

It's all in there. Hargreaves is quite simply and demonstrably wrong that "rights holders" should have all the protections they have now". I'm surprised that he tries to assert that.

Under current law, the owner of an unregistered copyrighted work (that's all copyrighted works) can sue if someone uses his orphaned work without permission. Under Hargreaves proposals, he couldn't. It's hard to see how Hargreaves can honestly believe that under his proposals "rights holders should have all the

protections they have now". They obviously and demonstrably wouldn't. Either in legal or in practical terms.



May 23rd, 2011 at 3:53 pm

Bob Croxford Says:

I wonder why Hargreaves did not suggest heavy penalties for infringements. Presumably the UK has already signed up to the idea.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0779:EN:NOT>

The Directive requires all Member States to apply effective, dissuasive and proportionate remedies and penalties against those engaged in counterfeiting and piracy and so creates a level playing field for right holders in the EU. It means that all Member States will have a similar set of measures, procedures and remedies available for rightholders to defend their intellectual property rights (be they copyright or related rights, trademarks, patents, designs, etc) if they are infringed.

The compensatory and dissuasive effect of damages

Measures, procedures and remedies provided for by the Directive must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. At present, damages awarded in intellectual property rights cases remain comparatively low. Only a few Member States have reported an increase in the damages awarded, as a result of implementing the Directive.

According to information received from rightholders, damages awards do not currently appear to effectively dissuade potential infringers from engaging in illegal activities. This is particularly so where damages awarded by the courts fail to match the level of profit made by the infringers.

The main aim of awarding damages is to place the rightholders in the same situation as they would have been in, in the absence of the infringement. Nowadays, however, infringers' profits (unjust enrichment) often appear to be substantially higher than the actual damage incurred by the rightholder. In such cases, it could be considered whether the courts should have the power to grant damages commensurate with the infringer's unjust enrichment, even if they exceed the actual damage incurred by the rightholder. Equally, there could be a case for making greater use of the possibility to award damages for other economic consequences and moral damages.

In cases where the infringer is a legal person and the rightholder fails to obtain damages because the infringer has no assets, has been liquidated or is in any other way insolvent, an assessment could be made as to whether the rightholder is able to claim damages from the company's managing director(s) under national law, and if so under what conditions.



May 23rd, 2011 at 4:30 pm

Paul Ellis Says:

A more extended version of Stop43's reply to Professor Hargreaves' post is available at <http://bit.ly/Iz5yNA>.



May 24th, 2011 at 7:31 am

Simon Brown Says:

The post by Simon Crofts with respect to Article 9(1) of Berne is a fair and valid point.

How about a response Professor Hargreaves? Has your review been misinterpreted? Is there a finer point of law missed somewhere? Or is the Berne challenge spot on and that aspect of the review fit for the shredder?

We look forward to your earliest reply with anticipation?



May 24th, 2011 at 7:44 am

Paul Ellis Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves

Stop43's initial response to your Report is the collated, consensus opinion of all of our members who were available to read it on its day of publication, and not just the opinion or misreading of one member. If we have all misapprehended its meaning, this can only be a result of vital, key points being omitted or buried among details. How, otherwise, did we all miss them? Our starting point was one of optimism.

PRICING

You say:

'Paul says the Digital Copyright Exchange will breach the law if it sets prices. But the report makes it quite clear the exchange won't do that. It says that pricing is a judgement for licensors.'

We are grateful for this clarification and glad that this is your intention.

However, given that pricing is a crucial function of the Digital Copyright Exchange, and not a minor detail, we are surprised that we all missed this in our initial reading of the Report and have been unable to find explicit mention of it in the text. Such a crucial characteristic should not be hidden in detail or left to be inferred; it must be stated unambiguously and explicitly. We would be most grateful if you would quote the relevant text to us, please.

Other crucial characteristics of the Digital Copyright Exchange appear to remain undefined. We have tried and failed to find explicit answers in the Report's text to the following questions. We have placed Stop43's National Cultural Archive proposal's answer in parenthesis:

- * Will there be a registration fee to join the DCE? (NCA: No. Any registration fee would preclude mass participation.)
- * Will the DEC be entirely free to submit to and to use non-commercially? (NCA: Yes. Again, fees for non-commercial use would preclude mass participation.)
- * Will commercial submissions and searches be chargeable? (NCA: No. Search fees would burden businesses small and large with substantial and onerous additional costs.)
- * Will submissions be automatic, compulsory for publishers and voluntary for creators? (NCA: Yes. This is the only way to guarantee mass participation and create a genuine de-orphaning system.)
- * Will it efficiently allow creators, rights-holders and users to negotiate usage fees in the normal way? (NCA: Yes. A properly functioning market depends on the ability of buyers and sellers individually to agree prices via negotiation.)
- * Will it create a two-tier copyright system, with only registered users enjoying the maximum protection of their IP rights that the law provides? (NCA: No. Apart from moral and ethical concerns, Stop43 believes this to be a mechanism of market distortion, as Simon Crofts argues.)

Again, we would be most grateful if you would quote to us your Report's text in which these questions are answered explicitly.

A further response to Professor Hargreaves will follow in a subsequent post.



May 24th, 2011 at 8:07 am
Paul Ellis Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves

INTERNATIONAL LAW

We will respond to your remarks in a subsequent post.

ORPHAN WORKS AND EXTENDED COLLECTIVE LICENSING

International lawyer-turned-photographer Simon Crofts has dealt with this clearly and succinctly on his blog. His verdict: "Hargreaves orphan works proposals couldn't work". Stop43 agrees with his opinion and the reasoning behind it.

TWO-TIER COPYRIGHT

You say:

'Paul has also suggested in the Stop 43 response that anything not registered with the DCE will become orphan. That's the opposite of what the review says. I have proposed a means of guaranteeing against orphaning. Nobody would be obliged to take it up, but it's simply perverse to construe this as Paul does.'

Whilst the DCE will in practice guarantee against orphaning, it will foster the idea that any IP not registered can be assumed to be orphan, and even if it is not can be treated as such, as Simon Crofts says on his blog.



May 24th, 2011 at 8:12 am
IP Review Team Says:

The IP Review blog and related Twitter account (@ip_review_uk) will close on Tuesday 31st May.

The IP Review team wishes to thank all of you who posted up comments, thoughts, ideas and concerns throughout the process. The team read and considered each and every tweet/blog comment posted to these channels, as and when they were sent.

We hope that you found the blog and twitter account useful in keeping you up to date with the review, and a quick and easy way to reach the team directly with your comments, over the period of the review.

Best Wishes

IP Review Team

May 24th, 2011 at 1:16 pm
Simon Crofts Says:



It seems we struck a nerve there.



May 24th, 2011 at 5:09 pm
Simon Crofts Says:

There is another point I would like to make, before this discussion is squashed.

Professor Hargreaves is a former Editor of The Independent, and staffer on the FT, a Director at the BBC, Editor at the New Statesman. Under the proposals, these organisations would no doubt systematically register copyright in their content on a daily basis, so would have it safely protected. They would also be free to use unregistered material from all over the world for a nominal payment, provided it wasn't obvious who the owner of it was. The BBC would have free use of all the orphan works that it has itself created by failing to keep proper records in its archives, and through systematic stripping of metadata.

Any proposals that might have been at all awkward for these organisations, such as imposing any kind of obligation to preserve metadata or other ownership records, has been rejected out of hand.

It is little wonder that articles in the media have been overwhelmingly welcoming of the report: New Scientist's article titled: "Intellectual property review keeps everyone happy" (they got that one wrong, didn't they?!), the Guardian's: "The stupidity of our copyright laws is finally laid bare". Media organisations such as these, and Professor Hargreaves' own alma maters, are precisely the ones who stand to win most from the proposals.

The Hargreaves Review looks very much as though it has been unduly influenced by lobbying from one sector. More than that, the Review almost looks like it itself is a piece of lobbying on behalf of media conglomerates, paid for by the tax payer.



May 24th, 2011 at 7:43 pm
Paul Ellis Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves

INTERNATIONAL LAW

You say:

'[Paul] thinks that it will breach the Berne Convention by making copyright protection conditional on participation. The report is clear that rights holders should have all the protections they have now, whether participating in the DCE or not. As a benefit it suggests that DCE participation should bring ADDITIONAL entitlements for rights holders, as well as the greater access to, and thus potential to license, their works.'

Your report suggests:

- providing that remedies, for example damages, are greater for infringement of rights to works available through the licensing exchange than for other works;
- making DEA sanctions apply only to infringements involving works available through the exchange

Article 5 of The Berne Convention states:

(1) Authors shall enjoy, in respect of works for which they are protected under this Convention, in countries of the Union other than the country of origin, the rights which their respective laws do now or may hereafter grant to their nationals, as well as the rights specially granted by this Convention.

(2) The enjoyment and the exercise of these rights shall not be subject to any formality;

(3) Protection in the country of origin is governed by domestic law. However, when the author is not a national of the country of origin of the work for which he is protected under this Convention, he shall enjoy in that country the same rights as national authors.

The central ideas in Article 5 are that you can't treat people from other countries worse than you treat your own, and this equality of treatment must not be subject to formality. Berne says nothing about allowing foreigners only SOME of the rights that nationals have, because nationals must register to gain further rights: Berne 5 merely says 'the rights', which must be accorded 'without formality'.

That DCE registration would offer important benefits – among them guaranteed parentage – IN PRACTICE is in no doubt, but It follows that under your proposal, foreigners will have to register in order to enjoy the same levels of protection IN LAW as UK nationals, and registration is a 'formality'.

Your coercive legal proposals therefore discriminate against foreign rights-holders, and in so doing breach Berne Article 5.

Continued...



May 24th, 2011 at 7:45 pm

Paul Ellis Says:

Dear Professor Hargreaves

INTERNATIONAL LAW

It could be argued that DCE registration would not discriminate against foreigners if, without formality, they are accorded the right to register. Informed legal opinion appears to be divided, which is why there is no legal consensus about whether the statutory damages available for infringed works registered with the US Copyright Office breach Berne or not, and there is no international case law to settle this matter.

The USA, which signed the Treaty in 1988, is the only Berne signatory that has a two-tier copyright system. Stop43 has been told by international IP lawyers that the continuation of the USA's registration system was the political price paid to gain the USA's signature to the Treaty. The UK is already signatory and bound by its Terms, and can be expected to pay a political price for breaching them.

Given this uncertainty over the legality in international law of two-tier copyright systems, the UK should err on the side of caution and not deliberately create one here.



May 25th, 2011 at 11:50 am

Simon Brown Says:

Dear IPO Team – we were hoping for a slightly more engaging process whereby the author of the report could go to some lengths to explain the reasoning behind the report. Stop43 have, after all, raised valid points.

Whilst we appreciate the fact you read them all, courtesy alone would mean a substantive rebuke (or agreement) was deserved.

Or is it a question of "Say nothing and hope it all goes away"?



May 25th, 2011 at 10:56 pm

Simon Crofts Says:

The EU have published a draft Directive on orphan works:

http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/copyright/docs/orphan-works/proposal_en.pdf.

On the face of it (with perhaps, one reservation on my part), the EU orphan works proposals look extremely sensible. And they also seem to have been carefully formulated with the Berne Convention in mind. And as far as I can see they don't seem a million miles from the suggestions of various photographer's groups (though I can't speak on their behalf) that have been so ignored in the UK.

Hargreaves approach looks so different from the EU proposals – can the Hargreaves team provide any clarification on how they see their proposals tying in with the draft EU Directive?



May 26th, 2011 at 2:55 pm

Gillian Spraggs Says:

Professor Hargreaves, thank you for your previous comment. I found the clarifications useful.

I have a few queries relating to passages in your report. I would be very grateful if you had the time to elucidate them. I think it would be helpful to all of us.

In 4.31 you describe the projected Digital Copyright Exchange as 'a network of interoperable databases'. Does this mean that there would be different databases for different sectors of the creative industries? Or did you have some other system in mind?

In 4.23, listing the benefits for creators of the Digital Copyright Exchange, you say that it would be 'a single point of access to UK collecting societies and eventually to competitor societies in other territories'. What do you envisage as the relationship between the Exchange and the collecting societies? In what way will it provide access to them?

In 4.36 you say that the running costs of the Digital Copyright Exchange are to be funded 'through a small user charge'. Which users? The licensees or the licensors?

In 4.51, in connection with the Extended Collective Licensing proposals, you say 'It should not be imposed on a sector as a compulsory measure where there is no call for it'. Call from whom? The creators who work in that sector? Or the enterprises seeking to use their works?

I am sorry to hear that this blog is to close. It has been a useful resource. I hope it will be archived accessibly on the web.



May 26th, 2011 at 11:44 pm

T. Swarbrick Says:

It would be a shame if this blog closed completely such that access to previous posts and materials ceased. Could it not be maintained or moved to an alternate UKIPO web address? It could even evolve into an ongoing forum for discussion of IP topics. There is an interesting diversity of backgrounds and opinions here that is not repeated on any other IP forum and there will still be much to discuss if there is any action taken by the government to implement proposals made in the report.

© **Crown copyright 2011** [Disclaimer](#) [Accessibility](#)
Website maintained by the Intellectual Property Office

Powered by [WordPress](#) | [Entries \(RSS\)](#) and [Comments \(RSS\)](#).