



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Copyright in the age of online access

Alternative compensation systems in EU copyright law

de Miranda Branco Tomé Quintais, J.P.

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Other version

License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Miranda Branco Tomé Quintais, J. P. (2017). *Copyright in the age of online access: Alternative compensation systems in EU copyright law*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Copyright in the Age of Online Access

Alternative Compensation Systems in EU Copyright Law

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus
prof. dr. ir. K.I.J. Maex
ten overstaan van een door het College voor Promoties ingestelde
commissie, in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Agnietenkapel
op donderdag 12 januari 2017, te 10:00 uur door

João Pedro de Miranda Branco Tomé Quintais

geboren te Oeiras – São Julião da Barra, Portugal

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor: Prof. dr. P.B. Hugenholtz, Universiteit van Amsterdam

Co-promotor: Dr. L. Guibault, Universiteit van Amsterdam

Overige leden: Prof. dr. M.M.M. van Eechoud, Universiteit van Amsterdam
Prof. dr. C. Geiger, University of Strasbourg
Prof. dr. D. Gervais, Law School, Vanderbilt University
Prof. dr. N. Helberger, Universiteit van Amsterdam
Dr. Joost Poort, Universiteit van Amsterdam

Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid

Concise Table of Contents

LISTS OF FIGURES AND TABLES	8
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	9
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	10
1 INTRODUCTION: CHALLENGES FOR COPYRIGHT IN THE ONLINE ENVIRONMENT	12
2 COPYRIGHT REWIND: PRECEDENTS FOR COMPENSATION SYSTEMS	28
3 ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEMS: TAXONOMY OF LEGALISATION PROPOSALS	83
4 BETWEEN RIGHTS AND LIMITATIONS: MAPPING THE SPACE FOR THE LEGALISATION OF THE ONLINE USE OF COPYRIGHT WORKS.....	138
5 COPYRIGHT REFORM: ADMISSIBILITY OF LEGALISATION UNDER THE THREE-STEP TEST AND THE OBJECTIVES OF EU COPYRIGHT LAW	211
6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS: TOWARDS ACCESS AND REMUNERATION	309
ANNEX 1. LIST OF PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEMS	343
REFERENCES.....	354
SHORT SUMMARY.....	397
SAMENVATTING.....	402

Table of Contents

LISTS OF FIGURES AND TABLES	8
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	9
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	10
1 INTRODUCTION: CHALLENGES FOR COPYRIGHT IN THE ONLINE ENVIRONMENT	12
1.1 BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM DEFINITION.....	12
1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	19
1.3 METHODOLOGY	21
1.4 SCIENTIFIC AND SOCIETAL RELEVANCE.....	25
1.5 OUTLINE.....	26
2 COPYRIGHT REWIND: PRECEDENTS FOR COMPENSATION SYSTEMS	28
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	28
2.2 PRECEDENT SELECTION.....	29
2.2.1 <i>Copyright Rule or Scheme</i>	30
2.2.2 <i>Regulation of Large-Scale or Mass Use</i>	30
2.2.3 <i>Non-voluntary Licences</i>	31
2.2.4 <i>Equitable Remuneration or Fair Compensation</i>	33
2.2.5 <i>Selection of Precedents</i>	35
2.3 STATUTORY LICENSING FOR PRIVATE COPYING.....	35
2.3.1 <i>A German Legal Creation</i>	36
2.3.1.1 Pre-1965: The GEMA Litigation that Shaped the Act.....	37
2.3.1.2 The 1965 German Copyright Act and its 1985 Amendment.....	40
2.3.2 <i>A Legal Chronology of International Developments</i>	43
2.3.2.1 Berne Convention: The 1967 Stockholm Revision Conference.....	43
2.3.2.2 Post-Stockholm: From 1967 to the 1990s.....	46
2.3.2.3 Preparatory Works for the 1996 WIPO Treaties.....	47
2.3.3 <i>Manifestations in the Acquis</i>	49
2.3.4 <i>Conclusions on Statutory Licensing for Private Copying</i>	54
2.4 COMPULSORY LICENSING FOR BROADCASTING AND COMMUNICATION TO THE PUBLIC.....	57
2.4.1 <i>The Early Days of Broadcasting</i>	57
2.4.2 <i>Compulsory Licensing for Broadcasting and Communication to the Public in the Berne Convention</i> 62	
2.4.2.1 Analysis.....	62
2.4.2.2 Justifications.....	65
2.4.3 <i>Compulsory Licensing for Related Rights: Brief Reference</i>	69
2.4.4 <i>Manifestations in the Acquis</i>	71
2.4.5 <i>Conclusions on Compulsory Licensing for Broadcasting and Communication to the Public</i>	75
2.5 CONCLUSIONS.....	78
3 ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEMS: TAXONOMY OF LEGALISATION PROPOSALS	83
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	83
3.2 CONCEPTUAL DESIGN.....	85
3.3 TYPES OF ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEM.....	91
3.3.1 <i>Some Basics on Collective Rights Management</i>	91
3.3.2 <i>Voluntary Collective Licensing</i>	95
3.3.2.1 Characterisation and Legal Framework.....	95
3.3.2.2 Legalisation Proposals.....	99
3.3.3 <i>Extended Collective Licensing</i>	101
3.3.3.1 Characterisation and Legal Framework.....	101
3.3.3.2 Legalisation Proposals.....	105

3.3.4	<i>Mandatory Collective Management</i>	107
3.3.4.1	Characterisation and Legal Framework.....	107
3.3.4.2	Theories on Mandatory Collective Management.....	110
3.3.4.2.1	Limited Applicability to Exclusive Rights	111
3.3.4.2.2	Broader Applicability to Exclusive Rights	112
3.3.4.3	Legalisation Proposals.....	115
3.3.5	<i>Legal Licences: Statutory and Compulsory</i>	116
3.3.5.1	Characterisation and Legal Framework.....	116
3.3.5.2	Legalisation Proposals.....	119
3.3.6	<i>State Systems</i>	122
3.3.6.1	Characterisation and Legal Framework.....	122
3.3.6.2	Legalisation Proposals.....	125
3.4	ATTRIBUTES OF ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEMS.....	127
3.4.1	<i>Subject Matter Scope</i>	127
3.4.2	<i>Substantive Rights Scope: Authorised Use</i>	128
3.4.3	<i>Compensation Type</i>	131
3.4.4	<i>Management System</i>	131
3.4.5	<i>Compensation Targets</i>	133
3.4.6	<i>Burden of Compensation</i>	134
3.5	CONCLUSIONS	135
4	BETWEEN RIGHTS AND LIMITATIONS: MAPPING THE SPACE FOR THE LEGALISATION OF THE ONLINE USE OF COPYRIGHT WORKS.....	138
4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	138
4.2	TYPOLGY OF ONLINE USES.....	139
4.2.1	<i>Browsing</i>	139
4.2.2	<i>Downloading</i>	140
4.2.3	<i>Streaming</i>	140
4.2.4	<i>Stream Capture or Ripping</i>	141
4.2.5	<i>Uploading</i>	141
4.2.6	<i>Hyperlinking</i>	142
4.2.7	<i>Digital Adaptations</i>	142
4.3	HOW DOES THE BUNDLE OF EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS IN THE <i>ACQUIS</i> APPLY TO MASS ONLINE USE OF WORKS BY INDIVIDUALS?.....	144
4.3.1	<i>Uses Covered by the Right of Reproduction</i>	145
4.3.1.1	Legal Framework	145
4.3.1.2	Application to Activities of Internet users	147
4.3.2	<i>Uses Covered by the Right of Communication to the Public</i>	148
4.3.2.1	Legal Framework	148
4.3.2.1.1	An “Act of Communication”	151
4.3.2.1.2	Communication to the “Public”.....	152
	New Public	154
	Specific Technical Means	156
4.3.2.1.3	Profit-Making Nature of the Communication	157
4.3.2.2	Application to Activities of Internet Users.....	158
4.3.2.3	Issues of Legal Certainty.....	162
4.4	WHAT LIMITATIONS APPLY TO USES COVERED BY EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS?.....	167
4.4.1	<i>General Framework, Objectives and Interpretation of Copyright Limitations</i>	167
4.4.1.1	General Framework.....	167
4.4.1.2	Relationship with Technological Protection Measures	169
4.4.1.3	Objectives.....	172
4.4.1.4	The Court’s Case Law: From Strict Interpretation to Restricted Flexibility	174
4.4.1.5	Interim Conclusions	179
4.4.2	<i>Temporary and Transient Copying</i>	180
4.4.3	<i>Private Copying</i>	185
4.4.3.1	Private Use.....	185
4.4.3.2	Non-Commercial.....	186

4.4.3.3	Fair Compensation	187
4.4.3.4	Rights Holders' Authorisation.....	188
4.4.3.5	Application of Technological Protection Measures.....	190
4.4.3.6	Lawfulness of Source.....	191
4.4.3.7	Third Party Devices Used for Copying.....	194
4.4.3.8	Application to Activities of Internet Users.....	195
4.4.4	<i>Limitations Susceptible of Application to Digital Adaptations.....</i>	197
4.4.4.1	Quotations	199
4.4.4.2	Incidental Inclusion.....	202
4.4.4.3	Caricature, Parody and Pastiche	203
4.4.4.4	Interim Conclusions.....	205
4.5	CONCLUSIONS	206
5	COPYRIGHT REFORM: ADMISSIBILITY OF LEGALISATION UNDER THE THREE-STEP TEST AND THE OBJECTIVES OF EU COPYRIGHT LAW.....	211
5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	211
5.2	ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE THREE-STEP TEST.....	212
5.2.1	<i>Variants and Interpretation.....</i>	212
5.2.1.1	The Berne Convention and its Relationship to Other Treaties.....	215
5.2.1.2	The WIPO Treaties and the Agreed Statements.....	217
5.2.1.3	The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Law	218
5.2.1.4	EU Copyright Law and its Relationship to International Law	219
5.2.2	<i>Spectrum of Readings.....</i>	222
5.2.2.1	Strict Interpretation.....	222
5.2.2.2	Flexible Interpretation	223
5.3	THE SPACE FOR AN ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEM IN THE THREE-STEP TEST	225
5.3.1	<i>Certain Special Cases.....</i>	226
5.3.1.1	Certain Cases.....	226
5.3.1.2	Special Cases: Qualitative and Quantitative Considerations.....	227
5.3.2	<i>Conflict with the Normal Exploitation of Works.....</i>	229
5.3.2.1	The Traditional View of Normal Exploitation.....	230
5.3.2.2	Objections to the Traditional View of Normal Exploitation	233
5.3.2.3	A Flexible Interpretation of Normal Exploitation	235
5.3.2.3.1	Normal Exploitation and Non-Commercial Use of Works.....	236
5.3.2.3.2	Indirect Effect on Commercial Exploitation	238
5.3.2.3.3	Normal Exploitation and Compensation.....	242
5.3.3	<i>Unreasonable Prejudice to Legitimate Interests.....</i>	243
5.3.3.1	Unreasonable Prejudice.....	244
5.3.3.2	Legitimate Interests of Rights Holders and the Public Interest.....	246
5.3.3.3	The Interests of Rights Holders and Fair Compensation	248
5.3.3.4	The Conflicting Interests of Creators and Exploiters.....	250
5.3.3.5	Public Interest in the Promotion of Creativity and Circulation of Works.....	251
5.3.3.6	Public Interest in the Respect of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms	253
5.3.3.6.1	Freedom of Expression and Information.....	254
5.3.3.6.2	Protection of Privacy and Personal Data	258
5.3.3.6.3	Intermediaries and Freedom to Conduct a Business	260
5.3.4	<i>Summary: Application of the Three-Step Test to Alternative Compensation Systems.....</i>	263
5.4	OVERCOMING CONFLICTS WITH THE NORMAL EXPLOITATION OF WORKS	267
5.4.1	<i>Embargo Periods.....</i>	267
5.4.2	<i>Opt-Out Rules.....</i>	270
5.4.2.1	Opt-Out Rules and Alternative Compensation Systems.....	270
5.4.2.2	Are Opt-Out Rules Prohibited Formalities?.....	274
5.5	THE NORMATIVE CHOICE BETWEEN EXCLUSIVITY AND REMUNERATED ACCESS	277
5.5.1	<i>Copyright Theories, Exclusivity and Remuneration.....</i>	277
5.5.1.1	Natural Rights	281
5.5.1.2	Utilitarianism	285
5.5.2	<i>The Access and Remuneration Dimensions of Copyright.....</i>	289
5.5.3	<i>Normative Consistency with EU Copyright Law.....</i>	296

5.6	CONCLUSIONS	302
6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS: TOWARDS ACCESS AND REMUNERATION	309
6.1	SUMMARY	309
6.1.1	<i>The Case for Reform of EU Copyright Law</i>	309
6.1.2	<i>Lessons from the Past</i>	312
6.1.3	<i>A Taxonomy of Alternative Compensation Systems</i>	314
6.1.4	<i>The Legal Space for Non-Commercial Online Use of Works in EU Copyright Law</i>	316
6.1.5	<i>The Admissibility of a Limitation-based Statutory Licence for Non-Commercial Online Use Under the Three-step Test and its Consistency with the Objectives of EU Copyright Law</i>	319
6.2	A BLUEPRINT FOR REFORM: A LIMITATION-BASED STATUTORY LICENCE FOR NON-COMMERCIAL ONLINE USE OF WORKS BY INDIVIDUALS.....	326
6.2.1	<i>Beneficiaries (and Intermediaries)</i>	326
6.2.2	<i>Subject Matter Scope</i>	326
6.2.3	<i>Substantive Rights Scope: Authorised Non-Commercial Online Use of Works</i>	329
6.2.4	<i>Fair Compensation</i>	332
6.2.5	<i>Agreed Contractual Terms</i>	334
6.2.6	<i>Basic Operation</i>	335
6.2.7	<i>Scaling Down Reform: Adaptability of the Proposal to Collective Licensing</i>	339
6.3	A WAY FORWARD.....	342
	ANNEX 1. LIST OF PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEMS	343
	REFERENCES.....	354
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	354
	PRIMARY SOURCES: LEGAL TEXTS.....	380
	<i>International Treaties and Conventions</i>	380
	<i>Council of Europe</i>	380
	<i>European Union: Treaties and Charter</i>	380
	<i>European Union: Directives</i>	381
	<i>European Union: Proposed Legislation</i>	382
	<i>National Legislation</i>	382
	SECONDARY SOURCES	384
	<i>International Documents (Records of Treaties and Conventions)</i>	384
	<i>EU: Proposals and Explanatory Memoranda</i>	384
	<i>EU: Commission Recommendations</i>	385
	<i>EU: Public Consultations and Reports</i>	385
	<i>EU: Green Papers, White Papers, Working Papers, and Memos</i>	386
	<i>EU: Communications of the Commission</i>	387
	<i>EU: Council Decisions, Resolutions and Guidelines</i>	387
	<i>EU: European Parliament</i>	387
	<i>Common Positions and Common Statements</i>	388
	<i>Council of Europe Recommendations</i>	388
	CASE LAW	389
	<i>European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)</i>	389
	<i>Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU): Judgements</i>	389
	<i>Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU): References for Preliminary Ruling</i>	391
	<i>Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU): Advocate General (AG) Opinions</i>	392
	<i>Commission Decisions</i>	393
	<i>World Trade Organization (WTO) Panel Reports</i>	393
	<i>National Cases</i>	393
	ELECTRONIC SOURCES	395
	SHORT SUMMARY.....	397
	SAMENVATTING.....	402

Lists of Figures and Tables

List of Figures

Figure 1. Non-voluntary Licences	32
Figure 2. Alternative Compensation Systems: Axis of Gradual Restrictions on the Exclusive Right.....	88
Figure 3. CMOs as Intermediaries in a Two-Sided Market.....	94
Figure 4. Scope of Multi-Territorial Licensing Regime in the CRM Directive	97
Figure 5. Mandatory Collective Management Rental Rights Directive	110
Figure 6. Embargo Period Alternative Compensation System	268
Figure 7. Opt-Out Rule in Statutory Licence Alternative Compensation System.....	272
Figure 8. Simplified Design for Alternative Compensation System	336

List of Tables

Table 1. Restrictions to Exclusivity	86
Table 2. <i>Acquis</i> Remuneration and Compensation Rights.....	118
Table 3. Scope of Online Reproduction Right and Legal Certainty Issues	147
Table 4. Scope of Online Right of Communication to the Public and Legal Certainty Issues...	166

List of Abbreviations

ACS	Alternative Compensation System(s)
ACTA	Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement
AG	Advocate General
ALAI	<i>Association Littéraire et Artistique Internationale</i> (International Literary and Artistic Association)
BC	Berne Convention for the Protection of Artistic and Literary Works
BGH	<i>Bundesgerichtshof</i> (the German Federal Court of Justice)
BIRPI	<i>Bureaux Internationaux Reunis pour la Protection de la Propriété Intellectuelle</i> (United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property)
Charter	Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU
CMO(s)	Collective Rights Management Organisation(s)
CISAC	<i>Confédération Internationale des Sociétés d'Auteurs et Compositeurs</i> (International Confederation of Authors and Composers Societies)
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union (former European Court of Justice (ECJ))
DRM	Digital Rights Management
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
ECL	Extended Collective Licence (or Licensing)
EU	European Union
EP	European Parliament
GEMA	<i>Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte</i> (German society for musical performing and mechanical reproduction rights)
HADOPI	<i>Haute Autorité pour la Diffusion des œuvres et la Protection des droits d'auteur sur Internet</i> . Also refers to the law that set up this authority, the Law No. 2009-669 of June 12, 2009, promoting the Dissemination and Protection of Creation on the Internet
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ISP	Internet Service Provider(s)
P2P	Peer-to-peer
RC	Rome Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TPM(s)	Technological Protection Measure(s)
TRIPS	Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Law
UGC	User Created/Generated Content
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
VCLT	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties
WCT	WIPO Copyright Treaty
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WIPO Treaties	The WCT and WPPT
WPPT	WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty
WTO	World Trade Organization

Acknowledgements

Writing a doctoral dissertation is as much an academic journey as it is one of personal discovery. This dissertation would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of many people, who not only contributed to my research, but also to my academic and personal development during this period. It is not possible to mention them all, but I would like to single out a few.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Bernt Hugenholtz and co-supervisor Lucie Guibault. Their supervision was outstanding, as was their availability, patience, constructive criticism, and friendship. It is a rare thing for a PhD candidate to have nothing but positive things to say about his supervisors, but this is truly the case. I am particularly indebted to Bernt for turning my career path away from law practice and towards academic research, which I am passionate about. As a master student in Munich, in the now distant years of 2010/2011, I was fortunate to have him as a professor and thesis supervisor. It was also Bernt who invited me to join the Institute for Information Law (IViR) in 2012 to do research in such an exciting project.

I was lucky to conduct most of my doctoral research at IViR, an institute with an exceptional intellectual and social ambiance. I am grateful to all past and current researchers and staff I have crossed paths, without exception. I would like to thank in particular the following colleagues for their generosity and availability in helping me think through my research ideas, concerns, and doubts: Christina Angelopoulos, Balázs Bodó, Kelly Breemen, Vicky Breemen, Annabel Brody, Marco Caspers, Christian Handke, Natali Helberger, Catherine Jasserand, Tarlach McGonagle, Joost Poort, Mireille van Eechoud, Nico van Eijk, Christiaan Alberdingk Thijm, Stef van Gompel, Joan-Josep Vallbé, and Frederik Borgesius. I also wish to leave particular thanks for the outstanding staff support provided by Anja Dobbelseen and Rosanne van der Waal, without whom I would either be lost in a bureaucratic maze, or still in search of an obscure publication.

Part of this dissertation was written during a research stay in UC Berkeley, School of Law. In this inspiring academic environment I had the privilege to discuss my research with Pamela Samuelson, to whom I am thankful for the time and guidance provided. I also want to especially mention the following academics that manifested interest in my research and kindly shared some of their time, insights and patience to my great benefit: Philippe Aigrain, Christophe Geiger, Daniel Gervais, Volker Grassmuck, Séverine Dusollier, Neil Netanel, Alexander Peukert, Martin Senftleben, and Jacqueline Seignette.

This research would not have been possible without the financial assistance from the *Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* – The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (Project number 407-11-050). My research stay in Berkeley was made possible by a grant from the *Prof. Mr. E.A. van Nieuwenhoven Helbach Stichting*.

To my friends (in Portugal, Amsterdam, and all over the world) and my family, I am thankful for all the support, encouragement and patience, especially during those times where you deserved more attention and presence than I was able to give. A special thanks to my parents, my younger brother Miguel, and my grandmother Gabriela; the distance that separates us is great, but you are always with me. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation and love to Melanie, my partner in life, crime, and academic research.

João Pedro Quintais

Amsterdam, 23 September 2016

Note: The research for this dissertation was completed on 31 March 2016. Subsequent developments in the relevant law are therefore not reflected in this study, with the exception of minor updates relating to judgments of the CJEU and AG Opinions cited in the text and published until 30 June 2016. This dissertation is written in UK English.