



EFJ Survey on Collecting Systems for Journalists' Authors' Rights in the European Union

This report was prepared for the seminar on *Ownership of authors' rights and collective management in the European Union*, held in Lisbon, Portugal, on 5–6 November 2005, by Wolfgang Mayer of the *Deutsche Journalistinnen- und Journalisten-Union* section of the union **ver.di**. The final revision was completed on 28 December 2005.

Contents

1) Introduction

2) Summary of answers to the questionnaire

3) Country reports

3.1) The situation in some of the “old” EU member states (joined before 2004)

- | | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| 3.1.1) Austria | 3.1.7) Greece |
| 3.1.2) Belgium | 3.1.8) Italy |
| 3.1.3) Denmark | 3.1.9) Portugal |
| 3.1.4) Finland | 3.1.10) Sweden |
| 3.1.5) France | 3.1.11) United Kingdom |
| 3.1.6) Germany | |

3.2) The situation in some of the “new” EU member states (joined since 2004)

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 3.2.1) Cyprus | 3.2.5) Lithuania |
| 3.2.2) Czech Republic | 3.2.6) Poland |
| 3.2.3) Hungary | 3.2.7) Slovakia |
| 3.2.4) Latvia | 3.2.8) Slovenia |

3.3) The situation in states participating in the EU pre-accession strategy

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| 3.3.1) Croatia | 3.3.2) Macedonia |
| 3.3.3) Serbia and Montenegro | |

3.4) The situation in non-EU states

3.4.1) Norway

4) The amount of money collected in the field of journalism

5) Conclusions

5.1) General conclusions

5.2) For an EU-wide collecting system?

Appendix: The Questionnaire

1) Introduction

The European Federation of Journalists (EFJ) represents 260,000 journalists in over 30 countries. Its goals include the strengthening of authors' rights for journalists and photographers throughout Europe. The EFJ calls for all journalists and photographers to be recognised as authors of the work they create, to have control over further use of their work and to receive equitable remuneration for these uses. Minimum standards for remuneration can be negotiated through collective agreements; it is normal for remuneration for "secondary" uses to be managed through collecting societies.

The intention of this survey was to provide an overview of the current situation and to show how it has developed in recent years. We use data from two questionnaires. The first was sent by the EFJ to all its European member unions in 1995. The second, posing the same questions as in 1995, was distributed during August and September 2005.

Unions in 23 countries completed the 2005 survey; the 1995 survey covered 22 countries. Direct comparison is possible in the case of 14 countries: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Websites used to provide additional information are indicated in the country reports.

2) Summary of the answers to the questionnaire

⑩ **For print media**, collecting systems for re-use of authors' rights exist in 14 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

These collecting system cover:

⑩ copying for educational purposes, in 10 of the 23 countries:

Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.

⑩ copying of press clippings for information purposes in private and public institutions and companies, in 13 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.

⑩ copying in libraries and /or for research purposes, in 9 of the 23 countries:

Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Greece, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.

⑩ compensation for private copying (funded by levies on hardware, copying machines, PCs, printers, *etc*), in 11 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia.

⑩ They also cover digital use in 7 of the 23 countries:

Austria (partly), Belgium (partly), Denmark (partly), France, Germany (partly), Norway (in specific cases), Sweden (partly).

⑩ **For audio visual media**, collecting systems for re-use of authors' rights exist in 14 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Macedonia, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

These collecting systems cover:

⑩ cable retransmission, in 15 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Macedonia, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.

⑩ retransmission by satellite, in 12 of the 23 countries:

Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Macedonia, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden.

⑩ retransmission through digital networks (*eg* the internet), in 5 of the 23 countries:

Cyprus, Denmark, Lithuania, Slovakia, Sweden.

⑩ copying for educational purposes, in 10 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Macedonia, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.

⑩ copying for research and archiving, in 10 of the 23 countries:

Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Macedonia, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.

- ⑩ compensation for private copying (blank tape or hardware levy or other source), in 9 of the 23 countries:
Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden.
- ⑩ They also cover digital use in 3 of the 23 countries:
Belgium (partly), Denmark (partly), Sweden.
- ⑩ **The beneficiaries of the collecting systems are:**
 - ⑩ employed journalists in the printed press (including photographers, illustrators, graphic designers, cartoonists...), in 13 of the 23 countries:
Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden.
 - ⑩ freelancers in the printed press (including photographers, illustrators, graphic designers, cartoonists *etc*), in 11 of the 23 countries:
Austria (partly), Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom.
 - ⑩ photographers (as a separate group), in 9 of the 23 countries:
Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Greece, Sweden.
 - ⑩ employed journalists in the broadcasting sector (including TV directors, text authors, TV photographers, TV editors), in 10 of the 23 countries:
Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France (partly), Germany, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia.
 - ⑩ freelancers in broadcasting (doing the same work as above), in 11 of the 23 countries:
Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Lithuania, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden.
 - ⑩ the media owners, in 13 of the 23 countries:
Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Lithuania, Macedonia, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, United Kingdom.
- ⑩ **Collective agreements cover these payments in 6 of the 23 countries:**
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Portugal, Sweden (for online databases since 2004).

3) Country reports

3.1) The situation in some of the “old” EU member states

This section deals with states that entered EU membership before 2004.

3.1.1) Austria (EU member since 1995)

The information received from Austria is contradictory. The print, paper and journalists’ union (*Gewerkschaft Druck, Journalismus, Papier, Sektion Journalisten* – henceforth DJP) reports only “slight progress” of the situation for journalists in the past ten years. The art, media sport and liberal professions union (*Fachgruppe Journalisten in Sektion Elektronische Medien in Gewerkschaft Kunst, Medien, Sport, freie Berufe* – henceforth KMSfB) reports, in contrast, that the “system has been working excellently and sufficiently for many years”.

Collecting systems for authors rights exist since 1936. There are now twelve collecting societies for authors’ rights in general – but the system seems, to an outside observer at least, chaotic. Some collecting societies are hostile to each other, and others are closely connected. There are no clearly defined limits to the responsibilities of each.

The Austrian government is now working on new legislation to harmonise the system. The main complaint of the DJP is that it has not been consulted in this process. The union also says that “there are enough funds, but not many authors benefit from them”. The system mainly depends on a levy on sales of media such as blank tapes, CD-ROMs and DVDs. This union considers that the system lacks transparency, efficiency and democracy, because journalists’ organisation are not involved in it.

The DJP is very sceptical about the idea of an EU-wide system. In Austria some of the money collected is used to support young professionals and the union fears that EU harmonisation might force this use of funds to be stopped and that this would mean only the “big players” would benefit from the system.

One of the major institutions responsible for daily and weekly newspapers is run by the publishers’ organisation (*Verband Österreichischer Zeitungen*) to administer payments for the commercial re-use of journalists’ works. Another collecting system is run by the public service broadcaster ORF.

Most journalists working for the printed press, however, have registered with the collecting society for literature (*Literar-Mechana*, www.literar.at). This makes payments to 8000 members who have registered through a standard mandate form, distributed according to a very complicated system. Payments to journalists in the broadcasting sector are calculated individually, on the basis of their contributions to the Austrian television and radio programmes. To make these calculations *Literar-Mechana* uses ORF transmission schedules and reports by journalists specifying their contributions. The total income of *Literar-Mechana* in 2005 was € 16.97 million, but we received no data on how much money was distributed to journalists.

The KMSfB also mentions a collecting society for visual artists (*Verwertungsgesellschaft bildender Künstler*), which also collects payments for photographers (and the same goes for the *Rechtsschutzverband der Fotografen*), one for the audiovisual media VAM (*Verwertungsgesellschaft audiovisuelle Medien*); and the broadcasting VGR (*Verwertungsgesellschaft Rundfunk*).

A levy on recording equipment and blank tapes is paid by its importers, with the domestic market distributors liable as joint warrantors. The Austrian Chamber of Commerce is partner in the negotiations on the tariffs, which are listed at http://www.aume.at/rte/upload/ura/tarife_lkv05.pdf.

3.1.2) Belgium (EU member since 1952/58)

The EFJ member union AGJPB (*Association Générale des Journalistes Professionnels de Belgique*) reports that Belgium is a success story. In 1995 AGJPB reported that it had just created a new commercial collecting society for the print sector, the SAJ (*Société de droit d'auteur des Journalistes* – www.saj.be), in co-operation with a separate organisation for journalists in the special-interest press. The SAJ was set up in line with 1994 legislation and in agreement with the Ministry of Justice. It works alongside the existing collecting society in the audio-visual sector, Sofam. The system was under construction in 1995; it is now well-established and works efficiently.

The SAJ receives and distributes the money collected by other collecting agencies, namely:

- Ⓢ Repobel, for reprographic rights (licensed in 1997, www.reprobel.be); and
- Ⓢ Auvibel, for private copying (www.auvibel.be).

The main revenues come from levies on copying machinery and on copies made (Reprobel), as well as blank tape levies (Auvibel). Fees are 3% of the sale price of a CD; 10 cents per playing hour for audio cassettes; 23 cents per playing hour for a CD-RW, and 59 cents for a DVD. There are further management societies for cable transmission.

Journalists receive money on the basis of an annual declaration of their works. The amount depends on a system which considers – among other things – the circulation of the newspaper. The AGJPB also entered into collective agreements on press clippings and electronic data bases.

The AGJPB complains, however, about difficulties in collecting remuneration for electronic re-use. The SAJ is pressing for a licence system for electronic press clippings similar to that which exists for press clippings on paper.

3.1.3) Denmark (EU member since 1973)

Denmark can be considered as an example of best practice. Collecting systems were already functioning very well in 1995, and have developed further since. The Danish Union of Journalists says the system is transparent, efficient and democratic. All journalists can benefit from it.

The money is collected by the collecting society COPY-DAN, founded in 1977

(www.copydan.dk). This is a collective rights management society controlled jointly by authors and performers, publishers and producers. COPY-DAN enters into agreements on behalf of rights holders and invoices user groups based on various information about uses made.

There is a levy on blank tapes, CD-Roms and DVDs. In the printing sector, several experimental collective license schemes cover digital uses in the education field. In the audiovisual sector, digital use is covered for electronic retransmission. Most money (€ 1.5 million of a total of € 2.7 million) comes from educational institutions and from analogue press clippings in the print sector. In the audio-visual sector € 0.8 million is collected from cable and satellite retransmission; € 0.2 million for educational purposes; and another € 0,2 million from levies on blank tapes. Less than 10% of the revenues are used for the management of the system.

Journalists can get money from the collecting society in two ways:

- 1) by individual payments from COPY-DAN based on the registration of uses – almost all uses in the print media are remunerated in this way; and
- 2) by payment from a specific authors' rights fund set up by the Danish Union of Journalists. The fund receives money from COPY-DAN for the support of journalistic works (of all kinds) in different fields. Journalists (and photographers, cartoonists, illustrators, documentarists, TV camera operators, *etc*) fill in a form to declare that they have produced works in the relevant field. The money they receive must be used for research projects, research travel or further education, and journalists must document the use. This system is mostly used in the audiovisual sector.

The Danish Union of Journalists also has collective agreements with a number of media companies, giving publishers the right to enter into contracts with electronic press clipping agencies. These specify that employed journalists shall get 50% of the revenues. DJ also has a collective agreement authorising the use of freelancers' work in electronic press clippings. In this case the authors get 0.75% in addition to the basic payment. The percentage increases if the use passes thresholds.

The union says that in future it will make extension of the existing collective license schemes to digital uses a priority. It reports: "This is presently being blocked by the publishers. We are also working to implement individual payment wherever possible, and to improve the reciprocal agreements systems. We support interoperability among collective rights management societies around the globe, but wish to keep the societies nationally-based since they have a significant social function which is important for the democratic influence of authors and performers, co-operation between authors and publishers and cultural development in general." Concerning digital uses, the union reported ten years ago that there is the "need to include digital uses in the various agreements and also a need to be able to effect individual payments to members/non-members".

3.1.4) Finland (EU member since 1995)

Finland can be considered as another good-practice case – as it was already ten years ago.

The collecting society is Kopiosto (www.kopiosto.fi), and employed journalists and freelancers alike in all media profit from the system. It represents more than 46,000 Finnish copyright owners who belong to 44 member organisations, one of which is the Union of Journalists in Finland.

Money is collected under license agreements from all institutional users, such as schools, universities, state institutions and businesses. Kopiosto's annual report states that, among the 2004 agreements, one with the Ministry of Education for photocopying in schools and educational institutions alone is worth € 24 million. Another agreement has been made to cover photocopying by the church council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and the Orthodox Church in Finland. Kopiosto's licences include, however, only traditional photocopying, not any kind of digital copying (for example scanning books).

Money can go directly to the proper authors' rights owner, whether employed or freelance. This is the case in collective agreements and in most employment contracts. Kopiosto's photocopying revenue, however, goes to the Union of Journalists in Finland, which distributes it to its members through scholarships and prizes. Kopiosto's revenues from the radio and TV sector are distributed in two different ways: mainly directly to the authors, but with a small amount going to the union to fund scholarships and prizes.

Total income in 2004 was € 20.7 million; of this € 9.2 million came from photocopying (which had increased by 20.9%); € 7.6 million from radio and TV programmes; and € 4 million from levies on blank tape. The reprographic remunerations from the different sources in 2002 were: € 2,155,019 from schools; € 1,291,314 from business and associations; € 819,550 from universities; € 796,295 from fee-based education; € 770,774 from further education colleges; € 554,858 from the state administration; € 526,737 from municipal administrations; € 193,491 from church administrations; € 87,737 from music schools; and € 51,426 from intermediary services – making a total of € 7,247,201.

On transparency and effectiveness, the Finish Union of Journalists says: “In general all is fine, no complaint. Maybe the current system could be a bit more efficient (it is already quite efficient) and transparent and our union members could be better informed about money distribution and their authors' rights, but there are no major problems existing”.

3.1.5) France (EU member since 1952/58)

When it comes to the remuneration for journalists' authors' rights, France seems still to be an underdeveloped country. A law on photocopying was passed by Parliament on 3 January 1995. Today, the situation for journalists is unclear even to experts. There are several different collecting societies. The French EFJ member organisation *Société Nationale des Journalistes* (SNJ) answered the questionnaire by saying that the system is neither transparent nor efficient nor democratic.

As an IFFRO member, the *Centre Français d'exploitation du Droit de Copie* (www.cfcopies.com) claims to have collected and distributed some € 20 million during the last year. But it is unclear how journalists profit from this system. The SNJ reports that employed journalists in the printed press are “in principle” among the beneficiaries, but “in practice – that's different”; and the same remark applies to freelancers. The answer

to the question “Under which conditions can journalists receive the money?” was: “That’s all under debate in France”. The union has no agreements on this matter.

3.1.6) Germany (EU member since 1952/58)

The system in Germany is well established and successful. There are two major independent collecting societies which distribute remuneration to journalists. The *Deutsche Journalistinnen- und Journalisten-Union* section of the union **ver.di** (DJU) answered the questionnaire by describing both as transparent, effective and democratic. Both DJU and the *Deutscher Journalistenverband* (DJV) have representatives on the decision-making bodies of both collecting societies.

Back in 1994 the *Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort* (VG Wort, www.vgwort.de) already had individual contracts with 81,269 authors and 4872 publishing companies. The numbers increased in the following ten years to 127,171 authors and 5706 publishing companies. During the same period revenues increased from € 53.8 million to € 79.1 million.

Of this total VG Wort received:

- Ⓢ from levies on sales of reprographic machines such as copiers, fax machines and scanners, 38.1% in 1994 and in 2004 35.8% or € 28.3 million;
- Ⓢ from radio & TV stations, 14.6% in 1994 and 17.7% in 2004;
- Ⓢ from libraries, 16.6% in 1994 and in 2004 12.3% or € 9.7 million;
- Ⓢ from other sources such as commercial copy-shops, universities, research institutions, schools, reprints in school books, and press reviews, 5.6 % of the total in 2004 or € 4.63 million.

In 1994 the other collecting society, the *Verwertungsgesellschaft Bild-Kunst* (VG Bild-Kunst, www.bildkunst.de) had 19,243 members, and ten years later 34,939. During the same period its revenues increased from € 16.1 million to € 34.4 million. The main source of income for VG Bild-Kunst is levies on sales of video recorders and blank tapes or cassettes.

Collecting societies’ activities in Germany are based on a very detailed law. Levies on machines are negotiated with industry umbrella organisations. Disputes often arise, however, and go to court. Many court decisions are still pending. The courts have finally confirmed the validity of levies on CD- and DVD-burners. The most exciting court case concerns a levy on PCs. A court decision at the end of 2004 confirmed a levy of € 12 on the sale price of PCs as an appropriate amount; but the industry announced that it will appeal this to the highest federal court. Another court case concerning printers is also still pending.

Journalists simply have to register with a collecting society and state the media they work for to receive an annual cheque. The amount of this cheque is calculated by a complicated system.

The DJU and DJV have also negotiated provisions in their general collective agreements that guarantee remuneration for the re-use of journalists’ works. In the future DJU will be concentrating on the fair treatment of journalists in the online world.

3.1.7) Greece (EU member since 1981)

In 1995 there was no legal provision in Greece for compensation when a journalist's work was re-used by their employer – neither on radio or TV stations nor in other publications owned by the employer or by third parties. Journalists' remuneration depended on collective or private agreements.

Ten years ago, the Journalists' Union of Athens Daily Newspapers wrote: "The existing system of collecting journalists' earnings in our country can be considered satisfactory. However, it needs additional legislation for collecting additional compensation in cases when the employer uses journalists' work for further exploitation". The lack of a collecting system was extremely bad for freelancers. The union report continued: "The majority of freelance journalists has no insurance coverage and is in a difficult situation. An over-supply of work exists, resulting in publications of poor quality and badly-paid journalists".

This situation has obviously not improved much. The Greek Copyright Law enacted in 1993 specified for the first time a levy on photocopying machines, to be collected by a collecting society. On the initiative of writers' and publishers' unions, the Greek Collecting Society for Literary Works (OSDEL) was formed in 1997. OSDEL has the legal status of a non-profit co-operative. It collected fees for the first time in 1999 and distributed money for the first time in 2003.

The Journalists' Union of Macedonia and Thrace Daily Newspapers (Esiemth) states, however, in answer to the 2005 questionnaire: "While photographers, as a separate group, are explicitly covered by the Greek copyright legislation and represented by a collecting society representing photographers exclusively, print and electronic media journalists are not explicitly covered by this law and are not represented by any such organisation. Although the law does not make any reference to journalists *per se*... it can be construed that the rights applicable to authors and creators apply to journalists as well. However, the new Collective Agreement for staff of daily newspapers in Athens and Thessaloniki contains an authors' rights clause, according to which "*with the exception of the on-line edition of the same newspaper, the reproduction of an author's work, as designated by Law 2121/93, is prohibited without further remuneration*"."

The union also reports that the 1993 law defines limits on authors' rights, if the free dissemination of a work meets society's demand for information, assists scientific progress, or meets educational or cultural demands.

3.1.8) Italy (EU member since 1952/58)

There is still no system for collecting remuneration for the re-use of authors' rights in Italy, reports the *Federazione Nazionale della Stampa Italiana* (FNSI). FNSI strongly supports an EU-wide system, because all negotiations with the government as well as with the media owners have failed on a national level.

The publishers accepted in principle five years ago that remuneration for the re-use of articles should be granted when the national collective agreement was revised; but there was no follow-up to this. The media owners were demanding 66% of the revenues, but

the union demanded 50%. The government department responsible for the press announced that it would try to settle the dispute, but nothing has happened since and FNSI is pessimistic that present negotiations will have any results.

The situation in Italy has thus not changed in ten years. In 1995 FNSI reported that a new copyright law was just drafted. It proposed, for instance, a 3% levy on photocopying machines. But the draft did not say to whom the money should be distributed or how. A new copyright law was adopted to implement the EU Infosoc directive. It will be interesting to watch coming developments.

3.1.9) Portugal (EU member since 1986)

There is no collecting society for journalists in Portugal – neither for print nor for audiovisual media – and journalists are excluded from the general system for collecting remuneration. Journalists may register as author of a work, but have to administer their interests for themselves and Portugal's Authors' Rights law excludes many kinds of work from its protection, for example speeches at press conferences, press clippings, fragments of stories on current affairs, the non-commercial re-use of photos, reproduction for schools and educational purposes, and articles dealing with ongoing economic, political or religious debates. This is not acceptable for journalists, as the *Sindicato dos Jornalistas* emphasises.

For a better understanding of the situation in Portugal, the union explained the legal background. The Statutes for Journalists in Portugal, laid down in Law N° 1 in 1999, acknowledge journalists' rights in texts and images. This law specified that within 122 days of its publication Parliament should legislate journalists' authors' rights. This never happened, however, and the protection of journalists' authors' rights still relies on the general *Código do Direito de Autor* of 1985. The development of multimedia applications has caused an increasing number of cases of journalists' works being misused.

Since 1999 the *Sindicato dos Jornalistas* has been insisting on the necessity of regulating authors' rights in the statutes for journalists, and the new (Socialist) government is preparing a revision of these statutes, with specific paragraphs to regulate authors' rights, in consultation with the media owners and the journalists' union. The Socialist Party had presented proposals to Parliament when it was in opposition, but these were handed to a parliamentary commission that never discussed them. The *Sindicato dos Jornalistas* summarises the situation by saying that "six years were lost". The media owners still strongly oppose the current legislation process.

Nevertheless, some collective agreements address authors' rights. The collective agreement for the non-daily press says that companies can re-use texts and photos only with the authorisation of the journalists, who get 50% of the revenue. An agreement with the information agency Lusa (www.lusa.pt) provides that authors receive at least 40% of revenue from the re-use of a text or photo. At *Rádio e Televisão de Portugal* (RTP) the rules say that all rights go to the broadcasting service. The collective agreement for journalists in the radio sector says that they should get a percentage of the revenues which must be decided case by case.

3.1.10) Sweden (EU member since 1995)

Sweden is another example of good practice. All journalists in the country can profit from the existing collecting system, either directly or collectively – except employed journalists in the broadcasting sector. These were excluded in 1994 and remain so today.

Different collecting societies act on behalf of the Swedish union (*Svenska Journalistförbundet* – SJ):

⑩ *Bonus Presskopia* (www.b-pk.se) is the result of a January 1999 merger of Bonus and Presskopia. Bonus (for pictures, words and printed music) was founded in 1973 when the first collective agreement was made between the Government and rights holders. Presskopia was created in 1982 by organisations operating in the field of newspapers and periodicals. In 1996 the organisations in the photo sector joined. The main purpose was to license companies, organisations and authorities for the reproduction of articles from newspapers and periodicals for internal use.

⑩ Copyswede (www.copyswede.se) is an umbrella collecting society that coordinates negotiations and agreements in certain copyright areas. It has established partnership agreements with TV and radio corporations and organisations that represent film and phonogram producers.

⑩ Alis, the Administration of Literary Rights in Sweden (www.alis.org) is a collecting society presently representing approximately 2500 writers. It was founded in 1995 by the Swedish Writers' Union (SFF), the Swedish Union of Journalists (SJ), the Swedish Playwrights' Union (SDF) and the Swedish Association for Educational Writers (SLFF).

The model is that the users make payments to the responsible collecting society; the collecting society collects this money and distributes it either to the union (mainly money from reprography) or to authors directly (money from cable retransmission and private copying). The union uses the money it receives for scholarships. All journalists can apply for these. Programs include English language courses in London, French in Aix-en-Provence and Spanish in Madrid. Freelancers are offered photo courses and courses on other subjects in a Press Institute. Scholarships for further education are up to € 5400. There are also “creativity scholarships” and “recreation scholarships”.

On transparency, the Swedish union says: “There is no obligation in the Swedish public law for the union to provide information on how remunerations that are distributed from the collecting society are used. The system is efficient and transparent on a general level but not on the individual level. Union members have influence via the union. There is also a veto right for non-members in the Copyright Act, and some uses (such as reprography) are covered by extensive collective agreements; no veto right exists however for cable/satellite retransmission.”

The Swedish Union of Journalists plans to initiate “discussions with other organisations about strengthening reprography rights and exploring possibilities to distribute reprography remuneration individually to authors”.

3.1.11) United Kingdom (EU member since 1973)

The situation in Great Britain has not improved much within the past ten years and is far from being satisfactory from journalists' point of view – although there are three collecting societies working in the country:

- ⑩ The Design and Artists Copyright Society DACS (www.dacs.org.uk) for images. It represents some 36,000 fine artists and their heirs as well as 16,000 photographers, illustrators, craftspeople, cartoonists, architects, animators and designers.
- ⑩ The Authors' Licensing and Collecting Society Limited ALCS (www.alcs.co.uk) for writers. Founded in 1977, it also collects money for lending and rental. Photocopying is currently ALCS's largest source of income. The ALCS, together with the Publishers Licensing Society (PLS) has appointed the Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA) to act as its agent to license photocopying on its behalf and on behalf of its members on a non-exclusive basis. The CLA offers photocopying licences to educational establishments within the UK, the British Library, the British Library Document Supply Centre, businesses, the professions and government departments (both local and national). In its Internet presentation ALCS writes: "In many European countries a levy is charged on the sale of blank tapes and recording machines. These are usually referred to as blank tape or machine levies and are intended to compensate rights-owners for the private copying of their works. The fees due to UK writers are collected by sister societies and sent to ALCS for onward distribution". Since its foundation ALCS has paid writers over £114 million (₤ 165 million) in fees. It is wholly owned and controlled by writers.
- ⑩ The Newspaper Licensing Agency (NLA), set up in 1996 on behalf of the newspaper proprietors (www.nla.co.uk). It offers a one-stop shop for a licence to copy, for internal management use, from all of the UK's national newspapers and many regional and foreign titles, too. NLA offers rights to photocopy/fax and digitally copy and transmit cuttings for internal use – even specialised rights to distribute externally.

The National Union of Journalists (NUJ) considers ALCS and DACS to be transparent, efficient and democratic, but not NLA. In its opinion NLA could be wound up, and ALCS could take its place.

Freelance journalists can receive money from ALCS and DACS by completing a form. But employed journalists are not beneficiaries. Ten years ago the NUJ reported: "Employed journalists have no copyright: all their work belongs to the employer... In a number of cases, freelances get – by their own efforts – some money. The system of distributing the money and its amount is unknown to the union". The NUJ in 1995 said it was discussing how to establish a copyright collecting society especially for its then 5000 freelance members. But lacking the knowledge and financial resource, this proved to be difficult. The union further said already in 1995 that the problem of copyright was getting more and more acute in Great Britain because many publishers insisted that freelance writers and photographers agree to assign all rights before they are given a commission.

The NUJ has no collective agreements with electronic press clipping agencies or online databases. However, the NUJ would also not support a EU-wide collecting system.

3.2) The situation in some of the “new” EU member states

This section deals with states that have entered EU membership since 2004.

3.2.1) Cyprus

In 1995 Cyprus had no collecting system for authors’ rights at all, and the Union of Cyprus Journalists was strongly interested in establishing one. Cyprus seems – at least for the south – to be a success story: ten years later, a collecting system is established and it works efficiently and democratically, as the union reports proudly. However, concrete data were not available on the way the money is distributed or on the amount of revenue. The union has also entered into collective agreement with electronic press clipping agencies and online databases.

There is a general Copyright Authority. Five collecting societies are active, and the union reports that they are strong institutions and have a very efficient and well-organised system for protecting the rights of their members:

- ⑩ The Performing Rights Society (PRS), registered in the United Kingdom and with a registration office in Cyprus;
- ⑩ The Mechanical Rights Society (MRS), also registered in the United Kingdom and having an office in Cyprus;
- ⑩ The Cyprus Federation Against Copyrights Theft (Cyfact);
- ⑩ AEPI, a Greek company for music works, acting in Cyprus through an agent; and
- ⑩ The Business Software Alliance.

The situation is completely different in the northern part of Cyprus, as the EFJ member union Basin-Sen reports. There is no collecting system for the re-use of authors’ rights in their area of responsibility, and moreover, no copyright either. Basin-Sen has tried to propose bills covering these rights but without success.

3.2.2) Czech Republic

There is no collecting society for journalists in the Czech Republic. Under the current copyright law, adopted in 2000, employers of employed journalists can claim all property rights. Freelances keep their rights, but are left alone to defend them – they are free to choose a representative or not.

The EFJ Czech affiliate Syndikát novináru České republiky (www.sncr.cz) refers to “Dilia”, the Czech theatre and literary agency. It covers “copyrighted literary, dramatic, music and dramatic, choreographic, pantomimic and audiovisual work, works of authors of picture components of audiovisual works, *ie* cameramen, architects, stage designers and other authors of audiovisual works, scenic music specially composed for use in a dramatic, choreographic and pantomimic work, except for scenic music used from a sound recording published for commercial purposes, scientific works including cartographic works and works of art and works of dubbing directors who are authors of the spoken component of audiovisual works in a different language”.

The agency has entered into global agreements with radio broadcasters. Royalties are distributed on the basis of publisher registration and journalists declaring published works. The rules explicitly say: “A theme of work itself, a daily report or any other information itself, an idea, procedure, principle, method, discovery, scientific theory, formula, chart and similar subject itself do not constitute a copyright work”. SNCR supports an EU-wide collecting system for journalists.

Ten years ago the union complained that there was no collecting system for journalists’ authors’ rights in the Czech Republic; there has been no progress as far as the interests of journalists are concerned since 1995.

There had been, however, such a system, which worked for 22 years in the former Czechoslovakia until the end of 1991. Two public organisations protected authors’ rights and controlled users, who had to pay a levy of 2%. The literature-fund had a journalists’ section which used the money to support journalists.

3.2.3) Hungary

The Hungarian Alliance Of Reprographic Rights (*Magyar Reprográfiai Szövetség – RSZ*) opened for business on 8 November 2000. As photocopying and reproduction of printed works had become more and more common in Hungary, the introduction of a new legal institution, a so-called reprographic fee, seemed necessary. The equipment for which reprographic fees should be collected was defined in a government decree that currently covers copying-machines, printers and multifunctional equipment. Revenues are also collected from sales of CDs and DVDs and from copy services. The law on copyright says that copying for educational purposes is free as well as copying of press clippings and copying in libraries.

The members of the RSZ alliance are: Artisjus, the Hungarian Bureau for the Protection of Authors’ Rights (for musical rights); Hungart, the Society of Hungarian Creative Artists (for visual arts); and Maszre, the Reprographic Society of the Hungarian Book and Periodical Writers and Publishers (representing literary writers and publishers, scientific writers and publishers). The list shows that there is no specific collecting system for the re-use of the authors’ rights of journalists working in the press. This is different in the audiovisual sector where journalists can profit from the system.

The current situation is not much changed from that reported in 1995, when a collecting system for authors’ rights covered only photographers, broadcast journalists and media owners. The condition of receiving money was having a contract with a special collecting organisation – but there was no information on the amount collected or distributed. Journalists in the printed press were excluded from the system, as they are today. Ten years ago the Association of Hungarian Journalists announced that a new law was planned that would also address printed media. This did not happen.

However, the Association of Hungarian Journalists has entered into collective agreements with electronic press clipping agencies and online databases. It also tries to collect money “whenever possible” directly from those who infringe copyrights. The revenues are not distributed to the authors themselves but the Association uses them to fund social purposes, primarily to assist retired members.

The Association of Hungarian Journalists reports the following – scandalous – blackmail story: There is a weekly magazine in the country, titled *Tallózó*. This magazine is a type of “readers’ digest” publication and mainly reprints articles and photos. The philosophy of the management is to say: “Oh, it’s an honour for you as an author to be included in the weekly selection; we hope you don’t charge for reprint, and if you do, well, we can’t offer you more than one to two Euro per article”. Most journalists reject this kind of remuneration, which anyway goes to the Association to be used for social purposes. The Association asked *Tallózó* to pay more for reprints but the answer was: If reprints are more expensive the magazine will have to close. The Association argues: “We should either force them to pay proper reprint fees or let them close their business. Sooner or later someone else will come up with a similar product, anyway, maybe with more acceptable conditions”.

3.2.4) Latvia

The Latvian Union of Journalists reports that there is no collecting system for the re-use of authors’ rights existing in Latvia.

3.2.5) Lithuania

Every story has to have a beginning. And the Lithuanian Journalists’ Union reports the introduction of an “operator levy for reprographic reproduction of works” – at least on paper. Money is collected from operators providing reprographic services for payment. The distribution of the collected money is decided by the journalists’ union and the publishers’ association.

A law on copyright and related rights in Lithuania came into force in 1999. It says: “When the lending of books and other publications is carried out through libraries, their authors shall have the right to receive equitable remuneration for the transferred exclusive right to lend a work. The amount of remuneration and the procedure of payment shall be established by the Government, taking into account the proposals of the Board of Copyright and Related Rights of Lithuania. This remuneration shall not be paid when the lending of books and other publications is carried out through libraries of education and scientific institutions”.

This article was supposed to come into effect on 1st July in 2000, but the Government put it off until February 2002. From July 1 of that year the collecting society *Lietuvos autorių teisių gynimo asociacijos agentūra* (LATGA-A) started collecting money on behalf of authors whose books were used in libraries, and their heirs. Currently LATGA-A represents almost 3000 Lithuanian authors of music, literature, drama and visual arts. The first royalties were distributed in 2002 to 210 registered people. The figures show that publishers get four times more money than journalists for reprography.

This being quite a new system, the union does not yet have proposals for improvements.

3.2.6) Poland

There is no collecting system in Poland, union representatives told the EFJ during a seminar in Berlin. Almost all print media in Poland are owned by German and Norwegian publishing houses (*Passauer Neue Presse* and *Okla*) which deal with labour rights, *etc*, locally. Two collecting societies distribute money for the use of books and songs, but journalists do not benefit from them. In summary it was said: “Theoretically journalists have authors’ rights, but practically not.”

3.2.7) Slovakia

According to Slovakian law, media owners “own” the author’s rights; journalists do receive royalties for copying. The Slovakian Union of Journalists nevertheless says that it considers the system to be transparent, efficient and democratic. There are no other collective (or other) agreements covering electronic press clippings, nor online databases.

The collecting society in Slovakia, which also represents the interests of journalists is called Lita (www.lita.sk). This was formerly the Slovak Literary Agency, founded in the 1950s and representing some 1500 authors. In 1993 – due to the changes in society – Lita transformed into a civil association of writers, scriptwriters, directors, cartoonists, choreographers and translators. The focus of its services moved from acting as an agency to the administration of authors’ rights.

Under to the Slovak Copyright Act of 2003 money is collected from importers of copying devices and from the importers of blank media such as writable DVDs; the levy on copying devices is 3% of the import price and on blank media 6% of the import price. Other revenues includes a levy on public access to the Internet. Journalists get their share from the money collected by Lita for copying according to a distribution formula. The union also reports that Lita has a Reprographic Committee, which consists of the representatives of unions of publishers and of authors, and agrees the distribution formula annually. Usually the publishers get 28% and the authors 72% – the authors’ share is then divided between the text authors (89%) and illustrators (11%). Journalists’ share is 24% of the money for text authors.

3.2.8) Slovenia

In Slovenia authors can register their copyright works with the Slovenian Copyright Agency, which was established after 1995 and collects money from individual users. Journalists who are members of the collecting society receive money according to a percentage of use. However, as the Slovene Association of Journalists reports, few journalists are members of the collecting society. There are no further collective agreements with electronic press clipping agencies or online databases.

The Slovene Association of Journalists writes: “We would like to start our own authors’ agency to represent journalists, especially freelancers, and to address secondary use of author’s rights. Journalists are giving up more or less all their rights although publishers are reusing their works, publishing them on the internet or reselling them to press clipping agencies. Press clipping agencies are a big problem in Slovenia because authors

are not getting any remuneration from them. The problem does not lie in the legislation but in the praxis, because we don't have established methods to collect this money. We are not sure if according to our legislation it could be done through a collecting society. In Slovenia publishers are still convinced that with salary or payment for first use of journalistic works they are getting all the rights".

3.3) The situation in states participating in the EU pre-accession strategy

3.3.1) Croatia

Croatia is accepted formally as an accession country. According to the "2005 enlargement strategy paper" communicated by the EU Commission on 9 November 2005, the country "faces no major difficulties in meeting the political criteria for membership". The Croatian government aims to join the EU before 2009, but so far the Commission has declined to endorse a target date.

There is no collecting system in Croatia, union representatives told the EFJ during a seminar in Autumn 2005 in Berlin. The majority of media belong to German owners (WAZ). There are more than 3500 journalists in the country.

Croatia is an example of good practice in Central and Eastern Europe, with nine collective agreements in the big media houses. There is a law on authors' rights, and the association of journalists feels responsible for this. As for the possible collection of fees for photocopies, the answer was: "Oh no, this question is far away in the space – far away from our environment."

3.3.2.) FYR Macedonia

The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia submitted its application for EU membership in March 2004 and it has been confirmed as a candidate state. However, the related negotiations have yet to start and no target dates have been specified.

There is no collecting system for print media in Macedonia. Collecting systems exist only for audiovisual media, covering cable retransmission, transmission by satellite and copying for educational, research and archive purposes. Media owners alone are the beneficiaries of the system; payments are agreed directly between them and customers. The rights of employed journalists are covered by their salaries. The Association of Journalists considers the system to be neither transparent nor efficient nor democratic. No data regarding the amount of money collected or the way it is distributed is available. Representatives generally remark that a more efficient representation of the professions' interests is needed.

3.3.3.) Serbia and Montenegro

In its "2005 enlargement strategy paper" of 9 November 2005 the EU Commission

recommended opening negotiations for a far-reaching Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) with Serbia and Montenegro, as a first step before candidate status.

In Serbia and Montenegro an Institute for Intellectual Property, an institution of the Ministry for Internal Economic Relations, is in charge of proposing legal acts in the field of intellectual property. But there is no collecting system for journalists' authors' rights registered in the country. EFJ member union JAS says such a system might be introduced under the Copyrights Law. There are already two organisations working in the general field: SOKOJ for the protection of authors' rights in musical works, and OFPYU for the protection of authors' rights in phonographs.

3.4) The situation in non-EU states

3.4.1) Norway

Two national referenda in Norway have rejected EU membership. A further debate on membership will open after 2007, when a date for another referendum will probably be set. It is, nevertheless, necessary to consider the case of Norway in the European context.

The existing collecting system for journalists in Norway is a best-practice case. It is close to the neighbouring Scandinavian countries inside the EU. The standards set by Norway, outside the EU, must be compared with the situation in the EU member state Poland, where the Norwegian *Orkla* Group is – together with the German *Passauer Neue Presse* – the dominant player in the media. Further progress is still necessary from the journalists' point of view, as the Norwegian Union of Journalists (NJ) reports.

There are three collecting societies:

- ⑩ KOPINOR (National collecting society for photo copying, www.kopinor.org). Founded in 1980, it collects money through a per-photocopy fee from the education, public and private sectors. The collecting society believes that over 80 % of Norwegian institutional photocopying is covered by copying agreements, including the whole public sector. All 452 municipalities and county municipalities are covered by reprographic remuneration agreements. In the private sector, the agreement encompasses 20,000 individual enterprises with an estimated total of 700,000 employees. Journalists, along with other authors, receive payments determined by large-scale surveys of what is being photocopied in each sector. Journalists' payments are distributed through NJ.
- ⑩ NORWACO (National collecting society for cable retransmission). It collects money from cable companies for the cable distribution of TV and radio programmes. Journalists, along with other authors, are paid according to declarations of what is being distributed. Money to journalists employed in the three main radio and TV companies in Norway (NRK, TV2 and TV Norge) is distributed through these companies; that for freelances and non-affiliated journalists is distributed through NJ.
- ⑩ KLARERINGSTJENESTEN is the Norwegian publishers' clearing service for digital copying of media clippings. Employed journalists get money through their company. NJ-organised freelances get money through the union.

In practice, NJ distributes the money it receives from KOPINOR to journalists by offering individual scholarships, financing an Institute of Journalism for further education for journalists and by supporting local and regional professional seminars, debates, studies and publications on professional and ethical questions. Money from NORWACO is distributed by NJ to freelancers by supporting individual travel, by financing their further education and by financing a legal adviser for freelancers. The money from KLARERINGSTJENESTEN is distributed locally in each company and similarly among all employed, NJ-organised journalists. The money to freelancers is distributed through NJ in the form of grants for professional training.

NJ considers KOPINOR to be a good system, but the NORWACO system as less efficient. It reports: “Negotiations between the organisations representing different rightsholders are time-consuming. KLARERINGSTJENESTEN is under development and further collective agreements are needed to cover digital copying for all journalists”.

NJ reports that it also negotiated in 2000 an agreement with the publishers of printed press, magazines, weeklies, local TV and internet editions, which allows the digital retransmission of its members’ protected journalistic works. The publishers have established a clearing service that sells the right to retransmit digital media clippings to customers; 50% of the income from this sale goes back to the journalists. In the 2005 state budget the government made a provision of money for compensation of private copying, but the distribution of this amongst the collecting societies and rightsholders/authors’ organisations is not yet finalised. In 2006 the NJ plans to negotiate a collective agreement on digital copying with Norwegian Public Broadcasting (NRK), and for different groups of freelancers.

4) Money collected in the field of journalism

Money collected in some of the “old” EU member states:

| | 1995 € | 2005 € |
|----------------|------------|-------------|
| Austria | no data | no data |
| Belgium | 271,000 | 3,240,227 |
| Denmark | 922,000 | 2,700,000 |
| Finland | 5,992,000 | 7,247,201 |
| France | 8,886,000 | no data |
| Germany | 69,894,000 | 113,500,000 |
| Greece | no data | no data |
| Italy | no data | none |
| Portugal | no data | no data |
| Sweden | 409,000 | |
| United Kingdom | no data | no data |

Money collected in some of the “new” EU member states

| | 1995 € | 2005 € |
|----------------|---------|------------|
| Cyprus | no data | no data |
| Czech Republic | no data | no data |
| Hungary | no data | < 15,000 |
| Latvia | no data | none |
| Lithuania | no data | ca. 15,000 |
| Poland | no data | none |
| Slovakia | no data | 60,300 |
| Slovenia | no data | no data |

Money collected in applicant states:

| | 1995 € | 2005 € |
|-----------------------|---------|--------|
| Croatia | no data | none |
| FYR Macedonia | no data | none |
| Serbia and Montenegro | no data | none |

Money collected in a non-EU state:

| | 1995 € | 2005 € |
|--------|--------------------|-----------|
| Norway | no comparable data | 1,655,300 |

It must be noted that it would be misleading to compare the absolute figures between states. There are too many differences in the number of persons benefiting from the systems (due to the extent of the national media landscape) and general incomes as well as living costs. For example the € 60,300 collected in Slovakia may be considered as a

big success. There is, however, a trend: wherever collecting societies are well established, the remuneration for the re-use of authors' rights has significantly increased within the past ten years.

Also note that in 2003 the total domestic collection for reprography and certain digital uses by Reproduction Rights Organisations around the world amounted to € 380 million.

5) Conclusions

5.1) General conclusions

The results of the EFJ survey make it clear that much work remains to be done to ensure that journalists receive fair remuneration for the use and re-use of their work. There have been improvements in some countries, and the increase in remuneration for re-use of authors' rights over the past ten years, where collecting societies exist, is – at least from an economic point of view – a real success story.

This shows that the management of the existing collecting societies works efficiently, whatever the model used. Collective licensing arrangements are the Nordic solution to copyright permissions. In Germany and other Central European states levies are dominant. Blank tape levies, however, are also common in the Scandinavian countries.

Most difficulties concern digital use of printed or audiovisual works. Introducing improvements in this field is an enormous challenge. The EU Directive on copyright and related rights in the information society is obviously neglected in most EU countries.

In some countries the general situation is really embarrassing. At the top of this list is Italy, one of the founding states of the EU. A possible explanation for this anomaly might be the mixture of political power and media ownership in the country: the responsibility of the state authority for media affairs combined with the interests of media owners is currently an obstacle to the introduction of a fair system of remuneration for journalists as rights holders. The position of journalists in some of the new EU member states, and even in some EU applicant states, is better than that facing journalists in Italy. This is particularly embarrassing for a country in which the history of authors' rights begins with the first law regulating copies of works, adopted in Venice in 1574.

But Italy does not stand alone. The position in Portugal, an EU member state since 1986, is poor. Austria must be mentioned – as well as France, Greece and the United Kingdom where no fair treatment is given to journalists.

The survey reveals significant problems in many of the “new” EU member states that joined the union in 2004. The interests of authors were not on the agenda during the process of harmonisation of systems and rights; they were not made a condition for accession and were largely ignored.

This omission must be corrected. The European Commission must ensure that the “new” EU member states implement the legal conditions for the creation of transparent and democratic collecting societies.

In Central and Eastern Europe the issue of authors' rights has the potential to be an instrument to promote social dialogue. It is fertile ground for negotiation of nation-wide agreements and could possibly bring journalists and publishers together in alliances to the extent that they have common economic interests that can be administered by a collecting society from which both parties can benefit.

The question of fair remuneration for authors and the specific question of collecting systems must be put on the negotiation agenda for each of the remaining applicant states. This is necessary to avoid repeating the mistake made in the case of the states which became EU members in 2004. This question should be raised in the negotiations for Stabilisation and Association Agreements. That it is especially important in the case of Turkey is shown by the lack of awareness of authors' rights by the administration in the northern part of Cyprus, revealed by this survey.

In some cases it was obvious that even union experts answering the questionnaire did not have sufficient information about the work of the national collecting society. This shows an obvious lack of effectiveness, transparency and democratic structures in some of the countries.

5.2) For an EU-wide collecting system?

The question was: Would your union support a EU-wide collecting system (one single collecting society would manage your rights across border) ?

From the “old” EU member states the answers were:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Austria | one union is very sceptical, the other says “no” |
| Belgium | no |
| Denmark | no |
| Finland | “difficult to answer, the matter must be discussed widely” |
| France | yes |
| Germany | very sceptical that this would work, due to different systems |
| Greece | not answered |
| Italy | yes |
| Portugal | union has not yet an opinion on that question |
| Sweden | no |
| United Kingdom | no |

From the “new” EU member states the answers were:

| | |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Cyprus | yes (both unions) |
| Czech Republic | yes |
| Hungary | yes |
| Latvia | not answered |
| Lithuania | not answered |
| Poland | yes |
| Slovakia | no |
| Slovenia | no |

From the applicant states answers were:

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Croatia | yes |
| Macedonia | not answered |

From the non-EU state surveyed the answer was:

| | |
|--------|----|
| Norway | no |
|--------|----|

There is a difference between countries where a functioning collecting system exists and countries that do not have such a system. Those journalists’ unions which complain about a missing or bad system are mainly in favour of an EU-wide collecting system; while the other group is against, or sceptical about such a system. These differing concerns would be equally addressed by setting Europe-wide standards of remuneration for the re-use of journalistic works – rather than a forced harmonisation of the individual systems.

Thanks to Mike Holderness for Edition

Appendix: The Questionnaire

Name of union:

Country:

1) Does a collecting system for re-use of authors' rights exist in your country?

• For print media (yes) (no)

What type of use does the collecting system cover?

copying for educational purposes (yes) (no)

copying of press clippings for information purposes in private and public institutions and companies (yes) (no)

- copying in libraries and /or for research purposes (yes) (no)

- compensation for private copying?(levies on hardware, copying machines, PCs, printers, *etc*) (yes) (no)

If yes to any of the above questions, does the collecting society cover digital use?

(please indicate which digital uses are covered):

For audiovisual media (yes) (no)

What type of use does the collecting system cover?

cable retransmission (yes) (no)

retransmission by satellite (yes) (no)

retransmission through digital net (yes) (no)

copying for educational purposes (yes) (no)

copying for research and archive (yes) (no)

compensation for private copying (blank tape or hardware levy or other) (yes) (no)

If yes to any of the above questions, does the collecting system cover digital use?

(please indicate which digital uses are covered):

2) Who are the beneficiaries of such system?

employed journalists in the printed press (including photographers, illustrators, graphic designers, cartoonists...) (yes) (no)

freelances printed press (including photographers, illustrators, graphic designers, cartoonists...) (yes) (no)

photographers (as a separate group) (yes) (no)

employed journalists in the broadcasting sector (including TV directors, text authors, TV photographers, TV editors) (yes) (no)

freelances broadcasting (same group as the above) (yes) (no)

10 media owners

(yes) (no)

3) Who collects the money?

A special organisation (a reprographic right organisation, for instance), the union, or other (please specify)?

4) How is the money collected and from whom?

5) Under which conditions can journalists receive the money?

6) How is the money distributed?

7) How much money was collected/distributed in 2004 from the different types of use?

8) Did your union enter into any collective (or other) agreement with

10a) electronic press clipping agencies (yes) (no)

10b) online databases? (yes) (no)

9) Would your union support a EU-wide collecting system?

(One single collecting society would manage your rights across border) ? (yes) (no)

10) Is the system in your country transparent, efficient and democratic?

What could be improved?

11) General remarks about your unions' policy, wishes, or plans.



*This publication has received funding from the European Community.
Sole responsibility lies with the European Federation of Journalists
and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may
be made of the information contained therein.*

*European Federation of Journalists
Résidence Palace
Rue de la loi 155
1040 Bruxelles, Belgium*

Tel +32 2 235 22 00