Turo Pekari, Teosto: Incentives and roadmap for the development of a copyright infrastructure
(Translation of transcript to English)

> *"…the ideal situation would be that we would have a value network or data network with different types of operators all of whom are capable of creating value in cooperation so that it's not just one-way. I find this a very important issue that should be thought about, and it's also the key for us to start doing these types of practices on a practical level"*

Good morning, everyone, and thank you, Anna, for the invitation. During the autumn, I participated in copyright infrastructure development through the subgroup discussions, and I have also had conversations with authors from different creative fields and with organisations representing them as to what we should do. And like Anna said, funding such activities is quite a critical issue, which has been well brought up by all parties involved. Especially when it comes to collective management organisations which, of course, played a major role in these discussions, such investments are actually quite significant both for our future and for the benefit of people at large, if you think about, say, Europe in a bigger picture, as well as data economy. In many fields, it is very difficult to start doing this type of development, because the money for something like that simply does not exist.

And indeed, to say a few words from Teosto's point of view, with this type of development activity, we seek to tackle the challenges that we have, and how Teosto – as a collective management organisation (CMO) – can operate in a more and more competed and international environment, ensuring that we can efficiently account royalties to our copyright holders. At the same time, I think it is good to acknowledge the fact that we often forget in these conversations that largely revolve – especially when it comes to metadata – around the metadata pertaining to a copyright protected work's ownership, is different kinds of work IDs and how to operate with them. That is very critical for our operations, and we have to be able to find solutions for both processing this data internally but also, in the future, more and more, efficiently share it with other parties. At the same time, however, if you think about the metadata in the music field, it is much more than just metadata related to the work. There is a great amount of, let's say, descriptive metadata that is the kind of data that is more visible to the consumers when people consume content. On the other hand, there's metadata produced and utilised by digital content services in particular: metadata related to finding content and recommendations. All these different types of metadata, in one way or another, we should link with each other, so that the whole thing works. In the picture shared by Anna, you can see different levels regarding the different perspectives of infrastructure development. In the subgroups, we have discussed different types of formats and standards a lot, and another thing we have also discussed a lot is how these things often tend to come from outside: they're international, and national operators may have a slim chance of impacting them. After all, I guess the bigger question is how they are actually used and how they can be shared between different types of operators. Especially in

some creative fields, the use of digital IDs is still very rare: for many operators, the first steps may involve thinking about how to deploy such IDs and how to build databases in order to get a better picture as to whose creative works are used and where. One way the other parties could make this sort of data more available is, of course, building application interfaces (APIs) that grant access to different kinds of databases, which in many fields are still unfortunately scarce. In most cases, they are used by internal networks, so especially when it comes to operators that enter the field from elsewhere, especially these days, it is quite typical that, say, different types of copyright services – provided by organisations like us – are also provided by commercial operators. And many companies that use music practically need that data in order to develop, on one hand, their own services and create value, but on the other hand, make sure that the data on the use of the works is also sent to organisations like us and of course, eventually, the money goes to the authors in the creative field.

These types of practices can be viewed from many perspectives, but one good first step is to start thinking about what different types of operators could or should there be in such networks where data is shared, and maybe to also let go of the thought that there are copyright operators who use money to buy services from technology companies and they provide us with service X. Of course, an ideal situation would be that we would have a value network or data network with different types of operators all of whom are capable of creating value in cooperation so that it's not just one-way. I find this a very important issue that should be thought about, and it's also the key for us to start doing these types of practices on a practical level.

In the data strategy of the European Commission, such data networks have been brought up in a very big role, and in other fields, there are quite many examples of those, but in creative fields, it's perhaps still quite scarce. I think that's one thing that should be focussed on in this work, thinking about the procedures and funding instruments we could use to encourage the operators in our field to start thinking about ways to take these things forward. Of course, one has to keep in mind that many of us, in the end, have very critical issues related to internal development which would have to be combined in one way or another in order to get the most benefit out of this – to avoid this becoming an unrelated activity that, in the longer run, would not serve the purpose for which collective management organisations exist. At the same time, thinking out loud, now that we are considering different funding alternatives for copyright infrastructure development, what I think is extremely important to remember is the fact that… in this call, too, there are many representatives from collective management organisations, and we are – in the end – in principle, non-profit operators who, however, operate in a business environment and in a competed environment, and a challenge that operators like us often have is that we are not fit for different types of funding instruments available for business development – precisely because of our non-profit nature. In that sense, it would be extremely important to find alternatives in which operators like us, too, would be eligible for development funding, so that we'd actually get to do these things in

practice. Ultimately, at the point we can create different kinds of tools – be it interfaces or other kinds of standard deployments – the most important work is to start doing it in practice, in other words, thinking about how we can share the data with different operators in a way that value is created both for our own operations, but I guess also, in a broader picture, thinking about how it serves consumers, how it serves different kinds of sender companies or online services who ultimately bring out content to the consumers. I guess those were my thoughts in a nutshell.