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Contrast between demand and revenues

In particular: (New) Google Images Search

Unauthorized use of third party content as a new business model
Contrast Between Demand and Revenues

High demand on images
- 1 trillion photos taken in 2014
- 1.8 billion photos were shared on Flickr, Snapchat, Instagram and Facebook in May 2014
- More photos are consumed than ever before

Low revenues for the image industry
- 85% of images found online by visual search systems online are unlawful copies
- Declining prices for images
- Declining traffic to websites with original images
In particular: (New) Google Images Search (1)

- Google controls more than **90% of the image search market** in the EU
- Google **Images Search** generates 519 million unique visitors per month = **45% of Google’s total search traffic**
- Google **distributes third party content** for free
In particular: (New) Google Images Search (2)

**Effects of new search design on users:**
- more clicks to get to the final image
- no correct image descriptions in lack of display of EXIF-information
- risk of unconscious copyright infringements

**Effects of new search design on image providers:**
- facilitation of illegal copying
- less traffic and revenue
- omitting the name deprives authors of the credit they deserve
- framing increases the bandwidth use of hosting site
- images are viewed out of context
In particular: (New) Google Images Search (3)
Development of traffic to sources

Traffic from Google Image Search to image providers’ websites, by referring domain, Jan 2012 - Apr 2015

No changes implemented on Google Images in Germany and France

Implementation of new Google Images Search
Unauthorized Use of Third Party Content as a New Business Model (1)

Example from Pinterest, search for “frog”
Unauthorized Use of Third Party Content as a New Business Model (2)

Example from Tumblr, search for “frog”
Unauthorized Use of Third Party Content as a New Business Model (3)

Example from Flickr, search for “frog”
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Challenges of the image industry

Shortcomings of the existing legal framework
  - Framing
  - Host provider privilege
  - Implied consent

CEPIC’s campaign
The authorisation of the copyright holders is not required “were the referring court to find [...] that when Internet users click on the link at issue, the work appears in such a way as to give the impression that it is appearing on the site on which that link is found, whereas in fact that work comes from another site.”

CJEU, judgment of 13 February 2014, Case C466/12, Svensson, para. 29
Framing (2)

• CJEU draws no differentiation between hyperlinking and framing

• A communication is only subject to the right holder’s authorization under Article 3 InfoSoc-Directive if it is directed to a “new public” (= a public that has not been taken into account by the rightholder upon publishing his work online)

• When published online and without access restriction all internet users are taken into account

• There is no room for a “new public” for works published online

• Consequence: Hyperlinking and framing are no communication to a “new public” subject to the right holders’ authorization
Questions for right holders:

• Is it appropriate to treat hyperlinks and framing equally?
• What about the similarities between framing and the uploading of images?
• Wouldn't the right to communication to the public be subject to exhaustion if understood this way?
Host Provider Privilege (1)

- Host providers are platforms that **merely host third party content**
- Most **aggregators** and **social media platforms** rely on this privilege
- Under Article 14 E-Commerce Directive host providers can only be held liable upon **knowledge or awareness**
- Right holders depend on ineffective **notice-and-takedown** procedures to trigger knowledge or awareness
- **Consequence:** it is almost impossible to enforce copyright towards host providers
Host Provider Privilege (2)

Questions for right holders:

- Is it appropriate to privilege providers that actively participate or intervene in the organisation or presentation of (illegally uploaded) third party content?
- Are notice-and-takedown procedures sufficient to enforce copyrights?
- What about automated filtering and monitoring tools readily available to host providers to detect infringing content?
Implied Consent (1)

“Thus, having uploaded images of her works onto the internet without protecting these from being found via search engines, the Claimant has agreed to images of her works being depicted as thumbnails in the Defendant’s search engine.”

From the search engine’s point of view this “could objectively be understood as an agreement for the images of the Claimant’s works to be used to the extent usual for image searches.”

German Federal Court of Justice, judgment of 29 April 2010, I ZR 69/08, Vorschaubilder I, para. 36
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Implied Consent (2)

• **Inconsistent application** of the concept of implied consent on national level

• German case law:
  • Search services are “common” on the internet
  • Right holders have **technical tools** at hand to prevent the finding and displaying of their works by search engines
  • Publishing of works without such technical measures can be regarded as **implied consent** (granted to anybody) that copies of the work may be used for search purposes
Questions for right holders:

• Is communication via robots.txt really sufficient / effective?
• Which exploitations are “common”?
• What about explicit disapprovals?
• Doesn’t the inconsistent application of the implied consent doctrine on national level trigger uncertainty among right holders on EU level?
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Unique opportunity for improvement of legal framework

Recommendations to European Legislator
Several EU institutions are assessing and evaluating EU copyright at the moment:

- **European Parliament** Legal Affairs Committee will vote on Julia Reda's report on the implementation of the InfoSoc Directive on 16 June 2015
- European Parliament plenary will vote on Julia Reda‘s report on 8/9 July 2015
- **Commissioner for Digital Economy & Society Oettinger** is currently working on a reform of copyright on EU level
- **Commission** has announced the first legislative proposal to be presented by the **end of 2015**
CEPIC’s Campaign

Recommendations to European Legislator

**Framing:**
Amendment of Article 3 and Recitals of InfoSoc Directive

Inclusion of framing into the right of communication to the public

**Host provider privilege:**
Amendment of Article 14 and Recitals E-Commerce Directive

Inclusion of providers that actively participate or intervene in the organisation or presentation of third party content

**Implied consent:**
Amendment of Article 5 and Recitals of InfoSoc Directive

Clarification that there is no implied consent
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