Regulatory environment for platforms, online intermediaries, data and cloud computing and the collaborative economy

Objectives and General Information

The views expressed in this public consultation document may not be interpreted as stating an official position of the European Commission. All definitions provided in this document are strictly for the purposes of this public consultation and are without prejudice to differing definitions the Commission may use under current or future EU law, including any revision of the definitions by the Commission concerning the same subject matters.

You are invited to read the privacy statement attached to this consultation for information on how your personal data and contribution will be dealt with.

This public consultation will close on 6 January 2016 (13 weeks from the day when all language versions have been made available).

The Commission invites all interested parties to express their views on the questions targeting relations between platform providers and holders of rights in digital content (Question starting with "[A1]"), taking account of the Commission Communication "Towards a modern, more European copyright framework" of 9 December 2015. Technical features of the questionnaire have been adapted accordingly.

Please complete this section of the public consultation before moving to other sections.
Respondents living with disabilities can request the questionnaire in .docx format and send their replies in email to the following address: CNECT-PLATFORMS-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu.

If you are an association representing several other organisations and intend to gather the views of your members by circulating the questionnaire to them, please send us a request in email and we will send you the questionnaire in .docx format. However, we ask you to introduce the aggregated answers into EU Survey. In such cases we will not consider answers submitted in other channels than EU Survey.

If you want to submit position papers or other information in addition to the information you share with the Commission in EU Survey, please send them to CNECT-PLATFORMS-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu and make reference to the “Case Id” displayed after you have concluded the online questionnaire. This helps the Commission to properly identify your contribution.

Given the volume of this consultation, you may wish to download a PDF version before responding to the survey online. The PDF version includes all possible questions. When you fill the survey in online, you will not see all of the questions; only those applicable to your chosen respondent category and to other choices made when you answer previous questions.

Please indicate your role for the purpose of this consultation

- An individual citizen
- An association or trade organization representing consumers
- An association or trade organization representing businesses
- An association or trade organization representing civil society
- An online platform
- A business, including suppliers using an online platform to provide services
- A public authority
- A research institution or Think tank
- Other

Please indicate your country of residence

United Kingdom

Please provide your contact information (name, address and e-mail address)

Reema Selhi, DACS, 33 Old Bethnal Green Road, London UK E2 6AA
reema.selhi@dacs.org.uk

Is your organisation registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission and the European Parliament?

Note: If you are not answering this questionnaire as an individual, please register in the Transparency Register. If your organisation/institution responds without being registered, the Commission will consider its input as that of an individual and will publish it as such.

- Yes
- No
- Non-applicable
Please indicate your organisation's registration number in the Transparency Register

103615018634-15

If you are an economic operator, please enter the NACE code, which best describes the economic activity you conduct. You can find here the NACE classification.

Text of 3 to 5 characters will be accepted

The Statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community, abbreviated as NACE, is the classification of economic activities in the European Union (EU).

I object the publication of my personal data

Yes
No

Online platforms

Social and economic role of online platforms

Do you agree with the definition of "Online platform" as provided below?

"Online platform" refers to an undertaking operating in two (or multi)-sided markets, which uses the Internet to enable interactions between two or more distinct but interdependent groups of users so as to generate value for at least one of the groups. Certain platforms also qualify as Intermediary service providers.

Typical examples include general internet search engines (e.g. Google, Bing), specialised search tools (e.g. Google Shopping, Kelkoo, Twenga, Google Local, TripAdvisor, Yelp.), location-based business directories or some maps (e.g. Google or Bing Maps), news aggregators (e.g. Google News), online market places (e.g. Amazon, eBay, Allegro, Booking.com), audio-visual and music platforms (e.g. Deezer, Spotify, Netflix, Canal play, Apple TV), video sharing platforms (e.g. YouTube, Dailymotion), payment systems (e.g. PayPal, Apple Pay), social networks (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, Tuenti), app stores (e.g. Apple App Store, Google Play) or collaborative economy platforms (e.g. AirBnB, Uber, Taskrabbit, Bla-bla car). Internet access providers fall outside the scope of this definition.

No
DACS considers that defining platforms in a meaningful way is difficult as it risks ruling out new business models or creating loopholes for some businesses to exploit. This is relevant to DACS’ members where Artist Resale Right (ARR) royalty payments are due but not paid. ARR royalties are due when artwork is sold for the 2nd time by galleries or auction houses (e.g. Sotheby’s, Christie’s et al). Some auction houses have teamed up with eBay to sell artworks and some are holding online-only auctions on their own sites. eBay is identified as a platform but it is not clear if an auction house would be despite both auctioning artworks. The fairest approach to regulation would be to examine the behaviour of all business in a market place, such as online auctions to ensure natural competitors/joint ventures are regulated evenly. Innovative economies will continue to flourish so flexibility in the approach as to what constitutes an online platform is essential to futureproof any proposals.

What do you consider to be the key advantages of using online platforms?

Online platforms…

☐ make information more accessible
☐ make communication and interaction easier
☐ increase choice of products and services
☐ create more transparent prices and the possibility to compare offers
☐ increase trust between peers by providing trust mechanisms (i.e. ratings, reviews, etc.)
☐ lower prices for products and services
☐ lower the cost of reaching customers for suppliers
☐ help with matching supply and demand
☐ create new markets or business opportunities
☐ help in complying with obligations in cross-border sales
☐ help to share resources and improve resource-allocation
☐ others:

Have you encountered, or are you aware of problems faced by consumers or suppliers when dealing with online platforms?

“Consumer” is any natural person using an online platform for purposes outside the person's trade, business, craft or profession.

“Supplier” is any trader or non-professional individual that uses online platforms to provide services to third parties both under their own brand (name) and under the platform's brand.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don’t know
Online platforms are frequently praised for their enterprising marketplaces, but it is clear that many are content to appeal to a global audience yet shield their corporate liabilities behind the laws of a specific and favourable jurisdiction. Some auction houses have promoted their tax (and other liability) avoidance to their audience. Auction house Fine Art Bourse (FAB) stated in an interview with The Financial Times (http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/73d0d824-967e-11e4-922f-00144feabdc0.html) that their strapline for their business was “No sales tax, no resale royalty, no copyright fee” as they were running auctions out of Hong Kong. Although FAB was a UK registered company with London offices they have since gone into receivership but the path remains open for other art market operations to follow.

The clear disregard not only for copyright and ARR royalties but also for tax payments is detrimental to the internal market. Whilst it is pleasing to see clampdowns on tax evasions are growing in the EU and UK, DACS believes that online platforms, such as those that auction houses use or maintain themselves, should be subject to the same level of scrutiny for their practices as other businesses.

Whilst ARR is adopted throughout the EU and overall in 81 countries worldwide, it has not yet been adopted in places such as Switzerland, the USA and China, therefore providing scope for structures where the contracts are agreed to be formed/entered into in one of these jurisdictions to avoid payment of royalties. There is not sufficient legal clarity as to where contracts are formed in auction situations and whether this depends on either the location of the seller, of the buyer or of the object being sold or all of them.

We refer to the submission from the British Copyright Council (the BCC) in respect of the access to infringing content that online platforms provide.

How could these problems be best addressed?

- market dynamics
- regulatory measures
- self-regulatory measures
- a combination of the above

TRANSPARENCY OF ONLINE PLATFORMS
Do you think that online platforms should ensure, as regards their own activities and those of the traders that use them, more transparency in relation to:

a) information required by consumer law (e.g. the contact details of the supplier, the main characteristics of products, the total price including delivery charges, and consumers’ rights, such as the right of withdrawal)?

“Trader” is any natural or legal person using an online platform for business or professional purposes. Traders are in particular subject to EU consumer law in their relations with consumers.

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

b) information in response to a search query by the user, in particular if the displayed results are sponsored or not?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

c) information on who the actual supplier is, offering products or services on the platform

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

d) information to discourage misleading marketing by professional suppliers (traders), including fake reviews?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

e) is there any additional information that, in your opinion, online platforms should be obliged to display?

500 character(s) maximum

Platforms should include information about their liabilities and governance, a declaration of legitimately acquired content, rights management information, copyright notices and information of any infringements, non-payments of royalties and disputes about copyright and related rights, including ARR.

Have you experienced that information displayed by the platform (e.g. advertising) has been adapted to the interest or recognisable characteristics of the user?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
Do you find the information provided by online platforms on their terms of use sufficient and easy-to-understand?

- Yes
- No

★ What type of additional information and in what format would you find useful? Please briefly explain your response and share any best practice you are aware of.

1500 character(s) maximum

We repeat here our response to point e) above.

We also consider that terms and conditions should be readily and easily available, clear and user friendly and that support is given to enable users to understand the meaning of the terms, for example with guidance or glossaries. Rights management information is equally important and should be made available to users.

We also support the BCC who recommend that such information should be available to the user at the point of upload or access to the content.

Do you find reputation systems (e.g. ratings, reviews, certifications, trustmarks) and other trust mechanisms operated by online platforms are generally reliable?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

What are the main benefits and drawbacks of reputation systems and other trust mechanisms operated by online platforms? Please describe their main benefits and drawbacks.

1500 character(s) maximum

USE OF INFORMATION BY ONLINE PLATFORMS

In your view, do online platforms provide sufficient and accessible information with regard to:

a) the personal and non-personal data they collect?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

b) what use is made of the personal and non-personal data collected, including trading of the data to other platforms and actors in the Internet economy?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
c) adapting prices, for instance dynamic pricing and conditions in function of data gathered on the buyer (both consumer and trader)?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding the use of information by online platforms

3000 character(s) maximum

We support the response of the BCC for this question who state the following:

The series of questions on “use of information by online platforms” does not allow us to address the importance of data for rights management and royalty or other payment purposes.

It is essential that online platforms provide data of a type and in a form suited to the needs of individual right holders, collective management organisations, or other agents or managers, which licences content to the platform. This data is crucial to the effective flow of royalties and the remuneration of creators, performers and other right holders and, consequently to the continued creation and continued availability of such content for online use.

RELATIONS BETWEEN PLATFORMS AND SUPPLIERS/TRADERS/APPLICATION DEVELOPERS OR HOLDERS OF RIGHTS IN DIGITAL CONTENT

Please provide the list of online platforms with which you are in regular business relations and indicate to what extent your business depends on them (on a scale of 0 to 3). Please describe the position of your business or the business you represent and provide recent examples from your business experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of online platform</th>
<th>Dependency (0:not dependent, 1: dependent, 2: highly dependent)</th>
<th>Examples from your business experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you experience the following business practices in your business relations with platforms?

The online platform …

*A parity clause is a provision in the terms of use of an online platform or in an individual contract between the online platform and a supplier under which the price, availability and other conditions of a product or service offered by the supplier on the online platform have to maintain parity with the best offer of the supplier on other sales channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requests me to use exclusively its services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies “parity clauses” *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies non-transparent fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies fees without corresponding counter-performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies terms and conditions, which I find unbalanced and do not have the possibility to negotiate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unilaterally modifies the contractual terms without giving you proper notification or allowing you to terminate the contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limits access to data or provides it in a non-usable format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puts significant constraints to presenting your offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presents suppliers/services in a biased way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refuses access to its services unless specific restrictions are accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotes its own services to the disadvantage of services provided by suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you do experience them, what is their impact on your business activity (on a scale from 0 to 3).

Impact on my business:
The online platform …

* A parity clause is a provision in the terms of use of an online platform or in an individual contract between the online platform and a supplier under which the price, availability and other conditions of a product or service offered by the supplier on the online platform have to maintain parity with the best offer of the supplier on other sales channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on business</th>
<th>0 – no impact</th>
<th>1 – minor impact</th>
<th>2 – considerable impact</th>
<th>3 – heavy impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requests me to use exclusively its services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies &quot;parity clauses&quot; *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies non-transparent fees</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies fees without corresponding counter-performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies terms and conditions, which I find unbalanced and do not have the possibility to negotiate</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unilaterally modifies the contractual terms without giving you proper notification or allowing you to terminate the contract</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limits access to data or provides it in a non-usable format</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puts significant constraints to presenting your offer</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presents suppliers/services in a biased way</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refuses access to its services unless specific restrictions are accepted</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotes its own services to the disadvantage of services provided by suppliers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you are aware of other contractual clauses or experience other potentially problematic practices, please mention them here

1000 character(s) maximum

Artists Resale Right (ARR) is a royalty payable on the secondary sale of an artwork in certain jurisdictions, described below in more detail. Online auction houses are free to decide the jurisdiction of their contracts of sale and as such they can avoid paying the resale royalty even where it would naturally be due in an offline scenario. This is detrimental to rightsholders who rely on the resale royalty and equally it is detrimental to the internal marketplace in the sense that an EU law can be so easily evaded.

★ Please briefly describe the situation
3000 character(s) maximum

ARR provides a royalty for artists and artists’ estates whenever their work is resold by a gallery or auctioneer for €1,000 or more. It was introduced in the UK through The Artist’s Resale Right Regulations in 2006 on the basis of the European Resale Right Directive 2001/84/EC and fully implemented in 2012 to include deceased artists (artists’ estates), whose works are still in copyright. It enables artists to have a share in the increasing value of their work and allows artists’ estates to continue to care for an artist’s legacy. ARR is a valuable and essential revenue stream for UK and European artists. To date DACS has distributed nearly £41m in royalties to over 3,700 artists and estates. There has been an exponential rise year on year: DACS distributed £2.3m in 2012 which more than doubled in 2 years to £5.4m in 2014. Artists and their beneficiaries use ARR royalties to help secure cultural heritage as many artists’ estates pay for storing, restoration and preserving artists’ work. This is essential work that benefits museums and gallery exhibition programmes and supports cultural tourism, but also the art market itself which often draws on the expertise of heirs and beneficiaries for the authentication of works and proof of provenance.

There are mechanisms in place that ensure that ARR also protects the interest of the art trade: royalty rates are cumulative on a sliding scale from 4% on works sold at €50,000 or less to 0.25% for works that exceed sale prices of €500,000 with a cap of €12,500 per sale. The UK Government was free to decide that a threshold of €1,000 should be implemented so ARR only becomes due on sales for or above that price. Some jurisdictions (both within and outside of the EEA) have not implemented ARR. These countries are being used as safe havens by online auction houses and other sales platform providers to avoid the payment of ARR royalties even when the location of the work or either party is within a jurisdiction that has implemented ARR. The law is unclear as to which jurisdiction auction sales take place in and whether this depends on the location of the seller, of the buyer or of the object being sold or all of them.
[A1] Are you a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright, which is used on an online platform?
- Yes
- No

As a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright have you faced any of the following circumstances:

An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator uses my protected works online without having asked for my authorisation.
- Yes
- No

An online platform such as a video sharing website or a content aggregator refuses to enter into or negotiate licensing agreements with me.
- Yes
- No

An online platform such as a video sharing website or a content aggregator is willing to enter into a licensing agreement on terms that I consider unfair.
- Yes
- No

An online platform uses my protected works but claims it is a hosting provider under Article 14 of the E-Commerce Directive in order to refuse to negotiate a licence or to do so under their own terms.
- Yes
- No
As you answered YES to some of the above questions, please explain your situation in more detail.

3000 character(s) maximum

DACS collects and distributes royalties to visual artists and their estates through Artist’s Resale Right (ARR) mentioned above, as well as individual copyright licensing, collective copyright licensing (through a scheme that we term Payback) and an image bank called Artimage. DACS acts as a trusted broker for 90,000 rightsholders of artistic works worldwide, many of whom have digital content protected by copyright used on an online platform and have suffered the problems outlined above.

Images of visual art works and photographs protected by copyright are disseminated widely through online platforms and social media sites without authorisation from or remuneration to the rightsholders of such works. Online platforms depend on such content, yet as a “mere conduit” under the E-Commerce Directive (2000/31/EC) they are absolved from liability to remunerate creators of such works.

Rightsholders are powerless to effectively grant licenses to the platforms or receive any compensation from the use of their works. Another problem is that this in turn reduces the value for creative content, weakening the bargaining position for rightsholders even further. Considering the decision in Svensson (Case C-466/12) that established that providing a hyperlink is only a licensable act if it reaches a new public, rightsholders are unable to licence their works to platforms providing links unless it reaches a new audience to the original site.

Is there a room for improvement in the relation between platforms and suppliers using the services of platforms?

- No, the present situation is satisfactory.
- Yes, through market dynamics.
- Yes, through self-regulatory measures (codes of conducts / promotion of best practices).
- Yes, through regulatory measures.
- Yes, through the combination of the above.

Are you aware of any dispute resolution mechanisms operated by online platforms, or independent third parties on the business-to-business level mediating between platforms and their suppliers?

- Yes
- No

CONSTRAINTS ON THE ABILITY OF CONSUMERS AND TRADERS TO MOVE FROM ONE PLATFORM TO ANOTHER
Do you see a need to strengthen the technical capacity of online platforms and address possible other constraints on switching freely and easily from one platform to another and move user data (e.g. emails, messages, search and order history, or customer reviews)?

- Yes
- No

Should there be a mandatory requirement allowing non-personal data to be easily extracted and moved between comparable online services?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding the ability of consumers and traders to move from one platform to another

*3000 character(s) maximum*

**ACCESS TO DATA**

As a trader or a consumer using the services of online platforms did you experience any of the following problems related to the access of data?

a) unexpectedly changing conditions of accessing the services of the platforms

- Yes
- No

b) unexpectedly changing conditions of accessing the Application Programming Interface of the platform

- Yes
- No

c) unexpectedly changing conditions of accessing the data you shared with or stored on the platform

- Yes
- No

d) discriminatory treatment in accessing data on the platform

- Yes
- No
Would a rating scheme, issued by an independent agency on certain aspects of the platforms' activities, improve the situation?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding access to data on online platforms

3000 character(s) maximum

Tackling illegal content online and the liability of online intermediaries
Please indicate your role in the context of this set of questions

Terms used for the purposes of this consultation:

“Illegal content”
Corresponds to the term “illegal activity or information” used in Article 14 of the E-commerce Directive. The directive does not further specify this term. It may be understood in a wide sense so as to include any infringement of applicable EU or national laws and regulations. This could for instance include defamation, terrorism related content, IPR infringements, child abuse content, consumer rights infringements, or incitement to hatred or violence on the basis of race, origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, malware, illegal online gambling, selling illegal medicines, selling unsafe products.

“Hosting”
According to Article 14 of the E-commerce Directive, hosting is the “storage of (content) that has been provided by the user of an online service”. It may for instance be storage of websites on servers. It may also include the services offered by online market places, referencing services and social networks.

“Notice”
Any communication to a hosting service provider that gives the latter knowledge of a particular item of illegal content that it transmits or stores and therefore creates an obligation for it to act expeditiously by removing the illegal content or disabling/blocking access to it. Such an obligation only arises if the notice provides the internet hosting service provider with actual awareness or knowledge of illegal content.

“Notice provider”
Anyone (a natural or legal person) that informs a hosting service provider about illegal content on the internet. It may for instance be an individual citizen, a hotline or a holder of intellectual property rights. In certain cases it may also include public authorities.

“Provider of content”
In the context of a hosting service the content is initially provided by the user of that service. A provider of content is for instance someone who posts a comment on a social network site or uploads a video on a video sharing site.

〇 individual user
〇 content provider
〇 notice provider
〇 intermediary
〇 none of the above

★ Please explain

DACS represents rightsholders who create content which is protected by copyright and some of these rightsholders have been subject to copyright infringement involving online platforms.

Have you encountered situations suggesting that the liability regime introduced in Section IV of the E-commerce Directive (art. 12-15) has proven not fit for purpose or has negatively affected market level playing field?

〇 Yes
〇 No
DACS supports the British Copyright Council’s (the BCC) response to this question, in particular where they note that the type of online platforms seen today were not as sufficiently developed, and the market place still in its infancy, when the E-Commerce Directive was brought into effect in 2000. As such, DACS considers that many online platforms are not passive enough in nature to be considered a conduit however the definition under Article 12 E-Commerce Directive allows such online platforms to avoid paying for creative content.

Do you think that the concept of a "mere technical, automatic and passive nature" of information transmission by information society service providers provided under recital 42 of the ECD is sufficiently clear to be interpreted and applied in a homogeneous way, having in mind the growing involvement in content distribution by some online intermediaries, e.g.: video sharing websites?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

Please explain your answer.

Again, DACS supports the BCC’s response in this instance. DACS considered that the Directive has not been interpreted in a unified manner across member states which give unfair advantage to some online platforms. DACS also agrees with the BCC that there should be a clear separation of “passive” and “active” online platforms, taking into regard the commercial reality of the operation of the platform such as monetising content and market share.

Mere conduit/caching/hosting describe the activities that are undertaken by a service provider. However, new business models and services have appeared since the adopting of the E-commerce Directive. For instance, some cloud service providers might also be covered under hosting services e.g. pure data storage. Other cloud-based services, as processing, might fall under a different category or not fit correctly into any of the existing ones. The same can apply to linking services and search engines, where there has been some diverging case-law at national level. Do you think that further categories of intermediary services should be established, besides mere conduit/caching/hosting and/or should the existing categories be clarified?

- Yes
- No

On the "notice"
Do you consider that different categories of illegal content require different policy approaches as regards notice-and-action procedures, and in particular different requirements as regards the content of the notice?

- Yes
- No

Do you think that any of the following categories of illegal content requires a specific approach:

- Illegal offer of goods and services (e.g. illegal arms, fake medicines, dangerous products, unauthorised gambling services etc.)
- Illegal promotion of goods and services
- Content facilitating phishing, pharming or hacking
- Infringements of intellectual property rights (e.g. copyright and related rights, trademarks)
- Infringement of consumer protection rules, such as fraudulent or misleading offers
- Infringement of safety and security requirements
- Racist and xenophobic speech
- Homophobic and other kinds of hate speech
- Child abuse content
- Terrorism-related content (e.g. content inciting the commitment of terrorist offences and training material)
- Defamation
- Other:

Please explain what approach you would see fit for the relevant category.

1000 character(s) maximum

Infringements can be subjective in some cases and facts may need to be examined more closely than for determining other types of illegal content. Infringements of copyrights also equate to a lack of remuneration as copyright is an economic right therefore that should also be taken into account when approaching such illegal content.

On the "action"

Should the content providers be given the opportunity to give their views to the hosting service provider on the alleged illegality of the content?

- Yes
- No
DACS believes that there should be a dialogue between rightsholders and online platforms and supports the response from the BCC in this respect. We also consider that if online platforms engage in such a way they will be taking a more ‘active’ role as distinguished in our response to the previous question about recital 42 of the E-Commerce Directive.

If you consider that this should only apply for some kinds of illegal content, please indicate which one(s)

Should action taken by hosting service providers remain effective over time (“take down and stay down” principle)?

- Yes
- No

Please explain

We support the position of the BCC in this respect. Once something has been identified as being an infringement, we consider that the requirement in Article 14 of the E Commerce Directive of ‘actual knowledge’ has been met and therefore the infringement must not be allowed to reappear.

On duties of care for online intermediaries:

Recital 48 of the Ecommerce Directive establishes that "[t]his Directive does not affect the possibility for Member States of requiring service providers, who host information provided by recipients of their service, to apply duties of care, which can reasonably be expected from them and which are specified by national law, in order to detect and prevent certain types of illegal activities". Moreover, Article 16 of the same Directive calls on Member States and the Commission to encourage the "drawing up of codes of conduct at Community level by trade, professional and consumer associations or organisations designed to contribute to the proper implementation of Articles 5 to 15". At the same time, however, Article 15 sets out a prohibition to impose "a general obligation to monitor".

(For online intermediaries): Have you put in place voluntary or proactive measures to remove certain categories of illegal content from your system?

- Yes
- No
Could you outline the considerations that have prevented you from putting in place voluntary measures?

1500 character(s) maximum

Do you see a need to impose specific duties of care for certain categories of illegal content?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

Please specify for which categories of content you would establish such an obligation.

1500 character(s) maximum

Content protected by copyright and content protected by related rights including Artists Resale Right (ARR)

Please specify for which categories of intermediary you would establish such an obligation.

1500 character(s) maximum

All categories of intermediaries including those selling artistic works via auction where ARR royalties would be due. Additionally, those intermediaries who allow users to upload content, to store it and make it available to others.

Please specify what types of actions could be covered by such an obligation.

1500 character(s) maximum

DACS considers that intermediaries should be obliged to ensure that sales of goods facilitated by platforms do not circumvent EU law and this obligation should apply to each sale made through the platform. DACS also considers that online platforms should be obligated to provide users with clear, unbiased information about copyright law in their jurisdiction and what licenses the service does and does not have.

Do you see a need for more transparency on the intermediaries’ content restriction policies and practices (including the number of notices received as well as their main content and the results of the actions taken following the notices)?

- Yes
- No

Should this obligation be limited to those hosting service providers, which receive a sizeable amount of notices per year (e.g. more than 1000)?

- Yes
- No
Do you think that online intermediaries should have a specific service to facilitate contact with national authorities for the fastest possible notice and removal of illegal contents that constitute a threat for e.g. public security or fight against terrorism?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding the liability of online intermediaries and the topics addressed in this section of the questionnaire.

5000 character(s) maximum

DACS considers that obligations by online platforms should not be determined by the number or size of the content, but more on the basis of the realities of the situation. For example, a threshold of 1000 notices per year for violation of copyright and related rights would not sufficiently cover the situation where artworks are sold online and ARR royalties are not paid to the artist, as the online platform facilitating those sales may make far fewer than 1000 qualifying sales a year. As such a holistic view should be taken as to what ignites such obligations by examining the (often economic) realities of such copyright and related rights violations.

Data and cloud in digital ecosystems

FREE FLOW OF DATA

ON DATA LOCATION RESTRICTIONS

In the context of the free flow of data in the Union, do you in practice take measures to make a clear distinction between personal and non-personal data?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Have restrictions on the location of data affected your strategy in doing business (e.g. limiting your choice regarding the use of certain digital technologies and services?)

- Yes
- No

Do you think that there are particular reasons in relation to which data location restrictions are or should be justifiable?

- Yes
- No

ON DATA ACCESS AND TRANSFER
Do you think that the existing contract law framework and current contractual practices are fit for purpose to facilitate a free flow of data including sufficient and fair access to and use of data in the EU, while safeguarding fundamental interests of parties involved?

- Yes
- No

In order to ensure the free flow of data within the European Union, in your opinion, regulating access to, transfer and the use of non-personal data at European level is:

- Necessary
- Not necessary

When non-personal data is generated by a device in an automated manner, do you think that it should be subject to specific measures (binding or non-binding) at EU level?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding data access, ownership and use

*5000 character(s) maximum*

---

**ON DATA MARKETS**

What regulatory constraints hold back the development of data markets in Europe and how could the EU encourage the development of such markets?

*3000 character(s) maximum*

---

**ON ACCESS TO OPEN DATA**
Do you think more could be done to open up public sector data for re-use in addition to the recently revised EU legislation (Directive 2013/37/EU)?

Open by default means: Establish an expectation that all government data be published and made openly re-usable by default, while recognising that there are legitimate reasons why some data cannot be released.

- Introducing the principle of 'open by default'[1]
- Licensing of ‘Open Data’: help persons/ organisations wishing to re-use public sector information (e.g., Standard European License)
- Further expanding the scope of the Directive (e.g. to include public service broadcasters, public undertakings);
- Improving interoperability (e.g., common data formats);
- Further limiting the possibility to charge for re-use of public sector information
- Remedies available to potential re-users against unfavourable decisions
- Other aspects?

Do you think that there is a case for the opening up of data held by private entities to promote its re-use by public and/or private sector, while respecting the existing provisions on data protection?

- Yes
- No

ON ACCESS AND REUSE OF (NON-PERSONAL) SCIENTIFIC DATA

Do you think that data generated by research is sufficiently, findable, accessible identifiable, and re-usable enough?

- Yes
- No

Do you agree with a default policy which would make data generated by publicly funded research available through open access?

- Yes
- No

ON LIABILITY IN RELATION TO THE FREE FLOW OF DATA AND THE INTERNET OF THINGS
As a provider/user of Internet of Things (IoT) and/or data driven services and connected tangible devices, have you ever encountered or do you anticipate problems stemming from either an unclear liability regime/non –existence of a clear-cut liability regime?

The "Internet of Things" is an ecosystem of physical objects that contain embedded technology to sense their internal statuses and communicate or interact with the external environment. Basically, Internet of things is the rapidly growing network of everyday objects—eyeglasses, cars, thermostats—made smart with sensors and internet addresses that create a network of everyday objects that communicate with one another, with the eventual capability to take actions on behalf of users.

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

If you did not find the legal framework satisfactory, does this affect in any way your use of these services and tangible goods or your trust in them?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

Do you think that the existing legal framework (laws, or guidelines or contractual practices) is fit for purpose in addressing liability issues of IoT or and Data driven services and connected tangible goods?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

As a user of IoT and/or data driven services and connected tangible devices, does the present legal framework for liability of providers impact your confidence and trust in those services and connected tangible goods?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

In order to ensure the roll-out of IoT and the free flow of data, should liability issues of these services and connected tangible goods be addressed at EU level?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

ON OPEN SERVICE PLATFORMS
What are in your opinion the socio-economic and innovation advantages of open versus closed service platforms and what regulatory or other policy initiatives do you propose to accelerate the emergence and take-up of open service platforms?

3000 character(s) maximum

PERSONAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

The following questions address the issue whether technical innovations should be promoted and further developed in order to improve transparency and implement efficiently the requirements for lawful processing of personal data, in compliance with the current and future EU data protection legal framework. Such innovations can take the form of ‘personal data cloud spaces’ or trusted frameworks and are often referred to as ‘personal data banks/stores/vaults’.

Do you think that technical innovations, such as personal data spaces, should be promoted to improve transparency in compliance with the current and future EU data protection legal framework? Such innovations can take the form of ‘personal data cloud spaces’ or trusted frameworks and are often referred to as ‘personal data banks/stores/vaults’?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don’t know

EUROPEAN CLOUD INITIATIVE

What are the key elements for ensuring trust in the use of cloud computing services by European businesses and citizens

“Cloud computing” is a paradigm for enabling network access to a scalable and elastic pool of shareable physical or virtual resources with self-service provisioning and administration on-demand. Examples of such resources include: servers, operating systems, networks, software, applications, and storage equipment.

☐ Reducing regulatory differences between Member States
☐ Standards, certification schemes, quality labels or seals
☐ Use of the cloud by public institutions
☐ Investment by the European private sector in secure, reliable and high-quality cloud infrastructures

As a (potential) user of cloud computing services, do you think cloud service providers are sufficiently transparent on the security and protection of users’ data regarding the services they provide?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not applicable
As a (potential) user of cloud computing services, do you think cloud service providers are sufficiently transparent on the security and protection of users' data regarding the services they provide?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

As a (potential) user of cloud computing services, do you agree that existing contractual practices ensure a fair and balanced allocation of legal and technical risks between cloud users and cloud service providers?

- Yes
- No

What would be the benefit of cloud computing services interacting with each other (ensuring interoperability)

- Economic benefits
- Improved trust
- Others:

What would be the benefit of guaranteeing the portability of data, including at European level, between different providers of cloud services

- Economic benefits
- Improved trust
- Others:
Have you encountered any of the following contractual practices in relation to cloud based services? In your view, to what extent could those practices hamper the uptake of cloud based services? Please explain your reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (Y[es] or N[no])</th>
<th>Sometimes (Y / N)</th>
<th>Often (Y / N)</th>
<th>Always (Y / N)</th>
<th>Why (1500 characters max.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with negotiating contractual terms and conditions for cloud services stemming from uneven bargaining power of the parties and/or undefined standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations as regards the possibility to switch between different cloud service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for the supplier to unilaterally modify the cloud service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far reaching limitations of the supplier’s liability for malfunctioning cloud services (including depriving the user of key remedies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the main benefits of a specific European Open Science Cloud which would facilitate access and make publicly funded research data re-useable?

- Making Science more reliable by better quality assurance of the data
- Making Science more efficient by better sharing of resources at national and international level
- Making Science more efficient by leading faster to scientific discoveries and insights
- Creating economic benefits through better access to data by economic operators
- Making Science more responsive to quickly tackle societal challenges
- Others

Would model contracts for cloud service providers be a useful tool for building trust in cloud services?

- Yes
- No

Would your answer differ for consumer and commercial (i.e. business to business) cloud contracts?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding data, cloud computing and the topics addressed in this section of the questionnaire

5000 character(s) maximum

---

The collaborative economy

The following questions focus on certain issues raised by the collaborative economy and seek to improve the Commission’s understanding by collecting the views of stakeholders on the regulatory environment, the effects of collaborative economy platforms on existing suppliers, innovation, and consumer choice. More broadly, they aim also at assessing the impact of the development of the collaborative economy on the rest of the economy and of the opportunities as well as the challenges it raises. They should help devising a European agenda for the collaborative economy to be considered in the context of the forthcoming Internal Market Strategy. The main question is whether EU law is fit to support this new phenomenon and whether existing policy is sufficient to let it develop and grow further, while addressing potential issues that may arise, including public policy objectives that may have already been identified.

Terms used for the purposes of this consultation:

"Collaborative economy"
For the purposes of this consultation the collaborative economy links individuals and/or legal persons through online platforms (collaborative economy platforms) allowing them to provide services and/or exchange assets, resources, time, skills, or capital, sometimes for a temporary period and without transferring ownership rights. Typical examples are transport services including the use of domestic vehicles for passenger transport and ride-sharing, accommodation or professional services.

"Traditional provider"

Individuals or legal persons who provide their services mainly through other channels, without an extensive involvement of online platforms.

"Provider in the collaborative economy"

Individuals or legal persons who provide the service by offering assets, resources, time, skills or capital through an online platform.

"User in the collaborative economy"

Individuals or legal persons who access and use the transacted assets, resources, time, skills and capital.

Please indicate your role in the collaborative economy

- Provider or association representing providers
- Traditional provider or association representing traditional providers
- Platform or association representing platforms
- Public authority
- User or consumer association

Which are the main risks and challenges associated with the growth of the collaborative economy and what are the obstacles which could hamper its growth and accessibility? Please rate from 1 to 5 according to their importance (1 – not important; 5 – very important).

- Not sufficiently adapted regulatory framework
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

- Uncertainty for providers on their rights and obligations
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
- Uncertainty for users about their rights and obligations
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

- Weakening of employment and social rights for employees/workers
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

- Non-compliance with health and safety standards and regulations
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

- Rise in undeclared work and the black economy
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

- Opposition from traditional providers
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5

- Uncertainty related to the protection of personal data
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
- Insufficient funding for start-ups
  ○ 1
  ○ 2
  ○ 3
  ○ 4
  ○ 5

- Other, please explain

How do you consider the surge of the collaborative economy will impact on the different forms of employment (self-employment, free lancers, shared workers, economically dependent workers, tele-workers etc) and the creation of jobs?
  ○ Positively across sectors
  ○ Varies depending on the sector
  ○ Varies depending on each case
  ○ Varies according to the national employment laws
  ○ Negatively across sectors
  ○ Other

Do you see any obstacle to the development and scaling-up of collaborative economy across borders in Europe and/or to the emergence of European market leaders?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

Do you see a need for action at European Union level specifically to promote the collaborative economy, and to foster innovation and entrepreneurship in its context?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

What action is necessary regarding the current regulatory environment at the level of the EU, including the Services Directive, the E-commerce Directive and the EU legislation on consumer protection law?
  ○ No change is required
  ○ New rules for the collaborative economy are required
  ○ More guidance and better information on the application of the existing rules is required
  ○ I don’t know what is the current regulatory environment

Submission of questionnaire

End of public consultation
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