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Orphan Works & Mass Digitization. Obstacle and Opportunities
Rationale for Arrow

- Initial concept (2005)
  - Book trade enjoy a good, standard based “book data infrastructure”
    - Books in Print, Library catalogue, Authority files, ISBN, ONIX and MARC, etc.
  - Moving from print to digital we also need to manage “rights information”
  - Need for a “rights information infrastructure”
    - Similar function than commercial data (“price and availability”) in the book trade

- Digital library projects as perfect use-case of the concept (2006-7)
  - Transaction costs are very high
  - Use cases emerging
Who we are
Partners and *liaison organisations (in italic)*

- **Libraries**
  - TEL and *Europeana Foundation*
  - National libraries in France, Germany, Spain, The Netherlands, UK, Norway, Slovenia, Italy, *Finland, Poland*
  - University library of Innsbruck

- **Publishers**
  - Federation of European Publishers
  - Publishers associations in Italy, Spain, Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Lithuania, Latvia, *France, UK, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania*

- **Authors**
  - European Writers Council
  - *ALCS in UK*

- **Collective management organisations**
  - IFRRO
  - EVA (European Visual Artists)
  - RROs in Poland, Greece, Spain, Ireland, UK, *France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Finland*

- **Technology developers**
  - Cineca (Italy)
  - Di-Tech (Romania)

- **Standard organisations**
  - *Editeur, ISBN International Agency*
  - ISBN agencies in Italy, Slovenia, Norway, Germany, Portugal, *Finland, France, Poland*
  - *European DOI agency (mEDRA)*
  - Editeur members
  - ISTC consortium members
ARROW is a (i) distributed system for (ii) facilitating (iii) rights information management in (iv) any digitisation programme, scalable to (v) further applications.

i. A distributed system: a network of data sources made interoperable through use of standards

ii. Facilitating implies time saving
   - Data from validation survey: Arrow allows 90%+ time saving
   - British Library survey: using Arrow reduces the search from 4h to 5m per title

iii. Rights information management: conceived as a separate function from (though linked to) “rights management”

iv. Any digitisation programme: ARROW is conceived to be neutral to legal frameworks and business models

v. Future applications: Rights information may be crucial in new digital markets
The Arrow workflow

- A library provides a bibliographic record + the type of use required
- We query four categories of data sources
  - Library catalogues (mainly through TEL)
  - Library authoritative files (mainly through VIAF)
  - Books in print
  - CMO repertoires
- We look for metadata useful to identify:
  - The *book* concerned (matching against authoritative records)
  - The *work* concerned
  - All other books containing the same *work* (clustering phase)
  - The *contributors* that may have rights in the work (author, translator, illustrator, etc.)
  - The *right status* (if in public domain or still copyrighted)
  - The *publisher(s)* that may have rights in the work
  - The *right-ownership* and presence of agents who manage the rights
  - *Contact details* of rightholders or their agents (including collective societies)
Use cases 1 - UK

- A digitization project launched by a private foundation (Wellcome Trust)
  - Not so large (some 10K books)
  - Specialized in one discipline / multinational and multilingual
  - No particular legal background
  - An existing CMO (CLA) provides a license for digitization and make available
- Arrow is a tool used by the CMO to better administer its process
- We provide value as far as we are able to:
  - Reduce the search time
  - Find the rightholders so to ask authorizations
- At the end of the workflow
  - Identification of orphan works
Use cases 2 - France

- New law (Feb 2012) on out of commerce
  - On the basis of a stakeholders agreement (Feb 2011)
  - Very large digitization programme (2M records to be managed by Arrow)
- The National Library (BNF) is called to establish an “out of commerce database”
- A representative CMO (to be appointed) will license OOC works
  - First option to publishers who own the “print” rights
  - Then to third parties
  - Last resort: libraries may make available the work
- Mandatory licensing scheme where rightholders may opt out
- Arrow is here the tool to:
  - Create the out of commerce database (registry)
  - Manage rights claiming and opt out
  - Notifying registered users
  - Identifying publishers to first offer the rights
Transaction costs and role of Arrow in the European debate

- We were born to approach a typical transaction cost problem
- Costs are related to:
  - Search of commercial status
  - Search of rightholders
  - Negotiation with individual rightholders
Solution 1: the EU Directive on orphan works

- In term of transaction costs any regulation on orphan works may be seen as fixing: **Search costs \( \leq \alpha \)**
- The challenge is: determining \( \alpha \) as a combination between “diligent” and “reasonable”, acceptable by stakeholders
  - Users claim for lower \( \alpha \) to decrease costs
  - Rightholders claim higher \( \alpha \) to increase certainty (“don’t kill the parents”)
- The European draft Directive states that concrete search criteria should be established at member state level, after consultation of stakeholders
- Arrow may help through reducing search cost without reducing accuracy
  - Arrow as a consensus facilitator
- N.B.: any law about orphan works only deals with part of the transaction cost issue For this reason, libraries often claim that the Directive is not enough
Solution 2: Memorandum of Understanding on Out of commerce works

- The MoU, signed on Sept 2011, promotes “stakeholders agreements” to deal with rights on out of commerce works, to be included in digital library projects.

- It states some key principles:
  - Criteria for determination of out of commerce status
  - Free negotiation with rightholders representatives
  - Presumption of representation for non registered rightholders
  - Best endeavors to inform individual rightholders
  - Opt out allowed

- Arrow may serve this type of agreements:
  - Determination of out of commerce status
  - Notification programme to rightholders and management of rightholders’ claiming and opt out

- Similar to ECL but includes a search:
  - Limited to commercial status and notification to registered rightholders
  - S is lower than with the Directive - S(CS) does not change, but S(RH) decreases

- The scheme reduces the transaction cost due to individual negotiation (N)
Solution 3 - ECL without search

- To avoid search you must include also in commerce works
  - Example: the BokHylla pilot in Norway

- Rationale: search cost = 0, so that 100% of library payment goes to rightholders remuneration
  - Or, said from the opposite viewpoint: costs for libraries are lower at the same level of rightholders remuneration

- Uses must be very limited, in order not to compete with normal exploitation of the work
  - in BokHylla: access only online, no download, no print, only from Norway, etc
  - It is not a matter of respecting the three steps test: no representative CMO will sign an agreement against its members’ interest

- No value from Arrow (or alike)

- Is it valuable for users?
  - End users have limited access, though to a broader repertoire
  - Many rightholders may be prepared to license their works for broader uses and at lower prices (also = 0, in CC)
Conclusions

- Voluntary stakeholders agreements (something like an “ECL with search” scheme) may be a way
  - And I think it will be THE European way
- We don’t need to make the registration mandatory
  - We started designing the RII as similar to books in print database
  - The countries with mandatory ISBN registration were historically the worst in serving the trade starting from ISBN data
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