Assessing Copyright and Related Rights Systems

Public Consultation on Law Proposals

Report on Piloting in Finland

This report is the result of the first pilot study implementing Methodology Card 5 – Public Consultation on Law Proposals, one of the 37 indicators constituting a methodology framework for assessing the operation of national copyright and related rights systems. The methodology framework has been developed at the Foundation for cultural policy research (Cupore) in Finland as part of a project financed by the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture. The pilot study was conducted by Project Researcher Jukka Kortelainen together with the core project team between April and September 2014. Section 2 was developed after an initial study made by Laura Mäkinen, student at the Department of Accounting and Commercial Law at Hanken School of Economics, between July 2013 and May 2014. The results were first published in December 2014 on the website of Cupore.

A handbook presenting the methodology framework is available on the website of Cupore at www.cupore.fi.
Executive summary

This document presents data collected in application of a methodology framework to assess the operation of copyright and related rights systems. More precisely, the information and analysis below correspond to the fifth methodology card presented in the methodology handbook, titled “Public Consultation on Law Proposals”.

There are different stages in the Finnish legislative process where stakeholders and other relevant experts are being heard. At the stage of regulatory drafting by the government the initial legislative proposal is circulated to representatives of different stakeholder groups. Comments are then summarized and published. At the stage of committee hearings (parliamentary review) the legislative proposal is examined further and public consultations are held by parliamentary committees. This pilot study focused on two questions: whether the opinions of different interest groups are taken into consideration in the law preparation process, and whether all stakeholder groups are included in the debate on legislative proposals. To answer these questions, quantitative data from 2002–2013 was analyzed.

The actors that submitted comments in public consultations at the preparation and regulatory drafting stages have been analyzed by focusing on a set of consultations concerning legislative drafting related to unauthorized file-sharing. Four consultations were held on the matter between 2009 and 2014. The statements received during the consultations were divided under the following categories of commentators: authors and performers, professional copyright users (including professional copyright users that are original right holders of their own related rights), intermediaries, end-users, experts, and others. It seems that authors and performers, professional copyright users and experts have together formed the major part of all the statements submitted for this particular set of consultations. On the other hand, the number and share of statements from representatives of end-users were particularly low.

Stakeholders are again invited to comment the bill in front of the parliament at the latest stage of committee discussions resulting in the final version of the legislative proposal. As part of this pilot study, the numbers of stakeholders’ and experts’ statements at this stage were analyzed. The results showed that experts such as representatives of public authorities as well as universities and research institutes had been invited to offer a significantly larger share of oral statements than the representatives of stakeholders. Authors and performers and professional copyright users are the stakeholders most often invited to provide written or oral statements on copyright-related issues in front of parliamentary committees. Intermediaries have been invited to offer their statements regularly but less often throughout the analyzed time frame. The number of statements from end-users was much lower. This could be partially explained by the fact that end-users are a less organized stakeholder group than the others.

In conclusion, it seems that the different stakeholder categories are being heard during the different stages of legislative processes concerning copyright. The organizations representing different interest groups seem to be heard more often at the preparation and regulatory drafting stages of the process, while the parliamentary committee hearings seem to focus more on consulting public authorities and experts not associated with particular stakeholders, such as representatives of universities.
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Introduction

A. CONTEXT OF THE PILOT STUDY

A methodology framework for assessing the operation of national copyright and related rights systems has been developed at the Foundation for cultural policy research (Cupore) in Finland. It is a collection of tools for achieving a systematic assessment of the functioning, performance and balanced operation of national copyright and related rights systems.

In the methodology, the assessment of the copyright and related rights system is determined through a framework consisting of so-called description sheets and methodology cards. The description sheets constitute guidelines to produce a comprehensive presentation and description of a country’s copyright and related rights system and its operating environment. The methodology cards propose the collection of specific sets of data, either quantitative, descriptive or qualitative, that will be used as indicators of the functioning, performance and balanced operation of the system. Description sheets and methodology cards are accompanied by detailed information on the data to be collected, as well as analysis guidelines that will help connect them to each other.

The methodology framework is envisaged to be continuously improved through application feedbacks. For more information, see the Cupore website, www.cupore.fi/copyright.php.

This report presents data collected in application of Methodology card 5 of the methodology framework, titled “Public consultation on law proposals”. It is the result of the first pilot study applying this indicator in Finland.1

This pilot study was conducted by Project Researcher Jukka Kortelainen together with the core project team between April and September 2014. Section 2 was developed after an initial study made by Laura Mäkinen (student at the Department of Accounting and Commercial Law at Hanken School of Economics) between July 2013 and May 2014.

B. PRESENTATION OF THE INDICATOR

The indicator implemented here is intended to present one of the copyright system’s elements. It is part of the second pillar of the methodology framework, “Functioning and performance of the elements of the copyright system”, and its first area, “Law, policy and public administration”. It is a methodology card which presents the existence of public consultation on legislative proposals, in order to support the analysis of the operation of the national copyright and related rights system.

As explained in the methodology handbook, the same policy measures affect different interest groups in dissimilar and often unpredictable ways. The benefits of a policy measure to one group can often come at the expense of other stakeholders with different interests. It is important that different interest groups have a possibility to comment copyright policy and law, and to be heard when developing the copyright system. Public debate both before the parliamentary readings and as a continuous dialogue has a potential to increase the acceptance, balance and efficiency of new legislations.

1 The study was conducted based on the draft version of the Methodology Handbook, dated 19.7.2012. This report is modified from the original report to better correspond to the version of the Methodology Handbook dated 20.12.2013.
The information collected using both Methodology card 5 (Public consultation on legislative proposals) and Methodology card 6 (The use of impact assessment and research in policy development) will together tell about the scope of the preparation of legislative proposals and the development of copyright policies. The sets of information will help to analyze the degree to which objective evidence is taken into account when preparing legislative proposals or changes to law, and when adopting new policies, strategies and programs. They also provide indications on the compliance to generally recognized good governance principles, such as equity and inclusiveness, participation, consensus orientation, transparency and strategic vision.

Methodology card 5 proposes to measure the extent to which legislative proposals are sent for comments. It also suggests collecting information on the amount of consultation and negotiation with different interest groups. In addition, the comments of different stakeholder groups for legislative proposals can be analyzed case by case. Organizing discussions and hearings with different stakeholder groups and circulating relevant documents for comments are essential characteristics of good governance. The existence of an organized consultation with stakeholders will tell about the opportunities for public debate on planned changes in the law. Such debate can also be independent from any organized consultation (in the press, the civil society, etc.).

The fact that a public dialogue has been opened indicates a commitment by authorities to take into account stakeholders’ points of view. As a result, this indicator will provide a basis for understanding the processes leading to new legislation and the balance and acceptance of legal measures. A more thorough assessment can be made by looking at each possible successive phase of public consultations separately, and by including, besides the number of hearings and negotiations, the overall number of comments submitted by different stakeholder groups. The analysis could also take a broader perspective by including the consultations on relevant policy and strategy documents.

The contents of the legislative proposals have a strong influence on the amounts of different actors invited to the hearings. Therefore the results should be analyzed in the context of subject matter of the proposals. In the analysis of the results, the level of organization of the industry could be taken into account, since some actors in highly organized industries may have a stronger position to influence the legislative process. On the other hand, the possibility of a stronger position for powerful lobbying parties should be kept in mind when analyzing the data. This could be assessed through the level of consultation with different interest groups, i.e. by comparing how often representatives of different stakeholder groups were consulted. In order to analyze to what degree the remarks were taken into account, the study could also evaluate the proportion of comments (for each individual legislative proposals or for all the legislative action over a certain period) that have been directly translated into law or that have been totally left unanswered.

This pilot report presents public consultation on legislative proposals in different phases of the legislative process. Section 1 of the chapter Research discusses the pre-parliamentary phase and the stakeholder consultations taking place in the course of the preliminary preparation and regulatory drafting. Section 2, on the other hand, focuses on the committee hearings. In this stage, stakeholders and experts are invited by the parliamentary committees to give their statements.

---

2 An example of such consultation: the Government of Canada followed through nation-wide consultations on copyright from July 20th 2009 to September 13th 2009. The consultations included round tables, town hall meetings, online submissions and online discussions. The consultations were "intended to provide all Canadians with a chance to voice their opinions on what is needed to make the system work, and to ensure that all perspectives are taken into account on copyright modernization". The five topics under discussion were Copyright and You, Test of Time, Innovation and Creativity, Competition and Investment and Digital Economy. Taking into account the consultations, the government will draft and table a new piece of legislation. (For more information on the consultations see http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/008.nsf/eng/h_04036.html. Visited on 12.12.2014.)

3 See Methodology card 22 discussing the assessment of stakeholders’ opinions.
This study does not take into consideration to what extent the comments were taken into account. However, the fact that a public dialogue has been opened indicates a commitment by authorities to take into account different stakeholders’ points of view during the legislative process.

The methodology card presenting the indicator can be found in Appendix A of this report.

C. METHODS

The information collected for this indicator can be found through available national and international information sources. The method chosen was therefore desktop studies.

Section 1 of the Results chapter discusses the pre-parliamentary phase and the stakeholder consultations in the course of the preliminary preparation and regulatory drafting. The data was found from the Finnish Parliament’s website, the legislative database Finlex, as well as other national data sources. The actors that submitted comments in public consultations at the preparation and regulatory drafting stages were analyzed by focusing on a set of consultations concerning legislative drafting related to unauthorized file-sharing. Four consultations were held on the matter between 2009 and 2014. The data on the consultations was found from the Government Project Register HARE.

In the second section of this study, committee hearings concerning copyright legislation in Finland were studied. The data on committee hearings was available on the internet pages of the Library of the Parliament of Finland. Both oral and written statements for each legislative proposal concerning copyright in a time period ranging from 2002 to 2013 were analyzed. Data on the statements to the Education and Culture Committee included years 2003 - 2013. The data related to committee hearings was available on the internet pages of the library of the Finnish Parliament. Data was sought using the keyword “copyright” (asiasona “tekijänoikeus” in Finnish). Other sources are recognized when used.

Lists of national and international information sources used for this report can be found in the Appendices.

- CATEGORIES OF STAKEHOLDERS AND OTHER CONSULTED PARTIES

The parties who provided statements during the different stages of legislative drafting were divided into different stakeholder categories. In addition to the stakeholder categories presented in the Methodology handbook, a new category of experts was created in order to acknowledge the experts consulted, such as professors and government officials. Moreover, copyright-related legislation may involve matters not related to copyright, and some of the groups invited to give statements in the committee hearings (like the Finnish Real Estate Federation) cannot be described through the pre-defined stakeholder categories. Therefore another category, others, was created.

The following box presents the division of stakeholders and other consulted parties used in this study. The stakeholder categories used are “authors and performers”, “professional copyright users”, “intermediaries”, “end-users”, “experts” and “others”.


5 Some proposals marked with the search word “copyright” in the database of the Library of Parliament of Finland did not include issues directly related to copyright. Therefore these proposals were left outside the scope of this study. They however are included in the lists of legislative proposals in Appendices C and D.
Box 1. Categories of stakeholders and other consulted parties

Different organizations may represent simultaneously several stakeholder positions, but for the purposes of this study, stakeholders were divided into different categories according to their main roles. The contents of oral and written statements were not analyzed. Some of the organizations were considered to operate in several main stakeholder roles. The definitions of the different stakeholder roles are presented below. All definitions and categorizations presented in this report are based on the interpretation of the research group and (in many cases) do not embrace all areas of operation of the organizations listed.

Authors and performers: Authors are the initial creators of the work, and as such, their economic and moral rights are protected by copyright legislation; performers bring creative input while performing, granting them with separate economic and often moral rights. In addition to content creation, authors and performers might be involved in the other value creation processes.

Professional copyright users: Professional copyright users can be individual professionals as well as small, medium-sized or large organizations using the protected subject matter in their operation to a significant degree. Professional copyright users are most likely to be involved in processes that add value to the copyrighted work or content but might as well take part in other processes in the value chain. They add value to the creative products and services through investment in time or money. Their activities are often based on rights acquired from the authors and performers, but certain categories of professional copyright users are original right holders of their own related rights (such as producers of phonograms and films or broadcasting organizations). Organizations representing these interests are indicated with “[incl. original related rights]” in the stakeholder divisions which can be found in the appendices.

Intermediaries: Intermediaries include distributors, telecom operators and other actors whose primary purpose is to disseminate products and content protected by copyright, including the intermediaries that work as facilitators. Compared to professional copyright users, intermediaries do not take any part in the creation process, neither through work nor investment. Their rights are acquired through licensing arrangements, except for some cases where the rights and responsibilities are determined by law (such might be, for example, the responsibilities of website owners regarding unauthorized content).

End-users: End-users of creative products and services are individual consumers as well as organizations and institutions both in the public and private sectors. They are not granted any specific rights by law, although they may benefit from copyright exceptions, for example when they are considered by law as a special public. Organizational end-users may be organizations using copyrighted material for commercial or non-commercial purposes as a support for their main activities (e.g. restaurants, hotels and churches). They are indicated in the stakeholder divisions with “End-users (organizational)”.

Experts: Experts are specialists in copyright, intellectual property rights, or other subject matter relevant to the proposals. The following actors were considered as experts in this study: representatives of public administration (such as ministries and courts), representatives of universities, research institutes and researchers’ associations, as well as representatives of organizations specializing in intellectual property issues.

Other: This category includes actors that either do not fit into any of the roles defined above or cannot be clearly categorized as representatives of a certain role. In this study, the category “other” includes the following organizations: Suomen yrittäjät ry, Suomen Kaupan Liitto, Suomen Kiinteistölitiitto ry, Keskuskauppakamari, Posti Oyj, Wärtsilä Oy Abp, Toimihenkilökeskusjärjestö STTK ry, Ammattiliitto Pro, Akava ry, Suomen Liikunta ja Urheilu SLU, SM-liiga.

---

6 The definitions of authors and performers, professional users, intermediaries and end-users are based on the draft methodology handbook (20.12.2013), p. 43-44. available in English at http://www.cupore.fi/copyright.php.
7 As well as public agencies and publicly funded foundations. As an exception to this rule, the Finnish Consumer Authority was considered as representative of “end-users” in this study.
8 The stakeholder roles of universities, research and rectors’ associations vary between the initiatives studied. In general, they were regarded as experts. Art universities were considered as representatives of authors and performers because of their focus on practical teaching of artistry. The Sibelius-Academy was also considered as a professional copyright user because of its role as a regular concert organizer and a phonogram producer (SibaRecords). In the proposal regarding storage and preservation of cultural materials, universities were classified as intermediaries and research associations as experts.
RESULTS

INRODUCTION: THE FINNISH LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

In Finland, the legislative process, summarized in the figure below, has two main components: the drafting stage (most often taking place at ministries) and the stage of parliamentary review.

Figure 1. Main stages of the Finnish legislative process

The legislative process begins with the initiative. These can come in the form of Government bills, Parliament Members’ initiatives, or citizens’ initiatives.9

Government bills constitute the majority of legislative proposals. Each year the Government submits 220-300 bills to the Parliament. Legislative proposals from Members of the Parliament are slightly less common; 150-200 such initiatives are submitted each year, and few of them lead to legislation.10 Finally, the Finnish Citizens’ Initiative Act enables a minimum of 50,000 Finnish citizens of voting age to submit an initiative to the Parliament of Finland. The initiative may include either a bill or a proposal that a bill drafting process should be started, and the 50,000 signatures (or statements of support) must be collected, either in paper or electronically, within six months.11 If the initiative is in the form of a legal text, it will be treated as a bill. If it is an initiative to start drafting legislation, it will receive a full reading in a plenary session of the Parliament, which will consider whether it accepts or dismisses the citizens’

---


initiative.\textsuperscript{12} Between 1 March 2012, when the Finnish Citizens’ Initiative Act came into force, and 24 April 2014, 5 initiatives have been presented to the Parliament.\textsuperscript{13}

Legislative proposals from the Government are subject to preliminary preparation, regulatory drafting (drafting of the bill) and government review before being submitted to the Parliament. The Parliamentary review of Government bills and Parliament Members’ initiatives includes a preliminary debate in plenary session, followed by its handling by a designated committee, and finally two consecutive readings in front of the plenary session ending with a vote. After the Parliament has approved a law, it is sent to the President of the Republic for ratification and published in the statute book.

Consultations of stakeholders and other experts take place at different stages of the legislative process. The first consultations are organized during the preliminary preparation and regulatory drafting of bills by the Government. Another round of commenting takes place during Parliamentary review. These stages are the objects of this research and are presented below.

**SECTION 1. PRELIMINARY PREPARATION AND REGULATORY DRAFTING**

**A. DESCRIPTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE STAGE**

Legislative initiatives from the Government go first through an administrative stage, preliminary preparation. This stage mainly consists in research made by the relevant ministries. At this point the initiative is evaluated and relevant information is gathered. The procedure selected and the depth of the preliminary research strongly depends on the topic at hand. Thus, it may be carried out in the appropriate ministry as daily routine work or separately by commission. At the end of this stage the process regarding the initiative is either terminated or continued to the regulatory drafting stage.

The end result of the regulatory drafting stage is a draft Government bill. At this stage the legal issues are further looked into and the potential impacts of the proposed legislation are assessed\textsuperscript{14}. Again, regulatory drafting can be made as official duties at a ministry or by commission. Separate working groups may be appointed, consisting for example of representatives of relevant stakeholder groups and experts in the field.

The purpose of the consultations at the preliminary preparation and regulatory drafting stages is to get all relevant information from the stakeholders and relevant experts. All known key stakeholders should be invited to be heard at this point\textsuperscript{15} and a public invitation to comment the process is forwarded in order to get as much empiric information as possible to make educated decisions.

After the consultations, legislative work continues based on the information gathered at the consultation stage. It is also at this stage that translations are made into the other national language (or

\textsuperscript{12} Source: the Population Register Centre’s website, \url{http://www.vrk.fi/default.aspx?id=706}. Visited on 14.5.2014.

\textsuperscript{13} Source: \url{https://www.kansalaisaloite.fi/fi/hae}. Visited on 26.5.2014.

\textsuperscript{14} For more information see the impact assessment guidelines of the Finnish Ministry of Justice, \url{http://oikeusministerio.fi/en/index/basicprovisions/legislation/parempisaantely/saadosvalmisteluohjeet.html}. Visited on 27.5.2014.

\textsuperscript{15} Source: \url{http://lainvalmistelu.finlex.fi/en/}, see stage 3, “Consultation”. Visited on 20.5.2014.
sami language if the matter at hand especially concerns the minority. These two versions are then submitted to the Unit of Legislative Inspection at the Ministry of Justice. During the inspection it is checked that the different language versions are consistent, the technical structure is correct and that the proposal is in accordance with the general legal principles. Special attention is also paid to linguistic accuracy and the preciseness and consistency of the proposal. After the preliminary preparation, consultations and inspection, the proposal is reviewed by the Government in plenary session, and then submitted to the Parliament.

**B. Consultations**

According to the guidelines on consultation during legislative drafting by the Ministry of Justice, "stakeholders can, for example, be consulted regarding completed reports, starting a project, alternative solutions, impact assessments and proposed legislation. In extensive legislative projects, opportunities for influence are offered and arranged in several different stages of the process and even before the actual proposed legislation is completed." The Ministry of Education and Culture organizes consultations on copyright-related legislative and policy initiatives, as well as regarding European Union’s and WIPO’s policy initiatives. The consultations in the preliminary and regulatory drafting stages provide actors in the copyright field with information about ongoing and upcoming copyright-related issues and with an opportunity to participate to the discussion at the very early stages of policy processes.

The Division for Copyright Policy and the Economy of Culture at the Ministry of Education and Culture organizes primarily the following types of consultations at the preliminary and regulatory drafting stages.

- Dozens of small discussions with anyone interested during the preliminary preparation of the legislative drafting.
- Extensive consultations, first in the preliminary stage and secondly after the regulatory drafting stage when the bill draft already exists.

The way consultations are held depends on the stage of the proposal. Regarding to the less far-reaching proposals at the preliminary stage, the ministry may organize hearings and discussion events without requesting written statements or vice versa. The more elaborated proposals such as bill drafts are sent for written statements, and hearing or discussion events are organized during the period of issuing the statements. According to the Consultation in Legislative Drafting guidelines drawn by the Ministry of Justice, “A minimum of six weeks and in extensive projects a minimum of eight weeks shall be reserved...”

---

19 In Finnish: “Kuuleminen säädösvaaliolosuussa. Ohjeet.”
21 The information was provided by Jukka Liedes, director at the Ministry of Education and Culture (interview on 16.6.2014).
22 It is typical for stakeholders to request for meetings with the ministry when they hear about planned actions in their interest areas.
23 The information was provided by Jukka Liedes, director at the Ministry of Education and Culture (interview on 16.6.2014).
for issuing a written statement requested concerning proposed legislation. The period is longer if it partly or entirely occurs during the general holiday season.”

The deadlines for written statements of the written statements are usually set to one or two weeks after the hearing or discussion event so that stakeholder groups are able to modify their statements after the discussions. The written statements or a summary of them is published on the website of the ministry and in the Government Project Register HARE.

Besides informing the public at large of each consultation for example through their website, the Ministry of Education and Culture maintains a consultation list of actors interested in copyright issues. The list is open to all interested parties and comprises approximately 170 stakeholders including ministries, authorities, experts, organizations and companies. Most of the copyright-related legislative proposals are sent to all actors in the list, plus some others whenever necessary. However, for some specific issues, requests for statements and invitations to discussion events are sent to a selection of 30 to 50 actors only. The number of participants in the discussion events has typically varied between 40 and 60, but there may be 100 participants to some events depending on the extent of the proposal or other policy document.

C. CASE EXAMPLE: CONSULTATIONS ON LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING RELATED TO UNAUTHORIZED FILE-SHARING

“In autumn 2008 Finland conducted branch talks led by Mr. Arne Wessberg in order to find means for promoting electronic commerce in creative content and reducing illicit file-sharing over the internet. The parties to the branch talks comprised representatives of the film, music and games industries, internet service providers, content business companies and authorities.” The discussions concluded that previously mentioned goals would be best achieved by (1) ensuring better access by developing legal services, (2) ensuring the conditions for rapid intervention against unauthorized file-sharing of creative content and (3) by disseminating knowledge to consumers on multiple forums. There have been two stages in legislative drafting regarding prevention of unauthorized file-sharing after the branch talks, (1) proposal on notification procedure that lapsed in the Parliament of Finland in 2010, as well as (2) ongoing legislative initiative including several optional measures for prevention of unauthorized file-sharing. These stages have included four separate consultations:


26 The information was provided by Jukka Liedes, director at the Ministry of Education and Culture (interview on 16.6.2014).


28 For example, the bill draft regarding prevention of unauthorized file-sharing in 2013 has been sent to 200 organizations.

29 The information was provided by Jukka Liedes, director at the Ministry of Education and Culture (interview on 16.6.2014).


33 In the notification procedure, the holder of the internet subscription sharing content without copyright owners permission would receive a letter, as a legislative option in preventing unauthorized file-sharing.

(2) The draft bill regarding the notification procedure. 

(3) The “Solutions to the challenges of the digital age” report of the Commission (2011-2012) introducing blocking access as a mean for preventing unauthorized file-sharing. 
Consultation on 30.01.2012 – 12.03.2012.

(4) The background study “Assessing means for diminishing unauthorized file-sharing” (2013) and related draft bill circulated to comments simultaneously. 

The stakeholder roles of the actors that provided written statements in the consultations were analyzed for this study and are presented in the following table. Some of the organizations were considered to operate in two main stakeholder roles. Statements of those organizations constitute half a point for each role in the table. The categorization is based on the interpretation of the research team and (in many cases) does not embrace all areas of operation of the organizations. The lists of stakeholders and definitions of stakeholder categories used in this study can be found in the appendices.

---


36 “Section 56 g of the Copyright Act be amended to allow courts to rule that teleoperators (Provider of internet connection) shall deny its clients access to a website whose purpose is to make available copyright protected content without the consent of the rightholder, unless it would be unreasonable taking into account the rights of the person making content available to the public, the intermediary and the author. Based on the judgment of the Commission such a regulation could work to decrease the negative effects of file sharing to the rightholders and the consumers and lead them to take advantage of legal services.” Source: Report of the Copyright Commission - Solutions to challenges of the digital age. Available in Finnish (summary in English) at http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2012/Tekijanoikeustoimikunnan_mietinto.htmlPlang=fi&extra_locale=fi. Visited on 8.7.2014.

37 The statements are available at the Government’s project registry HARE, available at http://www.hare.vn.fi/mAsiakirjojenSelailu.asp?h_iID=16398&a_iId=180100. Visited on 29.7.2014.

38 The background study “Assessing means for diminishing unauthorized file-sharing” (2013) was conducted by the official of the Ministry of Education and Culture to support the decision-making in the legislative drafting process. The study evaluates four different legal options for preventing unauthorized file-sharing which have become along in different stages of the process. These include notification procedure, access blocking, slowing down injunction and domain closure. For more information, see the study in Finnish at http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2013/Luvaton_verkkojakelu.html. Visited on 10.9.2014.

As the table shows, the consultations regarding the first two initiatives concerning the notification procedure resulted in significantly less statements than the two latest consultations. This can be caused at least partially by differences in the extent of the consultations; for example, the request for statements regarding the notification procedure draft bill was sent to 72 stakeholders, whereas the report and the draft bill in the fourth example was sent to 200 stakeholders. Therefore it is reasonable to analyze the proportional shares together with the numerical figures.

The table shows that authors and performers, professional copyright users (including actors owning their own related rights) and experts have together formed the major part (between 74 and 82 %) of the statements issued for each of the initiatives. The proportion and numerical shares of authors and performers have increased considerably in the two latest consultations. This could be explained by a possibly larger amount of authors’ and performers’ organizations in the distribution lists of the third and fourth consultations, increasing significance of copyright legislation to authors’ and performers’ organizations in the digital environment, as well these organizations’ willingness to bring up the impacts of different legislative options to their members’ activities which are presented in detail in the proposals subject to the third and fourth consultations. The proportional share of professional copyright users has decreased from 35 % to 19 %, but the numerical share has remained fairly constant. The change has been caused most of all by the increase in the amount of stakeholder groups in other categories.

40 The distribution lists of the first and third consultation were not found from the Government’s project registry HARE.
The numerical share of intermediaries has more than doubled between the first and fourth consultations. The share of experts has remained steady, varying between 22% and 25% of the total statements. However, the numerical amount of experts has increased in the two latest consultations, which results from an increase in the number of statements from public actors, universities, research institutes and researchers.

End-users’ statements constitute a minority of the total number of statements. The Finnish Competition and Consumer Authority has issued a statement regarding each initiative and the Consumers’ Union of Finland regarding the first three initiatives. The Pirate Party of Finland has issued a statement regarding the first three initiatives. Electronic Frontier Finland, promoting end-users’ rights in the digital environment, as well as the Finnish Hospitality Association Mara and the Church House of Finland representing organizational end-users have issued statements regarding the two latest initiatives. These consultations have also included four statements from groups in the category “other” including employees’ organizations and industry organizations.

SECTION 2. PARLIAMENTARY PHASE

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE STAGE

At the Parliament, the bill and the related documents are subjected to three levels of discussion and analysis. First there is a preliminary debate during a plenary session where the proposal is presented by the minister and reporting official responsible for its drafting. After the presentation all political groups and individual members of the Parliament are all allowed to present their opinions. At this stage no decisions are made regarding the content of the bill but the purpose of this debate is to provide a basis for committee work. After the preliminary debate the bill is referred to a committee for committee hearings. The committee then hears experts and interest groups to better evaluate the legislative proposal, including a representative of the ministry responsible for the proposals.

Each committee decides what experts or interested parties to call in a particular matter. Experts usually give oral statements but the committee can also ask for a written statement.

B. TOTAL NUMBER OF STAKEHOLDERS’ CONSULTATIONS

In this study all the committees discussing copyright-related issues were included. The data includes the government bills and legislative proposals that were found in the database of the Library of Parliament

41 Such as ministries, authorities, public offices and courts.
42 Formerly Finnish Consumer Authority.
43 Akava, Toimihenkilökeskusjärjestö STTK ry, Ammattiliitto Pro, Suomen Kiinteistöliitto ry, Kaupan liitto and Keskuskauppakamari.
44 In Finnish: esittelijä
with the search term “tekijänoikeus” (“copyright” in English). Parties that offered statements for copyright-related bills during the period 2002-2013 are listed in Appendix B. Each statement was counted as one, since the point of this research was to evaluate the variety of parties giving statements instead of assessing the quality of the statements.

Figure 3 presents the total amount of given statements for all committees discussing copyright-related issues. If the same organization has been invited to comment the same Government Bill in front of two different committees or as part of two different rounds of discussion, it is counted twice. The lists of stakeholders that submitted statements and the categories in which they were classified are detailed in the appendices of this report.

*Figure 3. Total number of statements submitted during parliamentary review on legislative proposals concerning copyright-related issues during the period 2002 – 2013*

Figure 4 shows the division of statements by different stakeholder groups and other consulted parties during the committee hearings (both oral and written statements are taken into account). The focus is on the time period 2002 to 2013.

---

47 Search terms are determined by the library of the Parliament with the aim of being as broad as possible. The initiatives found using the search term were further analyzed to identify whether they actually included issues directly related to copyright. Four initiatives (HE 139/2004, HE 259/2004, HE 92/2005, HE 156/2013) were excluded from the data on the basis of this analysis.
As can be seen from Figures 3 and 4, the largest share (39%) of the statements came from experts that do not represent a specific stakeholder group (for example, experts from ministries or universities). Professional copyright users constitute the second best represented category at the committee hearings (23%); this might be the result of, among others, the industries concerned being powerfully organized in Finland. Intermediaries as well as authors and performers provided a similar proportion of statements, at 15 and 16% respectively. Finally, end-users and other stakeholders originated a small minority of statements.

C. PROPORTIONS OF ORAL AND WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Written and oral statements are likely to have different kinds of influence: the written form has its limitations, as it does not allow spontaneous questions or discussion and thus faces a risk of being overshadowed by the oral statements. This is why it’s interesting to study the form in which different parties express their arguments.
From the above figure one can see that there are significant differences between the shares of oral and written statements for some stakeholder groups. For example, expert statements represent 42% of all the oral statements and 26% of the written statements. This further emphasizes the fact that this particular group has had more power to influence the legislative process than the others.

One can also see that end-users are relatively underrepresented. Only 2% of written statements and 4% of oral statements came from this stakeholder category. There could be a risk that their interests are not sufficiently taken into account, since there are not many organizations representing the actual end users. Moreover, the organizations that represent end-users tend to be young so they may not have yet become sufficiently recognized to be invited to give their opinion during the legislative process.

**D. Stakeholder Consultations at the Education and Culture Committee**

Many of the legislative proposals concerning copyright are discussed at the Education and Culture Committee. The work at this Committee was thus chosen as an example to be analyzed further. The data covers three electoral periods, from 2003 to 2013.48

In the period 2003-2013, the following legislative proposals were discussed at the Education and Culture committee:

---

48 The data includes all the government bills and legislative proposals that were found from the database of the Parliament of Finland with the search term ”tekijänoikeus” (”copyright” in English).
Committee reports (documents passed by the committee on the basis of which a plenary session makes a decision on the matter):49:
- **HE 29/2004 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle WIPO:n tekijänoikeussopimuksen ja WIPO:n esitys- ja äänitesopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laeiksi sopimusten lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määrysten voimaansaattamisesta)
- **HE 28/2004 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain ja rikoslain 49 luvun muuttamisesta)
- **LA 151/2005 vp** (Laki tekijänoikeuslain 50 a §:n muuttamisesta (Kasvi, Jyrki /vihr yum.))
- **HE 111/2005 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain muuttamisesta)
- **HE 126/2006 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 19 §:n muuttamisesta)
- **HE 68/2007 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi kulttuuriaineistojen tallettamisesta ja säilyttämisestä sekä eräiksi siihen liittyviksi laeiksi (Budjettilakiehdotus))
- **HE 76/2008 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 26 a §:n muuttamisesta)
- **LA 106/2010 vp** (Laki tekijänoikeuslain 58 §:n muuttamisesta)
- **HE 235/2010 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 60 a §:n ja sähköisen viestinnän tietosuojalain muuttamisesta)
- **HE 73/2013 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain muuttamisesta ja orpoteosten käyttämisestä)

Committee statements (written statements submitted to other committees):50:
- **HE 87/2009 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi televisio- ja radiotoiminnasta annetun lain muuttamisesta ja väliaikaisesta muuttamisesta sekä tekijänoikeuslain 25 b ja 48 §:n muuttamisesta)

**ELECTORAL PERIOD 2003 – 2007**

The figure below presents the numbers of statements related to copyright legislative proposals at the Education and Culture Committee during the electoral period 2003-2007 (19.3.2003 - 20.3.2007).

---

49 Täysistunto lähettänyt sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten.
50 Täysistunto lähettänyt sivistysvaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten
During the electoral period 2003-2007, the Education and Culture Committee passed committee reports on the following legislative proposals:

- **HE 29/2004 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle WIPOn tekijänoikeussopimuksen ja WIPOn esitys- ja äänitesopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laeiksi sopimusten laainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta)
- **HE 28/2004 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain ja rikoslain 49 luvun muuttamisesta)
- **LA 151/2005 vp** (Laki tekijänoikeuslain 50 a §:n muuttamisesta (Kasvi, Jyrki /vihr ym.))
- **HE 111/2005 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain muuttamisesta)
- **HE 126/2006 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 19 §:n muuttamisesta)

During this period, experts gave the largest share of oral statements, followed by representatives of authors and performers and professional copyright users with equal shares. Overall, oral statements seem to have been preferred during this period. The largest number of written statements were given by intermediaries but neither their absolute nor proportionate amount is significant.

### Electoral Period 2007 – 2011

During the electoral period 21.3.2007 - 19.4.2011, the Education and Culture Committee passed committee reports on the following legislative proposals:

- **HE 68/2007 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi kulttuurialueisten tallettamisesta ja säilyttämisestä sekä eräiksi siihen liittyviksi laeiksi (Budjettiliakiehdotus))
- **HE 76/2008 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 26 a §:n muuttamisesta)
- **LA 106/2010 vp** (Laki tekijänoikeuslain 58 §:n muuttamisesta)
- **HE 235/2010 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 60 a §:n ja sähköisen viestinnän tietosuojalain muuttamisesta)

In addition, a committee statement was passed on the following government bill:
During the electoral period 2007-2011 the amount of statements was lower than during the previous period and the division of statements between the different categories of parties consulted appears more equal. Experts remain the category providing the highest number of oral statements, followed by professional copyright users. All categories of stakeholders have offered written statements.

However, the overall number of hearings concerning copyright legislation during this electoral period is significantly smaller than the other periods examined, and therefore, the data is too small to allow drawing conclusions on the emphasis given to the hearings of different stakeholders and experts.


During the electoral period ongoing at the time of the research (starting 20.4.2011), one legislative proposal has been discussed at the Education and Culture Committee:

- **HE 73/2013 vp** (Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain muuttamisesta ja orpoteosten käyttämisestä)
During this period, most of both oral and written statements were made by authors and performers, and professional copyright users. However, only one legislative proposal concerning copyright resulted in consultations at the Education and Culture Committee. As a result, the figures should be interpreted in the light of the contents of the proposal and its technical aspects.
Conclusions

A. ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

- PRELIMINARY PREPARATION AND REGULATORY DRAFTING

Public consultations at the preliminary preparation and regulatory drafting stages are usually conducted by informing the public at large (for example on the Ministry’s website) and sending the legislative proposal for comments to a list of parties interested in copyright issues. Some discussions events are also held for some specific issues and in that case, invitations are forwarded to a smaller selection of actors.

The actors that submitted comments in public consultations at the preparation and regulatory drafting stages have been analyzed by focusing on a set of consultations concerning legislative drafting related to unauthorized file-sharing. Four consultations were held on the matter between 2009 and 2014. The lists of statements by stakeholders taking part in the consultations were divided between the following categories: statements from authors and performers, professional copyright users (including actors owning their own related rights), intermediaries, end-users, experts, and others.

The results showed that authors and performers, professional copyright users and experts have together formed the major part (at least 74%) of all the statements submitted. Among them, the proportion and numerical shares of statements by authors and performers have increased significantly in the two latest rounds of comments, possibly because of an increase in their interest in the content of these latest consultations. On the contrary, the number and share of statements from representatives of end-users have remained particularly low.

- THE PARLIAMENTARY STAGE

At the parliamentary stage, stakeholders and experts have the possibility to offer their opinion on a bill when they are invited to provide written or oral statements by a parliamentary committee. Arguably, oral statements offer a better possibility for influencing the legislative process than written statements. The proportion of each stakeholder group invited to offer statements was analyzed by calculating the total number of stakeholder’s consultations for copyright-related bills during the 2002-2013 period. The proportions of oral and written statements for each stakeholder category were also examined. Finally, the study focused on consultations concerning copyright-related bills at the Education and Culture Committee in order to offer an overview of the evolution of the number of comments over three electoral periods.

Experts such as representatives of public authorities as well as universities and research institutes had been invited to offer a significantly larger share of oral statements than the representatives of stakeholders. This might be connected to the technical complexity of the bills discussed. The decision making process also seems to depend on the nature of the proposals discussed as well as the political composition of the committees during each electoral period.

Authors and performers and professional copyright users are the stakeholders most often invited to provide written or oral statements in front of parliamentary committees. As a result, they seem to have a possibility to directly influence the legislative process. Intermediaries have been invited to offer their statements regularly but less often throughout the analyzed time frame. The number of statements
from end-users was much lower. This could be partially explained by the fact that end-users are a less organized stakeholder group than the others.

- **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

In conclusion, it seems the different stakeholder categories are being heard during the different stages of legislative processes concerning copyright, both at the drafting stage and the parliamentary phase. The organizations representing different interest groups seem to be heard more often at the earlier stages of the process, while the committee hearings seem to focus more on consulting public authorities and experts not associated with particular stakeholders, such as representatives of universities.

**B. METHODOLOGICAL FINDINGS**

- **LIMITATIONS**

Government bills and legislative proposals analyzed in this study (because they were found in the Library of Parliament’s database with the search term “tekijänoikeus”51) are connected to copyright to varying degrees. Some legislative proposals focus solely on the Copyright Act while others have only some points of contact with copyright issues.

All definitions and categorizations presented in this report are based on the interpretation of the research group and (in many cases) do not embrace all areas of operation of the organizations listed. In this study, some organizations were considered to operate in two stakeholder roles. Statements of those organizations constituted half a point for each role in the calculations. This however does not match with the actual emphasis given for different stakeholder roles in these organizations.

At the preparation and regulatory drafting stages, requests for statements are usually sent to high number of actors. Far-reaching conclusions based only on the number of comments from the different stakeholder groups cannot be made without analyzing the content of the statements. Some statements are bare references to other statements issued for example by umbrella organizations. The content of the statements can also be influenced by the background and role of the person drafting the statement.

This research only shows which interest groups issued statements at preliminary preparation and regulatory drafting stages or were given the chance to convince the decision makers in the Parliamentary committees’ hearings. Impacts resulting from the statements were not further analyzed. More far-reaching conclusions could be made if the statements were compared with the actual decisions resulting from the legislative process.

In order to make the data more comparable over time, a longer time period could be covered. The methodology suggests gathering data from the period of only five years. However it is impossible to draw conclusions from such short time period especially in a country like Finland, as the amount of data would not be sufficient. The study period of ten years not only provides a researcher with the sufficient amount of data but also allows observation of trends and developments.

---

51 "Copyright" in English.
**GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

In this study, government bills and legislative proposals found from the Library of Parliament’s database with the search term “tekijänoikeus” (“copyright” in English) were analyzed. This however turned out challenging: the search resulted in four legislative proposals focusing solely on industrial property rights. Therefore these proposals could not be analyzed within the context of the stakeholder roles defined in this study. In future research this problem could be tackled by further analyzing the subject matter of the initiatives as was done in this study. The study could alternatively focus only on the government bills and legislative proposals discussed by the Finnish Parliament’s Education and Culture Committee. This however implies the risk of excluding copyright-related initiatives discussed in other committees, for example related to taxation of royalties. In addition, this may result in inclusion of initiatives that are discussed by the Education and Culture Committee but do not include issues directly related to copyright (such as the initiative HE 259/2004 in this study).

The indicator focuses on the amounts of statements by the representatives of the different interest groups. Future studies could concentrate on assessing the extent to which the opinions of different stakeholder groups were actually taken into account during the legislative process. The results could also be interpreted in the light of the political views of the members of the Parliament.

The time needed for this pilot study will depend for each country on the availability of data. In the case of Finland, the workload for collecting data and drafting this report could be evaluated at 8 weeks of full-time work.

---

52 “Sivistysvaliokunta” in Finnish.
### Appendices

#### A. Methodology Card


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element: Law</th>
<th>Methodology card 5. Public consultation on law proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key question</strong></td>
<td>Are the opinions of different interest groups taken into account when preparing law proposals? Are planned legislations open to debate with stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of data</strong></td>
<td>Objective data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Extent of public consultation and communication with different stakeholders as well as independent experts (A definition of the different stakeholder groups can be found in Chapter 2 of the Methodology handbook. Alternatively, other division of different interest groups that will better serve the purposes of the study can be used.) Law proposals can be analyzed case by case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Parameters to measure** | 1. Are the law proposals sent out for comments? Additional information:  
- Stakeholders that have submitted written comments  
- The overall number of submissions from different stakeholder groups  
2. Number of hearings and negotiations with stakeholders |
| **Guidelines for data collection** | The data should be collected over a period allowing meaningful analysis and providing a representative overview of law proposals, and presented as yearly figures (consider for example the last 5 or 10 years). When possible, law proposals should be analyzed case by case. |
| **Definitions** | **Stakeholder groups**  
Content creators include authors, performers, and other creators of copyrighted works; professional copyright users’ activities are based on rights acquired from the authors and performers or their own related rights; intermediaries are actors whose primary purpose is to disseminate products and content; end-users can be individual citizens or end-user organizations; other organizations include ministries, government agencies, research institutions and other relevant authorities, enterprises or associations (see Chapter 2 for detailed definitions)  

**Proposal**  
Government or parliamentary proposals directly affecting the copyright system, either in the pre-parliament phase or after being submitted to the parliament  

**Hearings and negotiations**  
Hearings and negotiations organized by the ministry/government department, preparatory body or parliamentary committee responsible for copyright matters among the stakeholders most affected by the legislative work |
| **Limitations of the indicator** | - The indicator does not take into consideration to what extent the comments were taken into account.  
- Not all proposals affect all stakeholder groups.  
- In some cases it might be difficult to define to which stakeholder group a given comment belongs.  
- The indicator does not directly assess the balance between the lobbying power of different stakeholders during the different phases of the consultations  
- The indicator does not measure the actual existence of a free debate  
- Only comments made in writing might be recorded. |
### Stakeholders that Submitted a Written Statement Regarding Initiatives Related to Unauthorized File-Sharing

The following lists present the parties that submitted a written statement in a set of consultations concerning legislative drafting related to unauthorized file-sharing held between 2009 and 2014, as well as their stakeholder roles (see the definitions of stakeholder roles on p. 7). Different organizations may simultaneously represent several stakeholder positions, but for the purposes of this study, stakeholders were divided into different categories on the basis of their main roles. The categories used are “authors and performers”, “professional copyright users”, “intermediaries”, “end-users”, “experts” and “others”. Some of the organizations were considered to operate in several main stakeholder roles. All definitions and categorizations presented in this report are based on the interpretation of the research group and (in many cases) do not embrace all areas of operation of the organizations listed.

### Stakeholder Groups that Submitted a Written Statement Regarding the “Legislative Means for Eliminating Illicit File-Sharing” (2009) Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Stakeholder Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanasto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Journalistiliitto</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirjailijaliitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen käانتäjien ja tulkkin liitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Säveltäjät ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Säveltäjät ja Sanoittajat ELVIS ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av-tuottajien tekijänoikeusyhdistys</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuotos ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Software Alliance BSA</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinkeinolään keskusliitto EK</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanoma Entertainment</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanoma Oyj</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Elokuvatuottajien Keskusliitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEK ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Filmikamari ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Musiikkikustantajat ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Ääni- ja kuvatallennetuottajat</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÅKT ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestinnän keskusliitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramex ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopiosto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luovan työn tekijät ja yrittäjät LYHTY</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antipiratismiyhdistys ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Säveltäjänin Tekijänoikeustoimisto Teosto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekijänoikeuden tiedotus- ja valvontakeskus ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Oyj</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnet-liitto ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeliSonera Finland Oyj</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietoliikenteen ja tietotekniikan keskusliitto FiCom ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuluttajavirasto</td>
<td>End-users (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraatipuolue</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kuluttajaliitto</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin käräjäoikeus</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeusministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisäasianministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAKEHOLDER GROUPS THAT SUBMITTED A WRITTEN STATEMENT REGARDING THE NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE BILL DRAFT (UNAUTHORIZED FILE-SHARING) (2010)

Kuvasto Authors and performers
Sanasto ry Authors and performers
Suomen Kirjailijaliitto ry Authors and performers
Suomen Säveltäjät ry Authors and performers
Säveltäjät ja Sanoittajat ELVIS ry Authors and performers
Av-tuottajien tekijänoikeusyhdistys Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Tuotos ry Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
IFPI, The International Federation of the Phonographic Industry Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
MTV Media Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Suomen Elokuvaottajien Keskusliitto Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
SEK ry Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Suomen Filmikamari ry Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Suomen Musiikkikustantajat ry Professional copyright users
Yleisradio Oy Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Suomen Ääni- ja kuvatallennetuottajat ÄKT ry Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Suomen Antipiratismiyhdistys ry Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Säveltäjän Tekijänoikeustoimisto Teosto ry Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Tekijänoikeuden tiedotus- ja valvontakeskus ry Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
DNA Oy Intermediaries
Elisa Oyj Intermediaries
TeliaSonera Finland Oyj Intermediaries
Tietoliikenteen ja tietotekniikan keskusliitto FiCom ry Intermediaries
Kuluttajavirasto End-users (public auth.)
Piraattipuolue End-users
Suomen Kuluttajaliitto End-users
Helsingin käräjäoikeus Expert statements (public auth.)
IPR University Center Expert statements
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Oikeusministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Sisäasiainministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Tekes Expert statements
Työ- ja Elinkeinoministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Suomen Kaupan Liitto Other

STAKEHOLDER GROUPS THAT SUBMITTED A WRITTEN STATEMENT REGARDING THE “SOLUTIONS TO THE CHALLENGES OF THE DIGITAL AGE” REPORT (2011-2012)

Finlands svenska författarförening rf Authors and performers
Forum Artis ry Authors and performers
Kuvasto Authors and performers
Sanasto ry Authors and performers
Suomen elokuvaohjaajaliitto SELO ry Authors and performers
Suomen Journalistiiliitto Authors and performers
Suomen Kirjailijaliitto Authors and performers
Stakeholder groups that submitted a written statement regarding “Assessing means for diminishing unauthorized file-sharing” report and the draft bill (2013-2014)

- Finland's Authors and Performers
- Grafia ry - Visual Designers' Association: Authors and Performers
- Suunnittelijoiden järjestö: Authors and Performers
- Kuvasto ry: Authors and Performers
- Kuvittajat ry: Authors and Performers
- MUU ry: Authors and Performers
- Sanasto: Authors and Performers
- Sarjakuvantekijät ry: Authors and Performers
- Suomen elokuvaohjaajaliitto SELO ry: Authors and Performers
- Suomen Journalistiliitto ry: Authors and Performers
- Suomen Kirjailijaliitto: Authors and Performers
- Suomen kääntäjien ja tulkien liitto ry: Authors and Performers
- Suomen musiikkineuvosto: Authors and Performers
- Suomen Muusikkojen Liitto ry: Authors and Performers
- Suomen Näyttelijälitiitto: Authors and Performers
- Suomen Sääveltäjät ry: Authors and Performers
- Suomen Taiteilijaseura: Authors and Performers
- Suomen tietokirjailijat ry: Authors and Performers
- Sääveltäjät ja Sanoittajat Elvis ry: Authors and Performers
- Teosto ry: Authors and Performers
- Artie Music Oy: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Elinkeinoelämän Keskusliitto EK: Professional Copyright Users
- MTV: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Musiikkituottajat IFPI Finland ry: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Sanoma Media Finland: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Suomen Elokuvatuottajien Keskusliitto SEK ry: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Suomen Filmikamari ry: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Suomen Musiikkikustantajat ry: Professional Copyright Users
- Tuotos ry: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Viestinnän Keskusliitto: Professional Copyright Users
- Yleisradio Oy: Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Gramex ry: Authors and Performers; Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Kopiosto: Authors and Performers; Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Luovan työn tekijät ja yrittäjät Lyhty: Authors and Performers; Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- Tekijänoikeuden tiedotus- ja valvontakeskus ry: Authors and Performers; Professional Copyright Users (incl. original related rights)
- DNA Oy: Intermediaries
- Elisa Oyj: Intermediaries
- FiCom ry: Intermediaries
- Finnet-liitto ry: Intermediaries
- Sonera: Intermediaries
- Suomen Kansallisgalleria: Intermediaries
- Suomen museoliitto ry: Intermediaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDC Oy</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknologiateollisuus</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Frontier Finland ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilpailu- ja kuluttajavirasto</td>
<td>End-users (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkkohallitus</td>
<td>End-users (organizational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matkailu- ja Ravintolapalvelut MaRa ry</td>
<td>End-users (organizational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin käräjäoikeus</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR University Center</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markkinoikeus</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropoliia Ammattikorkeakoulu</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeusministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulun yliopisto</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisäministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Asiamajaliitto</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kuntaliitto</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIEKE Tietoyhteiskunnan kohittamiskeskus</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietosuojavaltutetun toimisto</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Työ- ja elinkeinoministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulkoasianministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valtioneuvoston kanslia</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valtiovarainministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestintävirasto</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammattiliitto Pro ry</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskuskauppakamari</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kiinteistöliitto ry</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toimihenkilökeskusjärjestö STTK ry</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Stakeholders Consulted for Copyright-Related Legislative Proposals During Parliamentary Review in the Period 2002 - 2013

The following lists present the parties heard in front of committees discussing copyright-related legislative proposals over the period 2002 - 2013, as well as their stakeholder roles (see the definitions of stakeholder roles on p. 7). Different organizations may simultaneously represent several stakeholder positions, but for the purposes of this study, stakeholders were divided to different categories on the basis of their main roles. The categories used are “authors and performers”, “professional copyright users”, “intermediaries”, “end-users”, “experts” and “others”. Some of the organizations were considered to operate in several main stakeholder roles. All definitions and categorizations presented in this report are based on the interpretation of the research group and (in many cases) do not embrace all areas of operation of the organizations listed.

2002

HE 112/2002

Oral:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Stakeholder Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Journalistiliitto</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Media Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal+ Finland</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainostajien Liitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskito Television Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oy Ruutunelonen Ab</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen audiovisuaalisen alan tuottajat SATU ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kaupallisten televisioiden liitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kaupallisten televisioiden liitto (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Suoramarkkinoaintiliitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teollisuuden ja Työnantajain Keskusliitto TT</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestinnän Keskusliitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestinnän Keskusliitto (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWelcom Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yleisradio Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokia Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users; intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teosto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digiya Oy</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Communications</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnet-liitto ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiolinja Oy</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satelliitti- ja antenniliitto SANT</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonera Oy</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Networks Oy</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kaapelitelevisionliitto ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telia Mobile Finland</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FiCom ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuluttajavirasto</td>
<td>End-users (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuurojen Liitto ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näkövammaisten Keskusliitto ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle viestintämärkkinoita koskevan lainsäädännön muuttamisesta
Kilpailuvirasto
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö
Oikeusministeriö
Eduskunnan valiokuntaneuvos
Huoltovarmuuskeskus
Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriö
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö
Oikeustieteen lisensiaatti Maija Sakslin
Oikeustieteen tohtori Riitta Ollila
Professori Hannu Nieminen
Professori Ilkka Saraviita
Professori Kaarle Nordenstreng
Professori Kaarlo Tuori
Professori Mikael Hidén
Professori Olli Mäenpää
Professori Teuvo Pohjolainen
Professori Tuomas Ojanen
Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen
Puolustusministeriö
Viestintävirasto
Suomen Kiinteistöliitto
Keskuskauppakamari

Written:
Sonera Oyj
Suomen Kuluttajaliitto
Suomen Kuntaliitto
Suomen Posti Oyj
Suomen Yrittäjät ry

HE 177/2002
Oral:

HE 178/2002
Oral:

2003

2004

HE 28/2004
Oral:
Suomen Elokuvaohjaajaliitto SELO ry
Suomen Kirjailijaliitto ry

Professori Hannu Nieminen
Professori Ilkka Saraviita
Professori Kaarle Nordenstreng
Professori Kaarlo Tuori
Professori Mikael Hidén
Professori Olli Mäenpää
Professori Teuvo Pohjolainen
Professori Tuomas Ojanen
Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen
Puolustusministeriö
Viestintävirasto
Suomen Kiinteistöliitto
Keskuskauppakamari

Professori Ilkka Saraviita
Professori Kaarle Nordenstreng
Professori Kaarlo Tuori
Professori Mikael Hidén
Professori Olli Mäenpää
Professori Teuvo Pohjolainen
Professori Tuomas Ojanen
Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen
Puolustusministeriö
Viestintävirasto
Suomen Kiinteistöliitto
Keskuskauppakamari

Written:
Sonera Oyj
Suomen Kuluttajaliitto
Suomen Kuntaliitto
Suomen Posti Oyj
Suomen Yrittäjät ry

54 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänosikeuslain ja rikoslain 49 luvun muuttamisesta
55 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle WIPO:n tekijänäkehysopimuksen ja WIPO:n esitys- ja äänitesopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laeiksi sopimusten lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta
56 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänäkehyslain ja rikoslain 49 luvun muuttamisesta
This association includes some organizations representing organizational end-users and intermediaries too. However, the association’s main role was considered as “professional copyright user” in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Individual</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen museoliitto ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeliaSonera Finland Oyj</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeliaSonera Finland Oyj (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FiCom ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkkohallitus</td>
<td>End-users (organizational) (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkkohallitus (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>End-users (organizational) (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Hotelli- ja Ravintolaliitto SHR</td>
<td>End-users (organizational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Frontier Finland ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näkövammaisten Keskusliitto ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asianajotoimisto Susiluoto Oy</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR University Center</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeusministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeusministeriö (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö(2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö(3.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö(4.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiteen keskustoimikunta</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietosuojavaltuutetun toimisto</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietotekniikan tutkimuslaitos HIIT</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKK-Innovaatiokeskus</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullihallitus</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullihallitus (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestintävirasto</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistentti Juha Lavapuro</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulttuuriministeri Tanja Karpela</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oikeustieteen kandidaatti Kristiina Harenko</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Pekka Läänsineva</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Rainer Oesch</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Rainer Oesch (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Rainer Oesch (3. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Ari-Matti Nuutila</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Kaarlo Tuori</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Kaarlo Tuori (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Kimmo Nuotio</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Mikael Hidén</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Mikael Hidén (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Olli Mäenpää</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Olli Mäenpää (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Tuomas Ojanen</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkija Tuomas Mylly</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkija Tuomas Mylly (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Yrittäjät ry</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written:**
- Suomen Ammattiliittojen Keskusjärjestö
- SAK ry
- Viestinnän Keskusliitto ry
- Arkkitehtitoimistojen Liitto ATL ry ja

Authors and performers
Authors and performers; professional copyright users
Professional copyright users
Suomen Arkkitehtiliitto SAFA ry  
Elektroniikan Tukkukauppiaat ry  
Kansallisarkisto  
Valtion taide­museo  
Dosentti Marjut Salokannel  
Liikenne- ja viestintä­ministeriö  

**HE 29/2004**

**Oral:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type of Entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Elokuvaohjaajaliitto SELO ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Journalisti­liitto</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkomusiikin säveltä­jät ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirjaili­liitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen kääntä­jien ja tulk­kien liitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Muusikko­jen Liitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Näytelmäkirjaili­liitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Näyttelijali­liitto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Säveltäjät ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen tietokirjailijat ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Säveltä­jät ja Sanoittajat ELV­IS ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teatteri- ja Mediati­öntekijät ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuaalisen alan taitelijoiden tekijänoikeushyd­istys Kuvasto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Media Oyj, edustaan MTV OY:­tä</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-tuottajien tekijä­noikeushyd­istys Tuotos ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-tuottajien tekijä­noikeushyd­istys Tuotos ry (2. lausun­to)</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kustannusosake­hi­tiö Nemo</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainostajien Liitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markkinointiviestinnän Toimisto­jen Liitto MTL</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanoma­WSOY Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Audiovisual­isen Al­an Tuottajat SATU ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen eloku­vatoimisto­jen liitto ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen pelio­hjelmi­sto­jen ja multimedi­ali­ten­neh­yd­istys Figma ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Ääni- ja kuvat­allen­net­tuottajat AKT ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekijänoikeuden käyttä­jien neuvot­telukunta</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yleisradio Oy</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestinnän Kesku­si­liitto</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swelcom Oy edustaan Oy Ruutu­nelen­onen Abitä</td>
<td>Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokia</td>
<td>Professional copyright users; intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopi­isto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopi­isto ry (2. lausun­to)</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibelius-Akatemia</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekijä­noikeuden tiedo­tus- ja val­ontakeskus ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekijä­noikeuden tiedo­tus- ja val­ontakeskus ry (2. lausun­to)</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramex ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle WIPOn tekijä­noikeus­opimuksen ja WIPOn esitys- ja äänitesopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laki­sopimusten lainsääd­ännön ala­an kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gramex ry (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teosto ry</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teosto ry (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Authors and performers; professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkistoyhdistys</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Oyj</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Oyj (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kaapelitelevisioliliitto ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen kirjastoseura</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen museoliitto ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeliaSonera Finland Oy</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeliaSonera Finland Oy (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FiCom ry</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkkohallitus</td>
<td>End-users (organizational) (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkkohallitus (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>End-users (organizational) (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Frontier Finland ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Näkövammaisten Keskusliitto ry</td>
<td>End-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Hotelli- ja Ravintolaliitto SHR</td>
<td>End-users (organizational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsianajotoimistoSusiluoto Oy</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR University Center</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeusministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeusministeriö (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetusministeriö (3.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiteen keskustoimikunta</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietotekniikan tutkimuslaitos HIIT</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTK-Innovaaatiokeskus</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullihallitus</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullihallitus (2. lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestintävirasto</td>
<td>Expert statements (public auth.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asistentti Juha Lavapuro</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oikeustieteen kandidaatti Kristiina</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harenko</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Pekka Länsineva</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Rainer Oesch</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Rainer Oesch (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeustieteen tohtori Rainer Oesch (3.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Ari-Matti Nuutila</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Kaarlo Tuori</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Kimmo Nuoto</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Mikael Hidén</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Olli Mäenpää</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Tuomas Ojanen</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkija Tuomas Mylly</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkija Tuomas Mylly (2.lausunto)</td>
<td>Expert statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Yrittäjät ry</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viestinnän Keskusliitto ry</td>
<td>Professional copyright users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kopiosto ry Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Hagelstam Huutokaupat Intermediaries
Oy Bukowski Ab Intermediaries
Suomen museoliitto ry Intermediaries
Suomen Taide- ja Antiikkikauppiaiden Yhdistys STAY ry Intermediaries
Valtion taide museo Intermediaries
Kilpailuvirasto Expert statements (public auth.)
Oikeusministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Opetusministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Professori Niklas Bruun Expert statements
Suomen Yrittäjät ry Other
Written:
Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)

LA 151/2005
Oral: -
Written: -

2006

HE 26/2006
Oral:
Viestinnän Keskusliitto Professional copyright users
Tekijänoikeuden tiedotus- ja valvontakeskus ry Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
FiCom ry Intermediaries
Electronic Frontier Finland ry End-users
Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriö (2. lausunto) Expert statements (public auth.)
Oikeusministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)
Oikeusministeriö (2. lausunto) Expert statements (public auth.)
Suomen teollisoikeudellinen yhdistys ry Expert statements
Oikeustieteen tohtori Marcus Norrgård Expert statements
Professori Juha Lappalainen Expert statements
Professori Olli Mäenpää Expert statements
Professori Olli Mäenpää (2. lausunto) Expert statements
Professori Teuvo Pohjolainen Expert statements
Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen Expert statements
Written:
Teollisuustaitteiden Liitto Ornamo ry Authors and performers
Elinkeinoelämän keskusliitto EK ry Professional users of copyright
Helsingin käräjäoikeus Expert statements (public auth.)

LA 29/2006
Oral:
Viestinnän Keskusliitto Professional copyright users
Tekijänoikeuden tiedotus- ja Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)

65 Laki tekijänoikeuslain 50 a §:n muuttamisesta (Kasvi, Jyrki /vihr ym.)
66 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi teollis- ja tekijänoikeuksia koskevan laineseen muuttamisesta
67 Laki tekijänoikeuslain sekä eräiden muiden teollis- ja tekijänoikeuksiin liittyvien lakien muuttamisesta
This proposal concerns the use and preservation of cultural materials in libraries and archives.
Universities and university libraries are therefore in this context regarded as “intermediaries” (institutions having duties on storage and preservation of cultural materials)

Oral:
AV-tuottajien tekijänoikeusyhdistys
Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Tuotos ry
MTV Oy
SanomAWSOY Oyj
Suomen Audiovisuaalisen Alan Tuottajat
SATU ry
Suomen Ääni- ja kuvatallennetuottajat
ÄKT ry
Viestinnän Keskusliitto
Swelcom Oy
Yleisradio Oy
Kopiosto ry
Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)

Eduskunnan kirjasto
Helsingin yliopisto
Kansallisarkisto
Kansalliskirjasto
Suomen elokuva-arkisto
Åbo Akademi
Opetusministeriö
Opetusministeriö (2.lausunto)
Professori Juha Karhu
Professori Kaarlo Tuori
Professori Mikael Hidén
Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)

Written:
Finlands svenska författareförening rf
Authors and performers
Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura
Authors and performers
Suomen Journalistiiliitto
Authors and performers
Suomen Kirjailijaliitto ry
Authors and performers
Suomen tietokirjailijat ry
Professional copyright users
Alma Media Oyj
Kulttuuri-, mielipide- ja tiedelehtien liitto
Kultti ry
Nokia
Professional copyright users
Professional copyright users; intermediaries
FICom ry
Joensuun yliopisto
Kuopion yliopisto
Lapin yliopisto
Näkövammaisten kirjasto Celia
Oulun yliopisto
Suomen kirjastoseura
Suomen tieteellinen kirjastoseura
Tampereen yliopisto
Turun yliopisto
Vaasan yliopisto
Valtion taidemuseo
Varastokirjasto
Suomen Nuorisokirjallisuuden Instituutti (SNI)
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö
Oikeusministeriö
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Intermediaries
Expert statements
Expert statements (public auth.)
Expert statements (public auth.)
Expert statements (public auth.)
Suomen Historiallinen Seura: Expert statements
Tiedotusopillinen yhdistys TOY ry: Expert statements
Tieteellisten seurain valtuuskunta: Expert statements
Keskuskauppakamari: Other

HE 76/2008
Oral:
Opetusministeriö: Expert statements (public auth.)

Written: -

HE 159/2008
Oral:
Gramex ry: Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Kopiostoy ry: Authors and performers; professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Teosto ry: Authors and performers; professional copyright users
Valtiovarainministeriö: Expert statements (public auth.)
Verohallitus: Expert statements (public auth.)

Written:
Opetusministeriö: Expert statements (public auth.)

2009

HE 87/2009
Oral:
Suomen Näytelmäkirjailijaliitto ry: Authors and performers
MTV Media: Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
PlusTV: Professional copyright users
Sanoma Entertainment Oy: Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
Viestinnän Keskusliitto: Professional copyright users
Elinkeinoelämän keskusliitto EK ry: Professional copyright users
Yleisradio Oy: Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
FiCom ry: Intermediaries
Dosentti Riitta Ollila: Expert statements
Julkisen sanan neuvosto: Expert statements
Kuluttajavirasto: Expert statements (public auth.)
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö: Expert statements (public auth.)
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö (2.lausunto): Expert statements (public auth.)
Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö (3.lausunto): Expert statements (public auth.)
Opetusministeriö: Expert statements (public auth.)
Valtion elokuvatarkastamo: Expert statements (public auth.)
Tutkijatohtori Päivi Tiilikka: Expert statements
Viestintävirasto: Expert statements (public auth.)
Professori Olli Mäenpää: Expert statements
Professori Veli-Pekka Viljanen: Expert statements
Suomen Liikunta ja Urheilu SLU: Other

Written:
Mainostajien Liitto: Professional copyright users
Sanoma Entertainment Oy: Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)
MTV MEDIA: Professional copyright users (incl. original related rights)

Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi tekijänoikeuslain 26 a §:n muuttamisesta
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi arvonlisäverolain 45 ja 85 a §:n muuttamisesta
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi arvonlisäverolain, Ahvenanmaan maakuntaa koskevista poikkeuksista arvonlisävero- ja valmisteverolainsäädäntöön annetun lain 18 b §:n ja eräistä vakuutusmaksumuista suoritettavasta verosta annetun lain 3 §:n muuttamisesta.

Laki tekijänoikeuslain 58 §:n muuttamisesta.

Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tehijdänoikeuslain 60 a §:n ja sähköisen viestinnän tietosuojalain muuttamisesta.

Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle markkinoikeutta ja oikeudenkäyntiä markkinoikeudessa koskevalta lainsäädännöksi (Budjettitilakirjodotus)
The proposal is marked with the search word “copyright” in the database of the Library of Parliament of Finland but it however does not include issues directly related to copyright.
Therefore this proposal was left outside the scope of this study.

**HE 211/2013**

Oral: Ulkoasainministeriö Expert statements (public auth.)

Written: -

### D. LIST OF COPYRIGHT-RELATED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS IN PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW IN THE PERIOD 2002 – 2013

The list includes all the government bills and legislative proposals that were found from the database with the search term “tekijänoikeus” (“copyright” in English). It covers the year 2002 – 2013. The list includes also information on the parliamentary committees to which the Parliament has sent the government bill or the legislative proposals for either a report (valmisteleväksi käsitetäväksi (mietintö)) or for a statement (lausunto).

#### 2002

**HE 178/2002 vp**

Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle WIPOn tekijänoikeussopimuksen ja WIPOn esitys- ja äänitesopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laeiksi sopimusten lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta

Rauennut (EK 49/2002 vp Eduskunnan työn lopettaminen, rauenneet asiat ja eduskunnan kokoontuminen)

**HE 177/2002 vp**

Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain ja rikoslain 49 luvun muuttamisesta

Rauennut (EK 49/2002 vp Eduskunnan työn lopettaminen, rauenneet asiat ja eduskunnan kokoontuminen)

**HE 112/2002 vp**

Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle viestintämarkkinoita koskevan lainsäädännön muuttamisesta

*Eduskunta lähetänyt 17.9.2002 liikennevaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Eduskunta lähetänyt 17.9.2002 perustuslakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten*

---

79 Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle Euroopan unionin ja sen jäsenvaltioiden sekä Korean tasavallan välisen vapaakauppasopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laeiksi sopimuksen lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta.

2004

HE 259/2004 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi oikeudesta korkeakouluissa tehtäviin keksintöihin sekä laiksi oikeudesta työntekijän tekemiin keksintöihin annetun lain muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 07.12.2004 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 07.12.2004 perustuslaki-valiokuntaan lausuntoa varten

HE 139/2004 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle patenttiyhteistyöopimukseen 22 artiklan 1 kappaleen muutoksen hyväksymisestä sekä laiksi patenttilain muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 14.09.2004 talousvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 85/2004 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi arvonlisäverolain 45 §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 11.05.2004 valtiovarainvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 29/2004 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle WIPO- ja patenttiyhteistyöopimukseen ja WIPO esitys- ja aänitesopimuksesta
hyväksymisestä sekä laiksi sopimusten lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten
voimaanantamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 23.03.2004 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 23.03.2004 perustuslaki-valiokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 23.03.2004 lakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Yhdistetty asian käsittelyyn: HE 28/2004 vp

HE 28/2004 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänäikeuslain ja rikoslain 49 luvun muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 23.03.2004 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 23.03.2004 perustuslaki-valiokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 23.03.2004 lakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.09.2005 suureen valiokuntaan mietintöä varten

2005

LA 151/2005 vp
Laki tekijänäikeuslain 50 a §:n muuttamisesta (Kasvi, Jyrki /vihr ym.)
Täysistunto lähettänyt 13.12.2005 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

LA 12/2005 vp
Laki taiteilijoiden ja eräiden erityisryhmien kuuluvien työntekijän eläkelain muuttamisesta (Sinnemäki,
Anni /vihr)
Täysistunto lähettänyt 31.03.2005 sosiaali- ja terveysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 111/2005 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi tekijänäikeuslain muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 13.09.2005 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

81 The proposal is marked with the search word ”copyright” in the database of the Library of Parliament of Finland but it however does not include issues directly related to copyright. Therefore this proposal was left outside the scope of this study.
82 The proposal is marked with the search word ”copyright” in the database of the Library of Parliament of Finland but it however does not include issues directly related to copyright. Therefore this proposal was left outside the scope of this study.
HE 92/2005 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle Eurooppapatenttien myöntämisestä tehdyn yleissopimuksen uudistamiskirjan ja patenttilakisopimuksen hyväksymisestä ja laeiksi sopimusten lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta sekä patenttilain muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 07.09.2005 talousvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

2006

LA 29/2006 vp
Laki tekijänoikeuslain sekä eräiden muiden teollis- ja tekijänoikeuksiin liittyvien lakien muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.05.2006 lakivaliokuntaan
Yhdistetty asian käsittelyyn: HE 26/2006 vp

HE 153/2006 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle Euroopan neuvoston tietoverkkorikollisuutta koskevan yleissopimuksen hyväksymisestä, laeiksi sen lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta sekä laeiksi rikoslain, pakkokeinolain 4 luvun, esitutkintalain 27 ja 28 §:n ja kansainvälisestä oikeusavusta rikosasioissa annetun lain 15 ja 23 §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 04.10.2006 liikenne- ja viestintävaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 04.10.2006 lakivaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 126/2006 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi tekijänoikeuslain 19 §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 15.09.2006 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 26/2006 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi teollis- ja tekijänoikeuksia koskevan lainsäädännön muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 04.04.2006 lakivaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 04.04.2006 perustuslakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Käsittelyyn yhdistetty aloitteita: LA 29/2006 vp

2007

HE 68/2007 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi kulttuuriaineistojen tallettamisesta ja säilyttämisestä sekä eräiksi siihen liittyviiksi laeiksi
(Budjettilakiehdotus)
Täysistunto lähettänyt 21.09.2007 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 21.09.2007 perustuslakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten

2008

HE 159/2008 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi arvonlisäverolain 45 ja 85 a §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 15.10.2008 valtiovarainvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 76/2008 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi tekijänoikeuslain 26 a §:n muuttamisesta

83 The proposal is marked with the search word "copyright" in the database of the Library of Parliament of Finland but it however does not include issues directly related to copyright. Therefore this proposal was left outside the scope of this study.
Täysistunto lähettänyt 10.06.2008 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

2009

HE 137/2009 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi arvonlisäverolain, Ahvenanmaan maakuntaa koskevista poikkeuksista arvonlisävero- ja valmisteverolainsäädäntöön annetun lain 18 b §:n ja eräistä vakuutusmaksuista suoritettavasta verosta annetun lain 3 §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 18.09.2009 valtiovarainvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Käsittelyyn yhdistetty aloitteita: LA 67/2009 vp

HE 87/2009 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi televisio- ja radiotoiminnasta annetun lain muuttamisesta ja väliaikaisesta muuttamisesta sekä tekijänoikeuslain 25 b ja 48 §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.06.2009 liikenne- ja viestintävaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.06.2009 perustuslakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.06.2009 sivistysvaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten

2010

Laki tekijänoikeuslain 58 §:n muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 01.12.2010 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 235/2010 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain 60 a §:n ja sähköisen viestinnän tietosuojalain muuttamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.11.2010 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Sivistysvaliokunta lähettänyt 10.12.2010 perustuslakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten

2012

HE 124/2012 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle markkinaoikeutta ja oikeudenkäyntiä markkinaoikeudessa koskevaksi lainsäädännöksi
(Budjettilakiehdotus)
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.10.2012 lakivaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
Täysistunto lähettänyt 09.10.2012 perustuslakivaliokuntaan lausuntoa varten

2013

HE 211/2013 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle Euroopan unionin ja sen jäsenvaltioiden sekä Korean tasavallan välisen vapaakauppasopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laiksi sopimuksen lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaantasattamisesta
Täysistunto lähettänyt 05.02.2014 ulkoasiainvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten
HE 156/2013 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laiksi patentti- ja rekisterihallituksen valitusasioiden käsittelystä annetun lain kumoamisesta annetun lain voimaanpanosta
Täysistunto lähetänyt 23.10.2013 lakivaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

HE 73/2013 vp
Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi tekijänoikeuslain muuttamisesta ja orpoteosten käyttämisestä
Täysistunto lähetänyt 18.06.2013 sivistysvaliokuntaan mietintöä varten

E. INFORMATION SOURCES

International


Finland

- Ministry of Education and Culture:
  - Website of the ministry, text in Finnish: http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Tekijaenoikeus/?lang=fi

- Ministry of Justice:
  - Decision of Government plenary session 10 March 2010 - Consultation in Legislative Drafting guidelines, text in English: http://oikeusministerio.fi/material/attachments/om/toiminta/laitjalainvalmistelunkehittaminen/6HBYRERh/Consultation_in_legislative_drafting_guidelines.pdf

- Parliament of Finland:
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- **Other:**
  - Raske2 Project on the website of the University of Jyväskylä: http://www.it.jyu.fi/raske/lainsaadantoprosessi.html

**F. CONSULTED PARTIES**

- Anna Vuopala, Counsellor of Government at the Division for Copyright Policy and the Economy of Culture, Ministry of Education and Culture (interview on 16.6.2014)
- Jukka Liedes, director at the Ministry of Education and Culture (interview on 16.6.2014)
Ministry of Education and Culture, Finland

Assessing Copyright and Related Rights Systems: Piloting of the methodology framework in Finland

Cupore webpublications 39:3 Technological Development. Report on Piloting in Finland.
Cupore webpublications 39:10 Copyright Policy. Report on Piloting in Finland.
Cupore webpublications 39:23 Copyright-related Information Activities. Report on Piloting in Finland.
Cupore webpublications 39:26 Copyright-related Education as Part of the Education of Professionals for Creative Industries. Report on Piloting in Finland.
Cupore webpublications 39:28 Copyright-related Research and Study Programs in Universities and Research Institutes. Report on Piloting in Finland.
Cupore webpublications 39:31 Access to Copyrighted Works for Follow-on Creation.