

Assessing Copyright and Related Rights Systems

# Analysis of Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System

Report on Piloting in Finland

---

Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry)



The logo for Cupore, consisting of the word "cupore" in a white, lowercase, sans-serif font, centered within a solid red rectangular background.

**Assessing Copyright and Related Rights Systems: Analysis of Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.**

This report is the result of the first pilot study implementing Methodology Card 22 – *Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System*, 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 Milla Määttä together with the core project team (Tiina Kautio and Nathalie Lefever), between April 2014 and January 2015. The results were first published in January 2015 on the website of Cupore.

*A handbook presenting the methodology framework is available on the website of Cupore at [www.cupore.fi](http://www.cupore.fi).*

**Cupore webpublications 39:36**

Kulttuuripoliittisen tutkimuksen edistämissäätiö (Cupore)

Foundation for Cultural Policy Research (Cupore)

© Authors and Foundation for Cultural Policy Research

Cover illustration: Oy Graaf Ab

**ISBN 978-952-7200-09-4**

**ISSN 1796-9263**

**May 2016**

## 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 Methodology Card 22 presented in the methodology handbook, titled “Analysis of Stakeholders’ Opinions on the Copyright System”<sup>1</sup>. The goal of this report is to provide an overview of the opinions of authors and publishers in the Finnish literature and book publishing industry.

The research was conducted by interviewing experts in the field and conducting two focus group meetings, the first one composed of representatives of authors’ and translators’ organizations, the second with representatives of publishers’ organizations and individual publishers. The members of the two focus groups provided answers in writing and orally to a list of questions prepared by the researchers on the basis of the methodology’s handbook. The topics discussed included the coherence and neutrality of the copyright system, the clarity and consistency of copyright rules, the access to copyrighted works and the system’s capacity to adapt.

The opinions of the respondents in both focus groups concerning the coherence of national copyright legislation varied. The majority of the respondents believed that the rules are coherent and there is no contradiction between different copyright rules. However, there were also those who thought that national copyright legislation is actually incoherent and there are contradictions between different rules and provisions.

The copyright system can be considered to be neutral when it provides the same level of rights for every stakeholder. Some authors’ organizations thought that the rights of authors are well protected by the copyright system, but there were also respondents who believed that the system is not able to protect the rights of authors properly. The representatives of authors and translators of literature believed that the rights of publishers and private users are protected well or very well by the system. In contrast, the publishers considered that the copyright system protects well or very well the rights of authors and private users. Some publishers believed that the rights of publishers are protected well, whereas some publishers considered that their rights are poorly protected.

The clarity and consistency of national copyright rules was analyzed by examining the opinions of the stakeholders on the complexity of the national copyright system and the availability of information on copyright rules and policies. Opinions concerning the complexity of copyright rules, policies and enforcement of rights in Finland varied greatly. It was also pointed out that the system is probably even more complex from the point of view of individual creators and users of copyrighted works.

The majority of the interviewees in both groups felt that information on copyright rules and policies provided by the private sector (i.e. non-governmental actors) is extensively available for the public at large. In contrast, concerning information provided by the public sector, opinions differed: in both stakeholder groups there were those who thought information offered by authorities is poorly available and those who felt that information offered by authorities is extensively available.

The opinions of interviewees in both stakeholder groups on the effect the national copyright system has on the availability of books varied. The majority of the representatives of Finnish authors believed that the system increases the availability of different kinds of books, but some publishers believed that the national copyright system limits the availability of electronic books, electronic learning material and audio books in the Finnish market.

All interviewees claimed that there is a need for certain reforms in the Finnish copyright system, and the majority believed that the need is urgent. Some possible reforms were proposed by the members of both focus groups.

---

<sup>1</sup> After the first publication of this pilot report, the title of this methodology card has been changed into “Stakeholders’ Opinions on the Copyright System”.

## Table of contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
A. Context of the pilot study .....	5
B. Presentation of the indicator .....	5
C. Methods .....	6
▪ Desktop study and expert interviews .....	6
▪ Selection of participants .....	6
▪ Questionnaires .....	7
▪ Focus group meetings .....	8
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Section 1. Opinions on the coherence and the neutrality of the copyright system .....	9
▪ Coherence of national copyright rules and policies.....	9
▪ Neutrality of the national copyright system .....	10
Section 2. Opinions on the clarity and consistency of copyright rules.....	11
▪ Complexity of the national copyright system .....	11
▪ Availability of information on copyright rules and policies .....	12
Section 3. Access to copyrighted works .....	12
Section 4. The copyright system's capacity to adapt and needs for reforms .....	13
▪ The copyright system's capacity to adapt to technological changes.....	13
▪ Needs for reforms in the national copyright system .....	13
<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
A. Analysis and summary of the results .....	15
▪ Opinions of the stakeholders on the coherence and the neutrality of the copyright system....	15
▪ Opinions of the stakeholders on the clarity and consistency of copyright rules.....	15
▪ Access to copyrighted works.....	15
▪ The copyright system's capacity to adapt and needs for reforms.....	16
B. Methodological findings.....	16
▪ Limitations.....	16
▪ Guidelines for future research .....	16
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>17</b>
A. Methodology card .....	17
B. Consulted parties .....	18
C. Questionnaires used in the focus group study .....	18

## 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 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 meant to be continuously improved through application feedbacks. For more information, see the Cupore website, [www.cupore.fi/copyright.php](http://www.cupore.fi/copyright.php).

This report presents data collected in application of Methodology Card 22 of the methodology framework, titled "Analysis of Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System"<sup>2</sup>. It is the result of the first pilot study applying this indicator in Finland.

This study was conducted by Project Researcher Milla Määttä together with the core project team (Tiina Kautio and Nathalie Lefever), between April 2014 and January 2015.

### ***B. PRESENTATION OF THE INDICATOR***

---

The indicator implemented here is part of the third pillar of the methodology framework, "Operational balance of the copyright system", and its fourth area, "Infringement, Opinions, and Public Acceptance". Its aim is to assess stakeholders' opinions on the copyright system and its operation in order to support the analysis of the operation of the national copyright and related rights system.

As explained in the methodology handbook, studying stakeholders' opinions on the different aspects of the copyright system's operation is one aspect in establishing a picture of a system's balanced operation. The positions of stakeholders as well as the architecture of value creation differ between industries. For this reason, the different types of creative activities and industries should be analysed separately on these topics. This study illustrates the use of the methodology when applied to one area of the copyright system: the literature and book publishing industry in Finland. It also focuses on two stakeholder groups: the representatives of authors and translators of literature, and professional copyright users.

Issues considered in the analysis include the image and neutrality of the copyright system, the functioning of the system's different elements and the need to update the current set of laws and policies. This information will also tell about the perceived legitimacy of the copyright system.

---

<sup>2</sup> After the first publication of this pilot report, the title of this methodology card has been changed into "Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System".

The analysis included questions on the changes in the working environment and especially the characteristics of the information society, and on stakeholders' opinions concerning the necessity to update the copyright system in this respect. The second pillar of this methodology was used as a framework for drafting the set of questions and when collecting the necessary information.

This study is based on the following issues defined in the methodology card:

- Stakeholders' opinions on the copyright system and its functioning:
  - The clarity and consistency of rules, as well as the availability of information on them
  - The copyright system's capacity to adapt
  - The current need for reforms
- Stakeholders' opinions on the neutrality of the copyright system
- Stakeholders' opinions on the access to copyrighted works.

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

### **C. METHODS**

---

This pilot study is part of a package of six pilot studies applying the methodology for assessing the copyright and related rights system with a focus on the literature and book publishing industry. This package includes pilot studies made in application of the following indicators:

- *Description Sheet 4. Markets for Copyrighted Products and Services*
- *Description Sheet 11. Individual Exercise of Rights*
- *Methodology Card 15. Efficiency of Copyright as an Incentive to Create and Invest in Creative Works*
- *Methodology Card 18. Transaction Costs in Transfer and Licensing of Rights*
- *Methodology Card 19. Terms for Transfer and Licensing of Rights*
- *Methodology Card 22. Analysis of Stakeholders' Opinions.*

These studies provide relevant background and complementary information that were used when conducting this study and analyzing its results.

The information collected for this indicator is mainly subjective data that was collected through focus group studies, surveys and interviews with representatives of authors and book publishers. An initial desktop analysis was conducted to identify the relevant stakeholders in the industry and the existing literature.

#### **▪ DESKTOP STUDY AND EXPERT INTERVIEWS**

Initial desktop analysis was necessary to identify the relevant stakeholders in the industry considered, and the elements of the copyright law and system that are most likely to affect these stakeholders.

Interviews with experts in the field of literature were conducted in order to better understand the operation of copyright in the industry, and to test the questionnaires that were used when conducting the focus group sessions.

#### **▪ SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS**

Following the initial desktop study, participants were selected to take part in the focus groups. The main purpose was to gather a number of participants small enough to result in meaningful discussions, but representative enough to offer a broad overview of the opinions of the industry as a whole. Ideally, the

focus groups composition should also cover as wide a selection of types of works (fiction books, non-fiction books, comics, works in both national languages and translations) as possible.<sup>3</sup>

The issue of representativeness was dealt with differently when deciding on the composition of each focus group. The stakeholder group of authors and translators is composed of representatives of main organizations in the field. As described in the pilot report on *Description sheet 4. Markets for copyrighted products and services*, a number of organizations exist in Finland to represent the interests of this category of stakeholders and to support them with various issues connected to their work. As a result, these associations had the representativeness and the expertise necessary to be able to provide information on the functioning of the copyright system from the point of view of their members. The following representatives from these organizations were invited to take part in this study:

*Focus group 1: Representatives of authors in the field of literature*

Karola Baran, Executive Director, The Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters

Merete Jensen, Executive Director, Finlands Svenska Författareförening

Sonia Meltti, In-house Counsel, The Union of Finnish Writers

Suvi Oinonen, Executive Director, The Union of Finnish Writers

Jukka-Pekka Pietiäinen, Executive Director, The Finnish Association of Non-Fiction Writers

Kalervo Pulkkinen, Secretary, The Finnish Comics Professionals

The stakeholder group of publishers, on the other hand, is composed of a limited number of individual organizations which each deal with a large number of works. The idea was to have a balanced representation of publishers of both fiction and non-fiction. The group is therefore able to provide a broad overview of the issues connected to the copyright system. However, this category of stakeholders is also organized in associations, of which the widest in scope and the most representative is The Finnish Book Publishers Association<sup>4</sup>. It was therefore decided to invite a representative of this association together with individual publishers dealing with different categories of literature in the focus group. The following representatives were invited to take part in this study:

*Focus group 2: Representatives of the Finnish book publishing industry*

Satu Kangas, Director/Copyright Expert, The Finnish Book Publishers Association

Antti Kasper, Editorial Director (Fiction), Otava Publishing Company Ltd

Vesa Kataisto, Editor (Comics), Arktinen Banaani

Tero Norkola, Publishing Director, Finnish Literature Society

Anna Suominen, Rights Manager, Werner Söderström Corporation / Bonnier Books Finland

## ▪ QUESTIONNAIRES

For the purposes of this study, the questionnaires presented in the separate questionnaires toolkit were translated in Finnish and adapted in order to fit in an assessment of the operation of the Finnish copyright system in the field of literature and the book publishing industry. The questionnaires used in the focus group studies are presented in Appendix E.

In order to facilitate the discussion, the questionnaires were sent to the focus group members two weeks before the first group session and answered in writing. Based on these answers, a selection was made to determine the questions that required further discussion. The sets of topics covered in the focus group sessions were narrowed on the basis of this selection.

---

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of the methodology implemented here, four main stakeholder roles in the copyright system were distinguished: authors and performers, professional users, intermediaries and end-users. This study focuses on the opinions of authors and professional copyright users.

<sup>4</sup> The 100 members of the association account for about 80 % of commercially published titles and over 70 % of book sales in Finland.

It should be kept in mind that although the methodology and the piloting studies are conducted in English, both the questionnaire's questions and answers and the opinions during the focus group meetings were provided in Finnish. Some translation issues have arisen, and some terms needed to be clarified together with the participants.

#### ▪ **FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS**

The meetings with representatives of each focus group were organized on 06.06.2014 for the focus group of authors' organizations and on 17.06.2014 for the focus group of publishers.<sup>5</sup> The discussions were structured around the topics selected based on the questionnaires and took the form of a free-flowing conversation rather than a strict questions-answers format. The discussions were recorded and later transcribed. The discussions focused on certain topics that already were covered in the questionnaires but needed more clarification. As a result, some issues were not tackled in details while some topics that had not been part of the questionnaires were also covered. The answers provided in writing were revised orally after discussing the scope of the questions. In the results chapter, the answers provided in writing and the discussions during the focus groups meetings are clearly distinguished whenever necessary.

A list of national and international information sources used for this report as well as a list of interviewees and commentators can be found in the Appendices.

---

<sup>5</sup> The discussions were conducted by Project manager Tiina Kautio (Moderator) and Project researcher Milla Määttä (Secretary).

## Results

This study focuses on the stakeholders' opinions on the copyright system and its functioning, including the clarity and consistency of rules, the availability of information on them, the copyright system's capacity to adapt, the current need for reforms, the neutrality of the copyright system and the access to copyrighted works.

When considering the results of this study, it should be kept in mind that the information provided by the participants are the results of their individual opinions and experiences. The subjective quality of their answers can result in contradictions between the opinions of participants in the same focus groups and the opinions of representatives of the two stakeholder categories interviewed. This study was not designed to be an objective overview of, for instance, the consistency of copyright rules or the differences in the way stakeholders in the book publishing industry are supported by the copyright system. Moreover, even though this study was designed to include a set of actors as representative as possible of the industry as a whole, it cannot be considered to present all the various points of view of actors in the industry.

### **SECTION 1. OPINIONS ON THE COHERENCE AND THE NEUTRALITY OF THE COPYRIGHT SYSTEM**

In the first section, the image and neutrality of the copyright system are discussed through analyzing the opinions of the stakeholders on the coherence of national copyright rules and policies and their ability to strike a balance between the interests of the different parties involved. The results are used to make an assessment of the perceived legitimacy of the system.

#### **■ COHERENCE OF NATIONAL COPYRIGHT RULES AND POLICIES**

The analysis of the coherence of national copyright rules and policies is based on two questions presented to both focus groups in the questionnaires:

- How would you qualify the coherence/consistency of national copyright legislation (meaning, the lack of contradiction between its rules)?<sup>6</sup>
- How would you qualify the coherence/consistency of national copyright policy in relation to values and principles generally accepted in the society?<sup>7</sup>

The opinions of the respondents in both focus groups concerning the coherence of national copyright legislation varied. The majority of the respondents believed that the rules are coherent and there is no contradiction between different copyright rules. However, there were also those who thought that national copyright legislation is actually incoherent and there are contradictions between different rules and provisions.

The majority of the respondents in both focus groups agreed on the coherence of national copyright policy in relation to generally accepted values and principles in the society. The authors' representatives considered the national copyright policy coherent and highlighted especially the importance of property rights in the society. Similarly, almost all publishers stated that national copyright policy is coherent.

---

<sup>6</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka johdonmukaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeuslainsäädäntöä (säännösten sisäinen ristiriidattomuus)?*

<sup>7</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka johdonmukaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeuspolitiikkaa suhteessa yhteiskunnassa yleisesti hyväksytyihin arvoihin ja periaatteisiin?*

However, certain inconsistencies in national copyright policy were pointed out by the publishers' side. Firstly, some interviewees thought that it is not coherent to have neighboring rights for producers of certain cultural goods when at the same time book publishers have no neighboring right of their own. Secondly, it was pointed out that it is incoherent that the national system of remunerations paid for Finnish public library lending provides remuneration only for the original creators and not for the publishers of books. Thirdly, one of interviewees felt that the originality of photographs has been assessed rather inconsistently in Finland, which has caused confusion among the users of photographs.

#### ▪ NEUTRALITY OF THE NATIONAL COPYRIGHT SYSTEM

The copyright system can be considered to be neutral when the rights of every stakeholder category are balanced in an impartial manner. The analysis of the neutrality of the system was based on the following question included in the questionnaire:

- How well do you think the rights of (i) authors, (ii) publishers and (iii) private users are protected by the copyright system (including rules, policies and enforcement of rights)?<sup>8</sup>

The representatives of authors and translators of literature had varying opinions. Some respondents thought that the rights of authors are well protected by the copyright system, whereas others believed that the system is not able to protect the rights of authors properly. Furthermore, the representatives of authors and translators of literature believed that the rights of publishers and private users are protected well or very well by the system.

In contrast, the publishers considered that the copyright system protects well or very well the rights of authors and private users. Some publishers believed that the rights of publishers are protected well, whereas some publishers considered that their rights are poorly protected. It was pointed out during the focus group session that the means of preventing online infringement are not sufficient from the right holder point of view. The representatives of publishers wanted to highlight also the fact that because of the challenges related to the digital operational environment they are forced to acquire rights with a scope as large as possible.

The stakeholders were also asked to share their thoughts concerning the following statement during the focus groups sessions:

"The objective of safeguarding a balance of rights and interests  
a) between the different categories of right holders, as well as  
b) between the different categories of right holders and users of protected subject matter  
is fulfilled in the national copyright system."<sup>9</sup>

According to the stakeholders, the Finnish Copyright Act and the national copyright system themselves are balanced and working properly. Problems concerning the balance of rights and interests of different parties are related to the functioning of the markets for rights and cultural goods as well as to the digital environment and new ways of utilizing creative contents.

The interviewees still believed that especially the rights and interests of the different categories of users of protected subject matter are protected by the national copyright system. From the authors' point of view the imbalances are related to the enforcement of rights. Even though the system is designed to safeguard the interests of different parties, some users of protected works do not know or respect the national rules and policies sufficiently and end up exploiting creative content as they wish. Furthermore,

---

<sup>8</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka hyvin tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) mielestäsi toteuttaa seuraavien osapuolten oikeuksia: i) tekijät; ii) kustantajat iii) yksityiset käyttäjät?*

<sup>9</sup> The statement in Finnish: *Tekijänoikeusjärjestelmään liitetty tavoite turvata a) eri oikeudenhaltijaryhmien välisten, sekä b) eri oikeudenhaltijaryhmien ja suojatun aineiston käyttäjien välisten oikeuksien ja etujen tasapaino toteutuu nykyisellään hyvin.*

according to the interviewees, the system enables the supply of a great variety of cultural products, and under numerous limitations to copyright private users can exploit these products without authorization. The authors' organizations believed that especially the system of extended collective licensing protects the interests of private users of protected works. It was also noted that the copyright system does not properly reflect the imbalances in the bargaining positions of different parties.

## **SECTION 2. OPINIONS ON THE CLARITY AND CONSISTENCY OF COPYRIGHT RULES**

---

In the second section, the clarity and consistency of national copyright rules are analyzed by examining the opinions of the stakeholders on the complexity of the national copyright system and by assessing the availability of information on copyright rules and policies.

### **▪ COMPLEXITY OF THE NATIONAL COPYRIGHT SYSTEM**

The analysis of the complexity of the national copyright system is based on the following question included in the questionnaire:

- How would you qualify the complexity of your national copyright system (copyright rules, policies and enforcement of rights)?<sup>10</sup>

Opinions of the stakeholders concerning the complexity of copyright rules, policies and enforcement of rights in Finland varied greatly: some respondents believed that the system is very complex, whereas some were of the opinion that the system is simple. Especially the publishers' group qualified the national copyright system as being complex or very complex. However, some opinions were also neutral.

The representatives of authors and translators of literature pointed out during the focus group session that the system is probably even more complex from the point of view of individual creators and users of copyrighted works. For example, it might be difficult for the users to know which copyright organization to contact and when authorization is actually required.

According to one interviewee in the focus group of authors' organizations, the system may seem complex partially due to shortcomings in the availability of information and education on copyright related issues. However, the interviewee believes, that there have also been actors who have consistently stressed the complexity of the system in the public copyright discussion, and to some extent this might have distorted the opinions of the general public.

It was also mentioned that since some of the provisions in the Copyright Act are from the 1960s, and the law has been amended numerous times, the phrasings may be somewhat unclear for the general public. However, the stakeholders admit that although the Copyright Act itself may seem complex to non-experts in the field, it might be hard to make it simpler because the whole concept of copyright is complicated and the law covers various issues. However, according to the interviewees, the idea of copyright as a property right should nevertheless be rather simple.

It was also pointed out that the system is under continuous development, and one of the objectives of the amendments of the system is to make it more functioning. Furthermore, the interviewees wanted to stress the fact that the industry itself can operate under the current legal framework and still develop more functioning practices on their own.

---

<sup>10</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka monimutkaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeusjärjestelmää (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja vahvonta)?*

The focus group of publishers agreed that the main complexities the book publishing industry faces concern the differences in national copyright laws of different countries.

#### ▪ AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON COPYRIGHT RULES AND POLICIES

Analysis of the availability of information on copyright rules and policies is based on the following question presented to the stakeholders:

- How would you qualify the availability of information on copyright rules and policies in your country?<sup>11</sup>

The majority of the interviewees in both groups felt that information on copyright rules and policies provided by the private sector (i.e. non-governmental actors) is extensively available for the public at large. In contrast, opinions concerning the availability of information provided by the public sector differed: in both stakeholder groups there were those who thought information offered by authorities is poorly available and those who felt that information offered by authorities is extensively available.

The representatives of Finnish authors stated that the public sector offers data and information on copyright on a very general level, and currently it is the industry organizations that are responsible on providing more detailed and practical information (e.g. on publishing contracts and licensing) for individual authors, publishers and users of copyrighted works. For example, national copyright rules are available online, but no authority produces information on how individual provisions should be interpreted in practice. The interviewees suggested that the public sector should provide information on copyright rules and policies in a more focused way.

### SECTION 3. ACCESS TO COPYRIGHTED WORKS

---

The opinions of the different stakeholders on the effects of the national copyright system on the availability of books were analyzed on the basis of the following question presented to the stakeholders:

- How do you think the current copyright system (including rules, policies and enforcement of rights) affect the availability of i) printed books and learning material, ii) electronic books, iii) electronic learning material and iv) audio books in Finland?<sup>12</sup>

The opinions of different interviewees in both stakeholder groups varied. However, although there were also neutral opinions, the majority of the representatives of Finnish authors believed that the system increases the availability of different kinds of books. Although some publishers agreed with the representatives of Finnish authors, there were also publishers who believed that the national copyright system limits the availability of electronic books, electronic learning material and audio books in the Finnish market.

The focus group of publishers stressed the incentive function of copyright: they believe copyright is a *sine qua non* condition for all (commercial) publishing activities. However, from the publishers' point of view, the narrow interpretation of old publishing contracts favoring the authors has hindered the publication of Finnish e-books.

---

<sup>11</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka kattavasti Suomessa on mielestäsi saatavilla tietoa tekijänoikeudesta (säännökset ja oikeuksien hallinnointi) kirja-alan toimijoille?*

<sup>12</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Miten tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) mielestäsi vaikuttaa erityyppisten kirjojen saatavuuteen Suomessa?*

Other issues related to the copyright system were also mentioned during the interviews. Firstly, there were those who believed that the availability of books is limited because of certain problems occurring at the book store level. Secondly, especially the publishers' side believed that the availability of e-books is limited because the value added tax is higher for electronic books than for printed books. Thirdly, the interviewees agreed that the ways of using creative contents have changed significantly: for instance, the number of possible channels of distribution of creative contents has increased drastically, and this has affected book sales and business activities in the book publishing sector.

## **SECTION 4. THE COPYRIGHT SYSTEM'S CAPACITY TO ADAPT AND NEEDS FOR REFORMS**

---

The capacity of the national copyright system to adapt was assessed by studying the opinions of the stakeholders represented in the focus group sessions. The analysis is focused on technological changes and current need for reforms in the national system.

### **▪ THE COPYRIGHT SYSTEM'S CAPACITY TO ADAPT TO TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES**

The analysis of the system's capacity to adapt to technological changes is based on the following question included in the questionnaires:

- How would you qualify the capacity of your national copyright system (including rules, policies and enforcement of rights) to adapt to technological changes from the book industry point of view?<sup>13</sup>

Individual interviewees in both focus groups held opposing views also in this case: some thought that the system has adapted well to technological changes from their point of view, while others claimed that the system has been incapable of adapting. Especially in the publishers' group there were those who believed that the national copyright system has not been able to adapt to technological changes from their point of view. This incapability to adapt was reflected also in the previous section, where the opinions of the stakeholders on the availability of different kinds of books in Finland were examined.

### **▪ NEEDS FOR REFORMS IN THE NATIONAL COPYRIGHT SYSTEM**

The analysis of the need for reforms in the national copyright system is based on the following two questions included in the questionnaires:

- How would you qualify the need for reforming your national copyright system (copyright rules and policies) from the book industry point of view? <sup>14</sup>
- If your national copyright system was to be reformed, what in your opinion would be the most urgent issue(s) to address from the book industry point of view?<sup>15</sup>

All interviewees claimed that there is a need for certain reforms in the Finnish copyright system, and the majority believed that the need is urgent. It was also pointed out during both focus group sessions that

---

<sup>13</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka hyvin Suomen tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka ja oikeuksien hallinnointi) on mielestäsi sopentunut teknologiseen kehitykseen kirja-alan näkökulmasta?*

<sup>14</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Kuinka suuria muutostarpeita Suomen tekijänoikeusjärjestelmässä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) on mielestäsi kirja-alan näkökulmasta?*

<sup>15</sup> The presented question in Finnish: *Jos kansallista tekijänoikeusjärjestelmää muutettaisiin jollain tavalla, mikä yksittäinen asia olisi mielestäsi kirja-alan näkökulmasta kiireisin muutostarve?*

the representatives of both the authors as well as the publishing industry should be consulted more on law proposals and decision making.<sup>16</sup>

The representatives of the authors and translators of literature stressed especially the need for regulation on fair remuneration and terms of contracts and on collective bargaining. Some believed that the provisions concerning publishing contracts (Sections 31–38 in the Finnish Copyright Act) are to some extent outdated and not applicable to digital publishing. Furthermore, there were individual comments concerning the scope and level of remunerations paid for Finnish public library lending.

From the publishers' point of view, the main problem concerning the national copyright system has been the narrow interpretation of old publishing contracts. The publishers feel that the current practice, where the publisher of a book is forced to acquire the e-book right separately if it has not been specifically transferred in the original publishing contract, is holding back the digital production and distribution of books in Finland.

The publishers felt also, that in order to maintain the functioning of the system, no new exceptions and limitations should be added to copyright legislation. One interviewee even claimed that revocation of the provision in the Copyright Act governing the right to alter the work or transfer the copyright to third parties (Section 28) would support the development of digital publishing. It was also proposed that, in addition to computer programs, the provision concerning works created under employment (Section 40b) should be extended to cover also other types of works.

Furthermore, the publishers were of the opinion that the system should provide the right holders a wider range of means to prevent online infringements. For instance, it was pointed out that creating a new neighboring right for book publishers would make it possible for individual publishers to react to online infringements also in cases where the publisher has not acquired the digital publishing rights for a book.

Finally, the publishers feel that they should be entitled to have more representatives in the collective management organization Kopiosto. At the moment, only two of the eleven board members represent Finnish publishing companies in the organization which grants licenses for example for the photocopying of copyrighted printed material and for their electronic use.

---

<sup>16</sup> The level of consultation of stakeholders during the legislative process in the field of copyright was analyzed as part of the pilot report on Methodology Card 5 – *Public Consultation on Law Proposals*, available on the website of Cupore: <http://www.cupore.fi>.

## Conclusions

### A. ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

#### ▪ OPINIONS OF THE STAKEHOLDERS ON THE COHERENCE AND THE NEUTRALITY OF THE COPYRIGHT SYSTEM

Most of respondents believed that there is no contradiction between different copyright rules. However, there were also those who thought that national copyright legislation is actually incoherent and that there are contradictions between different rules and provisions.

A majority of respondents in both focus groups agreed on the coherence of the national copyright policy with generally accepted values and principles in the society. However, examples of inconsistencies were pointed out by the focus group of publishers:

- Neighboring rights exist only for producers of certain cultural goods.
- Remunerations paid for Finnish public library lending provides remuneration only for the original creators and not for the publishers of books.
- The originality of photographs has been assessed inconsistently<sup>17</sup>.

The representatives of authors and translators believed that especially the rights of publishers and private users are protected well or very well. In contrast, the publishers considered that the copyright system protects well or very well the rights of authors and private users. The interviewees also believed that the interests of end-users are reflected in the national copyright system. In general, the Finnish Copyright Act and the national copyright system themselves are deemed to be balanced and working properly.

#### ▪ OPINIONS OF THE STAKEHOLDERS ON THE CLARITY AND CONSISTENCY OF COPYRIGHT RULES

Opinions of the stakeholders concerning the complexity of copyright rules, policies and enforcement of rights in Finland varied: some respondents considered the system very complex, whereas some were of the opinion that the system is simple. The system may seem complex partially due to shortcomings in the availability of information and education on copyright related issues.

The majority of the interviewees in both groups felt that information on copyright rules and policies provided by non-governmental actors is extensively available for the public at large. As for the availability of information provided by the public sector, opinions differed inside each focus group. The representatives of Finnish authors feel that currently it is the industry organizations that provide more detailed and practical information for individual authors, publishers and users of copyrighted works.

#### ▪ ACCESS TO COPYRIGHTED WORKS

The majority of the representatives of Finnish authors believed that the system increases the availability of different kinds of books. Although some publishers were of the same opinion, there were also those who believed that the national copyright system limits the availability of electronic books, electronic learning material and audio books in the Finnish market.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> There are different terms of protection for this category of works. Photographs that are considered as works of art are protected for 70 years (section 43 of the Copyright Act). Those that are not considered as works of art are protected for 50 years (section 49a of the Copyright Act). The difference between photographs and photographic works of art can be difficult to assess in practice.

<sup>18</sup> The publishers feel that the current practice, where the publisher of a book is forced to acquire the e-book right separately if it has not been specifically transferred in the original publishing contract, is holding back the digital production and distribution of books in Finland.

## ▪ THE COPYRIGHT SYSTEM'S CAPACITY TO ADAPT AND NEEDS FOR REFORMS

Some interviewees in each focus group thought that the system has adapted well to technological changes from their point of view, while others claimed that the system has been incapable of adapting. All interviewees claimed that there is a need for certain reforms in the Finnish copyright system, and the majority believed that the need is urgent. The reforms proposed by the representatives of authors and translators concerned the following topics:

- regulation on fair remuneration and terms of contracts and on collective bargaining;
- an update of the provisions concerning publishing contracts which are to some extent not applicable to digital publishing.

The representatives of publishers proposed the following reforms:

- the narrow interpretation of old publishing contracts should end;
- no new exceptions and limitations should be added to the copyright legislation;
- the provisions in the Copyright Act governing the right to alter to the work or transfer the copyright to third parties (Section 28) should be revoked in order to support the development of digital publishing;
- the provision concerning works created under employment (Section 40b) should be extended to cover other types of works than computer programs;
- the copyright system should provide the right holders with a wider range of means to prevent online infringements;
- a new neighboring right for book publishers should be created in order to make it possible for individual publishers to react to online infringements also in cases where the publisher has not acquired the digital publishing rights for a book;
- publishers should be entitled to have more representatives in the copyright management organization Kopiosto.

## ***B. METHODOLOGICAL FINDINGS***

---

### ▪ LIMITATIONS

The main limitations of this methodology card concern the highly subjective nature of the answers to the questions which can be influenced by their personal interests and result in contradiction inside stakeholder groups, making the interpretation of the answers difficult. In order to keep the interviews manageable, it is important to first compose the focus groups so that they properly represent all the actors in the industry.

### ▪ GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The data should offer a thorough but focused picture of the industry in question. In the case of Finland, data on book publishing industry was relatively easily available. This might, however, not be the case with other industries.

The time needed for this pilot study will depend on the availability of relevant information sources. In the case of Finland, the workload for collecting data and drafting this report could be evaluated at three weeks of full-time work. The information was collected for a package of pilot studies which reduced the total time needed for the study. This should be noticed when planning future studies based on the methodology card.

## Appendices

### A. METHODOLOGY CARD

Methodology card as presented in the Methodology Handbook, version 20.12.2013.

<b>Aspect: Infringement, opinions and public acceptance</b>	<b>Methodology card 22. Analysis of stakeholders' opinions on the copyright system</b>
Key question	What are the opinions of the different stakeholders concerning the functioning and performance of the copyright system?
Type of data	<i>subjective data</i>
Description	<p>Analysis of stakeholders' opinions on the copyright system: its functioning, defects, and legitimacy.</p> <p>The opinions of the following stakeholders could be collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- creators</li> <li>- performers</li> <li>- professional copyright users that are granted specific rights by law (such as producers of phonograms and films or broadcasting organizations)</li> <li>- professional copyright users without specific rights granted by law</li> <li>- end-users</li> <li>- specialists in the copyright field</li> <li>- intermediaries.</li> </ul>
Parameters to measure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Stakeholders' opinions on the copyright system and its functioning:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The clarity and consistency of its rules, as well as the availability of information on copyright rules</li> <li>- The copyright system's capacity to adapt</li> <li>- The current need for reforms – how urgent, subjects of reforms</li> <li>- The efficiency of CMOs, police and customs, unions and organizations of representatives, as well as courts and tribunals in their work within the copyright system</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>Stakeholders' opinions on the neutrality of the copyright system:</b> Do its rules favor a certain category of stakeholders?</li> <li>3. <b>Stakeholders' opinions on the access to copyrighted works:</b> Does copyright affect the availability of (certain kinds of) copyrighted works? In what way? How could it be remedied? This topic can also cover the availability of copyright licenses.</li> </ol>
Guidelines for data collection	<p>The information can be collected as surveys, interviews or focus group studies covering certain areas of interest, and qualitative studies on the opinions expressed in relevant journals and newspapers, Internet discussion forums and blogs.</p> <p><b><i>Exemplary questionnaires for surveys and interviews are presented in a separate toolkit.</i></b></p>
Limitations of the indicator	TBD

## **B. CONSULTED PARTIES**

---

### **Expert interviews:**

- Sakari Laiho, Director, The Finnish Book Publishers Association (Interviewed on 08.04.2014)
- Suvi Oinonen, Executive Director and Tuula-Liina Varis, Chairman, The Union of Finnish Writers (Interviewed on 09.04.2014)
- Annaliina Rintala, Secretary General, WSOY Literature Foundation (Interviewed on 14.04.2014)

### **Focus group of authors' organizations (Interviewed on 06.06.2014):**

- Karola Baran, Executive Director, The Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters
- Merete Jensen, Executive Director, Finlands Svenska Författareförening
- Sonia Meltti, In-house Counsel, The Union of Finnish Writers
- Suvi Oinonen, Executive Director, The Union of Finnish Writers
- Jukka-Pekka Pietiäinen, Executive Director, The Finnish Association of Non-Fiction Writers
- Kalervo Pulkkinen, Secretary, The Finnish Comics Professionals

### **Focus group of publishers (Interviewed on 17.06.2014):**

- Satu Kangas, Director/Copyright Expert, The Finnish Book Publishers Association
- Antti Kasper, Editorial Director (Fiction), Otava Publishing Company Ltd
- Vesa Kataisto, Editor (Comics), Arktinen Banaani
- Tero Norkola, Publishing Director, Finnish Literature Society
- Anna Suominen, Rights Manager, Werner Söderström Corporation / Bonnier Books Finland

## **C. QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THE FOCUS GROUP STUDY**

---

***The questionnaires are based on a set of exemplary questions for surveys, interviews and focus group studies that can be found in a separate toolkit of questionnaires.***

## **KYSELY KIRJA-ALAN TEKIJÄJÄRJESTÖILLE**

*Tämä pilottitutkimus on osa Kulttuuripoliittisen tutkimuksen edistämissäätiossä (Cupore) käynnissä olevan tekijänoikeusjärjestelmän toimivuuden arviointihankkeen kokonaisuutta ja keskittyy valikoituihin tekijänoikeuskysymyksiin kirja-alalla. Hankekokonaisuudesta löytyy tietoa Kulttuuripoliittisen tutkimuksen edistämissäätiosn (Cupore) internetsivuilta: <http://www.cupore.fi/tekijanoikeus.php>*

*Tämä kysely käsittelee 6.6. klo 9:30-12:30 järjestettävässä ryhmähaastattelussa esiin nostettavia teemoja ja toimii ryhmähaastattelun esikartoituksena. Pyydämme osallistujia vastaamaan kysymyksiin ja **palauttamaan kyselyn ma 26.5. mennessä** osoitteeseen --.--@cupore.fi.*

### **Ohjeita vastaajalle:**

*Kysymyksiin vastataan sen organisaation puolesta, jota vastaaja edustaa. Vastaukset käsitellään luottamuksellisesti ja mikäli osallistujat eivät halua tuoda nimiään tai organisaatiotaan julki tutkimusraportissa, näin voidaan erillisestä pyynnöstä toimia. Kyselyn täyttämiseen tarvittava aika on n. 30 minuuttia. Kiitos ajastanne!*

1. Valitse seuraavista vaihtoehdoista yksi tai useampi kategoria, joka parhaiten kuvaa organisaatiosi jäsenkunnan tuotantoa.

- Kaunokirjallisuus (kertomakirjallisuus (proosa, epiikka) ja runous)
- Draama (näytelmät, kuunnelmat, elokuva- ja televisiokäsikirjoitukset)
- Sarjakuva
- Lasten- ja nuortenkirjallisuus
- Tietokirjallisuus
- Oppimateriaali tai –kirjallisuus
- Käännökset
- Muu, mikä?

Mikä on organisaatiosi jäsenkunnan koko?

2. Arvioi, kuinka suuri osuus organisaatiosi jäsenkunnasta työskentelee kirja-alalla päätoimisesti: prosenttia

3. Mitkä seuraavista vaihtoehdoista lukeutuivat organisaatiosi jäsenkunnan suoraan tekijänoikeuteen perustuviin tulonlähteisiin vuonna 2013? *Valitse yksi tai useampi vaihtoehto. (Suluissa mainittu esimerkkejä.)*

- Palkka (kirjailijalle työ- tai virkasuhteessa maksettu palkka)
- Tekijänpalkkio (esim. kustannussopimuksessa määritelty rojalti)
- Muu palkkio (esim. palkkio sanoma- tai aikakauslehteen laaditusta kirjallisesta työstä / palkkio juhlarunosta)
- Käyttöluvasta (lisenssi) maksettava korvaus (esim. korvaus myönnetystä luvasta käyttää kirjallista teosta tai sen osaa muuttamattomana painetussa kortissa)
- Korvaus oikeuden luovutuksesta muutettaessa teos toiseen teoslajiin (esim. kirjailijan saama korvaus teoksen dramatisoinnista / teoksen käytöstä säveltaiteen teoksessa)
- Korvaukset yleisölle lainaamisesta kirjastoissa (lainauskorvaus)
- Muu korvaus teoksen käytöstä tai julkisesta esittämisestä (esim. Sanaston asiakkuussopimuksen perusteella tilittämät korvaukset teoksen esittämisestä runoillassa tai teoksen käytöstä osana radio-ohjelmaa)
- Tekijäjärjestöjen jakamat apurahat ja palkinnot, jotka rahoitetaan yksityisestä kopioinnista ja valokopiointiluvista kerätyistä korvauksista (hyvitysmaksu ja valokopiointikorvaus)
- Muu, mikä?

Mitkä edellä luetelluista vaihtoehdoista ovat organisaatiosi jäsenkunnan pääasiallisimmat tekijänoikeuteen perustuvat tulonlähteet (mainitse 1-3 pääasiallisinta tulonlähdettä):

4. Mitä muita tuloja organisaatiosi jäsenkunta on saanut kirjailijan työstä vuonna 2013?

- Apuraha
- Palkinto
- Esiintymispalkkio (esim. kirjailijavierailu tai esiintyminen televisiossa)
- Opetuspalkkio
- Muu, mikä?

5. Arvioi, mikä osuus organisaatiosi jäsenkunnan tuloista tällä hetkellä on suoraan tekijänoikeuteen perustuvaa tuloa (*tekijänoikeuteen perustuvia tulonlähteitä lueteltu kysymyksessä 3*)? ..... prosenttia

MIELIPITEET TEKIJÄNOIKEUSJÄRJESTELMÄN TOIMIVUUDESTA

6. Kuinka monimutkaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeusjärjestelmää (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta)?

Erittäin yksinkertainen					Erittäin monimutkainen
1	2	3	4	5	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

7. Kuinka johdonmukaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeuslainsäädäntöä (säännösten sisäinen ristiriidattomuus)?

Täysin epäjohdonmukainen					Täysin johdonmukainen
1	2	3	4	5	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

8. Kuinka johdonmukaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeuspolitiikkaa suhteessa yhteiskunnassa yleisesti hyväksytyihin arvoihin ja periaatteisiin?

Täysin epäjohdonmukainen					Täysin johdonmukainen
1	2	3	4	5	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

- **Vapaaehtoinen** kuvailu:

9. Kuinka kattavasti Suomessa on mielestäsi saatavilla tietoa tekijänoikeudesta (säännökset ja oikeuksien hallinnointi) kirja-alan toimijoille?

	Ei laisinkaan / Erittäin puutteellisesti				Erittäin kattavasti
	1	2	3	4	5
a) Julkisten toimijoiden tarjoama tieto	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Alan toimijoiden tarjoama tieto	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Kuinka hyvin Suomen tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka ja oikeuksien hallinnointi) on mielestäsi sopeutunut teknologiseen kehitykseen kirja-alan näkökulmasta?

Ei laisinkaan /  
Erittäin  
puutteellisesti

1

2

3

4

Erittäin hyvin

5

11. Kuinka suuria muutostarpeita Suomen tekijänoikeusjärjestelmässä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) on mielestäsi kirja-alan näkökulmasta?

Ei laisinkaan / Hyvin  
vähäisiä

1

2

3

4

Erittäin suuria

5

- **Vapaaehtoinen** kuvailu:

12. **Vapaaehtoinen:** Jos kansallista tekijänoikeusjärjestelmää muutettaisiin jollain tavalla, mikä yksittäinen asia olisi mielestäsi kirja-alan näkökulmasta kiireisin muutostarve?

13. Miten tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) mielestäsi vaikuttaa erityyppisten kirjojen saatavuuteen Suomessa?

	Negatiivisesti / Vähentää saatavuutta		Ei vaikutusta		Positiivisesti / Lisää saatavuutta		En osaa sanoa
	1	2	3	4	5		
Kirjat ja oppimateriaali painetussa muodossa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kirjat digitaalisessa muodossa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oppimateriaali digitaalisessa muodossa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Äänikirjat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## KYSELY KIRJANKUSTANTAJILLE

Tämä pilottitutkimus on osa Kulttuuripoliittisen tutkimuksen edistämissätiössä (Cupore) käynnissä olevan tekijänoikeusjärjestelmän toimivuuden arviointihankkeen kokonaisuutta ja keskittyy valikoituihin tekijänoikeuskysymyksiin kirja-alalla. Hankekokonaisuudesta löytyy tietoa Kulttuuripoliittisen tutkimuksen edistämissätiön (Cupore) internetsivuilta: <http://www.cupore.fi/tekijanoikeus.php>

Tämä kysely käsittelee 17.6. klo 9:30-12:30 järjestettävässä ryhmähaastattelussa esiin nostettavia teemoja ja toimii ryhmähaastattelun esikartoituksena. Pyydämme osallistujia vastaamaan kysymyksiin ja **palauttamaan kyselyn ma 9.6. mennessä** osoitteeseen --.--@cupore.fi.

### **Ohjeita vastaajalle:**

Kysymyksiin vastataan sen organisaation puolesta, jota vastaaja edustaa. Vastaukset käsitellään luottamuksellisesti ja mikäli osallistujat eivät halua tuoda nimiään tai organisaatiotaan julki tutkimusraportissa, näin voidaan erillisestä pyynnöstä toimia. Kyselyn täyttämiseen tarvittava aika on n. 20 minuuttia. Kiitos ajastanne!

### TAUSTATIEDOT

1. Toimenkuvasi ja tehtäväsi organisaatiossa?

**Ohje vastaajalle: Vastaa seuraaviin kysymyksiin koko organisaatiosi puolesta.**

2. Valitse seuraavista vaihtoehtoista yksi tai useampi kategoria, joka parhaiten kuvaa tuotantoanne.

- Kaunokirjallisuus, Vapaaehtoinen täsmennys:
- Sarjakuva
- Lasten- ja nuortenkirjallisuus
- Tietokirjallisuus
- Oppimateriaali tai –kirjallisuus
- Muu, mikä?

Julkaisetteko käännöskirjallisuutta?

- Kyllä
- Ei

3. Kuinka monta teosta olette julkaisseet vuonna 2013?

4. Kuinka monimutkaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeusjärjestelmää (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta)?

Erittäin yksinkertainen					Erittäin monimutkainen
1	2	3	4	5	
<input type="checkbox"/>					

5. Kuinka johdonmukaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeuslainsäädäntöä (säännösten sisäinen ristiriidattomuus)?

Täysin epäjohdonmukainen					Täysin johdonmukainen
1	2	3	4	5	
<input type="checkbox"/>					

6. Kuinka johdonmukaisena pidät kansallista tekijänoikeuspolitiikkaa suhteessa yhteiskunnassa yleisesti hyväksytyihin arvoihin ja periaatteisiin?

Täysin epäjohdonmukainen					Täysin johdonmukainen
1	2	3	4	5	
<input type="checkbox"/>					

- **Vapaaehtoinen** kuvailu:

7. Kuinka kattavasti Suomessa on mielestäsi saatavilla tietoa tekijänoikeudesta (säännökset ja oikeuksien hallinnointi) kirja-alan toimijoille?

	Ei laisinkaan / Erittäin puutteellisesti				Erittäin kattavasti
	1	2	3	4	5
c) Julkisten toimijoiden tarjoama tieto	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Alan toimijoiden tarjoama tieto	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Kuinka hyvin Suomen tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka ja oikeuksien hallinnointi) on mielestäsi sopeutunut teknologiseen kehitykseen kirja-alan näkökulmasta?

Ei laisinkaan /  
Erittäin  
puutteellisesti

1

2

3

4

Erittäin hyvin

5

9. Kuinka suuria muutostarpeita Suomen tekijänoikeusjärjestelmässä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) on mielestäsi kirja-alan näkökulmasta?

Ei laisinkaan / Hyvin  
vähäisiä

1

2

3

4

Erittäin suuria

5

- **Vapaaehtoinen** kuvailu:

10. **Vapaaehtoinen:** Jos kansallista tekijänoikeusjärjestelmää muutettaisiin jollain tavalla, mikä yksittäinen asia olisi mielestäsi kirja-alan näkökulmasta kiireisin muutostarve?

11. Miten tekijänoikeusjärjestelmä (säännökset, politiikka, oikeuksien hallinnointi ja valvonta) mielestäsi vaikuttaa erityyppisten kirjojen saatavuuteen Suomessa?

	Negatiivisesti / Vähentää saatavuutta		Ei vaikutusta		Positiivisesti / Lisää saatavuutta		En osaa sanoa
	1	2	3	4	5		
Kirjat ja oppimateriaali painetussa muodossa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Kirjat digitaalisessa muodossa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Oppimateriaali digitaalisessa muodossa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Äänikirjat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



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

Cupore webpublications 39:1	<i>National Context. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:2	<i>International and Regional Context. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:3	<i>Technological Development. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:4	<i>Macroeconomic Importance of Copyright Industries. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:5	<i>Markets for Copyrighted Products and Services – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:6	<i>Volume of Domestic Production of Copyrighted Products and Services. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:7	<i>Volume of Exported and Imported Copyrighted Products and Services. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:8	<i>Development of Digital Business Models and Income Based on Digital Distribution. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:9	<i>Copyright Law. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:10	<i>Copyright Policy. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:11	<i>Public Consultation on Law Proposals. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:12	<i>Use of Impact Assessment and Research in Policy Development. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:13	<i>Public Administration of Copyright. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:14	<i>Enforcement by Public and Private Actors – Focus: Public Authorities. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:15	<i>Enforcement by Public and Private Actors – Focus: Private Actors. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:16	<i>Sanctions and Remedies for Copyright Infringement. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:17	<i>Application of Sanctions and Remedies for Copyright Infringement. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:18	<i>Availability of Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:19	<i>Use of Alternative Resolution Mechanisms for Solving Copyright Disputes. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:20	<i>Individual Exercise of Rights – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:21	<i>Collective Management of Rights. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:22	<i>Efficiency of Collective Management Organizations. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:23	<i>Copyright-related Information Activities. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:24	<i>Copyright-related Education for the Public in General. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:25	<i>Public Awareness of the Rights. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:26	<i>Copyright-related Education as Part of the Education of Professionals for Creative Industries. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:27	<i>Research on Copyright-related Topics. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:28	<i>Copyright-related Research and Study Programs in Universities and Research Institutes. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:29	<i>Efficiency of Copyright as an Incentive to Create and Invest in Creative Works – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:30	<i>Access to Copyrighted Works by the Public. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:31	<i>Access to Copyrighted Works for Follow-on Creation.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:32	<i>Transaction Costs in Transfer and Licensing of Rights – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:33	<i>Terms for Transfer and Licensing of Rights – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:34	<i>Unauthorized Use of Copyrighted Works in Physical Form. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:35	<i>Unauthorized Use of Copyrighted Works in Digital Form. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:36	<i>Analysis of Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System – Focus: Literature (Book Publishing Industry). Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>
Cupore webpublications 39:37	<i>Analysis of Stakeholders' Opinions on the Copyright System – Focus: End-users. Report on Piloting in Finland.</i>