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Amendment 281
Kostas Chrysogonos, Jiří Maštálka

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

7. Calls on the Commission to harmonise
the term of protection of copyright to a
duration that does not exceed the current
international standards set out in the Berne
Convention;

Amendment

7. Notes that the term of protection of
copyright has been harmonised at EU
level by Directive 2006/116/EC (which
was revised by Directive 2011/77/EU)
without prejudice to the current
international standards set out in the Berne
Convention; and encourages Member
States to finalise the transposition and
implementation of this directive in a
streamlined manner;

Or. en

Amendment 282
Helga Trüpel, Heidi Hautala

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

7. Calls on the Commission to harmonise
the term of protection of copyright to a
duration that does not exceed the current
international standards set out in the Berne
Convention;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission to harmonise
the term of protection of copyright to a
duration that does not fall below the
current international standards set out in
the Berne Convention, while refraining
from any further extension of the terms of
protection;

Or. de

Amendment 283
Julia Reda, Josef Weidenholzer
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Motion for a resolution
7a. Notes that the current legal Acquis recognises the full harmonisation of exclusive rights, whereas exceptions and limitations to exclusive rights remain optional and not harmonised;

Amendment

Amendment 284
Julia Reda, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Motion for a resolution
7b. Notes the significant number of suggestions that have been put forward in the replies to the consultation of the Commission on the review of the EU copyright rules, to introduce new exceptions and limitations to exclusive rights, as well as broadening the scope of existing exceptions;

Amendment

Amendment 285
Jiří Maštálka

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution
8. Calls on the EU legislator to remain faithful to the objective stated in Directive 2001/29/EC of safeguarding a fair balance between the different

Amendment
8. Calls on the EU legislator to remain faithful to the objective stated in Directive 2001/29/EC of providing an adequate protection for copyright and
categories of rightholders and users of protected subject-matter, as well as between the different categories of rightholders;

neighbouring rights as one of the main ways of ensuring European cultural creativity and safeguarding a fair balance between the different categories of rightholders and users of protected subject-matter, as well as between the different categories of rightholders;

Amendment 286
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Calls on the EU legislator to remain faithful to the objective stated in Directive 2001/29/EC of safeguarding a fair balance between the different categories of rightholders and users of protected subject-matter, as well as between the different categories of rightholders;

Amendment

8. Calls on the EU legislator to remain faithful to the objective stated in Directive 2001/29/EC of safeguarding a fair balance between the different categories of rightholders and users of protected content, as well as between the different categories of rightholders;

Amendment 287
Kostas Chrysogonos, Jiří Maštálka

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Calls on the EU legislator to remain faithful to the objective stated in Directive 2001/29/EC of safeguarding a fair balance between the different categories of rightholders and users of protected subject-matter, as well as between the different categories of rightholders;

Amendment

8. Calls on the EU legislator to remain faithful to the objective stated in Directive 2001/29/EC of providing an adequate protection for copyright and neighbouring rights as one of the main ways of ensuring European cultural creativity and safeguarding a fair balance between the
different categories of rightholders and users of protected subject-matter, as well as between the different categories of rightholders;

**Amendment 288**
Pascal Durand

**Motion for a resolution**
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Motion for a resolution*  

8a. Recalls that Member States have a positive obligation to provide for a robust and flexible system of copyright exceptions and limitations in order to honour their human rights obligations

**Amendment**  

**Or. en**

**Amendment 289**
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

**Motion for a resolution**
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Motion for a resolution*  

8b. Emphasises that any legislative change in this field should guarantee people with disabilities access to works and services protected by copyright and related rights and should be adapted to the digital environment;

**Amendment**  

**Or. es**
Amendment 290
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

**Motion for a resolution**

9. Notes that *exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;*

**Amendment**

9. Notes that *digital and analogue markets are different, and that therefore use should be made of the techniques introduced since the entry into force of Directive 2001/29/EC;*

Or. fr

Amendment 291
Enrico Gasbarra

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

**Motion for a resolution**

9. *Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;*

**Amendment**

9. *Urges the Commission to adapt and standardise the exceptions and limitations that are permitted in the regulatory framework of the analogue world to the new scenario represented by the digital paradigm, and in particular by cloud computing technologies;*

Or. it

Amendment 292
Jean-Marie Cavada, Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

**Motion for a resolution**

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations *in the digital environment should be enjoyed*

**Amendment**

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations *must be applied in such a way as to take*
Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world; account of the particular respective characteristics of the digital and analogue environments;

Amendment 293
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9. Notes that technological changes have led to renewed interest in exceptions and limitations, especially their role in the digital environment and considers that the rights enjoyed by the creators of work in the digital world should be identical to those enjoyed in the analogue world, subject to the exceptions and limitations set out. Recognises that further analysis of the exceptions and limitations is sought so as to consider how these can serve the public in the digital age;

Or. fr

Amendment 294
Inês Cristina Zuber

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world; exceptions should be used for the purposes for which they were designed and not to create new business models;

Or. en

Or. pt
Amendment 295
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes the importance of exceptions and limitations in the digital environment being technologically neutral, where possible, and accessible for persons with disabilities; in this regard, notes the conclusion of the Marrakesh Treaty, which will facilitate access for the visually impaired for books, and encourages ratification in early course; believes that the Treaty is a good step forward, but that much work remains to be done in order to open up access to content for people with disabilities, in addition to those affected by visual impairment;

Or. en

Amendment 296
Constance Le Grip, Marc Joulaud, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment cannot be enjoyed in the same way in the digital environment and in the analogue environment; calls for exceptions and limitations to be tailored to the environment in which they apply;

(The two markets do not operate in the same way at all.)
Amendment 297
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Pavel Svoberda, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Rosa Estarás Ferragut, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Milan Zver, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes that technological changes have led to renewed interest in exceptions and limitations, especially their role in the digital environment and considers that the rights enjoyed by the creators of work in the digital world should be identical to those enjoyed in the analogue world, subject to the exceptions and limitations set out. Recognises that further analysis of the exceptions and limitations is sought so as to consider how these can serve the public in the digital age;

Amendment 298
Mary Honeyball, Silvia Costa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes that technological changes have led to renewed interest in exceptions and limitations, especially their role in the digital environment and considers that the rights enjoyed by the creators of work in the digital world should be identical to those enjoyed in the analogue world, subject to the exceptions and limitations set out. Recognises that further analysis of the application of the exceptions and

Or. fr

Or. en
Amendment 299
Tonino Picula

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment too should be enjoyed solely for their intended purposes; considers that the purpose of their establishment must not be to create new business models whereby authors’ works would be exploited by applying exceptions and limitations in such a way as to deny authors the royalties arising from the use of their works;

Or. hr

Amendment 300
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the extent to which it is feasible directly to transfer exceptions and limitations from the analogue world to a digital environment; stresses, at the same time, that the right of the creator to protection of his or her creative works must continue to apply in the digital age;
Amendment 301
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, José Blanco López, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world, ensuring that holders of copyright and related rights receive a fair remuneration for their works;

Amendment 302
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment

9. Notes that the rights and protection of creators in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment 303
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9
9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment
9. Notes that the ability to benefit from exceptions and limitations should be enjoyed in the digital environment without any unequal treatment compared to those granted in the analogue world;

Or. en

Amendment 304
Helga Trüpel, Heidi Hautala

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution
9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment
9. Notes that the ability to benefit from exceptions and limitations should be enjoyed in the digital environment without any unequal treatment compared to those granted in the analogue world;

Or. de

Amendment 305
Julia Reda, Victor Negrescu, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution
9. Notes that exceptions and limitations in the digital environment should be enjoyed without any unequal treatment as compared with those granted in the analogue world;

Amendment
9. Notes that the ability to benefit from exceptions and limitations should be enjoyed in the digital environment without any unequal treatment compared to those granted in the analogue world;

Or. en
Amendment 306
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution
Amendment
Highlights the advisability of introducing new exceptions and limitations which should take into account technological developments and new forms of both the expression and the use of works in a digital environment;

Or. it

Amendment 307
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution
Amendment
10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Or. es

Amendment 308
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10
10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Amendment 309
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Notes the right of each Member State to tailor exceptions in accordance with their market and traditions and in

Or. fr

Amendment 310
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;
exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities; line with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality; However, Member States may consider that some exceptions may benefit from common approaches and any exceptions pursued should aim to stimulate economic growth, the development of the Digital Single Market and competitiveness;

Amendment 311
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

10. Recalls that each Member State may continue to legislate on the basis of respect for and conservation and promotion of its cultural identity, contributing to the cultural richness of Europe;

Amendment 312
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

10. Observes that the list of 20 optional exceptions in Directive 2001/29/EC has permitted a flexibility of implementation which was necessary in order to take account of the diversity of the legal traditions of the Member States and their
market, in view of the development of cross-border activities; cultural policies, while ensuring the proper functioning of the internal market and respecting the principles of proportionality and subsidiarity;

Amendment 313
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Amendment
10. Notes the importance of European cultural diversity, which provides opportunities rather than obstacles to the Single Market, and notes that the possible differences in the implementation of exceptions may be handled on a case-by-case basis and market driven solutions, to avoid legal uncertainty and to protect the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Amendment 314
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Amendment
10. Stresses the importance of Member States’ room for manoeuvre in the implementation of exceptions, which reflects specific cultural and economic features in the Member States;
Amendment 315
Jean-Marie Cavada, Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Amendment

10. Notes that the room for manoeuvre left to Member States under the subsidiarity principle has made it possible to adapt the exceptions to social and economic realities in the Member States without creating obstacles to the functioning of the internal market;

Amendment 316
Mary Honeyball, Theresa Griffin

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Amendment

10. Notes the importance of European cultural diversity, which provides opportunities rather than obstacles to the Single Market, and notes that the differences in the implementation of exceptions may have negative effects on the functioning of the internal market, and may also lead to legal uncertainty, but that these should be handled on a case-by-case basis, while stressing that works of cultural value should be available to all to be enjoyed but should also be subject to copyright protection;
Amendment 317
Therese Comodini Cachia, Marc Joulaud, Mary Honeyball, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

**Motion for a resolution**

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

**Amendment**

10. Notes the importance of European cultural diversity, which provides opportunities rather than obstacles to the Single Market, and notes that the possible differences in the implementation of exceptions may be handled on a case-by-case basis and market driven solutions, to avoid legal uncertainty and to protect the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Or. en

Amendment 318
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

**Motion for a resolution**

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

**Amendment**

10. Notes the added value that cultural diversity offers for the European internal market, and stresses that possible differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis in order to avoid legal uncertainty and safeguard the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Or. de
Amendment 319
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of *differences* among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, *in view of the development of cross-border activities*;

Amendment

10. Views with concern, *in view of the development of cross-border activities*, the increasing impact of *the lack of uniformity* among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, *on the incentive to create and promote innovative industrial and trade models and on competition*;

Or. it

Amendment 320
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, *in view of the development of cross-border activities*;

Amendment

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty for authors and users and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities;

Or. it

Amendment 321
Julia Reda, Christian Ehler, Josef Weidenholzer

PE549.469v01-00 20/131 AM\1052463EN.doc
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

10. Views with concern the increasing impact of differences among Member States in the implementation of exceptions, which creates legal uncertainty and has direct negative effects on the functioning of the digital single market, in view of the development of cross-border activities and EU global competitiveness and innovation;

Or. en

Amendment 322
Pascal Durand

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 a (new)

10a. Emphasizes that industry geoblocking practices should not prevent cultural minorities living in EU Member States from accessing existing contents or services in their language that are either free or paid for;

Or. en

Amendment 323
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 b (new)

10b. Supports the initiatives aimed at
enhancing the portability, within the EU, of online services of legally acquired and legally made available content, whilst fully respecting copyrights and the interests of right-holders;

Or. en

Amendment 324
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 c (new)

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

10c. Calls for modern, harmonized EU wide copyright, to ensure innovative startups can flourish and roll out their services on a single European digital market;

Or. en

Amendment 325
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 d (new)

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

10d. Recalls that the European cultural markets are naturally heterogeneous because of the European cultural and linguistic diversity, notes that this diversity should be considered as a benefit rather than an obstacle to the Single Market;

Or. en
Amendment 326
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 e (new)

10e. Takes note of the importance of territorial licenses in the EU, particularly with regards to audiovisual and film production which is primarily based on broadcasters pre-purchase or pre-financing systems;

Amendment

Amendment 327
Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

Or. en

Or. el

Amendment 328
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

11. Calls on the Commission to make deleted

deleted
mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment 329
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Or. fr

Amendment 330
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Or. de
Amendment 331
Kostas Chrysogonos
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Jiří Maštálka

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Or. en

Amendment 332
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Or. fr

Amendment 333
Eva Paunova
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty; deleted

Or. en

Amendment 334
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

11. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC are implemented appropriately, that equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market is promoted and that legal certainty is improved, taking account of the subsidiarity principle, specific cultural and legal features in the Member States and the clearly demonstrated cross-border impact of the exceptions and limitations concerned;

Or. de

Amendment 335
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11
Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to ensure the proper application of the exceptions and limitations and to provide all the information necessary to promote equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment 336
Tadeusz Zwiefka, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. UNDERLINES THAT the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC should be implemented in a way to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment 337
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to examine a minimum of harmonisation of all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;
cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Or. es

Amendment 338
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to enhance the provision of information to creators and consumers regarding exceptions and limitations in all Member States to improve legal certainty;

Or. en

Amendment 339
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to ensure the proper implementation of all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, and to provide all necessary information to promote an equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty, while ensuring respect for the principle of subsidiarity, cultural diversity and evidence of clear cross-border impact;
Amendment 340
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to **make mandatory all the** exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, **to** allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and **to improve legal certainty**;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to **propose a list of mandatory** exceptions and limitations **in its review of** Directive 2001/29/EC, **as this would** allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and **improve legal certainty**;

Or. en

Amendment 341
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Amendment

11. Calls on the Commission to make **uniform and** mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

Or. pl

Amendment 342
Helga Trüpel, Heidi Hautala
11. Calls on the Commission to make mandatory all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, to allow equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty; takes the view that any harmonisation of copyright and related rights must be based on a high level of protection, since these rights are crucial for intellectual creation; notes that protecting these rights helps to ensure the maintenance and development of creativity in the interests of creators, performers, producers, consumers, culture, industry and the public at large;

Amendment 343
Therese Comodini Cachia, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Marc Joulaud, Pavel Svoboda, Jean-Marie Cavada, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Sabine Verheyen

11. Calls on the Commission to ensure the proper implementation of all the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, and to provide all necessary information to promote an equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty, while ensuring respect for the principle of subsidiarity, cultural diversity and evidence of clear cross-border impact;
Amendment 344
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

**Motion for a resolution**

11. Calls on the Commission to **make mandatory all** the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, **to allow** equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty;

**Amendment**

11. Calls on the Commission to **examine the application of minimum standards across the exceptions and limitations, and further to ensure the proper implementation of** the exceptions and limitations referred to in Directive 2001/29/EC, **and an equal access to cultural diversity across borders within the internal market and to improve legal certainty**;

Amendment 345
Pascal Durand

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 a (new)

**Motion for a resolution**

11a. Stresses that the "three-step test" of international copyright law should serve to encourage the establishment of a solid and flexible system of exceptions and limitations;

**Amendment**

11a. Stresses that the "three-step test" of international copyright law should serve to encourage the establishment of a solid and flexible system of exceptions and limitations;
11b. Urges the European legislator to ensure that all citizens can enjoy at national level, judicial or administrative procedures enabling to request the implementation and expansion of exceptions and limitations to assure their constitutional and human rights;

Or. en

11c. Calls on the Commission to examine the present limitations and exceptions with a view to bringing about policies to boost the development of the existing market, an aim which can be achieved only by ensuring a proper reward for authors, that is to say, those who create the products offered on that market, and by providing legal certainty;

Or. hr

11d. Calls for expanding mandatory
exceptions beneficial for public interest institutions, such as libraries, museums and archives, which play a central role in facilitating online access to cultural heritage, and access to information that allows them to make protected works in their collections, that are not in commercial circulation anymore, or otherwise actively managed by their rights holders, available for online access by the public;

Or. en

Amendment 349
Julia Reda

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 e (new)

Motion for a resolution

11e. Temporary acts of reproduction, which are transient or incidental [and] an integral and essential part of a technological process and whose sole purpose is to enable:

(a) a transmission in a network between third parties by an intermediary, or

(b) a lawful use of a work or other subject-matter to be made, and which have no independent economic significance, should remain a mandatory exception.

Amendment 350
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Evelyn Regner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 f (new)
11f. Considers it necessary to strengthen exceptions for institutions of public interest, such as libraries, museums and archives, in order to promote wide-ranging access to cultural heritage, including through online platforms;

Or. it

Amendment 351
Virginie Rozière, Mady Delvaux

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 g (new)

11g. Calls on the Commission to consider with care the possibility of making certain exceptions mandatory where the purpose is to protect fundamental rights, particularly to combat discrimination or protect freedom of the press; reall in this context that fair compensation should be provided for these exceptions;

Or. fr

Amendment 352
Jean-Marie Cavada, Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 h (new)

11h. Recalls the importance of SMEs in the cultural and creative industries in terms of job creation and growth in the European Union; stresses that the vast majority of SMEs in the cultural and
creative industries take advantage of the flexibility of copyright rules to produce, invest and distribute cultural and creative works but also to develop innovative solutions which enable users to gain access to creative works on line adapted to the preferences and specificities of local markets;

Amendment 353
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 i (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

III. Calls on the Commission to introduce new mandatory exceptions, such as for user-generated content, text and data mining;

Or. fr

Amendment 354
Julia Reda

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 j (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

IIj. Exceptions or limitations should be made mandatory in the following cases:

(a) in respect of reproductions on paper or any similar medium, effected by the use of any kind of photographic technique or by some other process having similar effects, with the exception of sheet music, provided that the rightholders receive fair compensation;
(b) in respect of reproductions on any medium made by a natural person for private use and for ends that are neither directly nor indirectly commercial, on condition that the rightholders receive fair compensation;

(c) in respect of acts of reproduction made by publicly accessible libraries, educational establishments or museums, or by archives, which are not for direct or indirect economic or commercial advantage;

(d) in respect of ephemeral recordings of works made by broadcasting organisations by means of their own facilities and for their own broadcasts; the preservation of these recordings in official archives should, on the grounds of their exceptional documentary character, be permitted;

(e) in respect of reproductions of broadcasts made by social institutions pursuing non-commercial purposes, such as hospitals or prisons, on condition that the rightholders receive fair compensation.

(f) use for the sole purpose of illustration for teaching or scientific research, as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible and to the extent justified by the non-commercial purpose to be achieved;

(g) uses, for the benefit of people with a disability, which are directly related to the disability and of a non-commercial nature, to the extent required by the specific disability;

(h) reproduction by the press, communication to the public or making available of published articles on current economic, political or religious topics or of broadcast works or other subject-matter of the same character, in cases where such use is not expressly reserved, and as
long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, or use of works or other subject-matter in connection with the reporting of current events, to the extent justified by the informative purpose and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible;

(i) quotations for purposes such as criticism or review, provided that they relate to a work or other subject-matter which has already been lawfully made available to the public, that, unless this turns out to be impossible, the source, including the author's name, is indicated, and that their use is in accordance with fair practice, and to the extent required by the specific purpose;

(j) use for the purposes of public security or to ensure the proper performance or reporting of administrative, parliamentary or judicial proceedings;

(k) use of political speeches as well as extracts of public lectures or similar works or subject-matter to the extent justified by the informative purpose and provided that the source, including the author's name, is indicated, except where this turns out to be impossible;

(l) use during religious celebrations or official celebrations organised by a public authority;

(m) use of works, such as works of architecture or sculpture, made to be located permanently in public places;

(n) incidental inclusion of a work or other subject-matter in other material;

(o) use for the purpose of advertising the public exhibition or sale of artistic works, to the extent necessary to promote the event, excluding any other commercial use;

(p) use for the purpose of caricature, parody or pastiche;
(q) use in connection with the demonstration or repair of equipment;

(r) use of an artistic work in the form of a building or a drawing or plan of a building for the purposes of reconstructing the building;

(s) use by communication or making available, for the purpose of research or private study, to individual members of the public by dedicated terminals on the premises of establishments referred to in paragraph 2(c) of works and other subject-matter not subject to purchase or licensing terms which are contained in their collections;

(t) use in certain other cases of minor importance where exceptions or limitations already exist under national law, provided that they only concern analogue uses and do not affect the free circulation of goods and services within the Community, without prejudice to the other exceptions and limitations contained in this paragraph;

Or. en

Amendment 355
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 k (new)

Motion for a resolution

11k. Urges increased legal certainty with regards to sharing copyright protected content through 'peer-to-peer' (P2P) networks;

Or. en
Amendment 356  
Marietje Schaake  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 11 (new)  

*Motion for a resolution*  

**Amendment**  

111. Calls for broad exceptions for non-commercial use of protected works for educational organizations, teachers and students;  

Or. en

Amendment 357  
Constance Le Grip  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 12  

*Motion for a resolution*  

**Amendment**  

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses;  

Or. fr

Amendment 358  
József Szájer  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 12  

*Motion for a resolution*  

**Amendment**  

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses;  

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses, and calls for fair remuneration solutions linked to new forms of exploitation of works on platforms and networks in the digital environment;
and stresses that these should be subject to the same level of copyright protection while keeping the best balance between an efficient protection that provides for a proper remuneration for creators and the objective of the public interest for access to cultural goods and knowledge.

Amendment 359
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses; and stresses in this connection the need for service-providers and technical intermediaries on the Internet to remunerate rightholders for the use of works on their platforms and networks;

Amendment 360
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, José Blanco López, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses; emphasises the need to ensure copyright is protected to the same extent as in the analogue world;
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses;

Amendment
12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses, and stresses that these should be subject to the same level of copyright protection while keeping the best balance between an efficient protection that provides for proper remuneration for creators and the objective of the public interest for access to cultural goods and knowledge;

Amendment 362
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses;

Amendment
12. Notes with interest the development of new forms of use of works on digital networks, in particular transformative uses, and stresses that these should be subject to the same level of copyright protection while keeping the best balance between an efficient protection that provides for proper remuneration and fair compensation for creators and the objective of the public interest for access to cultural goods and knowledge;
Amendment 363
Isabella Adinolfi

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12a. Acknowledges the importance of full exploitation of new technologies in order to increase the legal offer of content by encouraging re-use mechanisms and the birth of a digital second-hand market;

Or. en

Amendment 364
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12b. Calls for broad exceptions also for informal educational purposes;

Or. en

Amendment 365
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12c. Calls for open access in publishing, in particular for publicly funded research;
Amendment 366
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 d (new)

12d. Calls for making relevant existing exceptions such as parody, quotation and incidental use and private copying mandatory across all Member States;

Amendment 367
Tadeusz Zwiefka, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Amendment 368
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiaza-bal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13
13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;
limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Or. fr

Amendment 371
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

 deleted

Or. de

Amendment 372
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

 deleted
Amendment 373
Constance Le Grip, Marc Joulaud, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Amendment

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder; deleted

Amendment

13. Calls for the adoption of a de minimis exception and limitation to analogically apply the discipline already provided in Article 5.3, in cases that are not regulated, especially bearing in mind the swift technological evolution. Such de minimis exception should be evaluated in light of the qualitative and quantitative parameters of three-step test, as provided for by Article 5.5 of the Directive;

Amendment

13. Calls for the adoption of a de minimis exception and limitation to analogically apply the discipline already provided in Article 5.3, in cases that are not regulated, especially bearing in mind the swift technological evolution. Such de minimis exception should be evaluated in light of the qualitative and quantitative parameters of three-step test, as provided for by Article 5.5 of the Directive;
Amendment 375
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Jean-Marie Cavada, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. **Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of** exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

13. **Recalls that the** exceptions and limitations **should not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder, while keeping the interpretation of exceptions and limitations on the level of Member States to permit the adaptation of the copyright system to different national circumstances and social needs:**

Or. en

Amendment 376
Julia Reda, Mary Honeyball, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. **Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of** exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

13. **Calls for a flexible interpretation of exceptions and limitations to exclusive rights, allowing to apply exceptions and limitations to uses that are similar to the ones in the original legal provisions, thereby ensuring that** exceptions and limitations **can be adapted to new forms of usage emerging due to technological change; such flexibility would be subject to the three-step-test, which grants limitations and exceptions in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;**
Amendment 377
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. *Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do* not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Amendment

13. *Recalls that the* exceptions and limitations *should* not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder, *while keeping the interpretation of exceptions and limitations on the level of Member States to permit the adaptation of the copyright system to different national circumstances and social needs;*

Or. en

Amendment 378
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. *Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do* not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Amendment

13. *Stresses that* exceptions and limitations *should* not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder; *takes the view that, where necessary, the Member States should be able to adapt the exceptions and limitations in individual cases;*

Or. de
Amendment 379
Jean-Marie Cavada, Therese Comodini Cachia, Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Or. fr

Amendment 380
Enrico Gasbarra, Silvia Costa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Or. it

Amendment 381
Helga Trüpel, Heidi Hautala

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Calls for the adoption of a certain norm in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;
13. Calls for the adoption of an open norm introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder;

Amendment

13. Calls for consideration to be given to an open norm making it possible to react promptly to new technologies and content and introducing flexibility in the interpretation of exceptions and limitations in certain special cases that do not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightholder, in accordance with the three-step test;

Or. de

Amendment 382
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

13a. Calls for exceptions and limitations which have an appropriate level of flexibility and are technologically neutral;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 383
Virginie Rozière, Mady Delvaux

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers,

Amendment

14. Considers that the exception for quotation should continue to be strictly defined, while including the possibility of its extension to audio-visual quotations;
in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressively include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

Amendment 384
Tadeusz Zwiefka, Bogdan Brunon Wenta

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

Amendment

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence;

Amendment 385
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

Amendment

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations while serving the public interest by fostering incentives to create, finance and distribute new works and to make those works available to the public in new, innovative and compelling ways;

Or. en

Or. fr
Amendment 386
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations;

Or. de

Amendment 387
Enrico Gasbarra

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence;

Or. it

Amendment 388
Angelika Niebler
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

Or. de

Amendment 389
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure technological neutrality and future compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; therefore calls on the EU legislator to expressly include audio-visual quotations in the existing quotation exception in order to enable the use of quotations in new media formats; these quotations should be adequate in terms of length in relation to the type of source material;

Or. en

Amendment 390
Constance Le Grip, Marc Joulaud, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14
14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

Amendment 391
Julia Reda, Victor Negrescu, Josef Weidenholzer

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; therefore calls on the EU legislator to expressly include audio-visual quotations in the existing quotation exception in order to enable the use of quotations in new media formats; these quotations should be adequate in terms of length in relation to the type of source material;

Amendment 392
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Jean-Marie Cavada, Constance Le Grip, Rosa Estarás Ferragut, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Milan Zver, Sabine Verheyen

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence;
14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations while serving the public interest by fostering incentives to create, finance and distribute new works and to make those works available to the public in new, innovative and compelling ways;

Or. en

Amendment 393
Mary Honeyball, Silvia Costa

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations while fostering incentives to create, finance and distribute new works and to make those works available to the public in new, innovative and compelling ways;

Or. en

Amendment 394
Jean-Marie Cavada, Therese Comodini Cachia

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations while fostering incentives to create, finance and distribute new works and to make those works available to the public in new, innovative and compelling ways;
by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; *considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;* by taking due account of the effects of media convergence;

Amendment 395
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

*Motion for a resolution*

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include audio-visual quotations in its scope;

*Amendment*

14. Urges the European legislator to ensure the technological neutrality and future-compatibility of exceptions and limitations by taking due account of the effects of media convergence; considers, in particular, that the exception for quotation should expressly include *all content, including* audio-visual quotations in its scope;

Amendment 396
Enrico Gasbarra

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14 a (new)

*Motion for a resolution*

14a. Notes with interest the recent United States regulations regarding net neutrality, just launched by the US Federal Communications Commission; calls on the Commission to assess what inspiration it can draw from these new rules in the context of the revision of Directive 2001/29;

*Amendment*
Amendment 397
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\(^{12}\);

\(^{12}\) Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

15. Stresses that the ability to link from one resource to another, particularly by means of a hyperlink, is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet, and recalls that these hyperlinks may lead either to protected works or to content which is free of rights;

Amendment 398
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a
communication to a new public\textsuperscript{12};

\textsuperscript{12} Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 399
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazaabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

\textit{Motion for a resolution}

\begin{itemize}
\item 15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to \textit{make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public}\textsuperscript{12};
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{12} Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

\textit{Amendment}

\begin{itemize}
\item 15. Stresses that the ability to freely link one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to \textit{provide clarification on cases in which the establishment of links does not constitute an act of communication to the original public in line with the judgment of the Court of Justice in C-466/12 of 13 February 2014, the Svensson case;
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{12} Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 400
József Szájer
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Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public;

__________________

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment

15. Notes that the ability to link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet and underlines that any further legislation must accurately reflect the existing definitions and principles set in the European case law, stating that when the hyperlink allows the recipients to circumvent the restrictions on access to the protected work, so that can access the protected work, which was otherwise unavailable to them, then this constitutes a communication to a new public and it is subject to exclusive rights;

__________________

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Or. en

Amendment 401
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public and, by

15. Stresses that the ability to link from one resource to another by means of a hyperlink is indeed one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet, but that, in certain cases, the link and the incorporation may be regarded as a communication to a new public and, by
communication to a new public; \textit{virtue of that very fact, constitute a breach of copyright};

\begin{flushright}
12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Or. fr
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Or. de
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Amendment 402
Angelika Niebler
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

\begin{flushright}
Motion for a resolution
Amendment
15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another \textit{is one of} the fundamental building blocks of the internet; \textit{calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public};
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Amendment 403
Mary Honeyball
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).
\end{flushright}
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public;  

______________________________

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is an important feature of the internet, but stresses that under certain circumstances, embedding and linking may be prejudicial to the rights of the creator; further stresses the need to accurately reflect the existing definitions and principles set out in European case law;  

______________________________

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 404
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public;  

______________________________

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment

15. Notes that the ability to link from one resource to another is a feature of internet use and stresses that hyperlinks must be used in accordance with the relevant European case law, i.e. they must not be used to circumvent restrictions on access to a work that was originally protected and not accessible to users;  

______________________________

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).
Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof). See also: Judgment of the Court of Justice of 13 February 2014 in Case 466/12, Svensson.

Amendment 405
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. **Stresses** that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\(^\text{12}\);

---

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 406
Cecilia Wikström

---

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\textsuperscript{12};

__________________

\textsuperscript{12} Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the \textit{free and open} internet; calls on the EU legislator to further clarify that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\textsuperscript{12};

__________________

\textsuperscript{12} Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Or. en

Amendment 407
Therese Comodini Cachia, Pavel Svoboda, Marc Joulaud, Constance Le Grip, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Milan Zver, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. \textbf{Stresses} that the ability to \textit{freely} link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; \textit{calls on the EU legislator to make it clear} that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\textsuperscript{12};

__________________

\textsuperscript{12} Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment

15. \textbf{Notes} that the ability to link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet and \textit{underlines that any further legislation must accurately reflect the existing definitions and principles set in the European case law stating that when the hyperlink allows the recipients to circumvent the restrictions on access to the protected work so that can access the
protected work which was otherwise unavailable to them, then this constitutes a communication to a new public and it is subject to exclusive rights.

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 408
Enrico Gasbarra, Silvia Costa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to make it clear that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public;12;

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 409
Virginie Rozière, Mady Delvaux

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Or. en

Or. it
15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the Internet; calls on the EU legislator to **make it clear** that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\(^\text{12}\);

\(\text{---}\)

\(\text{12}\) Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

---

**Amendment**

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the internet; calls on the EU legislator to **incorporate the case-law of the Court of Justice into its positive law so** that reference to works by means of a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public\(^\text{12}\); **observes that this option must be strictly limited to links which lead to freely available content**; **observes that the online intermediaries liability regime applicable to links to illicit content should be tightened up, particularly by revising the e-commerce directive**;

---

**Amendment 410**

Julia Reda, Josef Weidenholzer

15. Stresses that the ability to freely link from one resource to another is one of the fundamental building blocks of the Internet; calls on the EU legislator to **clarify** that reference to works by means of
a hyperlink is not subject to exclusive rights, as it does not consist in a communication to a new public;  

12 Order of the Court of Justice of 21 October 2014 in Case C-348/13, BestWater International GmbH v Michael Mebes and Stefan Potsch (request for a preliminary ruling from Germany’s Bundesgerichtshof).

Amendment 411
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

15a. Suggests a review of the liability of service providers and intermediaries in order to clarify their legal status and liability with regards to copyrights, to guarantee that due diligence is exercised throughout the creative process and supply chain, and to ensure a fair remuneration for creators and rightholders within the European Union.

Or. en

Amendment 412
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

15b. Calls for an end to geoblocking, as it prevents the emergence of a single digital
market and hinders citizens access to information for which they have already paid taxes;

Amendment 413
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

16. Notes that the mere presence of a work in the public domain does not deprive the author of his rights;

Or. fr

Amendment 414
Ivan Jakovčić

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that this initiative on copyright makes for wider understanding of artistry and creativity and their importance for the development of society and to prevent the parasitic development of new commercial interests at the expense of authors and their rights;

Or. hr
Amendment 415
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

16. **Calls on** the EU legislator to **ensure** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is **permitted**;

Amendment

16. **Invites** the EU legislator to **recognise** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places **shall be considered to be in the public domain, where that use is for a non-commercial purpose or scale**;

Or. en

Amendment 416
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

16. **Calls on** the EU legislator to **ensure** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is **permitted**;

Amendment

16. **Stresses** that the **commercial** use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places **should always be subject to prior authorisation from the authors or their authors’ society**;

Or. fr

Amendment 417
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

16. **Calls on the EU legislator to ensure** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is **permitted**;

Amendment

16. **Acknowledges** that the use of
that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

photographs, video footage or other images of works considered to be in the public domain which are permanently located in public places is permitted for non-commercial purposes;

Amendment 418
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Or. de

Amendment

16. Calls for the Commission to report on the implementation of the Directive with regard to progress on increasing awareness for consumers regarding exceptions and limitations, in particular with regard to differences across the EU, including use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places;

Or. en

Amendment 419
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Or. en

Amendment

16. Calls on the Commission to propose in the review of Directive 2001/29/EC that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places shall be permitted;
Amendment 420
Tonino Picula

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted and that this initiative on copyright makes for wider understanding of artistry and creativity and their importance for the development of society, and to regulate the development of new commercial interests posing a threat to copyright;

Or. hr

Amendment 421
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. Considers that the commercial use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in physical public places should always be subject to prior authorisation from the authors or any proxy acting for them;

Or. fr

Amendment 422
Therese Comodini Cachia, Marc Joulaud, Constance Le Grip, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Giovanni Toti, József Szájer, Milan Zver, Sabine Verheyen
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. **Calls on** the EU legislator to **ensure** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. **Invites** the EU legislator to **recognise** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted **shall considered to be in the public domain, where that use is for a non-commercial purpose or scale.**

Or. en

Amendment 423
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. **Calls on** the EU legislator to **ensure** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. **Invites** the EU legislator to **recognise** that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in physical public places is permitted **and should be considered to be in the public domain, where that use is for a non-commercial purpose or scale.**

Or. en

Amendment 424
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that

Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that
the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted; the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted, unless this material is itself already protected by copyright;

Amendment 425
Inês Cristina Zuber

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted for non-commercial purposes;

Or. de

Amendment 426
Virginie Rozière, Mady Delvaux

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the non-commercial use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Or. fr

Amendment 427
Julia Reda
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;  

Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted, as a mandatory exception;

Or. en

Amendment 428
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Amendment

16. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that the use of photographs, video footage or other images of any objects which are permanently located in public places is permitted;

Or. pl

Amendment 429
Ivan Jakovčić

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

16. Maintains that the development of the digital market is impossible unless creative and cultural industries are developed alongside it;

Amendment

16a. Maintains that the development of the digital market is impossible unless creative and cultural industries are developed alongside it;

Or. hr
Amendment 430
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16 b (new)

Motion for a resolution  

Amendment

16b. Calls on Member States to consider incorporating into their national law the ‘panorama’ exception to the extent that works permanently located in public places are produced by the public sector;

Or. fr

Amendment 431
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution  

Amendment

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 432
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution  

Amendment

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the

deleted
parodic use;

Amendment 433
Enrico Gasbarra

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

Amendment

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use; deleted

Amendment

17. Highlights the importance of the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche for the protection of authors' freedom of expression, which should therefore be made mandatory; notes with concern the implication of the Deckmyn ruling (C-201/13) that rightholders other than the author of a work can claim moral rights, and therefore calls on the legislator to clarify that moral rights are rights of the author of a work, that cannot be transferred to third-party rightholders;

Or. fr

Or. it

Or. en
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

Amendment
17. Emphasises that the existing limitation on the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche must be kept to strike a fair balance between the interests and rights of the creators and original characters and the freedom of expression of the user of a protected work who is relying on the exception for parody, and to avoid uncontrolled abuse;

Or. en

Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

Amendment
17. Emphasises the importance of the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche as a factor in the vitality of democratic debate;

Or. fr

Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

17. Emphasises that the exception for

Amendment
17. Emphasises that existing exceptions for
caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;
caricature, parody and pastiche have allowed a fair balance to be struck between the interests of rightholders and users;

Amendment 438
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

Amendment

17. Emphasises that the existing exception for caricature, parody and pastiche must be maintained in order to ensure a fair balance between the interests of rightholders on the one hand and the freedom of opinion of users on the other;

Amendment 439
Therese Comodini Cachia, Mary Honeyball, Marc Joulaud, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Giovanni Toti, József Szájer, Milan Zver, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

Amendment

17. Emphasises that the existing limitation on the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche must be kept to strike a fair balance between the interests and rights of the creators and original characters and the freedom of expression of the user of a protected work who is relying on the exception for parody, and to avoid uncontrolled abuse\textsuperscript{12a};
12 Order of the Court of Justice of 3 September 2014 in Case C-201/13 (J. Deckmyn)

Amendment 440
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Emphasises that the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche should apply regardless of the purpose of the parodic use;

Amendment

17. Emphasises that the existing limitation on the exception for caricature, parody and pastiche must be kept to strike a fair balance between the interests and rights of the creators and original characters and the freedom of expression of the user of a protected work who is relying on the exception for parody, and to avoid uncontrolled abuse;

Or. en

Amendment 441
Constance Le Grip, Marc Joulaud, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Encourages solutions such as the licensing model for text and data mining for scientific research purposes;

Or. fr
Amendment 442
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

18. **Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes**, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

18. **Invites the Commission to assess whether data analysis activities could be covered by the exception for scientific research contained in Article 5.3.a) of the current Directive, which provides for an exception to the right of reproduction, (Article 2) when the protected work is used, and whether it enables automated analytical techniques for text and data, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;**

Or. en

Amendment 443
Therese Comodini Cachia, Pavel Svoboda, Mary Honeyball, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Giovanni Toti, József Szájer, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

18. **Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes**, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

18. **Invites the Commission to assess whether data analysis activities could be covered by the exception for scientific research contained in Article 5.3.a) of the current Directive, which provides for an exception to the right of reproduction (Article 2) when the protected work is used, and whether it enables automated analytical techniques for text and data, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;**

Or. en
Amendment 444
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Welcomes the fact that Member States may, on a voluntary basis and subject to licensing, enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’), provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Or. de

Amendment 445
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Stresses the need to facilitate formats for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for research purposes, while recognising the investment that this requires by rightholders; highlights that exceptions for text and data should not facilitate the publication or sharing of copies made under the exception;

Or. en

Amendment 446
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18
Motion for a resolution

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) through licensing agreements;

Or. de

Amendment 447
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to use the work has been acquired;

Or. it

Amendment 448
Virginie Rozière, Mady Delvaux

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for purposes which are not directly commercial, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Or. fr
Amendment 449
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’), provided that permission to read the work has been acquired and that the rightholders have been remunerated;

Or. fr

Amendment 450
Julia Reda

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired;

Amendment

18. Stresses the need to enable automated analytical techniques for text and data (e.g. ‘text and data mining’) for all purposes, provided that permission to read the work has been acquired, as a mandatory exception;

Or. en

Amendment 451
Tonino Picula

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18 a (new)
Motion for a resolution

18a. Maintains that the development of the digital market is closely linked to, and has to go hand in hand with, the development of creative and cultural industries, this being the only way to achieve lasting prosperity;

Or. hr

Amendment 452
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

18b. Acknowledges that Text and data Mining is an emerging and promising practice, in particular for the research field, recalls that innovative licensing solutions are established, but that any preferential treatment should only be applied for non-commercial use.

Or. en

Amendment 453
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

delete
Amendment 454
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 455
Jytte Guteland

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

deleted

Or. sv

Amendment 456
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19
Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Stresses the need for a sound economic and legal analysis of the use of protected works in education and research, and considers that any fresh exception to, or restriction of, copyright should be studied in depth;

Or. fr

Amendment 457
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity run under the aegis of educational programmes or institutions;

Or. es

Amendment 458
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but also educational or research activities linked to an educational establishment or institution recognised by national
authorities or legislation or within the purview of an educational programme;

Or. en

Amendment 459
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls on the Commission to consider making the exception for research and education purposes compulsory, and observes that this exception should be strictly defined;

Or. fr

Amendment 460
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for an exception for research and education purposes, which, alongside educational establishments should also cover educational and research programmes;

Or. de

Amendment 461
Enrico Gasbarra
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

19. Calls for very careful consideration to be given to the importance of exceptions for research and education purposes; notes with interest, in this regard, the discussion under way on the drafting of a new international treaty governing exceptions for libraries and archives;

Or. it

Amendment 462
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

19. Calls for targeted exceptions for research and education purposes;

Or. en

Amendment 463
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments, universities and institutions specialising
activity, including non-formal education;

in high-level artistic, musical and dance training but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education and the digitalisation of cultural traditions and heritage;

Or. it

Amendment 464
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a mandatory exception for research and education purposes, which should not only cover educational establishments, but also amateur educational and research activities conducted by non-governmental organisations outside education institutions as well as digital education, for example in the form of so-called massive open online courses (MOOC), provided that they are not aimed at making a profit;

Or. en

Amendment 465
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity;
Amendment 466
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution
19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment
19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, in the general public interest and in order to promote a virtuous circulation of knowledge; takes the view that this should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Or. fr

Amendment 467
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution
19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment
19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments in cross-border use, but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Or. pl

Amendment 468
Julia Reda, Victor Negrescu, Josef Weidenholzer
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a mandatory exception for research and education purposes, which should not only cover educational establishments, but also amateur educational and research activities conducted by non-governmental organisations outside education institutions as well as digital education, for example in the form of so-called massive open online courses (MOOC), provided that they are not aimed at making a profit;

Or. en

Amendment 469
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Jean-Marie Cavada, Mary Honeyball, Luis de Grandes Pascual, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but also educational or research activities linked to an educational establishment or institution recognised by national authorities or legislation or within the purview of an educational programme;

Or. en

Amendment 470
Inês Cristina Zuber
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research activity, including non-formal education;

Amendment

19. Calls for a broad exception for research and education purposes, which should cover not only educational establishments but any kind of educational or research institute, including non-formal education;

Or. pt

Amendment 471
Tadeusz Zwiefka, Bogdan Bruno Wenta

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19 a (new)

19a. stresses that any new exceptions or limitations introduced to the EU copyright legal system needs to be duly justified by a sound and objective economic and legal analysis

Or. en

Amendment 472
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

deleted

(Lending books to the public remotely in digital formats would again favour commercial providers in the digital
environment, to the detriment of the protection of authors and of the actual content of the works. From the technical point of view too, this raises numerous piracy issues.)

Amendment 473
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment

deleted

Amendment 474
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment

20. Recognizes the importance of libraries for access to knowledge and encourages the rightholders to identify appropriate market-based solutions to enable libraries to realise their potential in the digital environment while respecting the interests of all stakeholders, including consumers;

Or. en
20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

20. Recognises the importance of libraries for access to knowledge; encourages the parties concerned to work out appropriate solutions to enable libraries to realise their potential in the digital environment, while respecting the interests of rightholders;

Amendment 476
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

20. Stresses the importance of taking into account the conclusions of the numerous experiments being undertaken by the book industry to establish fair, balanced and viable business models;

Or. fr

Or. en

Amendment 477
Axel Voss, Christian Ehler

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;
Motion for a resolution

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment

20. Recognises the importance of libraries for access to knowledge and calls for appropriate market-based solutions to be developed that allow libraries to develop their potential in the digital environment while respecting the interests of all stakeholders, including consumers;

Amendment 478
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Pavel Svoboda, Marc Joulaud, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Luis de Grandes Pascual, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Milan Zver, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment

20. Recognizes the importance of libraries for access to knowledge and encourages the rightholders to identify appropriate market-based solutions to enable libraries to realise their potential in the digital environment while respecting the interests of all stakeholders included consumers;

Amendment 479
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20
Motion for a resolution

20. **Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;**

Amendment

20. **Recognises the importance of libraries for access to knowledge and encourages all stakeholders to enable libraries to realise their potential in the digital environment while respecting the rights of creators;**

Or. en

Amendment 480
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. **Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;**

Amendment

20. **Emphasises the importance, in the age of digitisation, of licensing agreements in order to allow libraries to lend books legally to the public in digital formats;**

Or. de

Amendment 481
Jiří Maštálka, Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. Calls for the adoption of *a mandatory* exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment

20. Calls for the adoption of *an* exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Or. en
Amendment 482
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution
20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment
20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing public and research libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats for personal use, irrespective of the place of access; recommends that authors should be compensated for e-lending through a statutory licence to the same extent as this is the case for the lending of physical books;

Or. en

Amendment 483
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution
20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment
20. Calls on the Commission to examine ways for libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats in compliance with copyright law and guaranteeing a fair remuneration for said rights;

Or. es

Amendment 484
Helga Trüpel, Heidi Hautala

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20
20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Amendment

20. Calls on the Commission to consider the introduction of an exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access, provided financial compensation (library royalties) is provided;

Or. de

Amendment 485
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Evelyn Regner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Motion for a resolution

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access, so that their public interest duty of disseminating knowledge can be fulfilled effectively and in an up-to-date manner;

Or. it

Amendment 486
Julia Reda, Victor Negrescu, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats, irrespective of the place of access;

Motion for a resolution

20. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing public and research libraries to lend books to the public in digital formats for personal use, irrespective of the place of access; recommends that authors should be
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compensated for e-lending through a statutory licence to the same extent as this is the case for the lending of physical books;

Amendment 487
Pascal Durand

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20a. Stresses the need to ensure the swift ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled, without making the ratification conditional to the revision of the EU legal framework on copyright, and then ensure that the copyright laws of Member States contain adequate exceptions to facilitate the availability of works in formats accessible to persons with visual impairments and other disabilities, such as deafness.

Or. en

Amendment 488
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20b. Calls for the adoption of a mandatory exception allowing libraries to digitalise content for the purposes of consultation, cataloguing and archiving;

Or. en
Amendment 489  
Kostas Chrysogonos  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 21

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception; delete

Amendment 490  
Jean-Marie Cavada  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 21

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception; deleted

Amendment 491  
Tadeusz Zwiefka, Bogdan Brunon Wenta  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 21
Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

delated

Or. en

Amendment 492
Jiří Maštálka, Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

delated

Or. en

Amendment 493
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

21. Considers that the licensing system currently in use should be improved with care;

Or. fr
Amendment 494  
József Szájer  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 21  

21. **Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;**

21. **Invites the Commission to analyse the necessity of measures, if any, to be implemented by Member States so as to provide compensation to rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception, while they should ensure that rightholders receive fair compensation and that the exceptions or limitations do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work or subject-matter and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightholders;**

Or. en

Amendment 495  
Therese Comodini Cachia, Mary Honeyball, Marc Joulaud, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Sabine Verheyen  

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 21  

21. **Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;**

21. **Invites the Commission to analyse the necessity of measures, if any, to be implemented by Member States so as to provide compensation to rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception, while they should ensure that rightholders receive fair compensation and that the exceptions or limitations do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work or subject-matter and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightholder;**

Or. en
Amendment 496
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Amendment

21. Calls on the EU legislator to ensure that Member States make provision for measures which are necessary in order to provide compensation for the harm caused to rightholders by acts made permissible by an exception;

Or. fr

Amendment 497
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Amendment

21. Calls on the EU legislator to continue to guarantee to Member States the option of compensating rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Or. fr

Amendment 498
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude

Amendment

21. Respects the possibility available to
Member States *from* introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Member States *of* introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Amendment 499
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

*Motion for a resolution*  
21. **Calls on** the EU legislator to *preclude* Member States *from introducing statutory licences* for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

*Amendment*  
21. **Proposes that** the EU legislator *examine whether* Member States *should take measures* for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Or. de

Amendment 500
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

*Motion for a resolution*  
21. Calls on the EU legislator to **preclude** Member States *from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of* rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

*Amendment*  
21. Calls on the EU legislator to **guarantee** rightholders *fair remuneration* for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Or. es

Amendment 501
Victor Negrescu
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

21. Deplores the introduction of statutory licenses in some member states aimed at news aggregators for acts already made permissible by an exception and calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from unilaterally introducing such schemes, which can cause significant damage to the digital economy;

Or. en

Amendment 502
Helga Trüpel, Heidi Hautala

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for alleged harm in the form of neighbouring rights for press publishers;

Or. de

Amendment 503
Julia Reda, Victor Negrescu, Josef Weidenholzer

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory

21. Deplores the introduction of statutory licenses in some member states aimed at
licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

news aggregators for acts already made permissible by an exception and calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from unilaterally introducing such schemes, which can cause significant damage to the digital economy;

Or. en

Amendment 504
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Amendment

21. Invites the Commission to analyse the necessity of measures, if any, to be implemented by Member States so as to provide compensation to rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception while they should ensure that rightholders receive fair compensation and that the exceptions of limitations do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work or subject-matter and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightholder;

Or. en

Amendment 505
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts

Amendment

21. Calls on the EU legislator to protect consumers by precluding Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm
made permissible by an exception; caused by acts made permissible by an exception;

Amendment 506
Enrico Gasbarra

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception; 21. Calls on the EU legislator to preclude Member States from introducing statutory licences for the compensation of rightholders for the harm caused by acts made permissible by an exception that is legally permitted under that country's own legislation;

Or. it

Amendment 507
Pascal Durand

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 a (new)

21a. Requests the Commission to explore the various legal bases at EU level that are necessary to allow, as EU rule or in Member States, the legalization of non-commercial private sharing between individuals of digital works, which is a right of EU citizens that should not be jeopardized by copyright rules;

Or. en
Amendment 508
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21b. Calls for ensuring access to information for persons with a disability, which is directly related to the disability and of a non-commercial nature;

Or. en

Amendment 509
Julia Reda, Christian Ehler, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21c. Deplores the lack of harmonisation between Member States as regards the interpretation of Article 5.2 b of Directive 2001/29/EC on exceptions for reproductions on any medium made by a natural person for private use, and as regards the remuneration schemes to compensate for the prejudice to rightholders put in place in some Member States to allow for the fair compensation of the rightholders in relation to these acts of copying, which affects the functioning of the internal market;

Or. en

Amendment 510
Jean-Marie Cavada

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22
Motion for a resolution

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;¹³

²². Considers that the right balance should be struck between the interests of the author and those of the public; the right of reproduction and adaption and the right to make back-up copies should be granted where the source of the copy is legal;

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment

22. Believes that the private copying system is a virtuous system that balances the exception for copying for private use with the right to fair remuneration of rightholders, and that it is a system worth preserving;

²². Considers that the right balance should be struck between the interests of the author and those of the public;

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.
process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment 512
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;

22. Underlines that citizens in all Member States should have a legal right to make private copies for their own use of legally acquired content without having to pay extra compensation to rightholders through cumbersome and illogical levies on technical devices; thus urges the commission to propose a fully harmonised private copy exception which would not cause harm to right holders and which would thus not need to be compensated through a levy system;

__________________

13 As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.
22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;¹³

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment 514
Constance Le Grip, Marc Joulaud, Jean-Marie Cavada, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

22. Recalls the European Parliament resolution of February 2014 which underlined the importance of the system of remuneration for private copying in seeking to strike a balance between the interests of consumers and those of rightholders;

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.
Amendment 515
Mary Honeyball

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States\(^{13}\);  

\(^{13}\) As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment

22. Suggests a review of the liability of service providers and intermediaries in order to clarify their legal status and liability with regards to copyright, in order to guarantee and to ensure a fair remuneration for creators and rightholders within the EU;  

\(^{13}\) As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Or. fr

Amendment 516
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States\(^{13}\);  

\(^{13}\) As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment

22. Notes that a further examination of the transparent implementation of measures such as the private copying levy for the fair compensation of rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use is necessary for the protection of authors’ and users’ rights;
As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment 517
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;¹³

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment 518
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

22. Notes that further analysis is necessary on the viability of measures to the fair compensation of rightholders in respect of reproductions made by natural persons for private use, in particular in regard to more transparency and better optimalisation for the existing measures as digital levies to safeguard rightholder and consumer rights;
22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States¹³; 

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 22

Amendment

22. Notes that further analysis is necessary on the viability of measures to the fair compensation of rightholders in respect of reproductions made by natural persons for private use, in particular in regard to more transparency and better optimalisation for the existing measures as digital levies to safeguard rightholder and consumer rights;

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Or. en
Amendment 520
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;¹³

---

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment 521
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, taking into account recital 35 of the Directive, which recognises that harm to rightholders in some circumstances is minimal and no payment is made, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States; Draws attention to the discretion of Member States to provide alternative modes of compensation to levies;

---

¹³ As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.
rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;  

13 As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment 522
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;  

13 As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Amendment

22. Calls for the adoption of harmonised criteria, established on the basis of scientifically proven studies, for defining the harm caused to rightholders in respect of reproductions made by a natural person for private use, and for harmonised transparency measures as regards the private copying levies put in place in some Member States;  

13 As stated in António Vitorino’s recommendations of 31 January 2013 resulting from the latest mediation process conducted by the Commission in respect of private copying and reprography levies.

Or. it
Amendment 523
Laura Ferrara

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 a (new)

22a. Notes that the right to impose private copying levies should be governed in such a way as to inform citizens of the actual amount of the levy, its purpose and how it is going to be used;

Or. it

Amendment 524
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 b (new)

22b. Stresses that digital levies should be made more transparent and optimised to safeguard rightholder and consumer rights and by taking into account Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market;

Or. en

Amendment 525
Evelyn Regner, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 c (new)
Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22c. Invites the Commission to include alternative types of remuneration in the Directive 2001/29/EG to ensure a fair balance between the copyright owner and the user;

Or. en

Amendment 526
Marietje Schaake

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 d (new)

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

22d. Cautions against private enforcement of copyright to ensure a clear separation of powers, and the appropriate judicial and democratic oversight;

Or. en

Amendment 527
Julia Reda, Josef Weidenholzer, Dietmar Köster

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 e (new)

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

22e. Proposes to strengthen authors' rights by making remuneration rights tied to exceptions and limitations non-transferable to other rightholders;

Or. en
Amendment 528  
Evelyn Regner, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 f (new)

22f. Asks for further clarification that in the light of a fair balance, no double remuneration should be charged, if the user makes a backup copy, where no harm is caused. The remuneration should refer to the actual damage.

Or. en

Amendment 529  
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 530  
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or

deleted
related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures;

Amendment 531
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures;

Amendment

23. Stresses that, especially in the digital age, the use of technological protection measures should be allowed to redress the balance between free reproduction (e.g., in the context of private copying) and the exclusive right to reproduction;

Amendment 532
Cecilia Wikström

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures;

Amendment

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures and that member states should have sufficient enforcement measures in place to deter any such actions;

Or. de

Or. en
Amendment 533
Jean-Marie Cavada, Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

23. **Stresses** that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, *should not be hindered by technological measures*;

23. **Notes** that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, *is guaranteed by Article 6(4) of Directive 2001/29/EC*;

Or. fr

Amendment 534
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

23. **Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures**;

23. **Considers that the concept of the principle of territoriality should be respected**;

Or. fr

Amendment 535
Julia Reda, Josef Weidenholzer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be
hindered by technological measures; hindered by technological measures or contractual terms;

Or. en

**Amendment 536**
**Pascal Durand**

**Motion for a resolution**
**Paragraph 23**

**Motion for a resolution**

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures;

**Amendment**

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be waived by contract or hindered by technological measures of protection or online contracts in the digital environment;

Or. en

**Amendment 537**
**Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim**

**Motion for a resolution**
**Paragraph 23**

**Motion for a resolution**

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be hindered by technological measures;

**Amendment**

23. Stresses that the effective exercise of exceptions or limitations, and access to content that is not subject to copyright or related rights protection, should not be unduly hindered by technological measures;

Or. en
Amendment 538
Christian Ehler, Sabine Verheyen, Marc Joulaud

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23 a (new)

Amendment

23a. Points out that the rapid rate of technological development in the digital market calls for a technologically neutral legislative framework for copyrights;

Or. en

Amendment 539
Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

delete

Or. el

Amendment 540
Constance Le Grip

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24
24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment 541
Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, José Blanco López

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24
Amendment 542
József Szájer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 543
Angel Dzhambazki, Sajjad Karim

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment

deleted
Amendment 544
Jiří Maštálka, Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment 545
Enrico Gasbarra

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed,
technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Or. it

Amendment 546
Axel Voss

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Or. de

Amendment 547
Jean-Marie Cavada, Therese Comodini Cachia

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

delete

Or. de
technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment 548
Therese Comodini Cachia, Eva Paunova, Marc Joulaud, Pavel Svoboda, Jean-Marie Cavada, Mary Honeyball, József Szájer, Giovanni Toti, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment 549
Angelika Niebler

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24
24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

24. Stresses that, especially in the digital age, the use of technological protection measures should be allowed which redress the balance between free reproduction (e.g. in the context of private copying) and the exclusive right to reproduction;

---

Amendment 550
Marie-Christine Boutonnet

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

24. Notes that the aims of the 2001 directive have not been attained; technologies which make it possible to limit unauthorised use of works, with the exception of software, must ensure interoperability;

---

Amendment 551
Inês Cristina Zuber
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

24. Recommends making legal protection against the circumvention of any effective technological measures conditional upon the publication of the source code or the interface specification, in order to secure the integrity of devices on which technological protections are employed and to ease interoperability; considers, in particular, that where the circumvention of technological measures is allowed, technological means to achieve such authorised circumvention must be available;

Amendment

Or. pt

Amendment 552
Isabella Adinolfi

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 a (new)

24a. Urges to establish that the orders against intermediaries to protect copyright are given only by the competent judicial authority with reference to the limits imposed by Directive 2004/48 (ex Art. 11), the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Article 51, par. 1, and Article 6 TEU;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 553
Mary Honeyball
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24b. Recognises the role of proportionate and effective enforcement in supporting creators, rightholders and consumers;

Or. en

Amendment 554
Virginie Rozière

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24c. Calls on distributors to publish all available information concerning the technological measures necessary to ensure interoperability of their content;

Or. fr

Amendment 555
Enrico Gasbarra, Silvia Costa, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24d. Expresses concern and regret with regard to the political obstacles in the Council which are still delaying ratification of the Treaty of Marrakesh for the Blind, which was already signed by the European Union in 2013;

Or. it
Amendment 556
Constance Le Grip, Marc Joulaud, Jean-Marie Cavada, Sabine Verheyen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 e (new)

Motion for a resolution

24e. Calls on the Commission and the legislature to consider solutions for the displacement of value from content to services; stresses the need to adjust the definition of the status of intermediary in the current digital environment;

Amendment

Or. fr