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Context

Digital media: music (works and recording), books/journals/newspapers, games, still images & audio visual

A right: granted by one party to another to do something which may be subject to prohibitions and/or conditions

The business problem: it’s difficult to
  • discover who owns the rights to a piece of content
  • obtain information about the rights
  • obtain a license to use the content

The data problem: this stuff is complicated!

The political take: the lack of a solution is a significant inhibitor to regional economic growth
Linked Content Coalition (LCC)

Membership:

- > 40 members to date
- All content types
- All elements of the supply chain
- EU and US (but should be global)

Goal: to improve access to, and licensing of, digital content for any media and use

Deliverable: to specify the framework for rights data interoperability.

Structure: a project (long term-governance to be decided)
The rights data supply chain

The roles of Source, Exchange and User may be played by the same party. The chain may be of any length or complexity.

Source

A creator or repository of rights data.

Exchange

Rights data flows along the supply chain, undergoing transformations as needed

User

Making rights data available to data Users.

A party needing information about rights, or an automated license.
Existing rights expression schemas

There are numerous existing rights expression languages

- ODRL, various profiles including RightsML 1.0
- XRML, various profiles including MPEG-21 REL
- ccREL (Creative Commons)
- ONIX-RS, ONIX-PL (Books, Journals)
- DDEX Work Licensing, Release Delivery messages (Sound Recordings)
- CISAC CWR (Common Works Registration) (Music)
- METSRights (Bibliographic)
- PLUS Coalition Schema (Images)
- etc, etc ... other standards, many proprietary schemas and statements, many DRMs, more being developed all the time

All do the job they were designed for
Not all will cope with changing requirements
None inter-relate
Options

Centralised IT Platform:
- not considered practical or desirable

Single, unified standard:
- facilitates market-driven development, but
- can’t ignore existing standards; not politically acceptable

Standards framework
- facilitates market-driven development
- encourage interoperability between existing standards; politically acceptable
- encourage adoption of “best of breed” practice
LCC requirements

Comprehensive
• represent all kinds of rights data for any kind of control or usage of any type of creation to any level of granularity

Extensible
• accommodate unknown variations without substantial revision

Commercially neutral
• represent rights and permissions for any business model or none

Sector neutral
• not biased to needs of any particular sector or content type

Technology neutral
• must not assume any particular technology implementation
LCC 2012 work plan

The heart of the LCC work in 2012 is a Rights Reference Model (RRM) expressed as both:

- an abstract model
- a formal version (probably as an XML schema)

Other workstreams will investigate

- Non-technical
  - business case
  - long term governance
- Technical
  - messages
  - identifiers
  - iconography (aka service definition)
RRM

Is based on best existing work with its origins in the <indecs> analysis of the late 1990’s

Will be mapped against existing schemas for proof

Has a generic, modular Attribute model, supported by an ontology

Is a schema for transformation, not a new rights message

Will be made freely available and may be implemented by multiple parties
A vision of the rights data supply chain
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Rights metadata

Rights metadata is essentially the same for all sectors – the differences can all be managed by vocabulary mapping in a common model.

Six types of rights data entity have been identified (so far)

- Rights
- Mandates
- Usage rights
- Licenses
- Rights assertions
- Conflicts

Note: rights management applies to groups of creations, not just individual items
Rightsholdings and Mandates

A **Rightsholding** is a state in which some party controls

- some % share of some rights
- in some creation or another Rightsholding
- for some kind(s) of usage
- for some kind(s) of control
- for some period
- for some place
- with perhaps some other contextual conditions.

Rightsholdings are granted by law and delegated by agreements (which we call **Mandates**).
Usage Rights and Licenses

A **License** is an agreement (an event) in which A & B agree that

- B can do X (**Usage Right**), but
- can’t do Y (prohibition), and
- must do Z (condition).

X, Y and Z are also kinds of events.
Rights Assertions and Conflicts

An Assertion is a kind of event in which A states that X is either true or false.

- If X is a Rightsholding, License, Usage Right or Mandate, then it is a **Rights Assertion**.
- If A makes a Rights Assertion and B makes a Rights Assertion and they are in conflict there is a state called a **Rights Conflict**.
Rights Data Integration (RDI) Project

RDI is a proposal submitted under the CIP ICT PSP 2012 work programme

An exemplary implementation of LCC

Includes examples of Sources and Exchanges

If successful will last for 2 years (2013/14)

15 partners from UK, Germany, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Greece

All elements of the supply chain
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