European Parliament
2024-2029

Committee on Legal Affairs

2025/2058(INI)

27.6.2025

DRAFT REPORT

on Copyright and generative artificial intelligence – opportunities and challenges
(2025/2058(INI))

Committee on Legal Affairs

Rapporteur: Axel Voss

PR_INI

CONTENTS

Page

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on Copyright and generative artificial intelligence – opportunities and challenges (2025/2058(INI))

The European Parliament,

– having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, in particular Articles 4, 16, 26, 114 and 118 thereof,

– having regard to Article 17(2) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,

– having regard to Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948 (Resolution 217 A), which affirms both the right to freely participate in the cultural life and the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production,

– having regard to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works,

– having regard to the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) of 15 April 1994,

– having regard to Directive 96/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 1996 on the legal protection of databases (Database Directive)[1],

– having regard to Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society (InfoSoc Directive)[2],

– having regard to Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights[3],

– having regard to Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ETS No. 009), which guarantees the right to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions and has been interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights as encompassing intellectual property rights, including in Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal (11 January 2007),

– having regard to Directive 2009/24/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the legal protection of computer programs[4],

[1] OJ L 77, 27.3.1996, p. 20.
[2] OJ L 167, 22.6.2001, p. 10.
[3] OJ L 157, 30.4.2004, p. 45.
[4] OJ L 111, 5.5.2009, p. 16.

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC[5],

– having regard to Directive (EU) 2016/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on the protection of undisclosed know-how and business information (trade secrets) against their unlawful acquisition, use and disclosure[6],

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2018/1807 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 November 2018 on a framework for the free flow of non-personal data in the European Union[7],

– having regard to Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market and amending Directives 96/9/EC and 2001/29/EC[8] (CDSM Directive),

– having regard to Directive (EU) 2019/1024 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on open data and the re-use of public sector information[9],

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2019/1150 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on promoting fairness and transparency for business users of online intermediation services[10],

– having regard to the Commission White Paper of 19 February 2020 on Artificial Intelligence - A European approach to excellence and trust (COM(2020)0065),

– having regard to the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) Copyright Treaty and the Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence (WIPO/IP/AI/2/GE/20/1 REV) of 29 May 2020,

– having regard to the Parliament resolution on Intellectual property rights for the development of artificial intelligence technologies of 20 October 2020,

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2022/868 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2022 on European data governance (DGA)[11],

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2023/2854 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2023 on harmonised rules on fair access to and use of data (Data act)[12],

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the

[5] OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1.
[6] OJ L 157, 15.6.2016, p. 1.
[7] OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 59.
[8] OJ L 130, 17.5.2019, p. 92.
[9] OJ L 172, 26.6.2019, p. 56.
[10] OJ L 186, 11.7.2019, p. 57.
[11] OJ L 152, 3.6.2022, p. 1.
[12] OJ L, 2023/2854, 22.12.2023.

Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (AI Act)[13],

– having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to the report of the Committee on Legal Affairs (XXXX/2025),

Context

A whereas the right to property, including intellectual property, is enshrined as a fundamental right in Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;

B. whereas the European Union faces the strategic challenge of lagging behind international developments in the field of artificial intelligence; whereas it is therefore essential to promote, rather than impede, the advancement of AI technologies within the Union in order to safeguard Europe's technological sovereignty, competitiveness, and capacity for innovation;

C. whereas copyright and related rights come into effect automatically and confer extensive exclusive rights, including those to reproduce works and other subject matter and adapt, distribute and communicate them to the public;

D. whereas generative AI (GenAI) is a type of artificial intelligence that, unlike traditional AI systems that only classify or predict, creates content, such as text, images, music, videos and code, often mimicking human creativity, thereby relying on pre-existing content, including copyright-protected materials;

E. whereas the development, the deployment and the use of artificial intelligence must be fully compliant with the existing legal framework; whereas it is unacceptable that such technological advancements disregard established rights, in particular those enshrined in copyright law;

F. whereas the key legal questions about the interplay between GenAI and copyright and related rights include whether the new kind of use of copyrighted works and other subject matter in training datasets is lawful under EU law and what the status of AI-generated content should be;

G. whereas the reference to the CDSM Directive in the AI Act is inadequate and fails to provide an appropriate and proportionate solution; whereas copyright and related rights, as fundamental rights enshrined in the Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union, are not overridden by the AI Act;

H. whereas fair remuneration for the use of protected content is the backbone of the creative industry in Europe; whereas the use of content protected by copyright and related rights as training data for generative AI models, without remuneration to rights holders, creates a systemic imbalance in the copyright ecosystem to their detriment, thereby undermining the economic sustainability of the creative sector in the European

[13] OJ L 1689, 12.7.2024, p. 1.

Union, particularly given that, at present, rights holders cannot easily or effectively exercise their right to opt out from the exception provided for in Article 4 of the CDSM Directive, nor verify whether their opt-out has been respected;

I. whereas ensuring proper enforcement of the law and a level playing field across the Union requires that European rules on copyright and related rights apply uniformly to all AI providers deploying products or offering services within the European Union, irrespective of their place of establishment and of where any use of protected content took place prior to such deployment or offer;

GenAI training

J. whereas Article 4 of Directive (EU) 2019/790 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market (CDSM Directive) introduced an exception for the reproduction and the extraction of works and other subject matter for the purpose of text and data mining (TDM), which, under Article 2 of that Directive, is defined as 'any automated analytical technique aimed at analysing text and data in digital form in order to generate information [...]'; whereas Article 4 was neither drafted nor intended to regulate the specific practices involved in AI training;

K. whereas this new and specific form of use (GenAI training) requires a clarification of the legal conditions under which such training may be conducted;

L. whereas high-quality and comprehensive training datasets are essential for the effective development of GenAI systems and to secure high-quality and trustworthy outputs of GenAI systems; whereas enabling the lawful use of such datasets within the European Union is therefore crucial to fostering innovation, ensuring technological sovereignty, and maintaining the Union's competitiveness in the rapidly evolving global AI landscape;

M. whereas the upcoming launch of the EUIPO Copyright Knowledge Centre would represent a timely and commendable initiative aimed at strengthening the interface between copyright and emerging technologies, particularly GenAI;

N. whereas, in addition to a standardised machine-readable opt-out, rights holders should also have the possibility to register such opt-out in a centralised registry, using a single technological standard and in machine-readable format, potentially managed by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), thereby enabling the effective exclusion of registered works from automated data crawling;

O. whereas any GenAI provider should ensure full and detailed transparency concerning all copyright-protected content used to train that system, irrespective of the jurisdiction in which the copyright-relevant acts underlying the training were performed; whereas this transparency shall consist in an itemised list identifying each copyright-protected content used for training; whereas the same requirement should apply mutatis mutandis to any subsequent use of content for inference, retrieval-augmented generation or fine-tuning not only by providers of AI models, as currently stipulated by Article 53 AIA, but also by providers or deployers of AI systems;

P. whereas such transparency could be facilitated through a trusted intermediary, such as

the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), which would be responsible for notifying rights holders of the use of their content, thereby enabling them to assert claims in relation to its use for training; such an intermediary should be endowed with the necessary powers and resources to assess whether providers and deployers comply fully with the transparency obligations;

Q. whereas, as an alternative to the aforementioned EUIPO register, transparency could also be achieved by enabling rights holders to watermark their works and other protected subject matter, and by requiring AI providers to make available search tools that allow for the detection of such watermarks among the materials used for training;

R. whereas, in addition to the obligation of full transparency concerning copyright-protected works and other protected subject matter, there is a need to establish a mechanism whereby, under certain conditions, the failure by AI providers or deployers to provide complete transparency shall give rise to an irrebuttable presumption that any relevant copyrighted work or other protected subject matter has been used for training purposes, thereby triggering all applicable legal consequences under Union and national law for the infringement of copyright or related rights; whereas, where a court finds in favour of a rights holder on the basis of either such a presumption or of submitted evidence, all reasonable and proportionate legal costs and other expenses shall be borne by the AI provider;

S. whereas there is a knowledge gap among GenAI providers, especially smaller firms, regarding their copyright obligations under EU law;

T. whereas the press sector holds a vital role in safeguarding democracy and the democratic structure within the European Union; whereas it is essential to ensure that GenAI models and systems do not engage in selective processing that favours certain publications over others, thereby preserving the plurality and impartiality of information; whereas GenAI models and systems must be designed to incorporate and consider the full spectrum of press publications to uphold fundamental democratic values of diversity and fairness in public discourse; whereas there is a need to establish clear quality standards for GenAI models and systems;

GenAI output

U. whereas transparency regarding the output generated by artificial intelligence systems is essential to enable proper classification of works as ‘human-created’ or otherwise; whereas such classification entails significant legal consequences, including for the applicability of copyright protection and the determination of rights and liabilities;

V. whereas the generation of outputs, characteristic of GenAI, can infringe the rights of reproduction, of making available to the public, or of communication to the public; whereas the TDM exception as provided for in article 4 of the CSDSM does not cover the right of making available to the public or the right of communication to the public;

X. whereas, when it comes to the legal treatment of GenAI outputs, EU copyright law remains grounded in the principles of human authorship; whereas according to the settled case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the concept of a ‘work’ entails two cumulative conditions: first, it must be an original subject matter that

reflects the author's own intellectual creation; second, that creation must be expressed in a manner that makes it identifiable with sufficient precision and objectivity;

Y. whereas inconsistent international regulation regarding the copyright eligibility of AI-generated content poses a risk to the global coherence of intellectual property law and may give rise to regulatory arbitrage or undermine the competitiveness of the Union's creative and AI sectors; whereas international convergence and the establishment of a global regulatory framework would provide a more effective and coherent alternative to the current fragmentation of legal approaches;

Z. whereas, to the extent permitted by international law, the existing principle of territoriality needs to be adapted for the training of GenAI systems in order to ensure that training with European content is subject to European law even if it is realised outside the EU;

1. Recommends that the Commission, independently of its planned review of the copyright framework and the CDSM Directive and without presupposing the need for legislative revision, urgently conduct a thorough assessment of whether the existing EU copyright acquis adequately addresses the legal uncertainty and competitive effects associated with the use of protected works and other subject matter for the training of generative AI systems, as well as the dissemination of AI-generated content that may substitute human-created expression;

2. Further recommends that such assessment aims to uphold a framework in which fair remuneration mechanisms enable the generation of the resources needed for European artistic and creative production to thrive in the context of AI-driven global transformation;

3. Notes the use of generative AI systems that rely on protected content without authorisation from, or compensation to, the rights holders affected by such use, particularly when integrated into search engines or other digital services that enable the generation, often in real time and at marginal cost, of content that imitates or directly draws upon original works and other protected subject matter on which the models were trained or that was scraped, including in real time, by such models; is alarmed that these practices may result in the provision of products and services that directly compete with those of the rights holders;

4. Calls on the Commission to immediately impose a remuneration obligation on providers of general-purpose AI models and systems in respect of the novel use of content protected by copyright or related rights, with such obligation applying until the reforms envisaged in this report are enacted;

5. Encourages the Commission to coordinate efforts on raising awareness on copyright among AI developers, which may include compliance checklists, legal and technological toolkits, and technical guides;

6. Supports the clarification of the TDM exception under Article 4 CDSM as regards the main flaws and ambiguities detected thus far in its application, especially as concerns the establishment of a clear machine-readable standard for the opt-out and the concept of 'lawful access';

7. Believes that a legal framework for GenAI should be established either through the introduction of a dedicated exception to the exclusive rights to reproduction and extraction, distinct from that provided for TDM under Article 4 of the CDSM Directive, or by expanding the scope of that provision to explicitly encompass the training of GenAI, which is currently not covered; stresses that rights holders shall have the right to opt out through a standardised, machine-readable mechanism;

8. Recommends that the Commission ensures the compatibility of this new GenAI legal framework with the three-step test of Article 5(5) InfoSoc Directive;

9. Recommends assigning the EUIPO responsibility for setting up and managing a central register of opt-outs and, where necessary, for mediating the licensing process, so as to streamline relations between GenAI providers and rights holders, establishing a workable, innovation-friendly framework that supports the Union's competitiveness without unduly hindering the development of AI technologies; further recommends that both opt-out declarations and licence offers be recorded in machine-readable form in the same register;

10. Calls on the Commission to propose the full, actionable transparency and source documentation by providers and deployers of general-purpose AI models and systems, with regard to the use of any copyright-protected work or other protected subject matter for any purpose, including for inferencing, retrieval-augmented generation, or fine-tuning, taking into due account the need to protect trade secrets and confidential business information;

11. Calls on the Commission to propose the establishment of an irrebuttable presumption that, for any general-purpose AI (GenAI) model or system placed on the Union market, works and other subject matter protected by copyright or related rights have been used for its training where the statutory transparency obligations set out in this resolution have not been fully complied with; further recommends that, where a rights holder succeeds in legal proceedings either on the basis of this presumption or through submitted evidence, any reasonable and proportionate legal costs and other expenses incurred in enforcing such rights shall be borne by the provider of the AI model or system;

12. Insists that AI-generated content should remain ineligible for copyright protection, and that the public domain status of such works be clearly determined;

13. Calls on the Commission to explore measures to counter the infringement of the rights of reproduction, of making available to the public and of communication to the public through the production of GenAI outputs;

14. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

With the ever-advancing digital and technological development, notably as regards AI and the so-called Generative Large Language Models, some rights such as copyright, the right to privacy and the right to non-discrimination are being devalued as it is becoming extremely difficult to enforce them without an enormous legal and financial risk to the rights holders.

This creates huge legal uncertainties for all parties involved. However, if the European legislator, through its lengthy procedures and a lack of courage, continues to refuse to tackle the crucial issues head on, the EU and its actors will always be left at a disadvantage and further dependencies will be created.

Therefore, the principle that must apply is that technological developments must respect existing laws while, on the other hand, existing laws must not hinder technological developments. This urgently calls for workable solutions, which are currently not being provided by market participants on either side, with technological developments colliding with copyright, such that they appear no longer compatible with each other. It is likely that perfect, comprehensive solutions will no longer be possible.

For this reason, the European legislator needs to strike a fair balance between the interests of all stakeholders at the earliest opportunity. It would also be desirable to find a permanent workable solution to avoid having to protect copyright claims against new technologies every five or six years. A 'General Copyright Protection Regulation', akin to the General Data Protection Regulation, could be helpful in this regard. The AI liability proposal ought to have provided procedurally swifter solutions. However, owing to a lack of strategic long-term vision on the part of various actors, this is now to be withdrawn (this being probably legally dubious) so that legal uncertainty will persist.

This report therefore is an attempt to bring a workable balance between new technology and copyright closer. This will require a combination of legal, technical and technological solutions.

The political context for the EU is not easy because:

1) in geopolitical terms, guiding values are diverging in the 'West';

2) European AI development is severely lagging behind and needs to be promoted without additional 'obstacles';

3) the current added value in digital development is being generated by large tech companies in the US, to the detriment of the European creative sector.

This report therefore also aims to support and promote the development of AI in Europe. After all, Europe needs AI to drive the digitalisation that is essential in our globalised world. The opportunities for European progress are immense and must under no circumstances be left untapped. However, we also want AI systems in Europe that meet certain requirements as regards quality and trustworthiness, and this can only be achieved with quality data belonging to content creators.

At the same time, we also want to preserve copyright protection for the works of our creative sectors and cultural professionals. European culture constitutes a fundamental part of our identity. European added value in the creative sectors is immense and it should not be possible to use it without compensation. This novel use of protected content (training data, data used for generative output) must therefore be remunerated. Only thus can European cultural professionals create the economic basis for the generation of further content.

In this context, the copyright-related rights relating to the content of press publishers play an additional special role for our European understanding of democracy and the rule of law. Freedom of the press, freedom of opinion and freedom of information must under no circumstances be undermined or subjugated by artificial intelligence, in particular where, as is currently the case, digital access and digital 'distribution' of information are increasingly taking place through search engines and AI and, in the case of generative AI, are also influenced by bots, all this being in the hands of a few companies. The control of information and disinformation, whether bot-driven or not, as well as deepfakes and the resulting interference in elections or influencing of public opinion, is extremely dangerous. Plurality and diversification of opinion in this context must therefore be guaranteed in the form of an independent press. This means that the processing of content in an automated and generative manner must trigger a commensurate compensation. However, it is also important for press publishers that they remain identifiable to users. This may require an obligation to cite sources.

In this connection, the comparable situation of so-called paywalls, the data behind which is not always solely copyright-protected material – though at times it is – should also be examined.

However, under the current situation, it must also be assumed that a slowly developing licensing market will no longer encompass all market participants. This means that not every press publisher or not all copyright-protected content is needed to provide training material for a fee, so that market participants lacking in bargaining power may no longer be taken into consideration if they demand compensation. A solution, if it is even necessary at this point, will probably only be possible by means of flat-rate fees or a stronger organisation to pool bargaining power. It is, however, questionable whether all parties would want to embark on such a path.

While this should mainly be left to the market participants, the question arises – given the generative AI systems that are offered worldwide –as to whether only 'global licences' will in future play a role in licensing.

Since this 'copyright-protected' data has been used for years (at least since late 2022) without a licence or other authorisation from the creators, consideration must also be given to the extent to which compensation should also be paid retroactively.

In any event, the European legislator or the European Commission should, pending the introduction of an appropriate provision to address this problem, establish an immediate, simple, flat-rate copyright fee for this use of 5 to 7% of global turnover in order to compensate for the added value that these businesses generate using the data of European creatives and to ensure it remains in Europe.

Of course, this also calls for a reassessment of the territoriality principle, as already envisaged in the AI Act. We cannot allow AI models to be trained just anywhere in the world using European copyright-protected data only for them to be then made available in Europe.

In the future, there may also be a need for a democratic legislator having to either review or standardise the quality of the basic data used by generative 'Large Language Models'. In the future, it may also be necessary for the legislator to require such AI developers to include copyright-protected works in order to maintain the quality of those models.

On the other hand, we should also use AI to enhance the independence and diversity of high-quality information.

AI also needs access to copyright-protected works in order to develop further in terms of quality. In recent years, therefore, a huge amount of content has been used by AI developers mainly, but not solely, for training purposes. Such training constitutes a completely novel use of content, to which the existing copyright rules are applicable only to a limited extent.

Currently, the lack of compensation results in enormous legal uncertainty. A legally clear solution to this source of conflict is required with the utmost urgency. As long as there is no clear legal framework regulating conflicting interests, European content will be used with the added value being generated elsewhere. The Commission must therefore take immediate action[14] without waiting for possible reviews of, for instance, the Copyright Directive or the AI Act.

A solution must arise from the interplay between licensing possibilities and transparency requirements on the basis of international law and the resulting right of disposal of the content creator.

Thus, a reference to Article 4 of the DSM Directive is still not sufficient and probably not in line with international copyright principles. The European legislator incorporated Article 4 in the AI Act without, however, having clearly established the consequences. The current exemption in Article 4 allowing text and data mining under the conditions specified was not drafted with the intention of enabling the use en masse of copyright-protected material by all through generative AI. And certainly not where it also leads to the creation of a competitive product accessible to the public.

Nevertheless, even if in the opinion of the rapporteur Article 4 is not applicable, we need a similar possibility allowing developers of AI to obtain licences for copyright-protected works in as straightforward and technically easy to implement manner as possible. This is best done digitally. Moreover, the rationale of Article 17 of the DSM Directive should also be taken into account.

At the same time, it is important to ensure that rights holders are still able to decide whether – or not – and how (licencing) their content can be utilised for this new type of use. Right-holders must be given the right to an opt-out.

However, for this to be recognised easily and unhindered by AI developers, it must be machine-readable and standardised[15]. It must also be the responsibility of the rights holder to make use of this opt-out in a legally and practically certain manner.

[14] as also stated in PolDep's opinion
[15] Cf. EUIPO study

In order to make implementation as simple as possible for AI developers, it seems necessary to record the opt-out in a European register. It would therefore seem appropriate for such a register to be maintained by EUIPO. The AI developer would thus have the possibility either to respect the standardised, machine-readable opt-outs or to identify through the register which works may not be used without permission.

On the other hand, only content protected with an opt-out or registered can still be protected from this type of use. It would even be possible to link the licensing process to this register, thereby simplifying matters and creating a kind of 'one-stop-shop' for AI developers.

As rights holders are not and cannot be aware whether their content is being used in this novel way, a transparency requirement is essential. This transparency requirement would oblige AI developers to provide a comprehensive and detailed list of the protected content they have drawn on for this novel use. The 'sufficiently detailed summary' provided for by the AI Act has so far been completely inadequate since it cannot provide clarity regarding the use of content precisely because it is a summary. An interpretation which can also be used in the context of copyright law is therefore necessary here.

If, for example, reasons such as trade secrets preclude access to this data base in the form of transparency that is relevant to the content creator, the obligation must be fulfilled through a trust as an intermediary. Here too, EUIPO could act as the intermediary. It could then inform the rights holders of the use made of their work.

The transparency obligation can also be fulfilled by requiring labelling of the copyrighted work, e.g. watermarks[16] or the like, and allowing rights holders to cross-check this either through access to the basic AI model or via the register. In a digital world, a digital fingerprint on the protected works seems essential anyway.

The legislator will probably also have to resolve the issue that not every private website containing a copyright-protected image is automatically excluded from the training data.

Abuse, manipulation of information, legal assumptions, reversal of the burden of proof or even the very strong legal remedy of liability must be considered or weighed very carefully at all times and at every step of the way.

In addition to considering how to solve this problem, copyright law needs generally to be adapted to technological developments. This will require further European harmonisation of Member States' national copyright laws.

[16] Cf. EUIPO study

ANNEX: ENTITIES OR PERSONS FROM WHOM THE RAPPORTEUR HAS RECEIVED INPUT

Pursuant to Article 8 of Annex I to the Rules of Procedure, the rapporteur declares that he received input from the following entities or persons in the preparation of the draft report prior to the adoption thereof in committee:

Entity and/or person
ITI - Information Technology Industry Council
Spitzenorganisation der Firmernwirtschaft
Fdup
Linklaters LLP
Mazagan
NBCuniversal
The lnternation Federation of Film Distributors' and Publishers' Associations
Allianz
Digital Music Europe
IFRRO
Duke University
Masaryk University (PhD Candidate, Intellectual Property Law)
Microsoft
Meseuro srl
AK Public Affairs
The Computer & Communications Industry Association
Zukunftfabrik2050.de
SACO
Liccium B.V.
European Blockchain Association
France Digitale
ACT Al NOW
Alliance de la Presse d'lnformation Generale
IFRRO
KPMG Law
TikTok
MFE-MEDIAFOREUROP EN.V.
Hanbury Strategy
VAUNET
EBU / UER - European Broadcasting Union
University of Turin; Eindhoven
VAUNET - Verband Privater Medien
Coalition for Creativity
The European Video on Demand Coalition
#WeAreEurope
Aleph Alpha GmbH

Cullen International
Bertelsmann
NAI apollo
IMPF
Tilburg University
Meta
YouTube
HBM
Initiative Urheberrecht
ICMP - The global voice
Access Partnership
AEPO-ARTIS
Toy Industries of Europe
EIMP - European Independent Media Publishers
EARE
DFL Deutsche FuP..ball Liga GmbH
Video Games Europe
Midjourney
Nexareg
EurolSPA
Keywords Studios
Advance/Conde Nast
Future of privacy forum
Society of Audiovisual Authors
Initiative Urheberrecht
APCO
European Publishers Council
Cloudflare
Elda
RELX
Center for Journalism & Liberty (CJL)
Business at OECD
Google
Bitkom e.V.
Creativity Works!
IFPI
STM
MVFP
CEPIC
National Law Institute University
Motion Picture Association
Copyright Clearance Center
Solutions for a Small Planet
European Parliamentary
Ives Attorneys
Freshfields
FREELENS e.V.

IFRRO
News Media Europe
Mediapro
Lausen
L'ARP - Societe civile des Auteurs Realisateurs Producteurs
EUROPEAN BLOCKTECH
RAAP
EMMA-ENPA
LAUSEN
MPA
BDI
Anthropic
Credo Al
ODISEIA
EG Legal Services
Federal Association of German Leasing Companies
Independent policy expert
European Producers Club (EPC)
Audiovisual Anti-Piracy Alliance (AAPA)
CEPI - European Audiovisual Production
365 Sherpas GmbH
Wikimedia France
IFPI
Federation of European Publishers
Federation of the European Sporting Goods Industry
Al Sweden
CEDRO
European Writers' Council
Dell
FTI Consulting
Apple
Adan
CEPI - European Audiovisual Production
FERA - Federation of European film directors
APCO
European Visual Artists
CGI
DGA Group
HP
DOT Europe
Schibsted media AS
Business Software Alliance
Vorsitzender
FREELENS
NCSR Demokritos
Bertelsmann SE & Co KGaA
Lawyer

Universal Music Group
Solutions for a Small Planet
Association of Commercial Television and Video on Demand Services in Europe
AK Public Affairs
ECSA, European Community Shipowners' Associations
PRSforMusic
International Trademark Association
L'ARP
EFAD
Arcom
Axel Springer SE
Auteursbond (Dutch)
Premier League
Deutscher Fotorat
Society of Audiovisual Authors
Bitkom e.V.
Futuro Publico
Al Caramba!
INTA
University of Liverpool / School of Law and Social Justice
Assonime
AIE
PlayRight CV, IMARA, GA
Assonime - Association
RTL Deutschland GmbH
Euralia
German Bar Association
Atresmedia
Amazon
Samman Law & Corporate Affairs
European Publishers Council
EUROCINEMA
Tony Blair Institute
European Illustrators Forum
AEPO-ARTIS
IHK fur Munchen und Oberbayern
GEMA
Hubert Burda Media
Access Partnership
FIAPF - International Federation of Film Producers Associations
Sky Group
The European Alliance of News Agencies
European Writers' Council
EGAIR
VERA Studio
Warner Bros Discovery
VAUNET

IHK fur Munchen und Oberbayern
Bundesverband Schauspiel
News Corp
Boardmember Dutch Writers Guild
Kunstenbond
Forward Global
Video Games Europe
APCO Worldwide
Getty Images
VERA Studio
EGAIR
Klarna
UGGC Avocats
FLA
Shearwater Global
EuroCommerce
MFE
International Federation of Actors

The list above is drawn up under the exclusive responsibility of the rapporteur.

Where natural persons are identified in the list by their name, by their function or by both, the rapporteur declares that he has submitted to the natural persons concerned the European Parliament's Data Protection Notice No 484 (https://www.europarl.europa.eu/data-protect/index.do), which sets out the conditions applicable to the processing of their personal data and the rights linked to that processing.