**RESTRICTIONS - PROJECT SUMMARY**

Restrictions are a way of expressing different elements of availability and can be grouped into distinct types, based on what constraints they impose on content:

* Limits on WHERE assets can be distributed or licensed (Territory)
* Limits on WHO can distribute or license assets (Publication, Industry, Accreditation)
* Limits on HOW assets can be licensed (products, subscriptions or bundles) or distributed (syndication, feeds, distribution channels)
* Limits on WHEN assets can be licensed (Embargo)
* Limits on WHAT assets can be licensed for (Usage)
* Limits on HOW MUCH assets can be licensed for (Minimum Pricing, Exclusives)

Restrictions can originate from a number of different sources which affect whether they need to be functional, informational, or both.

* Contractual – Provider
  + Image Partner/Company
  + Individual Contributor
  + Handouts
* Contractual - Credential
  + Sporting League contracts
  + Event Promoter
  + Event Organiser
  + Event Venue
  + Pool Arrangements (may restrict who is included in pool, and how pool members can use and syndicate pool content they receive)
* Contractual - Client
  + Assignment Client (Paid Assignments and ARBs)
  + Assignment Approver
  + Exclusivity/First Rights
* Internal - Business led constraints
  + Minimum Pricing
  + Managed Pricing
  + Exclusivity
  + Regional Control
  + Account Permissions (EZA, PA, Sub)
  + Third Party Distribution (Delegates)
  + Managed Access (Higher value content may be excluded from high volume/low cost usage)
* Legal
  + Copyright Law
  + National/Regional Law (may constrain use of assets taken in specific circumstances, or require alterations such as pixelating the face of individuals)
  + International Law
  + Release Limitations
* Informational
  + Equipment (special cameras, filters, or post-production processes applied to asset)
  + Organisational
  + Other Notes

Contractually-driven restrictions and approvals are typically related to content rights which need to be enforced; informational or internal business-driven restrictions can be more fluid and often need to be more flexible to keep up with a changing business.

**RESTRICTION MECHANISMS**

We currently have three main mechanisms for implementing restrictions

* FUNCTIONAL - Hide/Block, Subscriptions
* IMPLIED - PA restrictions, user account permissions, bundle rules
* DESCRIPTIVE - Visible, as in free-text Special Instructions data and the “auto restrictions” applied to Editorial assets on import

The first two are automated methods using controlled data throughout most systems; they are not quite as granular as we need them to be but give us a good platform to build on, and can already be utilized by the newer products currently in high demand, such as API/Connect.

Descriptive restriction data is still primarily in free text format, making it very difficult to control, update, or manage in the automated workflows for newer product streams. The “auto restrictions” applied to all Editorial assets on import are mapped from other existing data, based on a very complex mapping table that is difficult to change and add to, with many of the original restriction mappings now out of date due to the re-negotiation of the original league/partner contracts that drove them.

Since much of the data stems from contractual, legal or business driven requirements that must be honoured, it is vital that we find a way to build a more controlled format so the assets can be made available to all product streams with the necessary restrictions enforced, and changing contractual rules can easily be reflected in the asset level restrictions.

**FREE TEXT RESTRICTIONS - ANALYSIS**

Free Text Restrictions (as stored in the Special Instructions field in TEAMS) fall under the following categories:

* Restriction (typically contractual and prescriptive, often non-negotiable)
  + Territory
  + Usage (Advertising, Consumer Products, Marketing, Merchandising, Prints, Promotional
  + Resale, Retail Product, Wall décor, Wireless, Mobile, Television)
  + Usage Type (Editorial or Commercial)
  + Publication
  + Industry (Tobacco, Alcoholic Beverages, Book Publishing, Tabloids, Newspapers, Magazines)
  + Embargo
  + Syndication (No Archive, No Feeds, No Distribution)
* Approval (indicates content is not available for automated workflows, due to partial or full approval requirements)
  + Photographer
  + Publicist
  + Celebrity/Model
  + Sales/Internal
  + Positive Usage
* Pricing (contractual or business driven; more room for discretion but not always negotiable)
  + Minimum Price
  + Premium Rates
  + Subscription
  + Free
* Notification (informational on our end, but may be prescriptive for clients depending on their own business rules, such as family magazines avoiding assets with nudity or graphic imagery)
  + Graphic Content
  + Nudity
  + Quality
  + Circumstantial
  + Release Status
  + Legal
  + Internal
* Elaboration (usually more informational, with some limitations)
  + Handout
  + Pool
  + Exclusivity
* Referential (often informational only, provided as convenience with no enforcement required)
  + Story Reference
  + File Photo
  + Logical Groupings

Looking at the distribution of unique restriction phrases across those categories, some trends emerge:

* The largest percentage of unique phrases comes from AFP assets – over 50% of the total
* Category wise, the largest percentage of phrases falls into the Referential category which is largely informational rather than contractual or restrictive – and the majority of these phrases are from AFP assets. This is not unexpected since AFP use this field to provide data that links photos to the stories they go with; partnerships with any other providers who offer both visual and written content (and data to link them together) are likely to face the same situation
* Even for content in house collections where we control input, there is a surprising amount of variation in phrases simply due to very small differences in spelling or punctuation
* For content going through heavily controlled workflows (such as automated data mapping channels on import), there is far less variation and much higher consistency in phrasing
* The large variety of phrasings for similar restrictive information indicates a lack of definition for exactly what is being communicated, especially for content across different providers – what exactly do we mean by “Exclusive”, or “online use” or “wireless”?
* Despite a variety of spellings, territory restrictions can be grouped fairly easily when individual countries are involved, and follow mostly standard patterns of expression such as “<country> OUT” or “NO <Country>” or “<Country> ONLY”. More regional definitions such as South America or Europe would benefit from a more detailed definition down to the country level so they can be clearly understood by all parties
* Pricing related restrictions range from specific (“minimum price of $250”) to very vague (“Premium Pricing Applies” or “Higher Rates”), and often seem designed to force a managed customer interaction instead of allowing self-service

**RESTRICTIONS DEVELOPMENT**

The next steps towards more efficient management and control of restrictions are grouped in order of efficiency, starting with a simple expansion of systems we already use:

* Utilise existing pricing control mechanisms to manage price related restrictions
  + Review definitions of current free text pricing restrictions, and group them into sets for “manual pricing approval”, “specific price point” and “price code range”
  + Identify collections in need of additional price codes so higher price ranges can be set; tie this in with OPA and any discount settings to make sure these can be excluded; set up all needed price codes
  + Make price code accessible as a data point in Editorial upstream systems such as EWS (and eventually ESP) so assets can be submitted with higher price point set, not simply default to the main price code linked to each collection, and calculated on import for Editorial assets
* Create Business Definitions for most common restriction language
  + Align territory definitions across all Enterprise systems, and with external reference systems (such as ISO) to give us consistent, reproducible look-ups that can be made available both manually and automatically
  + Map sales-related restriction terms to actual license and sales terms from our T&C, internal systems and client contracts so they match
  + Share most commonly-used definitions with partners and suppliers so they can align their own language
* Controlled Restriction Vocabulary
  + Building a controlled vocabulary for restrictions allows for consistent application by both internal and external staff (inc outsourcers), for multi-lingual restriction availability (and/or application), and creates a framework for automated mapping from free text
  + Review existing restriction vocabulary used for Creative and align with free text data in the same categories
  + Territory restrictions would sync to Hide/Block setup
  + Make controlled values available in all input systems (from Portal to SSBI and EWS/ESP)
  + Investigate use of AMP for mapping free text data to controlled restrictions
  + Link sales, industry and use restrictions back to CRM and pricing systems (or an expansion of Hide/Block functionality) to allow for granular control of asset availability directly on the website, without requiring human interaction
  + Review existing “auto restrictions” and translate into controlled restrictions – this may allow us to eliminate the auto-restrictions and the confusion they often cause for staff and clients alike
* Cross-Content Compatibility
  + Determine controlled restriction needs across all content for the global business, to ensure that any new or added solutions will have value for all of our content types
  + Compare existing systems already in place for different content types and determine how compatible they are
  + Bring restriction requirements into data model discussions for new DAM Simple project, to ensure needs can be addressed in the new system
  + Clarify known data and logic issues that relate to restrictions, such as the calculation of wholly-owned/royalty-bearing data points, so they are clearer and more consistent
* Encoding Restrictions in Machine-Readable format
  + Identify restrictions to be encoded in asset data in machine readable format for clients, vs internal use
  + Develop system for encoding our restrictions in machine readable format, using new IPTC standard RightsML
  + Develop workflow for accepting RightsML for incoming assets, so we can read any asset restrictions we receive from a contributor or partner (AP already use it for some of their content, AFP are starting to consider it)