

Amendment	Recommendation	Comments
1	++	It adds some dearly needed nuance to the report
2	+	Improves the report
3	-	This claim appears to be without base, if anything copyright in its current form probably has reduced competitiveness of the EU.
4	+	The emphasis on the digital single market improves the report partially, on the other hand copyright in its current form actually inhibits creativity and competitiveness.
5	-	While we think cultural diversity is important, the relation with economic opportunities is not obvious.
6	-	This claim appears to be without base
7	++	We welcome this amendment
8	++	We welcome this amendment
9	++	We welcome this amendment
10	++	We welcome this amendment
11	-	There is no basis for claims about a need for (more) enforcement in favour of rightsholders. Possibly better protection of authors' income, but not their publishers.
12	++	We welcome this amendment
13	-	We feel that the use of the word 'rightsholders' is misleading and unjustified. Author income decrease is largely caused by rightsholders abusing copyright assignments.
14	-	Copyright in its current form actually inhibits creativity and competitiveness, contrary to what some copyright maximalists may claim.
15	++	While such a title may not necessarily be an improvement on substance, reducing the fragmentation of copyright in Europe is something we welcome.
16	++	Assuming that this is a translation error and that the actual inserted text is "as well as the education and research sectors and that these sectors benefit from exceptions and limitations to these rights" we welcome this amendment.
17	-	Copyright in its current form actually inhibits creativity and competitiveness, contrary to what some copyright maximalists may claim.
18	-	Copyright in its current form actually inhibits creativity and competitiveness, contrary to what some copyright maximalists may claim.
19	-	So far all empirical evidence shows that a high level of protection actually is detrimental to all the stated goals of this amendment.
20	+	While we concur with the call for protection of creators and not of rightsholders, we disagree with the notion that creative industries cannot exist without the current (overly high) levels of protection.

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
21	N/A	We have no opinion on this amendment
22	+	We agree with the need for flexibility in copyright.
23	++	We welcome this amendment, modernisation and flexibility are desperately needed.
24	++	We welcome this amendment.
25	-	Copyright in its current form actually inhibits creativity and competitiveness, contrary to what some copyright maximalists may claim.
26	-	We object to the term 'rightholders', copyright should be about authors and creators, not about rent-seeking cultural gatekeepers. Also there is no evidence of a need for a high level of protection.
27	-	It is not digital technology that has spread tolerance for infringements, it is the onerous high levels of protection of copyright that has deeply eroded the legitimacy of copyright.
28	++	We welcome this amendment
29	-	There is no evidence that supports this far-fetched claim. The digital single market's single greatest impediment is actually the sclerosis induced by outdated copyright-paradigms in the cultural sectors.
30	+	EDRi welcomes a return to the origins of copyright.
31	-	In a European Union that has freedom of movement of persons, this is a positively archaic view on the Common Market.
32	-	There is no evidence that supports this ridiculous hyperbole. Claims like this erode the legitimacy of copyright as well.
33	++	We welcome this amendment.
34	+	While we disagree with the necessity of a 'high' level of protection, we welcome the rest of this amendment.
35	+	While we support the call for modernisation, we feel it is less the user's behaviour that has to change, but that of the cultural industries.
36	++	We welcome this amendment.
37	-	We vehemently oppose any move to de facto private censorship of the internet through intermediary liability or dragnet surveillance in any shape or form.
38	++	We welcome this amendment.
39	++	We welcome this amendment.
40	-	We do not see the value of this amendment.
41	++	We welcome this amendment.
42	++	We welcome this amendment.
43	-	We feel such an unwaiverable right for remuneration precludes authors from disseminating

Amendment	Recommendation	Comments
		their works under free and open license models such as Creative Commons and the various open source licenses. Furthermore, remuneration improvement efforts should be aimed at authors and creators, not copyright holders.
44	++	We welcome this amendment.
45	++	We welcome this amendment.
46	+	If it weren't for the call for remuneration for right holders, we would be completely in favour of this amendment.
47	++	We welcome this amendment.
48	++	We welcome this amendment.
49	++	We welcome this amendment very much indeed.
50	++	We welcome this amendment.
51	++	We welcome this amendment.
52	++	We welcome this amendment.
53	++	We welcome this amendment.
54	-	The inclusion of this language only perpetuates the sclerotic copyright clearance situation in the Common Market.
55	+	All policy-making should be evidence-based, not just strengthening the negotiation and contractual position of authors and performers.
56	++	We welcome this amendment.
57	-	We feel that this amendment pushes towards a situation wherein the ability of authors to share their works without license-based remuneration, as is often done through Creative Commons licenses and/or free and open source licenses, may be taken away.
58	-	The inclusion of 'all creatives' would make the draft opinion unclear.
59	++	We welcome this amendment.
60	-	Any further liability for service providers and intermediaries will lead to chilling effects on the freedom of expression on the internet through privatised copyright enforcement.
61	++	We welcome this amendment.
62	++	We welcome this amendment.
63	++	We welcome this amendment.
64	-	This amendment weakens the opinion and makes it merely aspirational.
65	++	We welcome this amendment.
66	++	We welcome this amendment.
67	++	We welcome this amendment.
68	+	We welcome this amendment but feel that portability should not only be cross-border, but also across devices.
69	++	We welcome this amendment.

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
70	?	The text of this amendment seems to be a mistranslation
71	N/A	
72	-	We are of the opinion that cross-border access enhances respect for cultural diversity, so the juxtaposition in this amendment is illogical.
73	N/A	
74	+	We consider the wording of this amendment too aspirational to warrant real support.
75	-	This amendment is in denial that broadcasters pre-purchase or pre-finance systems have to adjust the new realities of the digital environment instead of the other way around.
76	+	We welcome this amendment.
77	++	We welcome this amendment.
78	++	We welcome this amendment.
79	++	We welcome this amendment.
80	++	We welcome this amendment.
81	++	We welcome this amendment.
82	++	We welcome this amendment.
83	++	We welcome this amendment.
84	-	While we are not necessarily against a departure of the notion that offline rules should always apply online, we are of the opinion that in the digital society many of the rationales for copyright become untenable to such an extent that additional copyright protection would be exactly the wrong direction.
85	-	A high level of protection may actually be counterproductive for innovation and creativity.
86	++	We welcome this amendment
87	-	An emphasis on the rule of law would make more sense elsewhere in the opinion.
88	-	An emphasis on the rule of law would make more sense elsewhere in the opinion.
89	++	We welcome this amendment.
90	++	We welcome this amendment.
91	-	The current enforcement measures are already detrimental to fundamental rights and the rule of law in a democratic society, a call for further expansion of them is not the right direction.
92	++	We welcome this amendment.
93	++	We welcome this amendment.
94	-	We disagree with the notion that any reuse by definition should result in compensation of rightholders.
95	++	We welcome this amendment.
96	+	This amendment is not strong enough compared to some others on this topic.

Amendment	Recommendation	Comments
97	+	We support the notion that efficiency is one of the measures for the feasibility of levies.
98	-	Libraries and archives have already more than tried to do this and have been blocked by rightholders at every step.
99	++	We support this amendment.
100	++	We support this amendment.
101	++	We support this amendment.
102	+	We feel that that ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty is more than something that should be 'noted'.
103	+	Mere expression of 'concern and regret' is not enough, the Council should be called upon to expedite the ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty.
104	++	We welcome this amendment.
105	++	We welcome this amendment.
106	++	We welcome this amendment.
107	-	Remuneration of rightholders is not the problem, remuneration of authors and performers is.
108	++	We welcome this amendment.
109	++	We welcome this amendment.
110	++	We welcome this amendment.
111	-	This is already covered in the Berne Convention and the TRIPS agreement.
112	-	The current enforcement measures are already detrimental to fundamental rights and the rule of law in a democratic society, a call for further expansion of them is not the right direction.
113	++	We welcome this amendment.
114	-	We disagree with the notion that any reuse of copyrighted works by definition should result in remuneration of rightholders, especially if this does not lead to direct revenue streams for the remixers and/or their publishing platforms. Such remuneration demands are inefficient and would inhibit cultural expression and therefore free speech.
115	-	We disagree with the notion that any reuse of copyrighted works by definition should result in remuneration of rightholders, especially if this does not lead to direct revenue streams for the remixers and/or their publishing platforms. Such remuneration demands are inefficient and would inhibit cultural expression and therefore free speech.
116	-	This amendment claws at the very fabric of the World Wide Web since it would put an onerous requirement for copyright clearance of hyperlinks on publishers on the web. It furthermore expands copyright law to activities that do not directly result in unauthorised reproduction of copyrighted works. Classic tort doctrines are sufficient for

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		the cases this amendment intends to address.
117	-	It is unclear why this lack of clarity needs to be introduced.
118	++	We welcome this amendment.
119	++	We welcome this amendment.
120	++	We welcome this amendment.
121	-	This is a disguised call for copyright levies on the internet.
122	-	Trade and/or investment agreement negotiations are not the right forum to address topics that so directly affect fundamental rights and the rule of law in a democratic society.
123	++	We welcome this amendment.
124	++	We welcome this amendment.
125	++	We welcome this amendment.
126	-	While we share the sentiment, we feel that data mining should be outside the scope of copyright anyway. The commercial or non-commercial nature of it is therefore irrelevant.
127	+	Better amendments in this regard have been proposed.
128	+	Better amendments in this regard have been proposed.
129	-	We are opposed to notice-and-action schemes.
130	-	This amendment confuses causes and effects of infringement.
131	++	We welcome this amendment
132	-	While we share the sentiment, we feel that data mining should be outside the scope of copyright anyway. The commercial or non-commercial nature of it is therefore irrelevant.
133	++	We welcome this amendment.
134	-	We are opposed to any expansion of copyright to include notions of 'contributing infringement', traditional tort doctrines are sufficient and appropriate.