Background on Music Licensing
Why Music Licensing?

When we hear music in a commercial setting the user of that music needs a license.

- One or more licenses are needed, depending on the use.

Types of licenses include

- **Performance License**: A license for the right to publicly perform the musical work
  - Uses include: Television, Radio, Streaming; Live performances; Restaurants, Malls, etc.
- **Synchronization License**: A license to use the music “in timed relation” with visual content
  - Uses include: Television programs and ads; Film; Internet videos; video games
- **Master Recording License**: A license to use musical recording in a media project
  - Uses include: Television programs and ads; Film
- **Mechanical License**: A license to mechanically reproduce sound
  - Uses include: CDs and digital downloads; Interactive streaming services (e.g., Spotify, Apple Music, Tidal, Amazon Unlimited, etc.)

Many of these licenses are *compulsory* or *statutory*, meaning that the copyright owner cannot exclude others from exploiting work so long as the user pays the appropriate royalty.
Licensing Sound Recordings

TV, Movie, YouTube
- Master Recording
  - Directly from Label or Artist
    - Not Statutory

Internet/Satellite Radio
- Performance
  - SoundExchange
    - Copyright Royalty Board
    - Statutory

Interactive Streaming
- Performance
  - Directly from Label
    - Not Statutory

* Terrestrial radio does not pay performance right
Current Royalty Structure for Sound Recordings

- **TV, Movie, YouTube**
  - **Master Recording**
  - Individually negotiated

- **Internet/Satellite Radio**
  - **Performance**
  - Internet Radio (2016-2020)
    - Paid Subs: $0.0022 per play
    - Ad-Supported: $0.0017 per play
    - Non-commercial: Min $500

- **Interactive Streaming**
  - **Performance**
  - Individually negotiated
  - Currently nearly 60% of revenue
  - Spotify recently signed contracts with lower rates in exchange for windowing

Satellite Radio
- 11% of revenue in 2017
- Rates for 2018-2022 TBD
Licensing Musical Works

TV, Movie, YouTube
- Synchronization
  - Directly from Publisher
    - Negotiated Rate
      • Not Compulsory

Live, Radio, Internet/SXM
- Interactive Streaming
  - PRO
    - ASCAP, BMI
      • Rate Court
      • Compulsory
    - SESAC, GMR
      • Arbitration or Negotiated License
      • Not Compulsory

Purchase of CD/Downloads
- Mechanical
  - Publisher, HFA or Similar Agency
    - Publisher or NMPA
      • Copyright Royalty Board
      • Statutory
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Current Royalty Structure for Musical Work

TV, Movie, YouTube

Live, Radio, Internet/SXM

Interactive Streaming

Purchase of CD/Downloads

Synchronization

Performance

Mechanical

Individually negotiated
- Est. $860 million in 2015

Est. $1.85 billion in 2016
- TV: Approx. $200 million
- Radio: Approx. 3.8%
- Internet Radio: Approx. 5%

Est. $2.13 billion in 2015
- CD and Downloads: $0.091 per song
- Streaming: Formula based on revenue, subscribers, and other royalty payments
  Rate for 2018-2022: TBD
What is a PRO?

What is a PRO

- ASCAP, BMI, SESAC, GMR

- Performing Rights Organization acts as agent for writers and publishers:
  - Negotiate licenses with music users
  - Collect and distribute royalties to writers and publishers
  - Monitor for infringing use

- Performing Rights Organizations are two-sided platforms:
  - Composers, songwriters, and music publishers are one side of the platform.
  - Licensees (TV and Radio stations; streaming services; arenas; restaurants; fitness centers; etc.) are on the other side of the platform

- Writers are generally represented by one PRO.

- ASCAP and BMI operate under Consent Decrees with Justice Department.
  - SESAC and GMR do not.
Why Consent Decrees?

DOJ was concerned that ASCAP had undue market power.

- DOJ sued ASCAP and entered into Consent Decree in 1941.
- DOJ sued BMI in 1964 and entered into Consent Decree in 1966.

Key Features of Consent Decrees:

- PROs may license *Performance Rights* only.
  - May not license other rights (e.g., Sync, Mechanical).
- PROs must offer *non-exclusive* licenses.
  - Users may license directly from composer.
  - Important for decision of CBS v. BMI (1979), which determined that aggregating musical works under blanket license is not anticompetitive.
- PROs must offer license to any party requesting a license (*compulsory*).
  - License to comparable users must be on comparable terms.
- If parties cannot agree on a license, rate and terms are determined by a *Rate Court*.
  - Federal judge oversees each Consent Decree and adjudicates all controversies.
DOJ Review of Consent Decrees

- Consent Decrees were last amended in 1994 (BMI) and 2001 (ASCAP).
- Beginning in 2011, major publishers wanted to withdraw their compositions from ASCAP and BMI for certain uses.
  - Withdraw for certain new media
  - Remain for traditional media
- Rate Courts ruled that Consent Decrees did not allow partial withdrawals.
- DOJ reviewed whether Consent Decrees should be amended.
- Review considered:
  - Whether copyright owners should be allowed to affiliate with ASCAP and BMI to license rights to certain types of users, but not others
  - Whether ASCAP and BMI should be allowed to offer other rights
Outcome of DOJ Review

- In 2016, DOJ decided not to amend Consent Decrees:
  - Copyright owner must offer works to all users, or withdraw completely.
  - ASCAP and BMI may *only* offer performance rights.

- DOJ also interpreted Consent Decrees to require *100 Percent Licensing*.

- DOJ interpreted Consent Decrees as not allowing *Fractional Licensing*:
  - BMI asked Rate Court for clarification on whether Consent Decrees allow fractional licensing.
  - Rate Court agreed with BMI.
  - DOJ is appealing.
Economic Issues
# Pricing of License Royalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sound Recording</th>
<th>Musical Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV, Film, YouTube – Sync/Master &amp; Performance Rights</td>
<td><strong>Master: Individual Negotiation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sync: Individual Negotiation Performance: Rate Court</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Radio – Performance Right</td>
<td><strong>No Payments in US</strong></td>
<td>Consent Decree/Rate Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Radio – Performance Right</td>
<td><strong>CRB Statutory Rate</strong></td>
<td>Consent Decree/Rate Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webcast – Performance Right</td>
<td><strong>CRB Statutory Rate</strong></td>
<td>Consent Decree/Rate Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD/Digital Download – Mechanical Right</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td><strong>CRB Compulsory Statutory Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Streaming – Mechanical &amp; Performance Rights</td>
<td><strong>Performance: Individual Negotiation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mechanical: CRB Statutory Rate Performance: Consent Decree/Rate Court</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Copyright owners and licensees may license directly, outside of Rate Court/CRB rate.
Future Developments

Pre-1972 Sound Recording Right Legislation

- Sound recordings made prior to February 15, 1972 are not protected by federal copyright laws.
  - They are protected by various state laws
- Artists have sued SiriusXM and Pandora for nonpayment of pre-1972 royalties.
  - California case settled for up to $100 million; New York and Florida cases dismissed (appeals pending).
- CLASSICS Act: would extend the performance right to pre-1972 recordings

Fair Pay Fair Play Act Legislation

- AM/FM radio is exempt from paying sound recording royalties.
- Congress has introduced legislation over the years to require radio to pay royalties.
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