The Present and Future of Digital Rights Management

Stefan Bechtold

Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Bonn, Germany Center for Internet and Society, Stanford Law School December 15, 2006

- 1. The law on anti-circumvention is a mess
- 2. The law on interoperability is a mess
- 3. Value-centered technology design
- 4. Emerging problems
- 5. Conclusion





- Anti-circumvention provisions concerning "rights management information" outlawing
 - Alteration & deletion of correct metadata
 - Rarely: provision of false metadata
 - Never: manufacturing & distribution of devices
 - International level: WCT, WPPT
 - U.S.: § 1202 DMCA, AHRA
 - Europe: Art. 7 Copyright Directive (2001)







- Regulatory options to reconcile DRM with © limitations:
 - Direct influence on the technological design
 - Indirect regulation / "right to hack"
 - Advantage: proximity to copyright limitations
 - Disadvantage: some preparatory activities have to be allowed, dual use problem

- Regulatory options to reconcile DRM with © limitations:
 - Direct influence on the technological design
 - Indirect regulation / "right to hack"
 - Indirect regulation / "key escrow system"
 - Advantage: preparatory activities can remain forbidden
 - Disadvantage: centralization, chilling effects

- Regulatory options to reconcile DRM with © limitations:
 - Direct influence on the technological design
 - Indirect regulation / "right to hack"
 - Indirect regulation / "key escrow system"
 - Removing market failures
 - Advantage: curing the underlying problem
 - Disadvantage: does it work?
 - Examples: § 95d German Copyright Act, Art. 166b Slovenian Copyright Act

- Regulatory options to reconcile DRM with © limitations:
 - Direct influence on the technological design
 - Not: Indirect regulation / "right to hack"
 - Indirect regulation / "key escrow system"
 - Removing market failures
- Limitations of Art. 6 (4) Copyright Directive
 - Priority of private ordering
 - Does not apply to all copyright limitations
 - Depends on the business model

Featu	re No Action	Influen cing technol ogy	ADR	Admi- nistration	Court	Right to hack (delay)	
Country		- 37					
Austria	^						
Beigium					I, G		
Denmark						Х	
Germany					I, G		
Greece							
Ireland					I		
Italy		Х	I		I		
Latvia			I.		l I		
Lithuania			- I		I		
Luxemburg					I, G		
Malta							
Netherlands				Х			
Norway (EEA)				Х		Х	
Slovak Republic	Х				I = individual G = interest group		
Slovenia							
United Kingdom				I, G			

- Proprietary versus open DRM systems
- U.S.:
 - Apple iTunes v. RealNetworks
 - Microsoft consent decree
 - Microsoft Zune
 - Davidson & Associates (bnetd) v. Internet Gateways (8th Cir. 2005)

- Proprietary versus open DRM systems
- U.S.
- Europe:
 - Art. 6 Software Directive
 - What is a computer program?
 - What about code obfuscation?
 - Microsoft proceedings

- Proprietary versus open DRM systems
- U.S.
- Europe
- France: Copyright Act as of August 2006:
 - Regulatory authority
 - Will mediate interoperability requests
 - Has power to impose fines up to 5% of the global turnover
 - But: DRM providers can escape interoperability requests if
 - All copyright holders have agreed to the proprietary format
 - Security risks exist









- Examples
 - Symmetric rights expression languages (RELs) and rights messaging protocols (RMPs)
 - Authorized domain architectures
 - Privacy-preserving DRM
 - DRM interoperability
 - Example: DReAM and OpenMediaCommons by Sun Microsystems

1. Anti-circumvention 2. Interoperability 3. Value-centered Design 4. Emerging Problems 5. Conclusion

DRM and the GPLv3

- No protection of GPL'd software by DRM systems
 - "No permission is given for modes of conveying that deny users that run covered works the full exercise of the legal rights granted by this License."
- Duty to disclose keys
 - "[The duty to convey the source code of GPL'd software] also includes any encryption or authorization keys necessary to install and/or execute modified versions from source code [...] [t]he fact that a key is generated based on the object code of the work or is present in hardware that limits its use does not alter the requirement to include it in the Corresponding Source."
 - What about legitimate security concerns (e.g. making sure that only a particular version of a software program can be executed on a particular hardware?)
- \rightarrow Hard to distinguish between copyright, security, and competition





- DRM and the GPLv3
- DRM and standardization
- DRM and levies
- Mandatory use of DRM systems
 - "No-mandate" clauses both in the DMCA and the European Copyright Directive, but
 - U.S.:
 - DAT: 17 U.S.C. § 1002 (a)
 - Analog consumer video equipment: 17 U.S.C. § 1201 (k)
 - Broadcast flag failed
 - Europe:
 - Pay TV: common scrambling algorithm (Universal Service Directive), but for competition policy reasons
 - DVB?



Stefan Bechtold

stef@n-bechtold.com www.bechtold.name