



Beyond the Book[®]



On Thursday, May 28, 2009, Copyright Clearance Center CEO **Tracey Armstrong** kicked off the all-day [“Big Ideas”](#) Conference for BookExpo America 2009 at New York City’s Jacob K. Javits Center.

Speaking on “Content Licensing & The Bottom Line: Up the Down Spreadsheet” with **Ned May**, Outsell Inc. Lead Analyst, Armstrong examined why managing rights and content with the highest-possible efficiency and customer value remains a challenge for leading players and independents alike.

The release of this podcast marks the 100th installment in the **Beyond The Book** series, underwritten by CCC, which explores all aspects of issues facing the information content industry. Since September 2006, podcasts have featured interviews with innovative CEOs, best-selling authors, and leading analysts in publishing and technology



KENNEALLY: Well, good morning. On behalf of Copyright Clearance Center and Book Expo America, I want to welcome you to the very first program at today’s Big Ideas Conference. My name is Chris Kenneally. I’m the director of author relations for Copyright Clearance Center and also producer for a podcast series we call *Beyond the Book*, and I want to let you know that today’s program will be available later this morning as a podcast in that series, so look for that if you would and share that with your colleagues.

But very happy to welcome you here and want to introduce the panelists today. Joining us is Ned May, who is director and lead analyst for Outsell Incorporated. Welcome, Ned.

MAY: Thank you, Chris.

KENNEALLY: He will be interviewing Tracey Armstrong, who is the chief executive officer for Copyright Clearance Center. Tracey, nice to see you.

ARMSTRONG: Good morning.



KENNEALLY: And I'll just turn it right over to Ned. We hope you enjoy the program and there will be opportunity for a couple of questions at the end. So thank you for joining us again. Ned.

MAY: And I thank you as well.

In the setup to this, I was meeting with Chris and he asked me if I could set it up in a way to really explain why are we here. And when he asked that question, I have to put in the story of an aside because that brought me back to earlier that morning, because it's the same question I'd heard from my kindergarten son.

KENNEALLY: So, Ned, tell us again. You were –

MAY: I'll just do it this way if I could. So taking it back a bit. When Chris first approached me on this panel and he was setting it up, he asked me to set it up by presenting the notion of why are we here, why are we in this room. But when he mentioned that to me, it took me back to earlier that morning when I was with my kindergarten son who was asking that same question of why we are here.

And for those of you that have had kids that age, it's a question you're quite familiar with, both them asking you that and also probably you asking yourself that, because often, I find myself explaining things to them and I get to a point where I don't realize where I've gone or why I'm going there and I'm thinking to myself, why am I here?

And as it happened that morning – and I have a kindergarten son and I also have a newborn son, so my wife has been pregnant throughout the school year. We're kind of a modern family where we fully disclose everything to our children, including the nature around the birth. And I was thinking to myself that morning, why couldn't I have just stuck with the story of the stork, because it would have been a lot simpler. It would have been a lot cleaner and I didn't know why I was there.

And that brought me back to Chris because I was thinking it's a similar situation we all face in the industry today, which is the genie is out of the bottle. We have entered into a new phase, a new kind of paradigm in publishing. It would be nicer if we weren't. It would be simpler if we weren't, but we have. It's really about the open access to information on the Web and trying to control that.

And I think two things have brought us to that point. It's one, something that's been ongoing for a while, which is the digitization of content, the uploading of



content, the notion that content can be free if ad-supported, that whole ecosystem around Web search and Google and online information.

But also, more recently, a second trend, which is the technology advancements, really the form, factors and devices like the Kindle, like the iPhone that are really starting to challenge the notion of what a book is. It's really the first time in the history of the book that that notion has been seriously challenged.

So if you couple those two things, it creates that question, and a question that I'd probably rather go back and talk to my 5-year-old about the meaning of life.

So with that, I hope that that kind of sets up why we're here and why we're talking about rights management and content licensing today. Because the big idea is that – for me, the big idea is not that we can't move forward but that we have let the genie out of the bottle, that this new form of accessing content and paying for content or distributing content is out there.

But there's a notion around that once the genie is out of the bottle, you can't put it back in, and I would like to challenge that a little bit. It's very exciting when the genie's out of the bottle, certainly the times we talk about. But the reason that's news is because most of the time, the genie is back in the bottle and just sitting there.

So it's a long way to set up why we're here and why I would like to ask some questions of Tracey, because I think she has a lot of expertise to bring to the table, the CEO of a rights management organization with roots in the pre-Web days of copy shops and Xerox machines. So this is an organization that has seen this before and has helped us navigate through this before.

So Tracey, I'd like you to just add a little more to that as far as the origins of CCC.

ARMSTRONG: Sure. How's the sound for everyone?

F: Good.

ARMSTRONG: Great. CCC actually started, opened for business in January of 1978 and the purpose behind that timing was to open when the Copyright Act of 1976 took effect. When the law was being rewritten, there were users – commercial publishers and authors – who got together and said, at the suggestion of Congress, and said, we'll demonstrate how the market can bring a solution to the table here in terms of brokering and exchanging rights.



And at that time, the cannibalization risk that was on the table for rights owners – authors, commercial publishers – was largely the photocopy machine. So there was a lot of fear and uncertainty around how this new technology was going to impact the sale of books.

MAY: And I'd just like to point out – kind of bring us back to that time. It's a time I was quite young at. But in researching it, you realize that Xerox and the power that Xerox had in the market at that time was immense. It owned the rights to copyright – or to photocopy. It had 100 percent of the market share. It was growing extremely rapidly. It dominated the market. It was the gorilla in the room. And as a kind of byproduct, it was disrupting industries that had built up on different models.

And I think that's interesting because the parallels to Google today are fairly significant. It may seem like it's an order of magnitude change larger, but I think disruptive change always seems that way. It needs to be.

So at the time, what Xerox brought was very similar to what the open Web and Google or Googling brought.

ARMSTRONG: Well, I think what we're seeing now and what we saw then is all boats rise with the tide. So when we – with the Internet and with online information, we think, well, what's really going to happen? And what we end up having is more information and the insatiable need – all of us, knowledge workers, students, young and old consuming more and more and more information.

And now we're getting out into quite esoteric material as well as more and more material is digitized, which of course has been a huge subject of discussion in the industry of late. But that is bringing together new collections of material and I think we're realizing that there are new ways to monetize that material, and that's in primary sale and in licensing, and I think that's very important.

It was what CCC was founded on in the late '70s, how can we capture the value of this activity. And that's the same thing that we're dealing with now.

MAY: And when we were talking earlier about that, you mentioned it's really about creating a market solution for that. I don't know if you could expand on that and some of the ways that CCC does that today or did that at that time. How do you figure out that roadmap?



Beyond the Book[®]



ARMSTRONG: Sure. Well, just to start with the basics, CCC is basically a broker and what we do is organize the – as an agent or a broker – organize the rights for rights owners and then vend them into the market to users. Predominantly, CCC is selling licenses into the corporate market and the academic market. The majority of the licensing activity is in the corporate market, and that has been true since the early '80s for CCC.

The vehicles, the licensing vehicles – really, what CCC is based on is, let's remove the obstacles, the roadblocks. Anyone in this room who's tried to reuse something – you've tried to reuse a video clip maybe for a presentation you're giving. You've tried to reuse an image or a chapter or some sort of a portion of a literary work. Getting the rights to reuse that is a heavy lift in some cases. You're out there calling, trying to find out who do I call. When you reach that person, if you reach a person, then you're negotiating the terms of that.

CCC is trying to simplify that process for users on a regular basis, so building licensing tools. For example, in the corporate market, we have a subscription-style product that we sell to corporations. They're paying for access to the collection of rights for a year for a certain set of materials, and they can reuse those in their R&D or other activities within the corporation for that period and they know they're covered.

Another example of how CCC is licensing today, we have a pretty sophisticated portfolio of tools. One of them is an online application that is affixed to digital content. For example, this particular tool is affixed to e-books, in the case of Elsevier, for example, about 8,000 e-books to date. And the online user can invoke this application and get rights to reuse those materials that are digitally available in the e-book content.

So it's a wide range.

MAY: And all of those solutions bring to mind the notion of how you protect the rights. Do you lock it down through a DRM system or do you use more of an open trust-based environment?

ARMSTRONG: Yeah. I like to call CCC the honor system. We don't have a DRM wrapper around the content that's out there. We're working with the content owner and their system. That's very, very important. I think CCC's models need to be flexible for our clients. It's not about what CCC wants. It's about what makes it easy for the user to pay the royalties needed – in the case where royalties are needed – to the rights owners, and how is the rights owner organizing their content? What does the rights holder want to convey?



Do they want to offer translation rights, for example? Do they want to offer permission to put something in a course pack? Do they want to offer any kind of republication rights for another rights owner for them to create new works? These are types of licensing that CCC does today.

And you know, Ned, the more I talk to – I’ve been CEO at CCC now two years in July. I’ve actually been there for about 19 years, so ask me about washing the windows. I can tell you how dirty they were 19 years ago.

The organization, I think – it may be a little bold to say – is not well understood by the industry, and in this just two short years that I’ve been in this role, I’ve been out talking to people and trying to build relationships, and it’s surprising to me how many times I’ll say something and someone will say, you do that? We license images, for example, and those are things that I don’t think are well-understood. Licensing is really complex.

MAY: And there’s a lot of threads there I’d like to explore, but one, I must confess, I follow CCC as a company and I’m regularly surprised by the things that you do. I’d like to explore on one side of that the range of services you provide publishers and authors as far as getting their rights to an enterprise or transferring them.

ARMSTRONG: Well, we do have a series of – a portfolio of licensing products, again, in the different market spaces, and everything that CCC does with rights owners is nonexclusive. We do license around the world. So in corporate, for example, we’re licensing corporate employees in 180 countries around the world.

And we actually have – CCC helped to found a network of collective management organizations, which is really what we are, a collective management organization. In the early ’80s – actually 25 years ago – we helped to found this network of these CMOs and we have bilateral agreements with them. And that’s a very significant portion of royalties that are coming in for U.S. rights owners.

For example, last year, CCC paid \$134 million in royalties to rights owners, and of that, \$30 million were from these international agreements. That’s a 25 percent increase year over year. And in the publishing industry, a 25 percent increase is a pretty respectable increase right now.

MAY: That’s also a respectable number, and now that it’s on the table, I’m going to take us in a slightly different direction, which is – I noticed that yesterday, the \$134 million paid out to rights holders for last year alone, and on another page of paper



next to me, I had the Google book settlement, which was a \$125 – or it's currently, I believe, \$125 million settlement.

And it struck me that CCC in one year alone paid out more to rights holders than that settlement is paying for basically access to the rights of those books in perpetuity. And you have to subtract what's going to the registry, what's going to the lawyers, and I believe it's about \$45 million or \$35 to \$40 million is actually going to the rights holders, or \$60 a book.

So I think that \$134 million needs to be highlighted in this discussion as we look for solutions to this problem that we face today.

ARMSTRONG: Well, of the \$134 million, what we do at CCC is we basically task every employee at CCC and they all have an annual goal to increase the royalties that are paid out on a year-over-year basis. Does that mean we're exclusively working for rights owners? No. It actually – it really speaks to the intermediary role that CCC plays that we're brokering between the users and the rights holders.

So on this point, you brought the registry up and I recently participated at a session, a meeting, at Columbia, a symposium-type format where they were discussing the settlement, which I am not an expert on. It's an extremely complicated model.

But there was a lot of discussion about the registry. CCC really supports the AAP, the Authors Guild, in their effort to draw the line and say Google needs to ask permission. And that was a – good for them. We highly support their activities and Google is now going to have to ask permission, and that's a great thing.

As far as the –

MAY: Can I interrupt for one second?

ARMSTRONG: Sure.

MAY: Around that. Because I was watching a podcast or a blog or some sort of online video and it was the woman in charge of copyright for the U.S. at the Library of Congress, and she was mentioning that Google had approached the Library of Congress first to ask for permission to scan all those books. And I think it's an important point because the notion is that Google is asking for forgiveness here rather than permission first.



Well, they did actually ask for permission first, were turned down, and then they went to the major university libraries to ask for permission. That's where they got it. So I just want to throw that in there.

And not to bash Google. I think Google is doing wonderful things. I think it goes back to my earlier point. It's about Googling, the verb, and what's happening online rather than any particular company.

ARMSTRONG: True. Yeah, it is true and what Google is doing in terms of making content available. Again, all boats rise with the tide. We're seeing more and more usage and that's actually good for all of us to be able to find these works that were in some dark corner somewhere and not widely available. That's a great thing, too.

When they did ask permission at the university, they weren't asking the rights owner, so I think that's a little bit of a difference. And the rights owner probably deserves a vote in that and I think demanded one through the process that we've just seen go through.

I think we may see some institutions in the U.S. start granting degrees. In the settlement, if you've tried to read it, it's pretty complicated so we might see actually some bachelors or maybe graduate degrees coming out in that.

The point, if I could just finish that point I was trying to make about the registry, one of the things that really comes up in discussion a lot is the database. What does CCC organize in terms of licensing, rights, all of these complex things?

My point in the broker role is it's more than a database, really. We're really helping to form markets. If CCC didn't exist, where would this money be that we're helping to organize? Who would be organizing the corporate user and brokering that license? That's, I think, a really important question.

And what are the benefits? The benefits on the user side are quite significant. To be able to have a portfolio, a broad portfolio of millions and millions and millions of rights that you can draw from one source. And that we hear over and over and over again from our users.

As a matter of fact, I have had major publishers say to me, why, why would the user buy this license? They're buying this content from us, they're buying – they have subscriptions, they buy this, they buy that, whatever it is. And the user says, simplicity. I need – I don't want to have to think about it. I need it built into my workflow. I want it to be transparent and easy to access. I have 50,000, 20,000,



90,000 employees around the world and I need to be able to give a worldwide policy to my employees, here's how to use this material.

MAY: And we've done a lot of research around that and it always indicates that enterprises don't want to violate copyright. It's just so complicated for them not to that they end up doing it. So I think it speaks to the solutions you offer. The violations of copyright, the sharing of information within work groups is done because there's just no easy way to enable it or they haven't come across that easy way to enable it today.

Going back to the Google book settlement for a bit, I think that during that event or the meeting you were mentioning at Columbia, I was looking at that. And someone brought up the notion of show me the money, that it's really about is there money in it for authors and publishers in a settlement that is granting a broad bit of rights to Google to serve this content primarily in an ad-supported way.

And I brought that up, but do you think that the ad-supported, open, free system is the way to go for content today, or is the licensing model here to stay and we need to build it out more?

ARMSTRONG: I think the licensing model net-net really complements what rights owners, authors, commercial publishers are doing today. I really think it is complementary. And what I just said from the user perspective I think really enhances that.

We actually sell an academic license which is very similar now in model just launched in 2007, a very similar model to our corporate license, so it's a subscription. And I think as anyone knows if you have college-age students, they're beyond e-mail. They're on to text message and I think IM is even getting a little sleepy. Everyone's using all these different devices now and different methods of communicating, Twitter, Facebook, etc.

The content movement is going in the same direction. And what CCC is finding and what we're hearing from our academic clients is, we're spending millions of dollars on content every year at this campus. We want to maximize the use of that content.

CCC's licenses, by the way, do not – the prohibit the user from using the license to substitute primary sale. So the primary sale still continues and the license is coming in and complementing that. Think about it as an accelerator. You get the content in your corporation or on your campus. Now, you want to be able to – as



Beyond the Book®



a faculty member. You and I are both faculty members. I want to e-mail you this article because we're working on a project together. Or we're colleagues at a major corporation, probably not even at the same location. I want to post it in some shared space that we're working on together, a shared online workroom that we're using, in some tool that our corporation has bought and probably imposed on us.

Those are normal things that happen every single day and what the license does is enables that sort of usage on top of the primary sale. So it's really an accelerator that helps to maximize the value of the content that the user has bought, and what that does is keeps them coming back and buying more.

MAY: It all sounds pretty complicated. You've touched on the database and that it's more than a database, but with all the different possible interactions, how do you manage that at CCC? What does that database or that interaction look like? How many different flavors do you have?

ARMSTRONG: A lot. As a matter of fact, one of the things that we've really been working on from a rights owner perspective is increasing transparency for our clients on the rights owner side into that complexity and we now have an online portal just like your retirement account where you can log on to your Fidelity or Schwab or wherever you're going and looking at your portfolio. We have that same sort of thing from a rights owner perspective.

Just to give you an example. I talked about that application that's on those e-books at Elsevier. They're also on O'Reilly Books. That same application on just an enormous amount of content today. There are over 150 different slices – and that is a growing number every week – of different types of permissions that individual rights owners want to grant. Some want to do just one type, one flavor. Some want to do a multitude of flavors.

It also includes reprint services and print on demand services. So there's a lot built in there in that functionality and it's highly customized. So it's more than the database.

And just in the database – sorry to be so long winded. But just in the database, we have things – just to give you one example.

We have things at CCC – where we speak our own language – called bi-active rights. When I started there back in window washing days, the bi-active rights were what we – that jargon referred to was something where we would have a different owner over time, so in the '80s we might have had one owner and then



in the '90s another owner, or from '82 to '93 and '93 to blah, blah, blah. Or the same owner over time but different terms, different royalty fees, different conditions of use.

Now, we have jettisoned way past bi-active, which basically indicated two, into multi-active. We have all kinds of different slices on one individual right, including reversions, all kinds of complexity. So that's all managed in this system.

But if it's just static in a system, it's not much help to anybody. What we're doing is organizing that and going out and putting that into these interactive licensing tools, which our users can work with.

MAY: Sounds a bit like a registry, the rights registry, to have all of those active rights. So what are your thoughts around the settlement and the proposed books rights registry? Is that a solution that the market needs? Is it a good solution? The right solution?

ARMSTRONG: Well, we totally support the formation of the registry and have offered our help to the leaders who are involved in the development of the registry, and having, again, been at this now for a couple decades personally and then three decades as CCC, we know what kind of a heavy lift this is to organize this information, and I think we can provide services to help make this efficient for authors and publishers and Google to make it efficient for everybody involved.

MAY: I get the notion registries are important, that it's a critical step in the solution to solving the rights issues.

ARMSTRONG: There are a lot of parallels, more parallels than not between how the settlement outlines the registry and CCC today.

MAY: Excellent. I don't know if we're opening it up for questions or –

KENNEALLY: We can certainly do that. I think we've established some things that are pretty critical about the whole licensing conundrum, which is the complexity of it, the idea that the management over time is as critical as establishing the right and the registry in the first place.

I know a lot of people here come from a variety of different types of publishers, from small to large and from e-book to print, so if anyone does have a question or two for either of our participants, I'd be happy to take them.



MAY: And while you're working on that, I'll just throw out a couple of other observations I've made.

One was, I picked up the addendum to the event, or what is it? Yes. The Book Expo America addendum, and I noticed that Amazon Kindle has got a booth and the last sentence describing their booth is that the Kindle's vision is to have every book ever printed in any language all available in under 60 seconds. So.

KENNEALLY: That's quite a task I'm sure they're putting to themselves, yeah. Absolutely.

And I guess I have a question, and that perhaps is for you both. The environment that we're living in publishing-wise is really challenging copyright and there's a question about the future of copyright. You investigate this from your work, Ned. Perhaps you have some thoughts about are we going to see a narrowing of copyright or an expansion in terms of what it can perform? And then Tracey, maybe you have some thoughts as well.

MAY: That's a great question. Is it broken?

I think regardless of what side you are on that answer, you come back to the same conclusion that it needs some work today. So, yes, it's broken. We should throw it and start again. No, it's not broken. We just need to tweak it. You come back to the middle ground that there is some work that needs to be done.

I think there's a notion that copyright – the survey work that we do shows that people want to be copyright compliant, but it's just too difficult or too expensive for them to do so. So I think that the work that CCC and others does as far as enabling compliance, educating, is some of what's needed in fixing copyright.

ARMSTRONG: I think regardless of how the legislature handles kind of the legislative solutions to copyright, I think licensing will persist. Even in – we've been talking a little bit about the settlement here. That's a license. The agreement is a license.

And I think that we'll see more and more licensing activities. And actually, I think publishers and authors are starting to see licensing revenue – what we used to call secondary use revenue – now getting a little bit closer to primary use, and it's becoming more strategic and core in how they're reviewing their revenue streams. And I think that will just naturally bring a shift over time.

Another thing, having been at this, and I'm sure there are several copyright experts in the room. Copyright doesn't make great cocktail party conversation.



Beyond the Book®



What do you do? I do intellectual property licensing. I work in copyright. Everybody kind of says, oh, are you a lawyer? And after you say no, they say, OK. Want a drink? Let's hit the bar? It's not great.

If I told you that in order for CCC to sell licenses effectively we had to educate everybody on copyright, you wouldn't believe me. I wouldn't believe myself. It's not going to happen. We do an enormous amount of education and we have educational programs that are well-attended and actually we have just an increasing demand. It's ridiculous the demand. I think we grew 40 percent in education last year. It's just a very strong demand for education.

But we also have to create methods of access. We need to help these users understand that it's built in. They don't have to have a law degree to determine do I need permission or what are the four factors of fair use. Who's had that come up in small talk socially? Oh, what's that fourth factor? That's really out there in the margins. Although when we're in it, it's everything.

So what licensing can help to do is build this in so that digital material can be available on the Internet, digitized out-of-print books. And what do users want to do? Use it. And what do authors want? More readers. And what do publishers want? More sales. So all boats rise with the tide.

So how can licensing really be built in and integrated and become more core there? And I think as this industry transitions, that will be more and more of a central question. It's a pretty hot space to be right now.

MAY: And I think the key point there is that they need to be market-driven solutions, too. They can't be created to say this is how someone needs to comply, but it needs to work with the user. This is how they're using information and how they can comply easily and seamlessly.

ARMSTRONG: Absolutely. Think about any online transaction you do today. When you get to the place where they say, OK, now before you can buy this, you need to create an account. How many people just say, skip this and check out? You don't want speed bumps.

KENNEALLY: Right. That little drop shopping cart thing, we don't want that happening with books or with rights.

We do have a question, actually, from – can you tell us who you are?



Beyond the Book®



STRUBLE: My name's Robert Struble. I'm the CEO of a company called Anywhere Radio. Since we're talking about the Kindle and I'll bring it to Kindle 2, let's talk about the scenario of the user buying an e-book to listen to on their Kindle 2. In other words, I pay for the right to download the book to my device, but it's recently been discovered that to listen to the text-to-speech function is considered a violation of the copyright.

I was wondering if you could maybe elaborate a little bit upon the nuance there because the user just wants the content he paid for and they don't understand what's the difference between you reading it off the screen or listening to it with headphones off the device. How is that –

KENNEALLY: Ned, did you follow that particular issue? I know that Amazon did do a switcheroo once – it was the Authors Guild, in fact, that objected to that, that's right.

ARMSTRONG: I can probably help a little bit there and say this isn't over yet, I think. There was actually – I was e-mailing somebody from the Copyright Office yesterday setting a meeting up for the week after next, and there's a big WIPO meeting. The World Intellectual Property Organization is meeting this week in Geneva and they're talking about actually visually impaired related issues, which of course, there was some debate about when this piece came out. Very controversial, I think.

I would go on – I'm not an expert on music and you probably much more so are than I, but I would go down the same road with music where we buy the CD and so can I put that content on my iPod or not? Can I upload it to my computer? I paid for the CD. What can I do with that music? And those very, very fine, fine layers of the onion, if you will, that's evolving. That's not all done either.

STRUBLE: Could it perhaps be because they are a trade that text-to-speech function starts to threaten to –

ARMSTRONG: Audio book.

STRUBLE: - the book itself (inaudible) professional talent (inaudible)?

ARMSTRONG: Yeah, the audio book. And also I think it's who's getting paid for what.

KENNEALLY: Absolutely, and if I can just sort of cap that question, I think there's all the negotiations involved, and again, that was the point that Tracey was making. I know that when the Kindle 2 came out, there was talk about Jeff Bezos was



going to save newspapers along with everything else because he was licensing some newspapers.

But many of the newspapers really found the terms that he was proposing really restrictive, and in fact, they've chosen not to make their work available on the Kindle 2 just because it's too onerous for them.

So negotiation really is critical. I would imagine negotiation is going to be part of the solution to that problem, and it will be throughout the coming years. So negotiation is really, I think, the key point there.

Do we have one more question at all from the audience? Yes, sir?

M: My name is (inaudible). I'm an independent author. I've been writing about urban America for the last several years and so I was wondering how could I make that, my writing, available to the many urban think tanks and urban institutes. There are quite a few of those. Barack Obama, President Barack Obama opened up an urban policy place, the center (inaudible) Action First actually did this (inaudible) and reading about it. How do I use (inaudible) like a CCC as an independent author to make that content available?

KENNEALLY: I think we –

ARMSTRONG: That's a great question. You want to take it? I can.

KENNEALLY: Well, I'm the director of author relations and I can just take that for you, but if you want to try first.

ARMSTRONG: Well, I was just going to say, Chris, and then you can elaborate on is that we actually have several services for individuals, authors, creators and small publishers as well.

One of our newest services is something called Ozmo. Ozmo is an online tag that you can place on your content to – and you set the rules for how you want it to be reused. It's really a viral-type system. It's actually built on the Creative Commons Plus platform so it actually complements any Creative Commons licenses that you may have on your content as well.

So I think that would be a very interesting thing, and I could talk to you offline, as could Chris, about the details of that.



KENNEALLY: Right. And I think, actually, that raises a good point, Tracey, and maybe we'll leave it at that, which is that one of the places we didn't talk about was Creative Commons and that has also added to the discussion, their work, in terms of opening up copyright and their whole new view of copyright. So if you aren't familiar with Creative Commons, it's worth taking a look at what they are trying to do as well.

ARMSTRONG: And just as a business model, Chris, Creative Commons is a license.

KENNEALLY: Absolutely.

ARMSTRONG: So when we talk about licensing – I was talking with a board member from Creative Commons a couple of years ago now, and they were estimating about 200 million link-backs on their – he was, individually – on the Creative Commons licenses. I'm sure that's grown exponentially by now. And that's what they are. They are licenses.

KENNEALLY: I think the point is that there's as many flavors of copyright these days as there are –

ARMSTRONG: That's right. Lots of choices.

KENNEALLY: - choices in terms of forms and so forth.

I want to thank Ned May, who is the director and lead analyst of Outsell for joining us today. Thank you very much, Ned. Appreciate your doing this.

(applause)

KENNEALLY: Thank as well Tracey Armstrong, chief executive officer for Copyright Clearance Center. Thank you, Tracey.

ARMSTRONG: Thank you very much.

(applause)

KENNEALLY: And thank everybody in the audience for joining us. My name is Chris Kenneally. Do look for us on beyondthebook.com for this podcast and many others in the series. And enjoy your Book Expo.

END OF PODCAST