

(Translation)
Notes of the 6th Working Group Meeting
on “Development of Non-statutory Guidelines
for Copying and Distribution of Works in an Electronic Environment
by Not-for-profit Educational Establishments”

Held on Friday 27 June 2003

at the Intellectual Property Department
Room 2501, 25th Floor, Wu Chung House,
213 Queen’s Road East,
Wanchai, Hong Kong

Present : Representative of The Open University of Hong Kong (OUHK)

Representative of Hong Kong Teacher-Librarians Association (HKTLA)

Representative of Hong Kong Subsidized Secondary Schools Council (HKSSSC)

Representative of Hong Kong Subsidized Primary Schools Council (HKSPSC)

Representative of Hong Kong Professional Teachers’ Union (HKPTU)

Representative of Task Force on Reprographic Rights Licensing established under Heads of Universities Committee (HUCOM)

Representative of The Hong Kong Association for Computer Education (HKACE)

Representative of Hong Kong Reprographic Rights Licensing Society (HKRRLS)

Representative of Hong Kong Library Association (HKLA)

Representative of Hong Kong Publishing Federation Limited (HKPFL)

Representative of Hong Kong Educational Publishers
Association (HKEPA)

Representative of The Anglo-Chinese Textbook Publishers
Organisation (ACTPO)

Representative of Motion Picture Association (MPA)

Representative of Business Software Alliance (BSA)

Representative of Composers and Authors Society of Hong
Kong Limited (CASH)

Representative of Music Publisher Association

Representative of Hong Kong Education City Limited (HKECL)

Ms. Rosanna YU
Commerce, Industry and Technology Bureau (CITB)

Ms. Mimi LEE
Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB)

Mr. Simon IP
Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB)

Mr. Stephen SELBY (Convenor)
Intellectual Property Department

Ms. Brenda WAN (Secretary)
Intellectual Property Department

Absent with apologies: Representative of Grant Schools Council (GSC)

Representative of Union of Government Primary
School Headmasters and Headmistresses

Representative of Hong Kong Copyright Licensing
Association (HKCLA)

*[In attendance for meetings of the Working Group
only]*

Representative of Joint University Librarians
Advisory Committee (JULAC)

Representative of The Hong Kong Academy for
Performing Arts (HKAPA)

Representative of Television Broadcasts Limited
(TVB)

Representative of Hong Kong Cable Television
Limited (HKCTV)

Representative of AOL Time Warner

Representative of International Federation of the
Phonographic Industry (IFPI) (Hong Kong Group)
Limited

Representative of Motion Picture Industry
Association Limited (MPIA)

The meeting commenced at 3:10 p.m.

1. Mr. SELBY welcomed the Working Group members.
2. Mr. SELBY said that earlier on he had a meeting with Mr. Ricky FUNG of IFPI (Hong Kong Group) Limited and Mr. Woody TSUNG of MPIA. They indicated that they would not be able to attend this meeting. Mr. Ricky FUNG wrote to Mr. SELBY and indicated that through participation in the discussions, he understood the need of the education sector in using sound recordings/audio-visual recordings and films. The industry was working out the idea of a blanket licence and hoped that the Guidelines would state clearly that teachers should not use pirated sound recordings/audio-visual recordings on the internet. The industry hoped that the Guidelines would not affect the legitimate interests of copyright owners.

Agenda Item I

3. The representative of HKACE proposed the following amendments to the Chinese version of the draft notes of the 5th meeting -

(a) Paragraph 17

The original version of “他認為，為「內聯網」一詞下定義時，不應有太多技術上的考慮” should be amended as “他又認為，為內聯網一詞下定義時，不應有太多技術上防止他人使用或複製的要求。”.

In the original version, the following sentence “已有現行法律去規管，不應追求各種技術防止再複製，才讓該複製品面世。” should be added as the last sentence.

(b) Paragraph 28

The original version of “中大的「校網」(school net)” should be amended as “中大的「香港學校網絡」(“Hong Kong School Net”)”.

(c) Paragraph 42

The original version of “他提及上次指引在「即興」的情況下...” should be amended as “他提及上次指引只容許在「即興」的情況下...”.

(d) Paragraph 61

The original version of “制訂 xml 格式只是技術問題...” should be amended as “以電腦軟件貯存記錄只是技術問題...”.

(e) Paragraph 92

The original version of “如果貯存在檔案是超越備份(backup)的目的而進行的，則複製及透過互聯網將之分發於公眾，便構成侵權” should be amended as “如果貯存檔案是超越備份(backup)的目的而進行，例如複製或透過互聯網將之分發於公眾，便構成侵權”.

(f) Paragraph 97

The original version of “...香港出版總會有限公司代表提及的情況都會存在” should be amended as “...香港出版總會有限公司代表提及的情況都有可能發生，問題並非由指引而導致”.

4. The representative of HKSPSC proposed the following amendments to the Chinese version of the draft notes of the 5th meeting -

Paragraph 62

The original version of “上述「記錄制度」就如影印的記錄” should be amended as “現時已有文本影印的記錄制度”.

5. Members of the Working Group accepted the above proposed amendments. The notes of the 5th meeting (Chinese version) were confirmed.
6. Mr. SELBY requested that further amendments, if any, be sent to the Secretariat by 5 p.m. on the following Thursday (3rd July). The English translation of the notes of the 5th meeting would be prepared by the Secretariat in due course for members' perusal.
7. The representative of HKACE suggested that the Secretariat could compile the amendments for members' reference before the meeting.
8. Mr. SELBY said that the amended notes would be presented in mark-up version.

Agenda Item II

9. The notes of the 4th meeting (English version) were confirmed.

Agenda Item III

10. Mr. SELBY pointed out that the conversion of films or sound recordings/audio-visual recordings into digital format for uploading onto the internet was not within the permitted scope of the Copyright Ordinance. He hoped that the education sector could reach a consensus

on the request so that copyright owners could consider actively the coverage of the licensing mechanism.

11. Mr. SELBY briefed the participants on a paper (in Chinese and English) tabled at the meeting. The paper, titled “Copying and Distribution of Works in an Electronic Environment by Not-for-profit Educational Establishments”, aimed to summarise the requests of the education sector.
12. Mr. SELBY said that he had misinterpreted section 41 of the Copyright Ordinance and thought that under section 41(2), teachers were allowed to copy films or sound recordings/audio-visual recordings for instruction purposes. In fact, section 41(2) stipulated that such permitted acts were only applicable to the making of films or film sound-tracks for instruction purposes. As such, the provision could be applied to particular educational establishments like the Academy for Performing Arts, but not applicable to acts done for general teaching purposes.
13. Mr. SELBY briefed the participants on section 44 of the Copyright Ordinance concerning the recording of broadcasts and cable programmes by educational establishments. He pointed out that under the law, teachers were not allowed to copy film clips with duration of 15 seconds from DVD or VCD and embed them in the PowerPoint presentation. Nevertheless, video or sound recording during broadcast was permitted. If teachers wanted to copy films such as Harry Potter or Lord of the Rings in the PowerPoint presentation, they had to do so when the films were broadcast on television. Otherwise, they had to obtain prior permission from the copyright owners.
14. Mr. SELBY apologised for giving a misleading explanation of section 41(2) of the Copyright Ordinance earlier.
15. Mr. SELBY informed the participants that section 41(2) as mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the paper on “Copying and Distribution of Works in an Electronic Environment by Not-for-profit Educational Establishments” should be amended as section 44.
16. Mr. SELBY asked the participants to note whether the paper could fully reflect the education sector’s requests to the copyright owners. He pointed out that as discussed in the meeting, the works that had to be

used by the education sector included literary and dramatic works, music works in the form of sheet music, artistic works, films, sound recordings and wireless or cable broadcasting works. Computer software was not included.

17. Mr. SELBY opined that the part on textbooks might be controversial. He asked the participants if it was necessary to include other kinds of books (non-textbooks).
18. Mr. SELBY asked the participants whether it was appropriate to set the ceiling of copying sound and film recordings at 15 seconds in duration. As regards the Digital Rights Management (DRM), he considered that a record should be made after using other people's works, but the information should only be disclosed in discovery procedures.
19. Mr. SELBY sought the participants' views on the paper and asked them to consider if any amendment was required.
20. The representative of HKSPSC considered the phrase "10 to 20 students" in paragraph 5 inappropriate. She said that in a bisessional primary school, there were generally 8 classes in a grade, with 30 to 40 students in each class. There were at least 320 students in one grade. She opined that schools would be unable to operate if the number of students was specified.
21. Mr. SELBY said that as in the previous Guidelines, the current Guidelines should only allow a teacher to print and distribute materials for "spontaneous" use when teaching a course in a classroom.
22. The representative of HKSPSC opined that basically information on the intranet was stored on a school basis and students were using the same intranet, regardless of the number of classes.
23. The representative of HKSSSC suggested that the words "10 to 20 students" be deleted.
24. Mr. SELBY agreed to the suggestion, but indicated that his original intention was to make the scope of the previous Guidelines applicable to the intranet environment. If there was no restriction to the number of users, it would be difficult to assess the response of the copyright owners.

25. The representative of HKACE pointed out that he had participated in the formulation of the previous Guidelines. He gave a brief account on the spirit of the previous Guidelines. It was unreasonable that teachers were required to obtain prior permission for copying under “spontaneous” circumstances. But if teachers had sufficient time to prepare for the copying, it was necessary for them to obtain permission or licence. He said, for example, two teachers could make copies spontaneously for two different classes respectively. However, if they made copies in preparing jointly a set of teaching materials, that would go against the “spontaneity” principle.
26. The representative of HUCOM told the participants that the previous Guidelines did not specify the number of students. In principle, only one copy was distributed to each student taking the course.
27. Mr. SELBY suggested that the current Guidelines should not go beyond the scope of the previous Guidelines.
28. The participants agreed to delete the words “10 to 20 students”.
29. Mr. SELBY proposed that the current Guidelines should follow the spirit of the previous Guidelines and also cover non-textbooks.
30. The representative of HKACE considered that if there was no objection from the copyright owners, the previous Guidelines could be applied in entirety. The most important issue was how to interpret the quantity or percentage of copying after the printed materials were converted into electronic format. If there was restriction on the number of students in the previous Guidelines, the current Guidelines should also allow the same number of students to have access.
31. The representative of HKPFL held that if the copying of graphic printing was applied to the intranet environment, the amount of copying would accumulate. The problem involved was how to assess the storage of information in the network. The greatest concern of the industry was the scatternet (e.g. the network among schools). He said, for example, if there were eight teachers and each copied 5% of a work, then the quantity accumulated would be quite considerable. If 10% of non-textbooks could be copied, the situation would be even worse. Although the Guidelines stipulated that not more than one chapter could

be copied, yet a book might only comprise one chapter. The industry's greatest concern was on what basis was this limit calculated or assessed. The industry was also very worried about possible systematic copying.

32. In response, Mr. SELBY said that consideration could be given to restricting the quantity of copying made in a certain period of time.
33. The representative of HKPFL asked whether the quantity of accumulated copying should be measured on the basis of a network or a course and whether the limit should be 5% for the whole school or 5% for each teacher. In the latter case, if there were 60 teachers in the school, the number of pages copied in aggregate would exceed a whole book.
34. Mr. SELBY said that he believed teachers would not copy the whole book in this way.
35. The representative of HKPFL pointed out that the industry had evidence showing that a primary school had copied a whole book for use as a school textbook. He opined that setting a limit for copying would make the industry rest assured.
36. The representative of HUCOM indicated that the amount of copying permitted in the previous Guidelines was measured on the basis of a course. It was only stipulated that no more than 5% of the number of pages of a textbook might be copied in aggregate for one course.
37. The representative of HKPFL held that it was not necessary to follow fully the previous Guidelines. With respect to printed works, it was easier to measure the quantity of printing on the basis of a course. However, under the scatternet structure, the quantity of accumulated copying would be quite considerable and the consequence would be inconceivable.
38. The representative of HUCOM pointed out that the previous Guidelines also involved the issue of accumulated copying. There should not be undue concern about the intranet environment. He held that as there was access control on the intranet, the information could not be accessed by anybody.
39. The representative of HKPFL pointed out that the industry required

sufficient protection. There were already requests for sufficient firewall safeguards from UK.

40. The representative of HUCOM responded that the primary and secondary schools might not have firewall safeguards in place, but they should have access control measures. If they did not have individual access control measures, they could not meet the requirements of an intranet.
41. The representative of HKPFL said that the industry was concerned that the primary and secondary schools might not have effective access control.
42. Mr. SELBY pointed out that besides passwords for individual students and access control, the intranet should also have privilege access. He asked whether this could be provided in the schools concerned. Some participants said they could do so.
43. The representative of HKACE said that whether privilege access could be provided depended on the extent of the access control. He said that the publishing industry had relatively high requirements in access control, such as requiring a day stamp and auto-delete functions. He doubted whether these could be done with the existing technology. He agreed in principle that access control was necessary but this could not guarantee that hacking would be totally curbed.
44. The representative of HKPFL said that instruction was given on a course basis in the universities, so effective access control could be established. However, an overall instruction mode was adopted in primary schools. It would be a burden for primary schools if they were required to provide a separate set of passwords for each subject. He queried whether it was feasible to adopt an across-the-board approach in dealing with the universities as well as the primary and secondary schools.
45. Mr. SELBY concluded that every student should have a separate password, and privilege access was required for each course (e.g. course materials which students of Class A could gain access to should not be accessible by Class B). He asked what difficulties the education sector had.

46. The representative of HUCOM said that it would be technologically feasible because instruction was given on a course basis in the universities, and on a class basis in the primary schools. The previous Guidelines had set a time limit of 3 working days for spontaneous copying. He considered that the chance of accumulated copying would not be high because it was not very likely that more than one teacher would copy 5% of the total number of pages from different parts of a book at the same time.
47. The representative of HKPFL insisted that there were cases of accumulated copying because the distribution of printed copies was very different in nature from that of digital copies.
48. The representative of HUCOM said that accumulated copying would also happen to printed works because the students could retain the copies.
49. The representative of HKPFL responded that this was different from unlimited access and browsing.
50. The representative of HUCOM emphasised that since every student could have access to only 5% of the data of that class, there was no accumulation of data.
51. The representative of HKPFL responded that the printed media were different from the digital media. The cost of photocopying in the digital media was very low. He pointed out that accumulated copying of the digital media would affect the intellectual property right owners' earnings. If accumulated and stored, the data could even be used to compile a library.
52. Mr. SELBY pointed out that the Guidelines did not aim to allow teachers or students to make copies. At the technological level, the intranet was equivalent to distribution, but it did not mean copying separately.
53. The representative of HKPFL said that the storing of data did not involve distribution. The industry was willing to approve the Guidelines under a controlled scope or regulated environment. The industry was only worried that the Guidelines would become a breeding

ground for systematic copying.

54. Mr. SELBY said that making available copies was regarded as distribution. Technically, storing of data in hard disks for the students' access definitely involved downloading. This was distribution but not issuing of the copy to the third person. Mr. SELBY explained the process by illustration.
55. The representative of HKPFL asked the participants if they would delete all the files every term.
56. Mr. SELBY responded that the question would be considered together with paragraph 12 of the paper and the issue had not yet been finalised.
57. The representative of HKPFL said the industry would find it acceptable if the schools set out clearly only a certain percentage of copies could be stored in the content server.
58. The representative of HUCOM pointed out that only planned copying and compilation of the data as texts for the end-users' use should be regarded as systematic copying. In doing so, schools would have breached the law. The education sector should only ensure that effective access control was in place in secondary and primary schools.
59. The representative of HKPFL further said that this would meet the UK's requirement. However, as the Government was not in support of the Technical Support Service (TSS), the industry was very worried about the situation.
60. Ms. Mimi LEE of EMB clarified that the Government did not stop providing TSS for schools. On the contrary, it would continue to provide schools with funds to give them support in computer technology.
61. Mr. SELBY opined that the situation would be improved if there were Guidelines for teachers to follow.
62. The representative of HKPFL said that the Guidelines were a compromise between the education sector and the intellectual property right owners. The industry simply wanted to narrow down the contentious parts. He asked whether the schools were able to manage a

large number of accounts effectively.

63. The representative of HKSPSC held that as instruction in the secondary schools was given on the basis of a class or a course, it would not be difficult to administer access control. But it was not sure if this could meet the requirement of the publishing industry. He suggested that if schools failed to meet the requirement of access control, they should not enjoy the rights granted under the Guidelines.
64. The representative of HKPFL pointed out that the spirit of the Guidelines was to make the copyright owners rest assured.
65. Mr. SELBY added that the Guidelines were also formulated for the education sector's convenience.
66. The representative of HKACE pointed out that there were provisions stating clearly what permitted acts were. If the publishing industry was still not at ease, the Working Group could draw up certain conditions to prevent systematic copying.
67. Mr. SELBY said that the fundamental spirit of the Copyright Ordinance was that accumulated copying was not allowed. He asked the participants to read carefully paragraphs 6 to 8 of the paper. He said that in order to cater for the needs of the education sector, teachers were allowed to copy a portion of a film in broadcast to the PowerPoint presentation. He also pointed out that under the copyright laws of the UK, distributing materials on the internet was also regarded as cable broadcasting. However, under the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, the act of downloading from the internet was governed in a different way. Thus, teachers were not allowed to download MP3 music recordings pursuant to section 41 of the Copyright Ordinance for education purposes.
68. The representative of HKSSSC enquired how the 15-second limit for copying segments of copyright works was set. He asked whether there were precedent cases to follow or whether the limit was set arbitrarily.
69. Mr. SELBY replied that it was just a preliminary suggestion made by some representatives.
70. The representative of HKSSSC responded that if the limit was set

arbitrarily, the duration of 15 seconds would be too short. He said, for example, the playing of Tchaikovsky's 1812 Overture for just 15 seconds in a history lesson might not achieve the instruction purposes. It would be more appropriate to play the music for 30 seconds.

71. The representative of OUHK also opined that a duration of 15 seconds was not sufficient.
72. Mr. SELBY reminded the participants that teachers could play the album directly in class if they thought that the duration of 15 seconds was insufficient. Moreover, a PowerPoint file containing film clips of 30 seconds in duration would be very large.
73. The representative of HKACE did not think that it was necessary to extend the 15-second limit. He pointed out that only under very special circumstances would a portion of a sound recording/audio-visual recording or film be copied and embedded in the PowerPoint software for further uploading onto the intranet.
74. Mr. SELBY asked the participants whether a duration of 15 seconds was sufficient. The participants said that this was acceptable.
75. Mr. SELBY sought the participants' views on the storage period as mentioned in paragraph 12 of the paper.
76. The representative of HKSPSC said that the length of an academic term could vary in different schools, while an academic year was generally accepted to last for one year.
77. Mr. SELBY responded that the person responsible for the management of the intranet should know the length of the academic term of the school concerned.
78. The representative of HKSPSC was of the opinion that with respect to the formulation of the Guidelines, the meaning of "academic term" was not standardized. It would be more appropriate that the storage period be set at one academic year.
79. The representative of OUHK pointed out that different courses would have different duration. As far as OUHK was concerned, it would be more suitable that the storage period be set at one academic term.

80. The representative of HKSSSC enquired if it would be clearer to set the storage period at six months or one year.
81. Mr. SELBY agreed but said that in view of the need to keep records, an objective time period would facilitate processing.
82. The representative of ACTPO pointed out that with respect to the storage period, the spirit of the previous Guidelines was that copying should be “spontaneous”. If the education sector needed to store information on the intranet for one academic year or one term, this would deviate from the “spontaneity” concept. He would like to know why the education sector needed to do so.
83. Mr. SELBY responded that this was not contrary to whether or not the copying was “spontaneous”. He pointed out that under the previous Guidelines, teachers were allowed to make copies of materials “spontaneously” and distribute them to students for reference. Students could keep the materials themselves. Thus, in principle, there was no difference except for the storage place.
84. The representative of ACTPO pointed out that as far as the publishing industry understood, printed works copied “spontaneously” would only be used on the day the copy was made but not in other circumstances. He enquired whether copyright works would be viewed and used repeatedly if they were stored on the intranet for a year.
85. Mr. SELBY replied that the meaning of “using” the materials was that students were able to view the materials on the intranet. This was equivalent to the “spontaneity” concept. The purpose was only to allow students to view the materials on the intranet within a limited period of time.
86. The representative of HKEPA asked the participants whether it was only regarded as reasonable if the materials were stored for a year. He pointed out that the Guidelines aimed to facilitate teachers to copy materials for instruction purposes and for students’ reference, but at the same time, the principle of fairness had to be upheld. He wondered whether, in storing materials on the intranet for as long as a year for instruction purposes, the principle of fairness would be abandoned, thus prejudicing the interests of the copyright owners.

87. Mr. SELBY pointed out that, when materials were stored on the intranet for a year for students' viewing, the crucial point was whether the interests of the copyright owners would be further prejudiced. He explained that as regards copying of printed works, students could continue to keep the materials. He was of the opinion that as compared with the previous Guidelines, copyright owners would not enjoy less economic interests under the current Guidelines.
88. The representative of HUCOM explained why students would like their teachers to store the materials on the intranet. First, the students had not attended the lesson. Second, they were interested in the subjects concerned. If teachers were required to delete the materials on the intranet after a short period of time, there would be a lack of continuity with regard to the contents of the materials. Moreover, students might copy such materials for future use. If the information could be stored on the intranet for a year, economic losses incurred by the copyright owners might be reduced.
89. The representative of HKACE was of the view that if the education sector hoped that the storage period would be set at a year, it had to convince the copyright owners concerned. The reasons for setting a longer storage period were that: (i) teachers could not finish lecturing on the materials copied spontaneously and had to continue in the next lesson; (ii) certain exercises or learning activities needed not be finished in class. Students might have to do some project-based learning; (iii) the materials were used for revision before the examinations. With respect to point (iii), he opined that the information could be deleted first and uploaded to the intranet again when the examination was approaching.
90. Mr. SELBY asked whether the industry needed to store the information in non-printable format and whether this was technically feasible.
91. The representative of HKACE replied that the "non-printable" portable document format (PDF) could be used, but users could still print the screen. He considered it very difficult to restrict fully the printing activities.
92. The education sector unanimously opined that it would only be adequate if the materials could be stored for one year.

93. The representative of HKEPA indicated that the industry could not accept the one-year storage period because the materials stored on the intranet could be printed without any limit.
94. Mr. SELBY asked the participants to suggest some ways to prevent the materials stored on the intranet from being printed readily.
95. Mr. SELBY then commented on paragraphs 14 to 16 of the paper. He pointed out that regarding record keeping, there were two preliminary views. Some representatives considered that it was unnecessary to keep a record, whereas some accepted the idea of record keeping but hoped that such record would not be readily disclosed. He suggested that such record would only be disclosed in legal proceedings. He pointed out that the Intellectual Property Department always encouraged schools to set up a software management mechanism to facilitate management of software used in the network. He sought the participants' views on this.
96. The representative of HKACE opined that the term "DRM" could be replaced by the phrase "record keeping", and there should not be any mandatory requirement that such record should be kept in digital format.
97. Mr. SELBY responded that technical terms should be avoided and it was adequate to use the phrase "record keeping". He asked the representative of HKRRLS if the licensing institutions had any special requirement for record keeping.
98. The representative of HKRRLS replied that no comment from their members had been received.
99. Mr. SELBY asked whether it was adequate to list the following information in the record -
 - The title of the work
 - The owner of the copyright work
 - The date of uploading to the intranet
 - The name of the person responsible for uploading to the intranet
 - The file name

100. The representative of HKRRLS replied that they had to discuss further with the members before a conclusion would be reached.
101. The representative of HKPFL personally held that there would be a great workload if it was necessary to note down in writing the information of uploading and downloading of the copies. Moreover, it was difficult for the teachers to delete all the expired files systematically. If the DRM measure was adopted, schools could set the time to activate automatic deletion of all files to save human resources. However, if written record was required, it would impede the copying of works by schools for instruction purposes.
102. Mr. SELBY said that this would not be a big problem for primary and secondary schools.
103. The representative of HKPFL responded that the problem for primary and secondary schools could be more serious. He reiterated that the publishing industry did not agree with the one-year storage period. He considered that it was very difficult to clear all the data scattered on the server. He opposed to keeping written records and insisted on using digital records.
104. Mr. SELBY suggested that the education sector could hold an internal discussion and share the outcome with the meeting next time.
105. The representative of HUCOM responded that the consensus of the education sector was that it was necessary to keep the record because (i) it could be used as evidence in court proceedings; and (ii) the schools could know who had used the data and what data were used. He opined that the schools could decide whether written or digital records should be kept.
106. HKPFL reiterated that they had to use the term “DRM” to convince the overseas copyright owners. Microsoft or other media companies also used the term “DRM”. This was the minimum protection.
107. Mr. SELBY said that in order to allow teachers to have a better understanding of the requirements of the proposed Guidelines, the term “DRM” should not be used.
108. The representative of HKPFL pointed out that he was merely reflecting

the concerns of the industry. He suggested replacing “DRM” with “RM”. He considered that simply by making records could not facilitate the school management work.

109. The representative of the Motion Picture Association added that members of the Motion Picture Association of America had reservations over the proposal of copying film clips for 15 seconds for storage on the intranet.

Agenda IV

110. Mr. SELBY said that he would not be able to attend the next meeting on 11 July 2003. He asked the participants if the meeting should be chaired by Mr. Peter CHEUNG, Deputy Director of Intellectual Property or by a member of the Working Group appointed by them. The participants requested that the meeting be postponed. The date of the next meeting would be announced in due course.
111. Mr. SELBY thanked the participants for attending the meeting and declared the meeting closed.

The meeting closed at 5:05 p.m.