
JUNE 2017 DISTRIBUTION OF LICENCE FEES FROM UNIVERSITIES

The June 2017 distribution of licence fees from universities will follow the same general approach as previous distributions of licence fees from universities, with one change in the allocation process.¹

The amount for distribution is approximately \$13.3m, being licence fees for January to June 2017.

The data for allocating the licence fees is drawn from surveys of usage in universities carried out by an independent research company on behalf of Copyright Agency. We survey in eight universities a year. To reduce variations in allocations, we use data from each survey twice.

The data for this distribution is from eight universities that were surveyed from December 2015 to November 2016. The first dataset (December 2015 – April 2016) has been used once before. The second dataset (May 2016 – November 2016) is being used for the first time.

Licence fees are apportioned into a series of ‘pools’ reflecting:

- images copied without text (‘standalone’)
- print music
- coursepacks:
 - coursepacks without images
 - coursepacks with images: text component
 - coursepacks with images: images component
- ‘general’:
 - ‘general’ without images
 - ‘general’ with images: text component
 - ‘general’ with images: images component

SHARING PAYMENTS

We send recipients a [payment summary](#) and a [payment spreadsheet](#) with each payment. These indicate if you need to check your obligations to share a payment with others (for example, under a publishing agreement).

MORE INFORMATION

Please email memberservices@copyright.com.au or call 1800 066 844 if you need assistance. You can also get information about payments from our website:

- [Distribution schedule](#)
- [Distribution policy](#)
- [Administrative fees](#)

¹ The records used for allocation of the pool for images copied with text (the ‘Illustration Fund’) will be from one semester (December 2015 – April 2016) rather than two. These records were also used for the previous distribution (in December 2016), together with records from the previous semester. Analysis by the Analytics Team of past distributions showed that the impact on recipients of using one semester’s data rather than two was small. The time and effort required to research and identify rightsholders from a second semester’s records is greater than the distribution benefit, largely because a very small number of ‘third party’ images (in which copyright is not owned by the publisher) are identified.