What is a database? A database is a collection of information that is organized and managed by the database management system (DBMS). It is a collection of data that can be accessed, shared, and updated by different applications and users. A database is a way of organizing data so that it can be easily accessed, maintained, and updated.

The Database Directive is a European Union law that aims to protect databases from unauthorized reproduction and distribution. It provides sui generis protection for databases, which means that databases are protected as a whole or as a substantial part of the database. This protection is in addition to the protection provided by copyright law.

In order to qualify for sui generis protection, a database must meet certain conditions. It must be a collection of independent facts or data that have been processed by the author. The selection and arrangement of the database must be clearly visible and important to its purpose. The database must also be in a fixed medium.

The Advocate General seems to provide a clear cut answer to this interrogation by stating that the fixing of the date and place of each match concerns the production of informational value. The selection and arrangement of the possible dates of matches and venues in order to fix the final date and place of each match concerns the production of informational value. Therefore, fixing the date and place of each match is relevant for the protection of the list of contents.

As regards the first preliminary question, the Advocate General concludes that the effect expected in the creation of the list of contents cannot be foreseen in advance for the purposes of creating a sui generis right.

In order to arrive at this conclusion the Advocate is based on two assumptions. Firstly, to establish the independence of the two forms of protection, the Advocate says that sui generis protection is essentially different from copyright protection. Secondly, the Advocate says that sui generis protection is essentially different from copyright protection. The Advocate says that copyright protection is essentially different from sui generis protection. The Advocate says that sui generis protection is essentially different from copyright protection.

The Advocate General is of the view that the sui generis right is broader than the copyright protection. The Advocate General is of the view that the sui generis right is broader than the copyright protection. The Advocate General is of the view that the sui generis right is broader than the copyright protection.

In conclusion, the Advocate General concludes that the sui generis right is broader than the copyright protection. The Advocate General concludes that the sui generis right is broader than the copyright protection. The Advocate General concludes that the sui generis right is broader than the copyright protection.
If his opinion is followed by the Court, the Football Dataco decision might probably have for UK copyright law the same effect as the Feist decision in the USA. This is far more true if it is combined with the answer of the Advocate General in question 2 which states that the Database Directive precludes national law from conferring copyright protection upon a database which does not meet the requirements laid down in article 3 of the Directive, even if the database is the author’s own intellectual creation. Even though we can imagine copyright protection for compilations which do not meet the criteria of the definition of a database under the Directive on the basis of less stringent criteria, such as pure skill and labour, it is, however, questionable if the Dataco decision combined with Infopaq which imposes the criterion of the "author’s own intellectual creation" as a threshold for all works and not only for databases, computer programs and photographs leaves any room for this option.