What is a database? Are database copyright protections and database sui generis protection compatible? What is the creative input for asserting that the selection and arrangement of a database’s contents is the author’s own independent creation? To what extent are meaningful and relevant data for all cases or merely for the specific circumstances of a particular user? If his opinion is followed by the Court the Football Dataco decision might probably have some consequences for UK copyright law. The Advocate General clearly opts for a continental oriented concept of originality as regards database copyright. While the Advocate General seems to provide a clear cut answer to this interrogation by stating that the fixing of the date of a match and the creation of the list of football matches, thus the creation of the database, are not necessarily two distinct activities. In fact, it seems that for the referring court the fixing of the date for a football match presupposes necessarily a selection and an arrangement of data, but this could not be relevant for the protection of the list as a database. Indeed, the selection and arrangement of possible dates and seasons can be done as a pre-draft for the selection and arrangement of possible dates and seasons for the creation of the database. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level for the award of copyright protection is the original arrangement of the database’s contents. Nevertheless, the Advocate General does not doubt that copyright protection is limited to the original selection of the database’s contents. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level of the framework of the database protection. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level of the framework of the database protection. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level of the framework of the database protection. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level of the framework of the database protection. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level of the framework of the database protection. The Advocate General made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the courts have been called out in the past for the protection of the autonomous informational value of data, which can be retrieved more easily, even though the latter might prove to be incorrect if the arrangement corresponded to the criteria of sensitivity and are evidently relevant in the database. The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of connection exist. That is, the freedom of the carrier of copyright protection is certainly valid at the level of the framework of the database protection.
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, thus which is not the author's own intellectual creation. Even though one 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.