If his opinion is followed by the Court the Football Dataco decision might probably have for UK copyright law.

The Advocate General expands the rule of exclusion of the creation of data which has been affirmed for the sui generis right to database copyright protection. This is the case which concerns the database of football fixtures lists. The Advocate General recommends findings that the creation of the database itself is taken into account for the award of sui generis protection. Indeed, the latter has been clarified and enriched by the ECJ. His argumentation is in line with a general attitude of the Advocate General and is based on the fact that the creation of the database cannot be taken into account for the purposes of accessing eligibility under copyright law. The Advocate General concludes that the creation of the database is not a substantial investment for the purposes of the sui generis protection. In fact, the Advocate General refers to the fact that the creation of the database is not a substantial investment for the purposes of 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, thus which is not 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 Feist 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.