What is a database? A database is a collection of data that was organized to facilitate access, retrieval, and management of information. Databases are used in various fields such as business, science, and technology to store and manage large sets of data efficiently.

A database can be protected under copyright law. Copyright law grants creators of original works the exclusive rights to reproduce, distribute, perform, and display their works. In the context of databases, copyright protection can be applied to the selection, arrangement, and structure of the database.

The Advocate General in Advocate Case C-203/02 Horseracing Board Ltd and Others v William Hill Organisation Ltd, Fixtures Marketing Ltd v Oy Veikkaus Ab, Database Directive, C-444/02, The British made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the Advocate General expanded the rule of exclusion of the copyright protection of databases. In a certain degree, this contradiction is inherent in the logic of the Advocate General's opinion.

The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of view are totally contradictory. The Advocate General in Advocate Case C-203/02 Horseracing Board Ltd and Others v William Hill Organisation Ltd, Fixtures Marketing Ltd v Oy Veikkaus Ab, Database Directive, C-444/02, The British made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the Advocate General expanded the rule of exclusion of the copyright protection of databases. In a certain degree, this contradiction is inherent in the logic of the Advocate General's opinion.

The question of the independence of the two forms of protection is not unequivocal, since certain points of view are totally contradictory. The Advocate General in Advocate Case C-203/02 Horseracing Board Ltd and Others v William Hill Organisation Ltd, Fixtures Marketing Ltd v Oy Veikkaus Ab, Database Directive, C-444/02, The British made an overview of the basic legal rules of the database protection regime as the Advocate General expanded the rule of exclusion of the copyright protection of databases. In a certain degree, this contradiction is inherent in the logic of the Advocate General's opinion.
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, 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 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.