Four years have passed since the adoption of Directive 2014/26/EU on collective management of copyright and related rights. The Directive aims to provide a remedy for the challenges of the collective management organisations (CMOs), which face issues such as transparency and abuse of power. In the absence of effective regulation, such organisations can act in a way that is detrimental to the interests of the beneficiaries. The Directive introduces a legal framework that aims to create a fair and transparent market for the collective management of copyright and related rights, and to ensure the implementation of EU directives on collective management.

In Greece, the Ministry of Culture and Sports is responsible for the implementation of the Directive. The Ministry has taken several steps to implement the Directive, including the issuance of implementing regulations and the establishment of a legal framework for the CMOs. However, the implementation process has been slow and difficult, due to various challenges such as the lack of cooperation from the CMOs, the complexity of the Directive, and the need for legal clarification.

The Ministry of Culture and Sports has tried to deal with the critical situation of AEPI, the main CMO in Greece. On 24 April 2017, a temporary commissioner was appointed to address the crisis. The temporary commissioner was given the authority to take necessary actions to ensure the proper functioning of AEPI. However, the appointment of the temporary commissioner did not solve the problems of AEPI.

The Directive imposes a significant number of obligations and formalities on CMOs, which have been often denounced for their lack of transparency and abuse of power. As a result, the Directive has been met with resistance and criticism. In the meantime, the long and unstable deliberations in relation to the final version of the law and the Directive have significantly affected the implementation process. The Directive was finally modified in March 2017, but the implementation process has been slow and difficult.

As will be shown in the first part of this blogpost (Part I), which focuses on the case of Greece, the attempts to implement the Directive have been met with resistance and criticism. The implementation process has been slow and difficult, due to various challenges such as the lack of cooperation from the CMOs, the complexity of the Directive, and the need for legal clarification. The Directive has been met with resistance and criticism, and the implementation process has been slow and difficult.

In this context, the process of implementation of Directive 2014/26/EU in Greece was puzzlingly closely related to the fate of AEPI. AEPI was denounced for its abusive practices in relation to the terms of its contracts with the authors and its management costs, which are significantly higher than those of other CMOs in Europe. AEPI’s poor financial situation and the lack of transparency in its business practices have led to widespread criticism and public debate.

Prior to the implementation of the Directive, Greek Law 2121/1993 provided for a legal mechanism of state control of CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated. The law did not provide a specific legal form for CMOs. As a result, even legal persons with a for-profit mission had to be regulated.

As a result, the Directive on collective management of copyright in Greece and Cyprus (Part I) will be discussed.
For a critical analysis of the provisions of the law, see: Dionysia Kallinikou, Pierrina Koriatopoulou, News from Greece, RIDA n°254, October 2017, p. 107.