2016 DISTRIBUTION OF LICENCE FEES FROM SCHOOLS

May 2016

This information is for recipients of Copyright Agency licence fees from schools in June 2016.

The 2016 distribution of licence fees from schools follows the same approach as previous distributions of licence fees from schools.[1]

The amount for distribution is approximately $51.2m, being licence fees for January to December 2016.

The data for allocating the licence fees is drawn from surveys of usage in schools carried out by AMR on behalf of Copyright Agency. We survey in all states and territories over a two year period. Because of this, we use data from each survey twice, so that there is data from all states and territories in each annual distribution. The data for this distribution is from approximately 460 schools that were surveyed from term 3 of 2013 to term 2 of 2015 (eight terms). The data from the first four terms was used before in the 2015 distribution, and the data from the second four terms will be used again in the 2017 distribution.

Licence fees are apportioned into a series of 'pools' reflecting:

- use type: 'digital' and 'hardcopy'
- school level: primary and secondary
- work type: poetry, short stories, plays and anthologised works, 'blackline masters', music, 'standard' text
- images: whether copied with or without text.

SHARING PAYMENTS

We send recipients a payment summary and a payment spreadsheet with each payment. These indicate if you need to check your obligations to share a payment with others (for example, under a publishing agreement).

MORE INFORMATION

Please email memberservices@copyright.com.au or call 1800 066 844 if you need assistance. You can also get information about payments from our website:

- Your payment summary
- Payment spreadsheet
- Distribution schedule
- Distribution policy
- Administrative fees

[1] There was one minor change: the subsample of images for distribution of the pool for accompanying images was drawn from seven rather than eight terms of data. This followed an analysis of the number of recipients identified for each term, and a comparison with recipients identified from other terms, which showed that the additional recipients who would be identified from researching an additional term of data would be very few, and that any benefit from that small number of additional recipients was outweighed by the costs processing.