The Linked Content Coalition (LCC) and the Rights Data Integration project (RDI)

An initiative to improve access to, and licensing of, digital content for any media and use.

**Linked Content Coalition (LCC)** launched April 2012 – to specify the framework for rights data interoperability. Initiated by European Publishers Council. > 40 members to date including IPTC and CEPIC. All content types – book, journal, news, image, musical works, sound recordings, audiovisual, games etc.

**Rights Data Integration (RDI)** project, proposed EC-funded project to start in Jan 2013 – create a working prototype for an implementation of the LCC specifications.
Issues: technical barriers to a better rights network

To achieve Linked (and sometimes Open) rights data:

- Source data quality
- Ambiguity of identity (who? what? to do what?)
- Different schemas and semantics
- Exchange services

This is the current scope of LCC
Scope of LCC

Facilitate the legitimate use of content.
Infrastructure and standards – not technology solutions.
About data, not law, enforcement or technology.
All media and content types.
All business models and none.
Initial focus on licensing – though solutions will help financial settlement systems and anti-piracy.

“A framework designed to encourage and facilitate existing media trade standards organisations in working together with their stakeholders to create interoperability”

Four LCC workstreams

Identifiers (Norman Paskin, IDF)
Metadata (Godfrey Rust, Rightscom)
Messaging (Niels Rump, DDEX)
Services / Iconography (?)
The Rights Data Supply Chain

The roles of Source, Exchange and User may be played by the same party. The chain may be of any length or complexity.

Source

- A creator or repository of rights data.

Rights data flows along the supply chain, undergoing transformations as needed (rights may or may not flow along the same chain).

Exchange

- Making rights data available to data Users.

User

- A party needing information about rights, or an automated license.

The Rights Data Supply Chain

The world of content rights according to the LCC

Godfrey Rust, Rightscom/LCC Presentation to IPTC CEPIC Metadata Conference May 17 2012

Rights data flows

The task of LCC is to specify what standards are needed to support this across all media and rights types.

Source

- Created and stored in a variety of different schemas.

Transformed in or out of Common Rights Format data by a “transform” process.

Transform

- Intermediate RRM data format preserves all semantics in a single format

Output data

- Various Rights Data Services accessed by a variety of methods provided by an Exchange.

Godfrey Rust, Rightscom/LCC Presentation to IPTC CEPIC Metadata Conference May 17 2012
Some rights expression schemas

ODRL, various profiles including RightsML 1.0
XRML, various profiles including MPEG-21 REL
ccREL (Creative Commons)
ONIX-RS, ONIX-PL (Books, Journals)
DDEX Work Licensing, Release Delivery messages (Sound Recordings)
CISAC CWR (Common Works Registration) (Music)
METSRights (Bibliographic)
PLUS Coalition Schema (Images)
etc ... other standards
etc ... many DRMs
etc ... many proprietary schemas and statements
More being developed all the time

LCC Rights Reference Model (“RRM”)

Rights metadata from all media sectors can be mapped to a single common schema - the heart of the LCC work in 2012.

RRM = Abstract model, but with a formal version (“Common Rights Format” XML schema). Based on best existing work, mapped against existing schemas for proof.

RRM = A schema for transformation, not a new rights message language (doesn’t replace RightsML 1.0 or PLUS schemas but provides a way of integrating all).
No special case for images

Rights metadata is the same for all sectors:

• **Rightsholdings** (delegated with **Mandates**)
• **Usage Rights** (granted with **Licences**)
• **Assertions** (“who sez?”) and **Rights Conflicts**

These are the six types of rights data entity identified* in LCC.

They can be described in the same way for all media - but there no common understanding of rights data at present (unlike descriptive metadata).

*work in progress so this is draft

---

Rightsholdings and Mandates

A **Rightholding** is a state in which some party controls some % share of some rights in some creation or another Rightsholding for some kind(s) of usage for some kind(s) of control for some period for some place with perhaps some other contextual conditions.

Rightsholdings are granted by law and delegated by agreements (which we call **Mandates**).
Usage Rights and Licenses

A License is an agreement (a kind of event) in which A & B agree that B can do X (Usage Right), but B can’t do Y (prohibition), and B must do Z (condition). X, Y and Z are also kinds of events.

Rights Assertions and Rights Conflicts

An Assertion is a kind of event in which A states that X is either true or false. If X is a Rightsholding, License, Usage Right or Mandate, then it is a Rights Assertion. If A makes a Rights Assertion and B makes a Rights Assertion and they are in conflict there is a state called a Rights Conflict.

Assertions add an additional layer to open data, and are a major reason why Linked Open rights metadata is more challenging than descriptive data.
RRM - an event-based, “modular” model

Rights data is not resource-based but event-based (events are identified things). Note: rights management applies to groups of creations, not just individual items.

With a good, extensible event/state model, you can model any rights data to any level of complexity. This is the basis of the RRM.

RRM also has a generic, modular Attribute model, supported by an ontology, which makes it fully extensible without changing its structure. Based on typing with controlled vocabulary (“things not strings”).

RRM can be represented in as relational or linked data (or in any other logical form).

Identity management in the digital network

If it can’t change – embed it.
If it can - reference it.
Identity of creator(s) and creation should be embedded as standard IDs (it doesn’t change).
Rightsholder metadata should be kept separate from the content and referenced by IDs (because it changes).
Registered, resolvable IDs are critical.
The image sector lags behind others in identifying its parties and content.
The work of PLUS and CEPIC in this is essential (included in the RDI project plan).
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