

**GLOBAL DIALOGUE ON CROSS-BORDER COPYRIGHT ROYALTY GOVERNANCE
IN THE DIGITAL ERA
Bali, Indonesia, 7 to 9 October 2026**

BACKGROUND MAPPING REPORT

*Prepared by the host on the basis of publicly available sources
October 2026*

SUMMARY

Creative works are now used across borders on a scale that national royalty systems were not designed for. Collections by authors' societies reached EUR 13.97 billion in 2024, and digital uses became the largest single source of that income. Yet the information needed to connect a use abroad to the right holder at home still passes through many systems that do not always speak to each other.

This Report gives participants a common factual starting point for the Dialogue. It maps the main stages of the cross-border royalty chain and, for each of the three themes of the Dialogue (transparency, accountability and interoperability), describes existing practices, recurring gaps and questions for discussion. It also sets out the development dimension and Indonesia's own experience as host.

No voluntary contributions had been received at the time of writing. The Report has therefore been prepared by the host on the basis of publicly available sources. It does not represent the views of any participant, does not propose a particular model and does not anticipate the outcome of the Dialogue. Contributions received before or during the Dialogue will be reflected in the Summary by the Chair.

Main observations

- **Digital use is now the leading source of collections**, but its benefits are unevenly distributed: Africa accounted for less than one per cent of global collections in 2024.
- **Most cross-border difficulties arise from information** rather than from the scope of rights: incomplete or conflicting data on works, ownership and use.
- **Well-developed transparency and accountability rules** exist in some jurisdictions and within international networks of collective management organizations (CMOs), but they are not universal and rarely cover the whole value chain.
- **Unallocated royalties are a symptom of poor data and weak matching**, and their treatment differs considerably between systems.
- **International identifiers and data standards** are widely used in established markets, while many smaller markets and institutions remain only partly connected to them.

I. PURPOSE, STATUS AND SOURCES

1. The Background Mapping Report has been prepared as an input to the Global Dialogue on Cross-Border Copyright Royalty Governance in the Digital Era. Its purpose is to

describe the current landscape in a neutral and factual way, so that participants can begin their discussions from a shared picture.

2. The Report is not a negotiated text and does not set out recommendations. It is issued without prejudice to the positions of any participant in the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) or in any other forum.¹

3. In preparation for the Dialogue, participants were invited to submit voluntary contributions describing national and institutional practices. No contributions had been received when this Report was finalized. The Report therefore draws on four types of publicly available sources: WIPO publications and committee documents; statistics published by the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC); legislation and official materials of selected jurisdictions; and documentation of international identifiers and data standards. Where information is incomplete, the Report says so rather than filling the gap with assumptions.

4. Because it relies on public sources, the Report gives more weight to jurisdictions and organizations that publish detailed information. Practices in many developing countries are under-represented for this reason. Participants are warmly invited to correct and complete the picture during the Dialogue, orally or in writing.

II. THE LANDSCAPE IN FIGURES

5. According to CISAC, the 228 member societies in 111 countries and territories that report to it collected EUR 13.97 billion in 2024, an increase of 6.6 per cent over 2023. Music accounted for EUR 12.59 billion, about 90 per cent of the total. Digital collections reached EUR 5.14 billion, rose 11.2 per cent in a year and represented about 37 per cent of all collections. Digital has been the largest source of creators' collections since 2022, and digital income has grown roughly seven-fold since 2015.²

6. These collections are unevenly distributed. In 2024, Europe and North America together accounted for around four fifths of the total. Asia-Pacific accounted for EUR 1.9 billion and grew by about 3 per cent, less than half the global rate. Africa accounted for EUR 90 million, less than one per cent of the total.

Region	Collections 2024 (EUR)	Share of total	Change on 2023
Europe	7.6 billion	54%	+6.7%
Canada and United States	3.5 billion	25%	+10.0%
Asia-Pacific	1.9 billion	14%	+2.9%
Latin America and Caribbean	786 million	6%	-0.6%
Africa	90 million	less than 1%	+14.2%
World	13.97 billion	100%	+6.6%

Source: CISAC, *Global Collections Report 2025*. Shares are rounded.

¹ Indonesia has submitted documents SCCR/47/6 and SCCR/48/4 to the WIPO Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR). They are listed among the references for information. The Dialogue is a separate, voluntary process and does not form part of the work of the SCCR.

² CISAC, *Global Collections Report 2025* (data for 2024). CISAC data covers authors' societies only and does not include the full income of performers, producers or publishers.

7. These figures show where royalties are collected, not where works are created or where their creators live. They depend on the size of each market, the value of each use and how effectively uses are licensed and collected. A large part of what is collected in one country may be due to right holders abroad, and reaches them only through representation agreements between collective management organizations.

8. Public data does not show how much the creators of each country earn from the use of their works abroad, or how much is paid out for foreign works used at home. The absence of such data is itself one of the transparency gaps that participants may wish to consider.

III. THE CROSS-BORDER ROYALTY CHAIN

9. A single use of a work abroad may involve the creator, one or more publishers or producers, a digital service, a licensing entity in the country of use, a CMO in that country, a CMO in the creator's home country, and the payment systems between them. Each step depends on information produced at an earlier step.

Stage	What happens	Typical cross-border difficulty
Documentation	Works, recordings, contributors and ownership shares are registered	Incomplete or conflicting ownership data held in different countries
Licensing	Uses are authorized by CMOs, publishers, producers or other licensors	Multi-territorial services and fragmented repertoire
Usage reporting	Services report what was used, where and how often	Large volumes of data in formats that vary between services
Matching	Reported uses are linked to works and right holders	Missing identifiers, duplicate records, disputed shares
Calculation and collection	Tariffs or contractual terms are applied and money is collected	Different calculation models and deductions
Distribution	Amounts are paid to right holders or to sister CMOs abroad	Delays, further deductions, currency and transfer costs
Reconciliation	Errors are corrected and disputes resolved	Limited visibility for right holders abroad

10. The three themes of the Dialogue follow this chain. Transparency concerns what information reaches whom. Accountability concerns who is responsible at each step and how errors are corrected. Interoperability concerns whether the systems used at each step can exchange information reliably.

IV. TRANSPARENCY

Existing practice

11. The most detailed legal framework on transparency in collective management is Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Union. It requires CMOs to give right holders, at least once a year, information on the amounts collected and paid on their behalf, the periods of use and the deductions made; to publish their statutes, tariffs and distribution policies; and to publish an annual transparency report that includes information on

unallocated amounts and on the use of deductions.³ Similar obligations exist in national laws in other regions, often with less detail.

12. At the international level, WIPO supports good governance in collective management through its publications and technical assistance, including a good practice toolkit for CMOs and the TAG of Excellence initiative on transparency, accountability and governance, developed with stakeholders.⁴ CISAC applies professional rules and governance standards to its member societies.

Gaps identified in public sources

- Transparency rules mostly apply to CMOs. Information held by digital services, aggregators, publishers and producers is often governed by contract and is not always visible to the creator.
- Right holders whose works are used abroad usually receive information only through their home CMO, and the level of detail depends on the representation agreements between societies.
- Royalty statements in many systems are difficult for individual creators to read and verify.
- Calculation methods used by digital services are often treated as commercially confidential.

V. ACCOUNTABILITY

Automated systems and distribution models

13. Large digital services rely on automated identification, matching and allocation. The choice of distribution model also affects outcomes. Under the prevailing pro-rata model, a service's revenue in a territory is divided according to total shares of streams. Some services have introduced user-centric or artist-centric adjustments that change how revenue is allocated among creators. These choices are usually made by contract and are rarely explained to the creators they affect.

Unallocated and unclaimed royalties

14. Royalties that cannot be matched to a right holder are a long-standing problem, and their treatment varies considerably. Two examples illustrate the range of approaches:

- Under Directive 2014/26/EU, CMOs must distribute amounts within nine months of the end of the financial year in which they were collected, take diligent measures to identify right holders, and make information on unidentified works available. Amounts that remain non-distributable after three years may be used as decided by the CMO's general assembly, for example for social, cultural or educational purposes.⁵

³ Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market, in particular Articles 18, 19, 21 and 22 and the Annex.

⁴ WIPO, Collective Management of Copyright and Related Rights, 3rd edition (2022); WIPO, Good Practice Toolkit for Collective Management Organizations; WIPO and partners, TAG of Excellence.

⁵ Directive 2014/26/EU, Article 13.

- In the United States, the Mechanical Licensing Collective established under the Music Modernization Act of 2018 holds unmatched mechanical royalties from digital services. After a minimum holding period, unclaimed accrued royalties may be distributed to known copyright owners on the basis of market share.⁶

15. In many other countries, there is no published information on the volume of unallocated amounts or on how they are eventually used. The treatment of unallocated amounts that relate to foreign repertoire is particularly relevant to the Dialogue, since it determines whether royalties generated by foreign works ever reach their creators.

Accountability across the value chain

16. Accountability mechanisms differ in strength and reach. They include government supervision or authorization of CMOs, general assemblies and supervisory boards, independent audit, complaint procedures, and alternative dispute resolution. Directive 2014/26/EU, for example, requires complaint procedures and access to independent dispute resolution.⁷ WIPO offers mediation and arbitration services that can be used in disputes involving copyright and collective management. These mechanisms mainly address CMOs. Responsibilities of other actors in the chain are generally defined by contract.

VI. INTEROPERABILITY

Identifiers and data standards in use

17. A set of international identifiers and data standards already supports the exchange of rights information, particularly in music.

Identifier or standard	What it identifies or does	Administered by
ISWC	Musical works	ISO standard; CISAC as registration authority
ISRC	Sound and music video recordings	ISO standard; IFPI as registration authority
IPI	Creators and publishers (interested parties)	CISAC network
ISNI	Public identities of contributors to creative works	ISO standard; ISNI International Agency
DDEX standards	Formats for exchanging release, usage and sales data between services and licensors	Digital Data Exchange (industry consortium)
CIS-Net	Network of databases on works shared among CISAC societies	CISAC
WIPO Connect	IT system for CMO operations, connected to regional and international networks	WIPO

⁶ United States Code, Title 17, section 115(d), as amended by the Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act (2018).

⁷ Directive 2014/26/EU, Articles 33 to 35.

Gaps identified in public sources

- Use of identifiers is uneven. Many works and recordings, particularly from smaller markets and independent creators, are registered without identifiers or with incomplete data.
- The same work may be described differently in national databases, with conflicting ownership shares, which leads to disputes and blocked payments.
- Smaller CMOs may lack the systems needed to process large digital usage reports.
- Newer uses of works, including those involving automated and AI systems, increase the demand for reliable, machine-readable rights information.

VII. THE DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION

18. The figures in Section II show that collections remain concentrated in established markets. Market size and the value of each use explain part of this pattern. Differences in capacity also play a role, including the maturity of CMOs, the completeness of national repertoire data, the ability to process digital usage reports, and access to international networks and identifier systems.

19. Public sources point to several areas where support could make a practical difference:

- building and maintaining national repertoire databases connected to international identifiers;
- strengthening CMO governance, transparency and data processing capacity;
- training for institutions and creators on registration and rights information;
- participation of developing countries in the development of technical standards; and
- ways for smaller markets to connect to international systems at affordable cost.

20. WIPO already provides technical assistance and capacity building in these areas, including through WIPO Connect. The Dialogue offers an opportunity to identify where further voluntary cooperation would add most value.

VIII. THE HOST'S EXPERIENCE: INDONESIA

21. Indonesia's copyright framework is set out in Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright, which provides for collective management organizations and established the National Collective Management Institute (LMKN) to collect and distribute royalties for songs and music on behalf of right holders.

22. Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021 on the Management of Royalties for Songs and/or Music sets out the framework for royalty collection and distribution. It provides for a song and music data center managed by the Directorate General of Intellectual Property and for a song and music information system (SILM) to support the recording of works and usage data and the distribution of royalties.

23. Indonesia's experience reflects challenges shared by many countries: building a complete national repertoire database, matching digital and foreign usage to Indonesian works, and ensuring that royalties generated abroad return to Indonesian creators in a

timely and transparent manner. These challenges informed Indonesia's decision to convene this Dialogue.

IX. CONSOLIDATED MAPPING

Theme	What exists	Main gaps	Possible focus for discussion
Transparency	Detailed rules in some jurisdictions; CMO governance standards	Limited visibility beyond CMOs; statements hard to verify	Information right holders should receive, including from abroad
Accountability	CMO supervision, audits, complaint and ADR mechanisms	Automated decisions rarely explained; varied treatment of unallocated amounts	Roles along the chain; handling of unallocated foreign royalties
Interoperability	International identifiers, data standards, CIS-Net, WIPO Connect	Uneven use of identifiers; conflicting data; limited capacity	Data quality and connection of smaller markets
Development	WIPO technical assistance; regional cooperation	Uneven capacity and share of collections	Targeted capacity building and participation in standards

X. QUESTIONS FOR THE DIALOGUE

24. The following questions correspond to the thematic panels of Day 2 and are offered as a starting point. Each panel will also include a separate exchange on future cooperation. Participants are free to raise other issues.

Panel 1: Transparency

- (a) How are roles, responsibilities and transparency obligations shared among governments, CMOs, digital services and other intermediaries?
- (b) Can rights and royalty information be traced across jurisdictions, from the use of a work to the right holder? Where does it break down?
- (c) What information do right holders need to understand, verify and, where necessary, challenge their royalty outcomes?

Panel 2: Accountability

- (d) What level of explanation and review is appropriate for automated systems that affect remuneration?
- (e) How should unallocated and unclaimed royalties, including those relating to foreign repertoire, be identified, held and resolved?
- (f) Which compliance, audit and dispute resolution mechanisms have proven effective across the value chain?

Panel 3: Interoperability

- (g) What would help make rights information more complete, consistent and machine-readable across systems?

- (h) How can smaller markets and institutions connect to international systems at reasonable cost?
- (i) What role can WIPO and international cooperation play in making interoperability inclusive?

Future cooperation (all panels)

- (j) What practical forms of voluntary cooperation could strengthen transparency, accountability and interoperability across borders?

ANNEX. WORKING DEFINITIONS

Term	Meaning in this Report
Copyright royalty	Remuneration for the authorized use of works or other subject matter protected by copyright or related rights.
Collective management organization (CMO)	An organization that manages copyright or related rights on behalf of more than one right holder, for their collective benefit.
Cross-border royalty governance	The legal, institutional, technical and operational arrangements that affect how royalties generated in one country reach right holders in another.
Transparency	The availability and clarity of information on rights, uses, calculation, deductions and distribution.
Accountability	The ability to identify who is responsible at each stage, review decisions, correct errors and obtain redress.
Interoperability	The ability of different systems to exchange and use information reliably, without requiring them to be identical.
Unallocated royalty	An amount collected or payable that cannot yet be attributed with sufficient certainty to a right holder.

REFERENCES

- CISAC, Global Collections Report 2025 (data for 2024).
- Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market.
- Republic of Indonesia, Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright.
- Republic of Indonesia, Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021 on the Management of Royalties for Songs and/or Music.
- United States, Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act (2018); 17 U.S.C. § 115(d).
- WIPO, Collective Management of Copyright and Related Rights, 3rd edition (2022).
- WIPO, Good Practice Toolkit for Collective Management Organizations.
- WIPO, WIPO Connect.
- WIPO, documents SCCR/47/6 and SCCR/48/4, submitted by Indonesia to the Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights.

[End of document]