

DSM Directive Survey

Questions for Representative Organisations of Authors & Performers

Section 2.1: Text and data mining (TDM), teaching exception, preservation exception

Use of TDM, educational and preservation exceptions (Articles 3–6).

For the next few questions please note that the Directive provides for an exception for text and data mining activities conducted for the purposes of scientific research (Article 3) and a general text and data mining exception (Article 4). Rightholders may reserve their rights and exclude their content from the scope of the latter exception.

Q10. Are you aware of instances where your work was used for the development of large language models / AI models or data analytics?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q12. [If Q10, Q11=yes] Can you please elaborate and indicate any concrete examples?

OPEN QUESTION

Q13. Have you taken any steps to reserve your rights under the TDM exception provided under Article 4 of the DSM Directive?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q14_1 [If Q13, Q14=Yes] Can you explain what methods you use to reserve your rights? Have you encountered any difficulties?

OPEN QUESTION

Q14_2 [If Q13=Yes] To your knowledge, have your rights reservations ('opt-outs') been respected by commercial TDM beneficiaries?

OPEN QUESTION

Q15. Have the TDM exceptions impacted your contractual, licensing or enforcement practices?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes (please explain)
2. No
3. I don't know

Q16. What unexpected benefits or challenges have you experienced in relation to the introduction of the TDM exceptions?

OPEN QUESTION

Section 2.2: Licensing mechanisms (ECL, OOCW, VoD)

The section aims to assess the impact of the Directive on the functioning and use of collective licensing with extended effect, rules on out-of-commerce works, and the Video on Demand negotiation mechanism.

For the next few questions please note that Article 8 concerns a mechanism for cultural heritage institutions (CHIs) to make available out-of-commerce works (works that are no longer commercially available through their usual sales channels) from their collections. Article 12 provides that, within well-defined areas of use, where individual authorisation from rightholders is impractical, licensing agreements concluded by collective management organisations may be extended to apply to rightholders who have not authorised that collective management organisation to represent them. Rightholders have a right to exclude their works from both the out-of-commerce mechanism and licences with extended effect.

Q43. Do you consider that some of your works are out of commerce?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q44. Are you aware of agreements concluded since 2019 between a CHI and a relevant collective management organisation for the use of out-of-commerce works?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q45. Are you aware of any extended collective licences (ECLs) being used in your country for your type of works?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q46. Have you been informed by a collective management organisation or cultural heritage institution that your works have been licensed or are intended to be licensed under the out-of-commerce mechanism or an extended collective licence?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes, once
2. Yes, several times
3. No
4. I don't know

Q47. Do you receive revenue from your works being used under the following licences?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Yes, from an extended collective licence for out-of-commerce works (Article 8)
2. Yes, from an extended collective licence for other specific uses (Article 12)
3. No
4. I don't know

Q47_1 [If Q46=1,2 or Q47=1,2] Have you exercised the right to exclude your works from extended collective licences or from the exception for out-of-commerce works?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Yes, I have excluded my works from extended collective licences concluded by a CMO for the use of out-of-commerce works by CHIs
2. Yes, I have excluded my works from the exception applying to the use of out-of-commerce works by CHIs (Article 8.2)
3. Yes, I have excluded my works from extended collective licences issued by CMOs for specific uses (Article 12)
4. No
5. I was not aware of the right to exclude my works
6. I don't know

Q47_2 [If Q47_1=1,2,3] What were your main reasons for excluding your works from such extended collective licences / exceptions?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. I do not want my works to be made available online by CHIs
2. I am unhappy with the terms of the licence
3. I object to the use of my work under an extended collective licence
4. I want to keep the possibility to commercially exploit my works
5. Other, please specify

Q48. What unexpected benefits or challenges have you experienced in relation to the Article 8 (out-of-commerce mechanisms) and / or Article 12 (extended collective licensing) mechanisms?

OPEN QUESTION

Q49. Do you consider that out-of-commerce works made available by CHIs under the conditions of the Directive should be used for AI training purposes? Please explain any measures that you have taken to limit or prevent such uses of out-of-commerce works (e.g. licensing conditions, technological protection measures).

OPEN QUESTION

Q50. Have you participated in any pre-implementation and / or subsequent sector-specific dialogues organised by Member States on the OOCW mechanism?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q50_1 [If Q50=Yes] To what extent did these dialogues improve the following:

- a) the relevance and usability of the mechanism
 - b) effective safeguards for rightholders
1. To a great extent
 2. To some extent
 3. To a little extent
 4. Not at all
 5. I don't know

Grid question with the following answer options:

For the next question please note that Article 13 concerns negotiations for making available audiovisual works on video-on-demand services. Negotiating parties should have the possibility to rely on an impartial body or mediation to help them reach an agreement in these negotiations.

Q51. Have you ever made use of an impartial body or of a mediator when seeking to conclude an agreement for making available audiovisual works on video-on-demand services?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. Considered, but could or did not use it
4. I don't know

Q51_1 [If Q51=Yes] What has been your experience with the negotiation mechanism set up by the DSM Directive in terms of the following:

- a) procedural clarity
 - b) administrative burden
 - c) duration of negotiations
 - d) conclusion of agreements
1. Very positive
 2. Somewhat positive
 3. Neutral
 4. Somewhat negative
 5. Very negative

Grid question with the following answer options:

Q51_2 [If Q51=Yes] Please provide any additional reflection on your experience with the mediation mechanism, such as specific examples of agreements concluded or quantitative data on the success rate of mediation, if possible.

OPEN QUESTION

Q51_3 [If Q51=Yes] What suggestions do you have for improving the effectiveness or efficiency of the negotiation mechanism?

OPEN QUESTION

Q51_4 [If Q51=3] What challenges or difficulties have you encountered when considering the negotiation mechanism?

OPEN QUESTION

Section 2.3: Press publisher right and obligations of online content sharing service providers (OCSSPs)

Article 15 (press publisher right) and Article 17 (OCSSPs).

For the next few questions please note that Article 15 provides press publishers with a neighbouring right regarding the online use of their press publications by information society service providers. This protection does not apply to private or non-commercial uses by individual users, hyperlinking, or the use of very short extracts.

Q59. Have your members, whose works appear in press publications, reported seeing increased remuneration due to Article 15?

Instructions: Please select one option. (Routed to representative organisations of authors and journalists.)

1. Yes, there has been an increase in remuneration
2. No change has been noted
3. No, there has been a decrease in remuneration

4. I don't know

Q59_1 Please briefly explain your answer.

OPEN QUESTION

Q60. To the extent that your works are part of press publications, have you received any additional remuneration linked to the revenues publishers receive for the licensing of their press-publication right?

Note: this question is routed only to individual Authors and is included here for reference.

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes, there has been an increase in remuneration
2. No change has been noted
3. No, there has been a decrease in remuneration
4. I don't know
5. Not applicable

Q60_1 Please briefly explain your answer.

Note: this question is routed only to individual Authors and is included here for reference.

OPEN QUESTION

For the next few questions please note that Article 17 concerns copyright-protected works uploaded by users to an online content-sharing service. The online content sharing service provider needs to obtain the authorisation of rightholders and, under certain circumstances, block or remove unauthorised content. Finally, service providers must put in place a fast and effective redress mechanism for users whose content has been blocked or removed.

Q73. Overall, what has been the impact of Article 17 on your organisation or members?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. No material impact
4. Somewhat negative
5. Very negative
6. I don't know

Q74. Since 2019, approximately how many OCSSPs have you concluded licensing agreements with under Article 17? Have you experienced any changes in this regard?

OPEN QUESTION

Q75. For your main licensing agreements with OCSSPs since 2019, what has typically been their territorial scope?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Single Member State
2. Several EU Member States
3. EU-wide
4. Global
5. Not sure / cannot answer

Q76. Where you do not authorise the use of your works or other subject matter by an OCSSP, how do you typically provide the relevant and necessary information needed for the purposes of Article 17(4)(b) and, where applicable, Article 17(4)(c)?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Metadata or ownership information

2. Reference files or fingerprints
3. URLs or identifiers of specific content
4. Notices submitted through platform notice tools or portals
5. Information provided through a CMO or another intermediary
6. Information provided manually by email or other direct communication
7. We do not usually provide such information
8. Not sure / cannot answer
9. Other (please specify)

Q78. What is your assessment of the costs associated with providing this information to OCSSPs?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very low
2. Low
3. Moderate
4. High
5. Very high
6. We do not incur identifiable costs
7. Not sure / cannot answer

Q79. For your main licensing agreements with OCSSPs since 2019, how would you describe their typical scope relative to your repertoire?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Blanket licence (covers essentially all works / rights represented by the licensor)
2. Mostly blanket, with some exclusions / limitations
3. Limited (specific catalogues / rights / use-cases only)
4. Not sure / cannot answer
5. Other (please specify)

Q81. In your experience, have OCSSPs updated their content moderation, licensing, or terms-of-service policies to address the presence of AI-generated content on their platforms in a manner consistent with the objectives of Article 17 DSM Directive?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes, adequately
2. Yes, but insufficiently
3. No
4. Don't know

Q82. Which specific OCSSP policy responses to AI-generated content, if any, do you consider most aligned with Article 17?

OPEN QUESTION

Q84. How would you characterise changes (if any) in revenues received from OCSSPs since Article 17 became applicable?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Significant increase
2. Moderate increase
3. No change
4. Decrease
5. Significant decrease

Q85. Have you experienced disputes with platforms regarding revenues, reporting, or the scope of licences since 2019?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q85_1 [If Q85=Yes] Can you please provide some details on the disputes that you have experienced.

OPEN QUESTION

Q86. How would you assess the reporting you receive from OCSSPs on the use of content covered by licensing agreements concluded under Article 17?

Instructions: please assess the reporting overall.

1. Very poor
2. Poor
3. Neither poor nor good
4. Good
5. Very good
6. I do not receive such reporting
7. I don't know

Q86_1 [If Q86=1,2] Please briefly explain the main reasons for your assessment.

OPEN QUESTION

Q87. What unexpected benefits or challenges have you experienced in relation to Article 17?

OPEN QUESTION

Q90. Are you aware of any out-of-court dispute settlement mechanisms in your Member States that have been used to resolve disputes linked to Article 17(9) complaints?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes, and used
2. Yes, but not used
3. No
4. I don't know

Q90_1 [If Q90=1] Have you been involved in such dispute settlement mechanisms, and if so, please give the approximate number of cases since 2021, typical outcomes, and whether it improved resolution speed or consistency.

OPEN QUESTION

Q90_2 [If Q90=1] What suggestions do you have for improving the effectiveness or efficiency of this dispute settlement mechanism?

OPEN QUESTION

Q91. To what extent does Article 17 remain fit for purpose, in the context of current technological and business developments?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. To a great extent
2. To some extent
3. To a little extent

4. Not at all
5. I don't know

Q91_1 [If Q91=2,3,4] Please elaborate on your response.

OPEN QUESTION

Section 2.4: Contractual fairness & remuneration

The section focuses on the provisions of the DSM Directive concerning transparency, remuneration, revocation rights, and alternative dispute resolution (ADR).

Section 2.4.1: Remuneration for publishers under Article 16

For the next few questions, please note that Article 16 provides that when an author transfers or licences a right to a publisher, Member States may provide that the publisher is entitled to receive a share of the compensation received for uses under a copyright exception or limitation (e.g., private copying).

Q93. To what extent has the introduction of Article 16 impacted the compensation you receive for uses of your work under copyright exceptions or limitations?

Note: this question is routed only to individual Authors and is included here for reference.

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. To a great extent
2. To some extent
3. To a little extent
4. Not at all
5. I don't receive / I am not aware of any compensation for uses of my work under exceptions or limitations
6. I don't know

Section 2.4.2: Contractual fairness and remuneration for authors and performers

Q95. Which law governs the contracts that you conclude for the transfer / licence of your rights?

Instructions: Select all that apply.

1. My EU Member State law
2. The EU Member State law of my contractual counter-party
3. Another EU MS law (please specify)
4. Another non-EU law (please specify)
5. I don't know

Q95_1 [If Q95=3,4] Please explain why this was designated as governing law.

OPEN QUESTION

Q97. Please indicate how often you (or who you represent) are remunerated through the following methods:

Instructions: Select all that apply.

1. Lump-sum payments
2. Royalties
3. Profit sharing
4. Advance payments
5. Mix of two or more types of remuneration methods

6. Other, please specify

Grid question with the following answer options:

- a) Not applicable
- b) Never
- c) Rarely
- d) Often
- e) Always
- f) I do not know

For the next few questions please note that Article 18 establishes the principle of appropriate and proportionate remuneration of authors and performers. Member States are free to use different mechanisms in ensuring implementation, including collective bargaining. Member States may also define specific cases for the application of lump sum payments, which may constitute proportionate remuneration, but should not be the rule.

Q98. How have the practices on remuneration through lump-sum payments changed since the implementation of the Directive?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. The prevalence of lump-sum payments has increased
2. The prevalence of lump-sum payments has stayed the same
3. The prevalence of lump-sum payments has decreased
4. Lump-sum payments are no longer used
5. I don't receive remuneration through lump-sum payments

Q99. Have there been any changes in your remuneration and bargaining power since the implementation of the Directive in your country?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. It has significantly improved
2. It has somewhat improved
3. There has been no change
4. It has somewhat deteriorated
5. It has significantly deteriorated
6. I don't know

Q99_1 [If Q99=1,2] Please elaborate on the main reasons why you consider that the remuneration has improved. Where appropriate, please distinguish between the impact of the Directive and other factors that may have influenced your remuneration.

OPEN QUESTION

Q99_2 [If Q99=3,4,5] Please elaborate on the main reasons why you consider the remuneration not to have improved. Where appropriate, please distinguish between the impact of the Directive and other factors that may have influenced your remuneration.

OPEN QUESTION

Q100. Has there been an increase in Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) in your sector / industry in the last 5 years?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q100_1 [If Q100=1] Please elaborate on the main reasons why you consider that the prevalence of CBAs has changed. Where appropriate, please distinguish between the impact of the Directive and other factors that may have influenced the conclusion of CBAs.

OPEN QUESTION

Q104. Are you part of or covered by any CBA?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q104_1 [If Q104=1] How has your remuneration been affected by any CBAs in your sector / industry in the last 5 years?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very positively
2. Somewhat positively
3. No change
4. Somewhat negatively
5. Very negatively
6. I don't know

Q104_2 [If Q104_1=1,2,3,4,5] Please explain your response.

OPEN QUESTION

Q106. What unexpected benefits or challenges have you experienced in relation to the principle of fair remuneration set out in Article 18?

OPEN QUESTION

Q107. How do you rate the impact of the adoption of generative AI tools in your industry / sector on the fair remuneration of authors / performers?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. It already has a significant impact
2. It has a potentially significant impact
3. It is not significant
4. I don't know

Q107_1 [If Q107=1,2] Please detail the most significant positive or negative impacts.

OPEN QUESTION

For the next few questions please note that Article 19 institutes transparency requirements for the benefit of authors and performers. Their contractual counterparties must provide them up to date, relevant and comprehensive information on the exploitation of their works / performances at least once a year. Transparency obligations also extend to those to whom rights have subsequently been licensed (sub-licensees).

Q113. Do you (or who you represent) receive information on the exploitation of your works or performances from parties to whom you have licensed or transferred your rights? (for example, information related to revenue generated, streaming numbers etc.)

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes, and I receive this information more than once a year
2. Yes, and I receive information at least once a year
3. Yes, and I receive information less than once a year
4. Yes, but I only receive information infrequently

5. No, I do not
6. I was not aware I should receive such information
7. I don't know

Q114. Has the information received provided meaningful indications concerning the exploitation of your works or performances, and the value of your rights?

- a) The amount of information I receive
- b) The relevance of the information I receive

Grid question with scale from 1 to 5. With 1 representing information not being meaningful and 5 representing very meaningful information.

1. Scale 1–5

Q114_1 [If Q114=2,3,4] Please explain what information about the exploitation of your works or performances you consider lacking?

OPEN QUESTION

Q115. What type of information do you usually receive?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Information on the different modes of exploitation of work or performance (for example: broadcasting, online streaming, sub-licensing)
2. Frequency of use of the work or performance through different modes of exploitation (for example streaming numbers)
3. Information on the revenue generated by each mode of exploitation
4. Information on the revenue generated overall
5. Information on remuneration due
6. Other information

Q116. How clear and easy to understand is the information you receive?

Instructions: 1 being very difficult to understand and 5 being very easy to understand.

1. Slider: 1 2 3 4 5

Q117. In your experience, have any rules in Collective Bargaining Agreements improved transparency on how your works or performances are exploited?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes, CBAs have significantly improved transparency
2. Yes, CBAs have somewhat improved transparency
3. No change
4. No, transparency has gotten worse
5. No, transparency has gotten significantly worse
6. I don't know
7. Not applicable

Q118. What unexpected benefits or challenges have you experienced in relation to the transparency obligations set out in Article 19 of the Directive?

OPEN QUESTION

For the next few questions please note that Article 20 allows authors and performers, where they have entered into a contract for the exploitation of their works or performances, to claim additional appropriate and fair remuneration when the remuneration originally agreed on turns out to be disproportionately low compared to the revenue generated from the exploitation of the works or performances.

Q119. How often have you experienced a situation where the remuneration for the exploitation of your work or performance turned out to be disproportionately low compared with the revenue generated by exploitation of your work or performance?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Often
4. Always
5. Don't know

Q119_1 [If Q119=2,3,4,5] Have you ever invoked the contract adjustment mechanisms provided for under Article 20 of the Directive to claim additional remuneration?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No, I have not needed to
3. No, I considered the adjustment mechanism but decided against using it
4. I was not aware of this possibility
5. I don't know

Q119_2 [If Q119_1=3] Can you explain the situation in which you considered the contract adjustment mechanism and the reasons you decided against using it?

OPEN QUESTION

Q119_4 [If Q119_1=1] How many times have you assisted authors and performers with contract adjustments?

Open numeric

Q119_5 [If Q119_1=1] How many times were you successful in assisting authors & performers?

Open numeric

Q119_6 [If Q119_1=1] How would you evaluate the contract adjustment process?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very positively
2. Rather positively
3. Rather negatively
4. Very negatively
5. Don't know

Q119_7 [If Q119_1=1] Please explain the situation(s) where you resorted to the contract adjustment mechanism and what benefits and challenges you may have encountered?

OPEN QUESTION

Q119_8 [If Q119_1=1] In your experience, to what extent are representative organisations for authors and performers involved in contract adjustments?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Representative organisations are always involved
2. Representative organisations are often involved
3. Representative organisations are rarely involved
4. Contract adjustment is negotiated individually by authors and performers

For the next few questions, please note that Article 21 provides an Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanism for disputes between authors / performers and their counterparties relating to

transparency and contract adjustments in connection with the exploitation of their works or performances. This is intended to offer an option where authors and performers may be reluctant to enforce those rights before a court or tribunal.

Q121. In case of disputes concerning transparency obligations or contract adjustments, have you used Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Yes, for issues with the transparency of exploitation of works or performances
2. Yes, for claims for additional remuneration (contract adjustment)
3. I was not aware of the possibility of Alternative Dispute Resolution
4. I was not involved in disputes concerning the transparency obligations or contract adjustment
5. I used other means to invoke these rights
6. I don't know

Q121_1 [If Q121=5] What other means than ADR do you use to address disputes?

OPEN QUESTION

Q121_4 [If Q121=1,2] How many times were you involved in ADR proceedings?

Open numeric

Q121_5 [If Q121=1,2] How many times were you successful in ADR proceedings?

Open numeric

Q121_6 [If Q121=1,2] Overall, how would you evaluate the process?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very positively
2. Rather positively
3. Rather negatively
4. Very negatively
5. Don't know

Q121_7 [If Q121_6=3,4] What were the issues that you encountered during the process?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. The other party did not abide by the outcome
2. Relevant data to substantiate the claim was not available
3. I lacked means to defend the case
4. The process was lengthy and burdensome
5. Other (please explain)

Q121_8 [If Q121=1,2] What suggestions do you have for improving the effectiveness or efficiency of the alternative dispute resolution process?

OPEN QUESTION

For the next few questions please note that Article 22 enables authors and performers to revoke (end) exclusive contracts in which they licensed or transferred their rights, in case of lack of exploitation of their work or performances.

Q122. Have you used your right to revocation in case of lack of exploitation of your works or performances (Article 22)?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No

3. I was not aware of this possibility
4. I don't know

Q122_2 [If Q122=1] How many times have you assisted authors and performers with revocation?

Open numeric

Q122_3 [If Q122=1] How many times were you successful in assisting authors & performers?

Open numeric

Q122_4 [If Q122=Yes] Overall, how would you evaluate the revocation process?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very positively
2. Rather positively
3. Rather negatively
4. Very negatively
5. Don't know

Q122_5 [If Q122_4=3,4] Please elaborate on the difficulties that you have encountered.

OPEN QUESTION

Q124. What unexpected benefits or challenges have you experienced in relation to the contract adjustment and revocation rights provided for by the Directive?

OPEN QUESTION

Q125. For which of the following aspects of the Directive have you resorted to court litigation?

Instructions: Please select all that apply.

1. Fair & appropriate remuneration
2. Transparency obligations
3. Contract adjustments
4. Rights of revocation
5. No, I have not gone to court

Q125_1 [If Q125=1,2,3,4] Did you have to go to court outside the EU?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No

Q125_2 [If Q125_1=1] Please explain the circumstances.

OPEN QUESTION

Q125_4 [If Q125=1,2,3,4] How many times have you assisted authors and performers with court proceedings?

Open numeric

Q125_5 [If Q125=1,2,3,4] How many times were you successful in assisting authors & performers in court proceedings?

Open numeric

Q125_6 [If Q125=1,2,3,4] How difficult were the court proceedings?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Very difficult
2. Moderately difficult
3. Slightly difficult
4. Not difficult at all
5. Don't know

Section 2.5: Other impacts

The following questions concern the value added by the Directive, as an EU-level intervention, compared to the pre-existing situation in the Member States. Please respond based on your direct experience.

Q126. Based on your experience, please indicate one key benefit or value added by the DSM Directive, if any?

OPEN QUESTION

The following questions concern the efficiency of the Directive and aim to assess the incurred costs of the Directive. Please respond based on your direct experience.

Q127. To what extent has your organisation incurred compliance costs because of the Directive?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. To a great extent
2. To some extent
3. To a little extent
4. Not at all
5. I don't know

Q128. What is the nature and level of those compliance costs and in relation to which of the Directive's provisions are they incurred?

OPEN QUESTION

The following questions concern the coherence of the Directive and aim to assess to what extent the provisions of the Directive are coherent with other national or international laws.

Q129. How well do the DSM Directive's provisions align with other relevant EU legislation (e.g., GDPR, AI Act, Digital Services Act, Orphan Works Directive)?

Instructions: with 1 being not at all aligned and 5 being fully aligned.

1. Slider: 1 2 3 4 5

Q129_1 [If Q129=1 or 2] Please specify any particular laws where you have noticed alignment or conflict.

OPEN QUESTION

Q130. Have you experienced any legal or practical tensions or conflicts between the DSM Directive as implemented and other national laws in your country?

Instructions: Please select one option.

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Q130_1 [If Q130=Yes] Please describe the tension or conflict and its impact.

OPEN QUESTION