Appendix 6

Resale royalty arrangements – major proposals

Listed below are major proposals submitted to DCITA as part of the department's consideration of a resale royalty scheme in Australia in 2004.

The Australia Council

The Australia Council supported a model that incorporated the following features:

- a minimum price threshold of \$3000;
- a sliding scale that starts at 5 per cent and trends down to one per cent;
- coverage of all sales through professional intermediaries;
- administration by a copyright collecting society; and
- supervision by the Copyright Tribunal.¹

NAVA

NAVA proposed the following arrangement:

- the scheme should apply to all Australian artistic works which are resold in Australia or overseas in countries with comparable schemes;
- the duration of the scheme should be tied to copyright arrangements that is, the life of the artist plus 70 years;
- the level of the threshold should be set by the copyright collecting society (which would be appointed by the Attorney General); and
- the royalty should be a flat rate of 5 per cent.²

Viscopy

Viscopy proposed that:

- all artistic works currently in the period of copyright should be covered;
- the duration should exist for the same period as other forms of copyright, that is 70 years;

¹ The Australia Council, *Submission 9* to DCITA inquiry, p. 1.

² NAVA, Submission 23 to DCITA inquiry, pp 8–12.

- an appropriate threshold would be between \$1000 and \$3000; and
- the royalty should be a flat rate of 5 per cent.³

Desart

Desart proposed the following arrangements:

- a minimum threshold of \$5000;
- a sliding scale stating at 2.5 per cent for the portion of the sale price up to \$200 000; 0.75 per cent for the portion of the sale price up to \$500 000 and 0.25 per cent exceeding \$500 000;
- the scheme should cover all works of fine art, craft and sculpture;
- a collecting agency should be established; and
- the duration of arrangements should be in line with copyright arrangements.⁴

³ Viscopy, *Submission 32* to DCITA inquiry, pp 7–9.

⁴ Desart, Submission 14 to DCITA inquiry, pp 2–3.