

ANSI-Proposed Default DRM Parameters, v2.8
Based on input from 3/2/04 Meeting of OMF DRM Ad-Hoc

Below are ANSI-proposed default DRM parameters. These values are the represent the recommended maximum level of permissiveness with regard to DRM protection parameters. SDOs may, of course, deploy controls that are more restrictive than these proposed consensus controls.

Common to all recommended parameters is the goal of deterring flagrant and deliberate violators while not inhibiting the legitimate user.

Parameter	Proposed Default Parameter <i>(maximum level of permissiveness)</i>	Comments
Render Rights (Rights to render content)		
View	Unrestricted viewing of successfully opened file.	One could restrict the viewing of a range of pages, or restrict the number of times a document is viewed.
Print	Allow 5 complete prints of the document.	Two possible ways of controlling: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Count number of print requests (assuming user remembers to print the entire document when making a print request). 2. Count pages in each document and allow 5 X that number of printed pages. <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Other possible print controls: 1. Print X number of pages over a period of time, with re-set. 2. Restrict printing of certain page ranges. + Since high-speed/high-volume photocopying of a hard copy is so easy, is this parameter more likely to just cause unnecessary customer dissatisfaction? + Print controls would deter high-speed/high-volume printing directly from PDF file.

Transport Rights

(Rights to copy or move content from one device to another)

Copying files to allow for simultaneous use	Not allowed – file locked to owner’s device. Note exceptions below.	Prevents copying or forwarding to another device. Note the various exception scenarios below, and their interdependencies.
EXCEPTIONS:		
1. Simultaneous use on user-owned devices	Allow locked file to be copied to and opened on 2 additional user-owned devices.	For Adobe Content server 3.0, requires authorized “activation” of additional user-owned devices via online identity that is independent from device (e.g, .NET Passport or Adobe ID). At the proposed most permissive level, a user could, for example, open the locked file on their desktop at work (original locked device), and also one 1 laptop and 1 PDA. Use of .NET Passport or Adobe ID raises some privacy concerns. This may be considered “reasonable personal use”, but not established in law.
2. Move locked file	Allow originally locked copy to be moved to a different device 2 times if copy on previous device is disabled/destroyed.	Solution for verifying disabling of previous file would be needed.
3. Back-up locked file	Allow 1 back-up copy, which must be accessed by the same device.	Purpose is to allow recovery of a locked file if the original is no longer available due to accidental deletion, hardware failures, or other losses. Since the backup can only be accessed by original device, this parameter does not conflict with proposed parameters for “Space Shifting” or “Move locked file.”
4. Forwarding of file by centralized purchaser	Allow once.	To account for centralized purchasers (e.g., corporate librarians) who would be use to forwarding downloaded copies of documents to the actual user. Exception 1 may not work here since the device receiving the file is owned by someone other than the purchaser. URL to file could possibly be intercepted and forwarded so that the purchaser does not lock the file to their device.

Parameter	Proposed Default Parameter (maximum level of permissiveness)	Comments
Derivative Work Rights (using portions of text to create additional (derivative) works)		
Extract (Copy – Paste)	Allow unlimited Copy-Paste requests.	<p>Would allow user to legitimately extract excerpts from standards text and insert in other documents, assuming they include appropriate citations.</p> <p>Raises the issues of “fair use” – must allow user to create derivative works depending on a) Purpose and character of use, b) Nature of copyrighted work c) Amount and substantiality of the extract d) Impact on market value for original work.</p> <p>But electronic copy/paste is just a convenience – just keeps the user from having to re-type text. So the primary concern SDOs is that large parts of or complete text of a document can be extracted, manipulated, and represented as another work.</p> <p>The current state of technology in this area should be examined. Unprotected PDF files, for example, can now be converted to Word using a utility. But with protected files, how efficient is it to abuse the “copy-to-clipboard” feature? Amazon.com faced criticism from authors when they released their “search inside book” feature, which allowed copying from full text pages – even though it would be incredibly cumbersome for somebody to copy and paste the entire book in this way.</p> <p>Options for more restrictive parameters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set maximum number of “copy-to-clipboard” requests over a given period of time – maximum number is re-set after period expires. Proposed parameter: 30 to 50 requests per day. 2. Set maximum total number of “copy-to-clipboard” requests with no re-set. Proposed parameter: 750-1000 requests. 3. Disallow completely.
Edit	No changes allowed to original text.	Copy-pasted text can be edited.
Other Rights		
File Expiry	Only relevant with subscription applications or when limited duration viewing is deployed. No default parameters proposed, since expiry date will vary depending on business model.	

Watermarking	Include on every page of document, with text specific to customer (name/company, order ID, date of download, etc.).	Discourages photocopying abuse. A more permissive option is for text to be more generic, e.g., "Single user license only. Copying or networking prohibited."

ANSI-Proposed Default DRM Parameters, v2.8

Additional notes based on input from 6/3/04 meeting of OMF DRM Ad-Hoc

Below are some additional comments about the ANSI-proposed Default DRM Parameters v2.8. These comments were made by members of the OMF DRM Ad-hoc during a 6/3/04 teleconference.

Printing: Many members are seeking to mirror their hard copy restrictions on making copies, which in many cases is only 1. But it was ultimately decided that the best approach was to state the restriction level to the customer, but then offer a more permissive restriction setting in the background to allow for a certain margin for error. So the final parameter should be changed from allow 5 to publish allowance of 2 to customer while allowing 5 complete prints in the background.

Multiple device copying vs. moving: There was not a consensus on whether to offer the use of a document on multiple devices vs. requiring the user to destroy the copy on a previous device after moving.

As an alternative, members suggested that different prices could be charged for different levels of permissiveness. For example, if a customer wants to use the document on a 2nd owned device (e.g., PC at home, laptop at home), they would be charged a 10% premium for the use of the 2nd device.

Copy-Paste: The majority of members wanted to maintain the current parameter as unlimited because they felt that this was a key value-added of an electronic document and felt the risk of substantial abuse was low.

Watermarking: Members felt that a customer-specific watermark was many times more effective than a generic one.