



[CB-CDA 2023-047]

## **RULING OF THE BOARD - *Erratum***

**Proceeding: Online Audiovisual Services – Music (2014-2018)**

**Subject: Ruling separating the Online Audiovisual Services – Music (2014-2018) proceeding into two proceedings: i) Online Music Video Services (2014-2018) and ii) Online Audiovisual Services – Music (2014-2026)**

September 13, 2023 (revised on September 20, 2023)

### **I. OVERVIEW**

[1] In Ruling CB-CDA 2023-010, I stated that I intended to rule on whether the Board should consider tariffs proposed for music videos beyond 2018, and on whether to separate the consideration of the proposed tariffs for Online User Generated Content (UGC) Services and other Online Audio-Visual Services, and Online Music Video Services into two distinct proceedings.

[2] Following consultations with parties, I hereby rule to separate the present proceeding into the two following proceedings:

1. *Online Music Video Services (2014-2018)*; and
2. *Online Audiovisual Services – Music (2014-2026)*.

[3] The *Online Music Video Services (2014-2018)* proceeding (the “OMV proceeding”) will cover the use of music in audiovisual content by an

- i) **online music video service** (an online service that predominantly transmits music videos and is neither an online user-generated content service, nor an allied audiovisual service); and
- ii) **online music service**.

[4] The *Online Audiovisual Services – Music (2014-2026)* (the “OAVS-M proceeding”) will cover the use of music in audiovisual content by an audiovisual service that is

- i) **an online UGC service** (an online audiovisual service that predominantly transmits user-generated content); and

- ii) any other **online audiovisual service** that is not an online music video service.

For the purposes of establishing the scope of these proceedings, a “music video” is defined as an audiovisual work, including a concert video,

- i) for which the visual content was produced to accompany one or more sound recordings of one or more musical works;
- ii) where the sound recordings are in the foreground of the audiovisual work; and
- iii) where the making of the audiovisual work was authorized by the owner of copyright, or their agent, licensee, or other representative.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

[5] On January 25, 2023, following a case conference, I (Order CB-CDA 2023-001) asked parties to comment on several procedural issues, including the separation of the current proceeding into two distinct proceedings.

[6] In the subsequent Ruling CB-CDA 2023-010, I

- ruled that the Board would consider proposed tariffs for AV content other than music videos through to 2026; and
- expressed my preliminary view that the proposed tariffs under consideration should be considered in two distinct proceedings: one considering the proposed tariffs for music videos, and one considering proposed tariffs for UGC and other audiovisual services.

[7] Given parties’ uncertainty about which proposed tariffs would apply to their activities, I invited parties to attend a technical meeting with Board Staff (Notice CB-CDA 2023-018) and required SOCAN and SODRAC—and permitted other parties—to file detailed submissions on the appropriate scope of the music video proceeding (Order CB-CDA 2023-029).

## **III. ISSUES**

[8] The question to answer is as follows:

- a. whether the proposed tariffs should be considered in two distinct proceedings.

[9] If the answer is yes, what should the scope of each proceeding be? In particular:

- b. How should the scope of services/activities in the music-video proceeding be defined?;
- c. What should the definition of “music video” be?; and
- d. Which years should be considered in the music video proceeding?

## **IV. ANALYSIS**

### **A. SHOULD THE PROPOSED TARIFFS BE CONSIDERED IN TWO DISTINCT PROCEEDINGS?**

[10] Most parties that filed submissions on this issue agree that the proposed tariffs should be considered by way of two distinct proceedings.

[11] However, Stingray is of the view that it would be more efficient to hear all proposed tariffs together, so as to avoid duplication related to evidence gathering. MPA Canada (MPA-C) and Sirius XM both expressed concerns about certainty, with Sirius XM pointing to the difficulty of identifying the boundaries between works that qualify as “music videos” and “non-music videos.”

[12] I find these submissions useful in that they point to issues we will need to be mindful of as we proceed in this matter.

[13] However, my view remains that, because the consideration of the proposed tariffs covering music videos is expected to be less complex and require different procedural steps than the consideration of the proposed tariffs related to UGC and other AV services, it would be more appropriate to consider music videos separately.

### **B. THE SCOPE OF THE MUSIC VIDEO PROCEEDING**

#### *Online Music Services will be included in the OMV proceeding*

[14] Among the parties that explicitly made submissions on how online music services should be treated, there is agreement that an online music service that also transmits music videos should be included in the music video proceeding.

[15] SOCAN explains that many online music service providers start out streaming and providing downloads of sound recordings first, and then add music videos to their services. The licensing of these two uses of music is often negotiated and set out in the same licence agreement. Apple notes the historical relationship between royalty rates for music videos and online music.

[16] I accept this explanation, and include the use of music in music videos by online music services in the OMV proceeding.

#### *User-Generated Content Services will not be included in the OMV proceeding*

[17] Among the parties that support the separation of this proceeding into two proceedings and address online user generated content services explicitly, there is agreement that user-generated content services should not be included in the music video proceeding.

[18] Additionally, SOCAN and TikTok both point to the fact that SOCAN’s proposed User-Generated Content Service Tariff (22.D.2) covers the use of music in all “audiovisual programs, including but not limited to music videos, by a user-generated content service.”

[19] I agree with this approach. Among other things, it avoids user-generated content services having to identify music videos and separately allocate revenues to their use.

[20] As such, the use of music videos by online user-generated content services will not be included in the OMV proceeding, but will remain as part of the OAVS-M proceeding.

*Defining Online Music Video Services that will be covered in the OMV Proceeding*

[21] There is general agreement among parties that online audiovisual services that focus on music videos (i.e., online music video services) should be covered by the OMV proceeding; while other audiovisual services should not, even if some smaller portion of the services' content is music videos.

[22] However, there is disagreement on how to determine whether a service focuses on music videos. For example, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) suggests that the music video proceeding could apply to a service for which music videos constitute more than 90% of its programming time.

[23] SOCAN, on the other hand, submits that determining whether a service “focuses primarily” on music videos be a holistic analysis, not a rigid one. In SOCAN’s view, applying a rigid, quantitative, threshold could mean that a service meets the threshold in one reporting period, but not in the subsequent one.

[24] In my view, entities should be able to ascertain, with relative certainty, which proceeding would cover their services. As such, I prefer a criterion that is easier to evaluate than a holistic evaluation. The criterion should be closely linked to the activities covered by the tariffs and, for this reason, I find that using the proportion of transmissions that are of music videos is more appropriate.

[25] I agree that using a fixed quantitative measure, such as 90%, is probably too rigid. Instead, I refer to SOCAN’s proposed tariff 22.D.2, which uses the term “predominantly” to qualify a service as a user-generated content service.

[26] For completeness, I note that the communications carried out in connection with the operation of allied audiovisual services (see e.g., approved tariff *SOCAN Tariff 22.D.3 – Audiovisual Services Allied with Programming and Distribution Undertakings (2007-2013)*), are not under consideration in this proceeding. However, the reproductions made in connection with the operation of an allied audiovisual service—even one that would qualify as an online music video service—are under consideration in the OAVS-M proceeding.

*Conclusion*

[27] The Online Music Video proceeding will cover the use of music in audiovisual content by

- online music services; and

- online music video services (i.e., an online audiovisual service that i) is not an allied audiovisual service, ii) predominantly transmits music videos and iii) does not predominantly transmit user-generated content).

[28] The OAVS-M proceeding will cover the remainder of the activities covered by the Proposed Tariffs under consideration. These are:

- the use of music in audiovisual works by online user-generated content services (audiovisual services that predominantly transmit user-generated content); and
- the use of music in audiovisual works by “regular” online audiovisual services (audiovisual service that do not qualify as an online music video service, nor as a user-generated content service).

### **C. DEFINITION OF MUSIC VIDEO**

[29] When SOCAN and SODRAC filed proposed tariffs separately, the proposed tariffs filed by SOCAN used the term “music video”, which had a relatively narrow definition, and those filed by SODRAC used the term “musical audiovisual work,” which had a broader definition.

[30] The parties that made submissions on this question agree that there should be a single definition of music videos that would apply to both SOCAN and SODRAC tariffs, that the definition should be based on the concept of “music video” as opposed to “musical audiovisual work,” and that a music video is a kind of audiovisual work with music at the forefront.

[31] However, there is disagreement on

- how to characterize the concept of music being at the forefront;
- whether a music video must be “official”; and
- whether to limit music videos to a single sound recording or work.

[32] I consider these sub-issues, in turn.

#### **i. Music at the forefront**

[33] The parties agree that music is at the forefront of an audiovisual work that qualifies as a music video. I agree. Furthermore, the Board’s jurisprudence already contains the distinction between foreground and background. The use of the term foreground has the benefit of not introducing a new concept, and conveys the primary role of music. Therefore, I will use a definition where music is in the *foreground* of the audiovisual work.

[34] Among the concepts used by SOCAN, I find the concept of music being “featured” to be appropriate in that it provides somewhat an idea of the purpose of the production of the music video, However, I find that the concept lacks precision. Therefore, I will use a definition which specifies that the audiovisual work (the music video) was produced to accompany a sound recording.

**ii. “Official” nature**

[35] Some parties submitted that music videos need to have an “official” aspect to them. I agree.

[36] However, SOCAN cautions that limitations, such that a music video would need to be “produced by a record label, publisher or other rights-holder” is overly restrictive. This could exclude audiovisual works such as concert videos or karaoke videos.

[37] I am of the view that a requirement that music videos have some official aspect to them is required to exclude works produced, for example, under the UGC exceptions in the *Copyright Act*. Furthermore, it is possible to maintain some level of “official” nature of the music video, without unduly constraining the scope of the audiovisual works that qualify as music videos.

[38] For the purposes of this proceeding, I will require that the production of a music videos to have been authorized by the owner of copyright or their agent, licensee or other representative.

[39] Authorized karaoke or concert videos will not be excluded by this requirement.

**iii. Single sound recording**

[40] Some parties submitted that a music video should be related to a single sound recording.

[41] SOCAN disagrees with this approach, arguing that this would be unduly restrictive, and contrary to past decisions of the Board. It notes that the Board has previously approved tariffs in which videos of concerts have been included as a kind of music video. SOCAN also notes that it is aware of services that focus on concerts, and that these should be covered in the OMVS proceeding.

[42] It appears that at least some of the disagreement among parties about whether concert videos—and in particular concert videos that include non-musical scenes, such as discussion—should qualify as music videos.

[43] I am of the view that audiovisual works such as karaoke videos and concert videos should be covered by a definition of “music video.” The relationship of the musical component and the visual component in karaoke and concert videos is more akin to that in an archetypal “official” music video, than in other audiovisual works.

[44] As such, provided the other features of a music video are met, it is not appropriate to restrict these to only those audiovisual works containing a single sound recording or only a single musical work.

[45] Moreover, permitting music videos to include more than one sound recording removes the possibility of issues arising from attempting to determine whether works such as a concert video contains a single sound recording or several.

**iv. Conclusion**

[46] For the purposes of these proceedings, a “music video” is defined as:

an audiovisual work, including a concert video,

- i) for which the visual content was produced to accompany one or more sound recordings of one or more musical works;
- ii) where the sound recordings are in the foreground of the audiovisual work; and
- iii) where the making of the audiovisual work was authorized by the owner of copyright, or their agent, licensee, or other representative.

**D. WHICH YEARS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE ONLINE MUSIC VIDEOS PROCEEDING?**

[47] The Online Music Videos proceeding will cover the years 2014-2018.

[48] SOCAN, Apple, Google, Amazon, and Spotify submit that the OMVS proceeding should be limited to the years 2014 to 2018. These parties note that the non-music-video portion of SOCAN Tariff 22.A has always served as a proxy for the music-video-rates. According to them, given the historical link between the provision of music videos by online music services, and given that the Board has only considered SOCAN 22.A up through 2018, it would be not be appropriate to consider further years for the video portion of that tariff.

[49] The argument regarding the use of SOCAN 22.A as a reference is difficult to accept given that the non-music video portion of SOCAN 22.A [2014-2018] is being withdrawn by SOCAN. That being said, it is apparent from its Application<sup>1</sup> that there are agreements in place for those years. In the absence of approved tariffs, such agreements could serve as proxies.

[50] Furthermore, SOCAN states that, during the period of 2019-2026, tariff users changed both their offerings and the technology used to support those offerings. It submits that this would likely make a proceeding covering that period more demanding in terms of evidence and other information required.

[51] I accept the general premise that uses and technologies have changed, and that a proceeding covering 2014-2026 is likely to require more evidence—and therefore potentially interrogatories—than a proceeding covering only 2014-2018.

[52] The MPA-C, the CAB and Stingray submit that it is more efficient to consider as many years as possible in a single proceeding.

[53] Even though I acknowledge that this is a real possibility, given the purported changes in uses and technologies, I do not think that this will necessarily lead to more efficiency. Furthermore, such a proceeding would undoubtedly be longer. This would further delay the approval of proposed tariffs for years that are already many years in the past.

[54] Therefore, given that an OMVS proceeding covering only the years 2014 to 2018

---

<sup>1</sup> Application by SOCAN to amend its proposed Tariff 22.A for the years 2014 to 2018 pursuant to section 69 of the Copyright Act, April 12, 2023

- will likely involve fewer parties,
- require less extensive evidence, and therefore interrogatories, and
- may potentially serve as a point of reference for a proceeding covering the years 2019+,

I limit the OMV proceeding to proposed tariffs for years 2014-2018.

## V. CONCLUSION

[55] The scope of the two proceedings fully partitions the proposed tariffs under consideration.

*Online Music Video Services (2014-2018)*

[56] Effective immediately, the following proposed tariff portions are removed from the current proceeding, and placed in a new proceeding, to be named “*Online Music Video Services (2014-2018)*”:

- SOCAN Tariff 22.A – Online Music Services (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018) [music videos only]
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D – Audiovisual Content (2014, 2015) [online music video services only]
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Internet – Other Uses of Music - Audiovisual Content (2016, 2017, 2018) [online music video services only]
- SODRAC Tariff 6 – Online Music Services - Music Videos (2014)
- SODRAC Tariff 6 – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Musical Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2015, 2016, 2017, 2018) [online music services & online music video services only]

[57] This proceeding will cover the activities of the following services:

- **online music video services** (an online service that predominantly transmits music videos and is neither an online user-generated content service, nor an allied audiovisual service); and
- **online music services.**

[58] I note that, for the year 2014, the SODRAC proposed tariff is limited to online music services, and there is no proposed tariff that would cover the activities of audiovisual services. I expect that this distinction for the year 2014 can be addressed and handled in the OMV proceeding.



*Online Audiovisual Service-Music (2014-2026)*

[59] The following proposed tariffs remain in the Online Audiovisual Service-Music proceeding, which shall now be styled as “*Online Audiovisual Service - Music (2014-2026)*”:

- SOCAN Tariff 22.D – Audiovisual Content (2014, 2015) [excluding online music video services and online allied services]
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Internet – Other Uses of Music - Audiovisual Content (2016, 2017, 2018 [excluding online music video services and online allied services], 2019, 2020, 2021-2023 [excluding online music video services])
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Online Audiovisual Services (2024-2026) [excluding online music video services]
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2 – Internet - Other Uses of Music - User Generated Content (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020)
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2 – Internet - User-Generated Content (2021-2023)
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2 – User-Generated Content Services (2024-2026)
- SODRAC Tariff 6 – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Musical Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019) [excluding online music services & online music video services]
- SODRAC Tariff 7 – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019)
- SOCAN-SODRAC Tariff 22.D.1.R – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2020)
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1.R – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2021-2023, 2024-2026)

*Proposed tariffs relating to online music video services for 2019-2026*

[60] For greater certainty, the following tariff-portions are not being considered in either proceeding, and will be considered by the Board at a later time:

- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Audiovisual Content (2019, 2020, 2021-2023) [online music video services only]
- SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Online Audiovisual Services (2024-2026) [online music video services only]

[61] For ease of reference, the proposed tariffs under consideration in each of the proceedings are listed in the Annex to this Ruling, along with the current objectors and interveners.

## VI. NEXT STEPS

[62] Any party that wishes to participate in the *Online Music Videos (2014-2018)* proceeding and

- has filed an objection to any proposed tariff under consideration in the proceeding, or
- has previously been granted intervener status,

shall indicate their intent to do so, as well as the official language in which wish to participate, no later than **Wednesday, October 4, 2023**.

[63] Any party that wishes to participate in the *Online Audiovisual Service – Music (2014-2026)* proceeding and

- has filed an objection to any proposed tariff under consideration in the proceeding, or
- has previously been granted intervener status,

shall indicate their intent to do so, as well as the official language in which wish to participate, no later than **Wednesday, October 4, 2023**.

[64] After receiving confirmation of participation, I will schedule separate case conferences in respect of each of the proceedings.

[65] I intend for the case conferences to address the remaining items in Order CB-CDA 2023-001, namely: identification of issues, setting of procedural steps and fixing schedules. Separate notices will be issued for that purpose.

[66] For greater certainty, despite Rule 24 of the *Copyright Board Rules of Practice and Procedure*, no joint statement of issues is required at this time. Such a joint statement may be ordered, if appropriate, at a future date.

Nathalie Théberge  
Case Manager

**ANNEX: SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

<b>Title of Proceeding</b>	<i>Online Music Videos (2014-2018)</i>	<i>Online Audiovisual Service – Music (2014-2026)</i>
<b>Proposed Tariffs Under Consideration</b>	SOCAN Tariff 22.A – Online Music Services (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018) [music videos only]	
	SOCAN Tariff 22.D – Audiovisual Content (2014, 2015) [online music video services only]	SOCAN Tariff 22.D – Audiovisual Content (2014, 2015) [excluding online music video services and online allied services]
	SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Internet - Other Uses of Music - Audiovisual Content (2016, 2017, 2018) [online music video services only]	SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Internet - Other Uses of Music - Audiovisual Content (2016, 2017, 2018 [excluding online music video services and online allied services], 2019, 2020, 2021-2023 [excluding online music video services])  SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1 – Online Audiovisual Services (2024-2026) [excluding online music video services]
		SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2 – Internet - Other Uses of Music - User Generated Content (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020)  SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2 – Internet - User-Generated Content (2021-2023)  SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2 – User-Generated Content Services (2024-2026)
	SODRAC Tariff 6 – Online Music Services - Music Videos (2014)  SODRAC Tariff 6 – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Musical Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service	SODRAC Tariff 6 – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Musical Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019) [excluding online music services & online music video services]

	(2015, 2016, 2017, 2018) [online music services & online music video services only]	
		SODRAC Tariff 7 – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019)
		SOCAN-SODRAC Tariff 22.D.1.R – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2020)  SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1.R – Reproduction of Musical Works Embedded in Audiovisual Works for Transmission by a Service (2021-2023, 2024-2026)
<b>Activities Covered</b>	use of music in audiovisual content by an  <b>online music video service</b> (an online service that predominantly transmits music videos and is neither an online user-generated content service, nor an allied audiovisual service); and  <b>online music service.</b>	use of music in audiovisual content by  <b>an online UGC service</b> (an online audiovisual service that predominantly transmits user-generated content); and  any other <b>online audiovisual service</b> that is not an online music video service.

**Objectors and Interveners to Tariffs Under Consideration in *Online Music Videos (2014-2018)***

<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.A</b>	
2014	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Quebecor Media Rogers Communications Canada
2015	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Netflix (intervener) Quebecor Media

	Rogers Communications Canada
2016	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Quebecor Media Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group
2017	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Quebecor Media Netflix (intervener) Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group
2018	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Quebecor Media Netflix (intervener) Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group
<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.D</b>	
2014	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Facebook (intervener)
2015	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener)
<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1</b>	
2016	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener)
2017	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener)
2018	Netflix (intervener)
<b>SODRAC Tariff 6</b>	
2014	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Canadian Association of Broadcasters Vidéotron Rogers Communications Canada
2015	Canadian Association of Broadcasters
2016	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener) Stingray Digital Group
2017	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener)

	Stingray Digital Group
2018	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener) Stingray Digital Group

**Objectors and Interveners to Tariffs Under Consideration in *Online Audiovisual Service – Music (2014-2026)***

<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.D</b>	
2014	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener)
2015	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener)
<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1</b>	
2016	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener)
2017	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener)
2018	Netflix (intervener)
2019	Apple and Apple Canada DANZ (Perform Investment Ltd.) Goodlife Fitness Centres Québecor Média Restaurants Canada Sirius XM Canada Stingray Digital Group
2020	Apple Canada Facebook Goodlife Fitness Centres Netflix Québecor Média Rogers Communications Canada Sirius XM Canada Stingray Digital Group
2021-2023	Apple Canada Facebook Goodlife Fitness Centres Netflix Québecor Média Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group
2024-2026	Apple and Apple Canada Canadian Association of Broadcasters Meta Platforms (formerly known as Facebook) Netflix Québecor Média

	Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group Warner Bros. Entertainment Canada
<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.D.2</b>	
2016	Stingray Digital Group
2018	Stingray Digital Group
2019	Apple and Apple Canada Entertainment Software Association & Entertainment Software Association Canada Goodlife Fitness Centres Google Stingray Digital Group
2020	Apple Canada Entertainment Software Association & Entertainment Software Association Canada Goodlife Fitness Centres Google Meta Platforms (formerly known as Facebook) Stingray Digital Group
2021-2023	Apple Canada Entertainment Software Association & Entertainment Software Association Canada Facebook Goodlife Fitness Centres Google Stingray Digital Group
2024-2026	Canadian Association of Broadcasters Entertainment Software Association & Entertainment Software Association Canada Google Meta Platforms (formerly known as Facebook) Stingray Digital Group TikTok Technology Canada
<b>SODRAC Tariff 6</b>	
2015	Canadian Association of Broadcasters
2016	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Stingray Digital Group
2017	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Stingray Digital Group
2018	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener)

	Netflix (intervener) Stingray Digital Group
2019	Apple and Apple Canada Canadian Association of Broadcasters Facebook Goodlife Fitness Netflix Sirius XM Canada Stingray Digital Group
<b>SODRAC Tariff 7</b>	
2015	Bell Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Rogers Communications (intervener) Vidéotron (intervener)
2016	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Bell Canada Quebecor Media Canadian Association of Broadcasters Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener) Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group TELUS Communications Vidéotron
2017	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Quebecor Media Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group TELUS Communications Vidéotron
2018	Apple and Apple Canada (intervener) Canadian Association of Broadcasters Quebecor Media Motion Picture Association – Canada (intervener) Netflix (intervener) Rogers Communications Canada Stingray Digital Group TELUS Communications Vidéotron
2019	Apple and Apple Canada Canadian Association of Broadcasters Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) Facebook, Goodlife Fitness Centres



	<p>Netflix                  Sirius XM Canada                  Stingray Digital Group</p>
<b>SOCAN-SODRAC Tariff 22.D.1.R</b>	
2020	<p>Apple Canada                  Canadian Association of Broadcasters                  Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC)                  Goodlife Fitness Centres                  Netflix                  Sirius XM Canada                  Stingray Digital Group</p>
<b>SOCAN Tariff 22.D.1.R</b>	
2021-2023	<p>Apple Canada                  Canadian Association of Broadcasters                  Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC)                  Goodlife Fitness Centres                  Facebook                  Motion Picture Association – Canada                  Netflix                  Québecor Média                  Rogers Communications Canada                  Sirius XM Canada                  Stingray Digital Group                  TELUS Communications</p>
2024-2026	<p>Apple and Apple Canada                  Bell Canada                  Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB)                  Canadian Communication Systems Alliance                  Cogeco Communications                  Meta Platforms (formerly known as Facebook, )                  Motion Picture Association – Canada                  Québecor Média                  Rogers Communications Canada                  Stingray Digital Group                  TELUS Communications</p>