



Hargreaves, Robert ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8778-7417> (2026) Copyright and Community Choirs: Optimising Licensing for Rehearsals, Livestreams and Performances. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/13913/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpag016>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at [ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)

# Copyright and Community Choirs: Optimising Licensing for Rehearsals, Livestreams and Performances

## Introduction

Community choirs operate within a copyright framework whose fragmented structure exposes them to licensing errors arising not from scale or commercial intent, but from the number of restricted acts their routine activities engage in under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (CDPA). Rehearsals held in publicly accessible spaces, ticketed or unticketed concerts, the use of commercial backing tracks, the circulation of copied scores, and the livestreaming or recording of performances each constitute distinct statutory acts that attract different rights holders and licensing mechanisms. Treating these activities as a single instance of ‘using music’ obscures the doctrinal divisions that determine infringement and compliance.

At the level of black-letter law, choral activity routinely triggers the public-performance rights in musical and literary works.<sup>1</sup> The communication to the public right where performances are livestreamed or made available online,<sup>2</sup> the reproduction and distribution rights implicated when scores, lyric sheets or rehearsal materials are duplicated,<sup>3</sup> and, where commercial recordings are used, the discrete sound-recording and performers’ rights regime in Part II.<sup>4</sup> These rights vest in different owners and correspond to different statutory acts; authorisation for one does not extend to another as a matter of statutory structure.

The institutional structure reflects this doctrinal fragmentation. Performing rights in musical and literary works are administered by PRS for Music, while rights in sound recordings fall within the remit of PPL; both operate as collective management organisations under the UK’s regulatory framework, and although tariff administration is now conducted jointly through PPL PRS Ltd, the underlying repertoires remain legally and operationally distinct. The separation is embedded in both statute and jurisprudence; the House of Lords in *CBS Songs v Amstrad Consumer Electronics Plc*,<sup>5</sup> affirmed that the musical work and the sound recording embody independent copyrights, each requiring distinct authorisation.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, a licence permitting the public performance of a composition does not extend to the use of a commercial recording of that composition, and the availability of one permission cannot cure the absence of the other. It is at this juncture, particularly where choirs rely on commercially purchased accompaniment or rehearsal tracks, that inadvertent infringement most commonly occurs.

Arrangements introduce a further layer of legal complexity. Under ss 3(1) and 21 CDPA, an arrangement constitutes an adaptation requiring authorisation unless the underlying copyright has expired. Contemporary jurisprudence confirms that modern performing editions may themselves constitute original musical works. In *Sawkins v Hyperion Records Ltd*<sup>7</sup> the Court of Appeal held that Dr Sawkins’ performing editions of Lalande, produced through extensive scholarly intervention, correction of errors, reconstruction of missing material and interpretative editorial judgment, were not “mere copies” but original musical works created through a substantial application of skill, labour

---

<sup>1</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 s 19.

<sup>2</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 s 20.

<sup>3</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 ss 17-18

<sup>4</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 ss 182A-182D.

<sup>5</sup> [1988] 1 AC 1013 (HL).

<sup>6</sup> *CBS Songs Ltd v Amstrad Consumer Electronics Plc* [1988] AC 1013 (HL) 1047.

<sup>7</sup> [2005] EWCA Civ 565, [2005] 1 WLR 3281.

and judgment.<sup>8</sup> Each edition, therefore, acquired its own independent copyright term, notwithstanding that Lalande's underlying compositions had long entered the public domain. This significantly narrows the practical scope of the musical public domain: community choirs performing ostensibly public-domain repertoire frequently rely on modern editions or arrangements that remain fully protected.

Digital dissemination exacerbates these issues rather than simplifying them. Where a performance is livestreamed, the relevant restricted act is communication to the public under s 20 CDPA, a right interpreted by the CJEU in *ITV v TVCatchup*<sup>9</sup> as technologically neutral and capable of encompassing any form of online transmission. Where a choir records its own performance and publishes the video, an additional rights issue arises through synchronisation, namely the pairing of music with moving images. Synchronisation sits outside collective-management mandates in the UK and ordinarily requires work-by-work licensing from the relevant music publishers.<sup>10</sup> The common assumption that a venue's public-performance licence extends to digital dissemination is therefore incorrect as a matter of statutory rights.

Significant misalignments persist between formal copyright doctrine and the informal realities of amateur choral practice. This practice point moves beyond a rehearsal of settled law to translate doctrinal requirements into a functional rights-clearance framework for practitioners advising community music ensembles. By isolating the restricted acts engaged across three operational contexts, rehearsals, live performances, and digital dissemination, the analysis identifies with precision where collective management (blanket licensing) is sufficient and where direct permissions are non-negotiable. The contribution of this practice point lies in providing an operational model that replaces prevailing assumptions in community music practice with a rigorous application of the statutory copyright framework.

## **2. What Rights Are Engaged in Choral Activity?**

### *2.1 Copyright in the Musical Work*

The starting point for choral activity is copyright in the musical work itself. Under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (CDPA), a musical work is protected as an original work of authorship, distinct from any particular performance or sound recording of it.<sup>11</sup> The principal restricted act engaged by choirs is the public performance of the work, which encompasses concerts and other performances to which the public has access, whether or not admission is charged.<sup>12</sup> Where a performance is transmitted or made available online, the relevant restricted act is instead communication to the public.<sup>13</sup>

For licensing purposes, this distinction is critical because the scope of authorisation required depends on the restricted act performed, rather than on the identity or non-commercial status of the user. Copyright operates through discrete, act-specific exclusive rights: the same musical work may require different permissions depending on whether it is performed live, communicated to the public by livestream, reproduced in a recording, or copied in written form.<sup>14</sup> In practice, community choirs

---

<sup>8</sup> [2005] EWCA Civ 565, [2005] 1 WLR 3281 [86].

<sup>9</sup> C-607/11 [2013] Bus LR 1031 (CJEU).

<sup>10</sup> Simon Stokes, *Digital Copyright* (5<sup>th</sup> edn, Hart 2022) 212-214.

<sup>11</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 ss 1(1)(a), 3(1).

<sup>12</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 ss 16(1)(d), 19.

<sup>13</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, ss 16(1)(d), 20; *ITV Broadcasting Ltd v TVCatchup Ltd* (C-607/11) [2013] Bus LR 1031 (CJEU).

<sup>14</sup> Lionel Bentley et al, *Intellectual Property Law* (6<sup>th</sup> edn, OUP 2022) 198-200.

frequently conflate these acts, assuming that authorisation to perform a work in public extends to digital dissemination. As a matter of statutory structure, it does not.

## 2.2 Lyrics as a Literary Work

Where a choral work includes words, those lyrics are protected as a separate literary work under the CDPA, distinct from the musical composition to which they are set.<sup>15</sup> Copyright in the lyrics subsists independently of copyright in the music, even where the words and music were created collaboratively or are commonly exploited together. This distinction is not merely formal: it has direct implications for licensing, duration of protection, and the identification of the relevant rightsholders.

As a matter of statutory structure, literary works are protected under s 1(1)(a) CDPA, with copyright subsisting where the work is original in the sense that it is the author's own intellectual creation. The reproduction of literary works constitutes a restricted act under s 17 CDPA, and it is well established that even the reproduction of a short extract may infringe where it reflects the author's intellectual creation.<sup>16</sup> Public performance and communication of literary works are also restricted under ss 19-20 of the CDPA. Accordingly, the act of singing lyrics in public engages copyright in the literary work independently of copyright in the musical work, notwithstanding that the two are experienced simultaneously by the audience.

This separation is particularly significant for choral repertoire, as many works commonly treated as "songs" are, in law, composite works comprising at least two distinct copyrights: the musical composition and the literary text. The House of Lords in *CBS Songs Ltd v Amstrad Consumer Electronics Plc*<sup>17</sup> emphasised that copyright subsists separately in each protected work engaged by a single act of use, and that authorisation in respect of one does not exhaust or negate the need for authorisation in respect of another. Although *Amstrad* was concerned with sound recordings, the underlying structural principle applies equally to the relationship between lyrics and music.

Duration further complicates matters. Where lyrics and music are "created to be used together," the CDPA provides a special rule for calculating the term of protection: copyright in both the musical and literary works expires 70 years after the death of the last surviving author of either the words or the music.<sup>18</sup> This means that lyrics may remain protected long after the music alone would otherwise have entered the public domain. For community choirs performing older repertoire, the assumption that a musical composition is out of copyright does not therefore resolve the position in relation to the words.

In practical terms, the risk most commonly arises in three contexts relevant to community choral practice. First, where choirs reproduce lyrics in printed programmes, rehearsal handouts, or projection slides, the reproduction right in the literary work is engaged, requiring authorisation unless a statutory exception applies. Secondly, where lyrics are displayed on-screen during performances or livestreams, the communication to the public right is engaged independently of the musical performance. Thirdly, where choirs adapt or alter lyrics, for example to modernise language, create inclusive versions, or produce parodic variants, an adaptation of the literary work may occur, engaging s 21 CDPA and requiring the consent of the lyricist or publisher.

---

<sup>15</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 ss 1(1)(a), 3(1); see also David Bainbridge, *Intellectual Property Law* (10<sup>th</sup> edn, Pearson 2018) 34-36.

<sup>16</sup> Case C-5/08 *Infopaq International A/S v Danske Dagblades Forening* [2009] ECR I-6569, [2012] Bus LR 102 [1988] 1 AC 1013 (HL).

<sup>18</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 ss 10A, 12(8); Copyright and Duration of Rights in Performances Regulations 2013 (SI 2013/1782), reg 4 and reg 5.

The existence of collective management arrangements, however, can obscure these distinctions. While public performance of lyrics is ordinarily licensed alongside musical works through PRS for Music, this does not extend automatically to reproduction, adaptation, or digital dissemination of the words. A choir that is authorised to perform a song publicly may therefore still infringe copyright in the lyrics by reproducing or adapting them without permission.

For advisers and choir leaders, the key practical point is that lyrics must be analysed as a separate copyright asset. Any activity beyond ephemeral performance, including copying, projecting, adapting or transmitting the words, requires independent consideration of whether an applicable licence exists or whether direct permission must be obtained. Failure to disaggregate lyrics from music remains a recurrent source of inadvertent non-compliance in community choral practice.

### *2.3 Arrangements and Performing Editions: Managing Derivative Copyright Risk*

Even where the underlying musical composition is in the public domain, arrangements and performing editions routinely introduce a further layer of copyright protection that is frequently overlooked in community choral practice. Under ss 3(1) and 21 CDPA, an arrangement or transcription of a musical work constitutes an adaptation and requires authorisation unless the copyright in the source work has expired and no new protectable material has been added. In practical terms, the copyright status of the composer is therefore not determinative of the legality of the score used in performance.

Following the principles outlined in the introduction, modern performing editions can attract independent copyright protection when they embody sufficient editorial intervention. For advisers, the key point is not the doctrinal threshold itself, but its operational consequence: a choir may lawfully perform a public-domain work only if the *specific edition* used is also free of copyright. Performing from a modern scholarly edition, publisher-prepared score, or reconstructed version may infringe copyright even where the underlying composition is centuries old.

This risk arises most acutely in three common scenarios. First, where choirs source scores from online repositories or archives labelled “public domain” without scrutinising the editorial content, they may inadvertently use protected editions incorporating modern reconstructions, continuo realisations, or interpretative markings. Secondly, where choir leaders commission or prepare bespoke arrangements for their ensemble, a new copyright asset is created. Absent an express written assignment, copyright in that arrangement will vest in the arranger rather than the choir, limiting the ensemble’s ability to distribute rehearsal copies, share digital files, or reuse the arrangement in future performances. Thirdly, where protected editions are scanned, photocopied, or circulated electronically, the reproduction right under s 17 CDPA is engaged independently of any permission to perform the work in public.

For licensing purposes, it is therefore insufficient to rely on the public-domain status of the composer or the existence of a blanket performance licence. Advisers should instead audit the provenance of the score itself. Practical indicators of continuing copyright protection include modern editorial notices, credited editors or arrangers, realised accompaniments, publisher imprints, or claims to typographical arrangement. Treating the performing edition as a distinct copyright asset allows practitioners to identify when reproduction, distribution, or performance requires direct permission, and to avoid the recurring but mistaken assumption that “old” music is necessarily free to use.

### *2.4 Sound Recordings and Performers’ Rights: the dual-licensing burden*

Where a community choir incorporates commercial backing tracks, rehearsal recordings, or pre-recorded accompaniments, it enters a distinct regulatory regime governing sound recordings and

performers' rights. Under s 1(1)(b) CDPA, copyright subsists in a sound recording as a work independent of the underlying musical and literary compositions. As a result, authorisation to perform a musical work does not extend to the use of a particular recording of that work, which requires separate clearance through the sound-recording rights framework.

For practitioners, this distinction has immediate licensing consequences. Even where a venue's blanket licence covers the public performance of a song's music and lyrics, the use of a commercial CD, digital download, or streaming service as an accompaniment engages copyright in the sound recording and ordinarily requires a PPL licence. In community choir settings, this is a common point of inadvertent non-compliance, particularly where rehearsal tracks are treated as functionally equivalent to live accompaniment.

Further complexity arises under Part II CDPA, which confers property and non-property rights on performers in relation to qualifying performances. Making a recording of a performance without the performers' consent constitutes a restricted act,<sup>19</sup> and where a choir records its own performance for rehearsal circulation or online dissemination, a new sound recording is created. Copyright in that recording initially vests in the "producer", defined as the person who undertakes the arrangements necessary for the recording to be made.<sup>20</sup>

In practice, risk most often arises from the absence of clear performer consent. While consent may be implied for internal rehearsal use, digital dissemination or public upload requires express permission from performers to mitigate potential claims. Advisers should therefore audit not only the provenance of any audio used, distinguishing between PPL-protected commercial recordings and royalty-free accompaniments, but also the contractual basis for the recording and sharing of choir members' performances. It should also be noted that synchronising sound recordings with moving images falls outside standard collective licensing and requires direct permission from both the sound recording rightsholder and the music publisher.

### 2.5 "Grand Rights" and Dramatico-Musical Works

A distinct licensing issue arises where choral activity involves the performance of dramatico-musical works, including operas, operettas, musicals and other works conceived for dramatic presentation. While the underlying musical and literary rights subsist in the usual way, performances of this kind fall outside the scope of collective public-performance licensing and require direct authorisation from the copyright owner, commonly referred to in practice as "grand rights".

The legal basis for this distinction lies not in the subsistence of copyright but in the scope of licensed acts. Performing rights collecting societies in the UK are mandated to license only non-dramatic public performances of musical and literary works. Dramatic performances of dramatico-musical works are excluded from collective administration and remain subject to direct licensing. This division is well established in both judicial authority and academic commentary and reflects the long-standing industry distinction between "small rights" and "grand rights".<sup>21</sup>

Whether a choral performance engages grand rights turns on the nature of the presentation, not the identity, scale or commerciality of the ensemble. A performance may be classed as dramatic if it involves narrative continuity, characterisation, staging, costumes, choreography, or other elements that together constitute a dramatic realisation of the work. Conversely, a concert-style performance

---

<sup>19</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 s 182.

<sup>20</sup> Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 s 9(2)(aa).

<sup>21</sup> Lionel Bently et al, *Intellectual Property Law* (6<sup>th</sup> edn, OUP 2022) 234-236.

of isolated excerpts, without dramatic action or narrative coherence, may remain within the non-dramatic licensing regime. The boundary is fact-sensitive and must be assessed holistically.<sup>22</sup>

UK courts have repeatedly emphasised that copyright licences are construed restrictively by reference to the acts authorised, and that exclusions are given real effect. In *Green v Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand*,<sup>23</sup> the Privy Council confirmed that the classification of a performance depends on its substance rather than its label. That dramatic elements can transform what might otherwise appear to be a musical performance into a dramatic one. Although not a UK collecting society case, the reasoning has been cited approvingly in subsequent UK commentary on the scope of dramatic performance rights.<sup>24</sup>

For community choirs, the risk most often arises in themed concerts, semi-staged performances, or presentations involving narration, movement, or role allocation drawn from a single dramatico-musical work. Even where no scenery or costumes are used, the sequential performance of numbers with a linking narrative may be sufficient to trigger the grand rights regime. Reliance on a venue's blanket licence in such circumstances does not cure the absence of direct authorisation.

From a practice perspective, optimisation depends on early classification. Advisers should assess proposed repertoire at the programming stage and identify whether any work is dramatico-musical in nature and whether the manner of performance risks crossing the line from non-dramatic to dramatic. Where doubt exists, the safer course is to proceed on the basis that a direct licence is required. Attempting to re-characterise a dramatic performance as a "concert" after the fact is unlikely to withstand scrutiny and exposes choirs to avoidable infringement risk.

### **3. Rights Clearance in Practice**

Having identified the principal categories of rights engaged by choral activity, the practical question for advisers is not whether copyright subsists, but how these rights are cleared efficiently and lawfully in everyday choral context. Community choirs rarely engage in a single, isolated act of use. Rehearsals, performances, and digital dissemination typically overlap, often across different venues and platforms, each engaging a distinct combination of restricted acts under the CDPA.

Licensing complexity arises not from legal uncertainty, but from the mismatch between the act-specific structure of copyright law and the operational assumptions commonly made in amateur music practice. Choirs frequently rely on venue-based licences, informal permissions, or historical practice without reassessing whether those arrangements map onto the acts being carried out. From an advisory perspective, the optimisation task is therefore one of classification: identifying which restricted acts occur in which context and ensuring that an appropriate licence or permission supports each.

This section analyses three operational contexts in which licensing failures most commonly arise: rehearsals, live performances, and livestreams or recorded dissemination. In each case, the analysis isolates the relevant restricted acts, identifies the licensing mechanisms typically relied upon, and highlights points at which collective management ceases to provide coverage and direct authorisation becomes necessary.

#### ***3.1 Rehearsals***

---

<sup>22</sup> David Bainbridge, *Intellectual Property* (11<sup>th</sup> edn, Pearson 2023) 164-166.

<sup>23</sup> [1989] RPC 469 (PC).

<sup>24</sup> Laddie, Prescott and Vitoria, *The Modern Law of Copyright and Designs* (5<sup>th</sup> edn, LexisNexis 2018) para 21.45.

Rehearsals are frequently assumed to be non-licensable on the basis that they are private, preparatory, or non-commercial. That assumption is often incorrect. The legal position turns not on purpose, but on access and activity.

Where rehearsals take place in premises to which members of the public have access, or where attendance is not strictly limited to a closed and domestic circle, the public performance right in musical and literary works may be engaged. In such cases, the existence of a venue-held PRS for Music licence will ordinarily authorise the public performance of works within its repertoire. However, that licence does not extend to every act commonly undertaken in rehearsal settings.

By contrast, rehearsals conducted within a genuinely private and closed domestic setting, such as in a private home with attendance strictly limited to choir members, will not ordinarily engage the public performance right, although reproduction, recording, or digital circulation of materials may still require separate authorisation.

The most frequent compliance risks arise where rehearsals involve:

- The use of commercial backing or rehearsal tracks (engaging sound and recording rights).
- The distribution of photocopied or scanned scores (engaging reproduction rights).
- The circulation of digital rehearsal files via email or online platforms (engaging reproduction and communication rights).

PRS licensing does not authorise reproduction or distribution of scores, nor does it cover the use of sound recordings, which fall under PPL's remit. Advisers should therefore treat rehearsals as a composite licensing environment rather than a low-risk preparatory activity.

### *3.2 Live Performances*

Live performances represent the context in which licensing assumptions are most deeply embedded and most frequently misunderstood. Public performance of musical and literary works is typically licensed through PRS for Music, either via a venue-held licence or a promoter-specific arrangement. Where that licence is in place, and the repertoire performed falls within PRS's mandate, the performance of the composition itself will ordinarily be authorised.

However, live performance frequently involves additional acts that fall outside this core permission. The use of recorded accompaniment, for example, requires separate authorisation for the sound recording. Likewise, the projection of lyrics, surtitles, or translations during performance engages reproduction and communication rights that are not covered by public performance licensing.

A further risk arises where performances incorporate elements that move beyond a concert presentation into dramatic realisation, triggering grand rights considerations addressed in Part 2.5. Advisers should be alert to programme structure, narration, staging, and thematic continuity, all of which may alter the licensing position even where no admission fee is charged.

### *3.3 Livestreams and Recorded Dissemination*

Livestreaming and post-performance uploads represent the highest-risk licensing context for community choirs. Unlike live performance, digital dissemination is not licensed incidentally by venue permissions and engages a distinct set of restricted acts.

Livestreaming a performance constitutes communication to the public under s 20 CDPA. Where recordings are made available after the event, reproduction and making available rights are engaged.

These acts require express authorisation from relevant rightsholders and are not covered by standard public performance licences.

In addition, the creation of audiovisual recordings introduces synchronisation rights, which fall outside UK collective management frameworks and require direct clearance from both music publishers and record producers. Where the choir records its own performance, performer consent under Part II CDPA must also be secured, ideally through written release arrangements agreed in advance.

From a compliance perspective, the key optimisation step is to treat livestreams and recordings as new exploitations, rather than as extensions of a live event. Failure to do so is the single most common cause of infringement in contemporary community choral practice.

### *3.4 Operational Decision Tool: A Step-by-Step Framework for Rights Clearance*

The preceding sections identify the principal categories of rights engaged by choral activity and the points at which collective licensing ceases to provide coverage. This subsection translates that analysis into a step-by-step decision framework for advisers and choir leaders to use at the planning stage for rehearsals, performances, and digital dissemination.

Rather than proceeding by reference to venue, non-commercial intent, or historical practice, the framework requires sequential identification of the restricted acts undertaken.

- Step 1 is to identify whether music is being used at all. Where it is not, no copyright clearance arises.
- Step 2 is to identify the context of use. Where music is used the analysis moves immediately to the context: rehearsal, live performance, livestreaming, or recording. Each context engages a different constellation of rights under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 and must be assessed separately.
- Step 3 is to determine whether the activity constitutes a public performance or communication to the public. Where it does, the public performance right in musical and literary works is engaged and may be licensed through collective management. Where it does not, attention shifts to reproduction and communication acts, which are never covered by venue-based performance licences.
- Step 4 is to identify escalation triggers requiring additional clearance. The framework isolates the most common escalation points in community choral practice: the use of sound recordings, the copying or projection of lyrics and scores, digital transmission, and audiovisual fixation.

Each of these acts triggers a discrete legal consequence. Use of commercial recordings engages sound recording rights. Copying or circulating scores and lyrics engages reproduction rights. Streaming or uploading performances constitutes communication to the public. Pairing music with moving images engages synchronisation rights, which fall entirely outside UK collective management. Where performances incorporate narrative, staging, or characterisation, the analysis identifies the transition from small rights to grand rights, requiring direct authorisation from the copyright owner. Where performers are recorded, the framework flags the need for performer consent under Part II of the CDPA.

The framework deliberately produces conservative outcomes. Where collective licensing clearly applies, advisers can proceed with confidence. Where additional licences or direct permissions are identified, those requirements must be satisfied before the activity proceeds. Where uncertainty

remains, the correct response is not to rely on informal consent or historical custom, but to suspend the activity pending clearance.

Applied consistently, this operational approach reduces both under-licensing and over-licensing. It provides a structured method for diagnosing risk, allocating responsibility, and ensuring that community choirs operate within the statutory framework while avoiding unnecessary administrative burden.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Community choirs do not encounter licensing difficulty because copyright law is unclear, but because its act-specific structure does not align with the informal assumptions that govern amateur music-making. Rehearsals, performances, recordings, and digital dissemination are routinely treated as a single continuum of “using music”, when in law they engage distinct, restricted acts, different rightsholders, and separate licensing mechanisms.

This practice point has demonstrated that effective compliance depends on early classification rather than retrospective justification. By identifying the specific acts carried out in each context, advisers can distinguish those uses that fall within collective management from those that require direct permission. The step-by-step decision framework, provided in Part 3.4 is designed to support that process, translating doctrinal requirements into a practical decision-making tool that can be applied at the planning stage of choral activity.

Used consistently, this approach reduces both under-licensing and over-licensing. It enables advisers and choir leaders to allocate responsibility accurately, avoid reliance on informal consent or historic practice, and intervene before infringement risk arises. Most importantly, it reframes licensing not as an obstacle to participation, but as a manageable component of responsible cultural activity. By aligning choral practice with the statutory framework of the CDPA, community ensembles can rehearse, perform, and disseminate their work with confidence, clarity, and legal security.