



# ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

## **Telecoms, Media & Internet Laws & Regulations 2017**

**10th Edition**

A practical cross-border insight into telecoms, media and internet laws and regulations

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

Arioli Law  
Bagus Enrico & Partners  
BEHRING - Société d'avocats  
Borenus Attorneys Ltd  
Chajec, Don-Siemion & Zyto Legal Advisors  
Dr. Norbert Wiesinger, Law Offices  
Gün + Partners  
Heuking Kühn Lüer Wojtek  
King & Wood Mallesons  
Kromann Reumert  
Linklaters LLP  
Melchior, Micheletti & Amendoeira Advogados

Melnitsky & Zakharov, Attorneys-at-Law  
Mori Hamada & Matsumoto  
Nishith Desai Associates  
Olswang LLP  
Pachiu & Associates  
Shay & Partners  
Shearn Delamore & Co  
Tashko Pustina – Attorneys  
Tilleke & Gibbins  
Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie  
Wiley Rein LLP



global legal group

**Contributing Editor**  
Rob Bratby, Olswang LLP

**Sales Director**  
Florjan Osmani

**Account Directors**  
Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

**Sales Support Manager**  
Paul Mochalski

**Editor**  
Caroline Collingwood

**Senior Editor**  
Rachel Williams

**Chief Operating Officer**  
Dror Levy

**Group Consulting Editor**  
Alan Falach

**Group Publisher**  
Richard Firth

**Published by**  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
59 Tanner Street  
London SE1 3PL, UK  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720  
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk  
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

**GLG Cover Design**  
F&F Studio Design

**GLG Cover Image Source**  
iStockphoto

**Printed by**  
Stephens & George  
Print Group  
September 2016

Copyright © 2016  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
All rights reserved  
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-911367-15-4  
ISSN 2050-7607

**Strategic Partners**



## General Chapter:

1	<b>The EU's Digital Single Market Proposals: Audiovisual Media, Geo-blocking and Telecoms Regulatory Proposals</b> – John Enser & Rob Bratby, Olswang LLP	1
---	---	---

## Country Question and Answer Chapters:

2	<b>Albania</b>	Tashko Pustina – Attorneys: Flonia Tashko-Boriçi & Jolita Hoxholli	5
3	<b>Australia</b>	King & Wood Mallesons: Renae Lattey	13
4	<b>Austria</b>	Dr. Norbert Wiesinger, Law Offices: Dr. Norbert Wiesinger	23
5	<b>Belgium</b>	Linklaters LLP: Tanguy Van Overstraeten & Guillaume Couneson	30
6	<b>Brazil</b>	Melchior, Micheletti & Amendoeira Advogados: Silvia Regina Barbuy Melchior	38
7	<b>China</b>	King & Wood Mallesons: Rui Wang	51
8	<b>Denmark</b>	Kromann Reumert: Torben Waage & Rebecca Louise Overgaard Andersen	61
9	<b>Finland</b>	Borenius Attorneys Ltd: Hannu Järvinen & Henriikka Piekkala	68
10	<b>France</b>	BEHRING – Société d'avocats: Anne-Solène Gay	75
11	<b>Germany</b>	Heuking Kühn Lüer Wojtek: Dr. Dirk Stolz & Dr. Lutz Martin Keppeler	86
12	<b>Hong Kong</b>	King & Wood Mallesons: Neil Carabine	94
13	<b>India</b>	Nishith Desai Associates: Rakhi Jindal & Smitha Prasad	102
14	<b>Indonesia</b>	Bagus Enrico & Partners: Enrico Iskandar & Bimo Harimahesa	111
15	<b>Japan</b>	Mori Hamada & Matsumoto: Hiromi Hayashi & Akira Marumo	118
16	<b>Kosovo</b>	Tashko Pustina – Attorneys: Rudi Metaj & Erkand Kola	126
17	<b>Malaysia</b>	Shearn Delamore & Co: Timothy Siaw & Elyse Diong	133
18	<b>Nigeria</b>	Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie: Olajumoke Lambo & Godson Oghenechuko	141
19	<b>Poland</b>	Chajec, Don-Siemion & Zyto Legal Advisors: Andrzej Abramczuk & Mariusz Busiło	148
20	<b>Romania</b>	Pachiu & Associates: Remus Ene & Ioana Iovanesc	156
21	<b>Russia</b>	Melnitsky & Zakharov, Attorneys-at-Law: Semion Melnitsky & Anastasia Sivitskaya	165
22	<b>Switzerland</b>	Arioli Law: Martina Arioli	173
23	<b>Taiwan</b>	Shay & Partners: Arthur Shay & David Yeh	179
24	<b>Thailand</b>	Tilleke & Gibbins: David Duncan & Luxsiri Supakijjanusorn	186
25	<b>Turkey</b>	Gün + Partners: Uğur Aktekin & Begüm Yavuzdoğan Okumuş	194
26	<b>United Kingdom</b>	Olswang LLP: Rob Bratby & Tomos Jones	204
27	<b>USA</b>	Wiley Rein LLP: Jennifer Hindin & Brett Shumate	213
28	<b>Vietnam</b>	Tilleke & Gibbins: Jim Dao & Tu Ngoc Trinh	222

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

### Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

---

## EDITORIAL

---

Welcome to the tenth edition of *The International Comparative Legal Guide to: Telecoms, Media & Internet Laws & Regulations*.

This guide provides the international practitioner and in-house counsel with a comprehensive worldwide legal analysis of telecoms, media and internet laws and regulations.

It is divided into two main sections:

One general chapter. This chapter provides an overview of the EU's digital single market proposals.

Country question and answer chapters. These provide a broad overview of common issues in telecoms, media and internet laws and regulations in 27 jurisdictions.

All chapters are written by leading telecoms, media and internet lawyers and industry specialists and we are extremely grateful for their excellent contributions.

Special thanks are reserved for the contributing editor Rob Bratby of Olswang LLP for his invaluable assistance.

Global Legal Group hopes that you find this guide practical and interesting.

The *International Comparative Legal Guide* series is also available online at [www.iclg.co.uk](http://www.iclg.co.uk).

Alan Falach LL.M.  
Group Consulting Editor  
Global Legal Group  
Alan.Falach@glgroup.co.uk

---

# France



BEHRING - Société d'avocats

Anne-Solène Gay

## 1 Overview

**1.1 Please describe the: (a) telecoms; (b) audio-visual media distribution; and (c) internet infrastructure sectors in your jurisdiction, in particular by reference to each sector's: (i) importance (e.g. measured by annual revenue); (ii) 3–5 most important companies; (iii) whether they have been liberalised and are open to competition; and (iv) whether they are open to foreign investment.**

According to the INSEE, in 2014, telecommunications represented €55 bn (*i.e.* 2.8% of GDP) and audio-visual distribution represented €11.6 bn (*i.e.* 0.54% of GDP). The Internet sector is not singled out in French statistics but the digital economy as a whole is estimated to weigh €113 bn (*i.e.* 5.5% of GDP) and to provide direct employment to 3.3% of the active population.

Based on ARCEP last annual report, electronic communications services retail market represented €35.9 bn turnover in 2015 and telecom operators employed about 118,000 people at the end of the year. In 2015, without including the price of spectrum acquisition, investments made by telecom operators reached an historical record of €7.8 bn as a result of a 10% increase compared to the previous year.

The main players in the telecom market are Orange (France Telecom), SFR Numericable (Altice), Bouygues Telecom and Free (Iliad).

The Internet infrastructure sector is controlled by the above-mentioned telecom operators but OVH successfully developed as a pure player in this segment.

Prevailing companies in the audio-visual media distribution sector are France Televisions, TF1, M6 and Canal Plus.

Subject to foreign investment restrictions for sensitive segments (see *infra* question 1.4), these markets are now fully liberalised. By exception, the audio-visual distribution market is subject to specific ownership restrictions designed to preserve media pluralism and competition. These restrictions prevent any single individual or legal entity from holding, directly or indirectly, more than 49% of the capital or the voting rights of a company that has authorisation to provide a national terrestrial television service where the average audience for television services (either digital or analogue) exceeds 8%. In addition, it is forbidden for any single individual or legal entity that already holds a national terrestrial television service where the average audience for this service exceeds 8% to, directly or indirectly, hold more than 33% of the capital or voting rights of a company that has authorisation to provide a local terrestrial television service.

**1.2 List the most important legislation which applies to the: (a) telecoms; (b) audio-visual media distribution; and (c) internet sectors in your jurisdiction.**

The operation of electronic communications networks and the provision of electronic communication services are governed by the postal and electronic communications Code (CPCE) which was mainly based on the provisions of Law n°96-659 of 26 July 1996 regulating telecommunications and then amended and enriched notably by Law n°2004-669 of 9 July 2004 on electronic communications which transposed the new EU regulatory framework of 2002 (“Telecoms Package”) into French law.

More recently, the telecom sector was impacted by the adoption of the following texts:

- Ordinance n°2014-329 of 12 March 2014 on the Digital Economy which restored ARCEPs power to sanction following the French Constitutional Council ruling which considered the previous provisions unconstitutional (Constitutional Council, Decision n°2013-331 QPC of 5 July 2013).
- Law n°2015-912 of 24 July 2015 relating to intelligence services which organises the control of the technologies used by said services.
- Law n°2015-990 of 6 August 2015 to promote the economic growth, activity and equity economic opportunity (*Loi Macron*) which includes provisions regarding electronic communications operators and Internet players.
- European regulation 2015/2120 of 25 November 2015 laying down measures concerning open Internet access and roaming on public mobile entered into force on 30 April 2016.

France is now on the verge of passing a law “for a Digital Republic” which will significantly impact the French digital economy. The bill aims at strengthening consumer confidence in the Internet. It is also meant to increase competition between service providers by lowering entry barriers. It will also give the telecom regulator the authority to oversee net neutrality and open Internet access.

Law n°86-1067 of 30 September 1986 on Freedom to Communicate forms the basis of audio-visual media distribution regulation. It was subsequently amended, notably by Law n°2004-669 of 9 July 2004 about electronic communication and audio-visual communications services which expanded the missions and strengthened the powers of the broadcasting authority, reviewed the broadcasting licensing regime and softened the anti-concentration provisions, and by Law n°2013-1028 of 15 November 2013 relating to the independence of the French public service broadcasting.

General privacy and data protection rules are set by Law n°78-17 of 6 January 1978 on Information Technology, Data Files and Civil Liberties, as subsequently amended notably by Law n°2004-801 of 6 August 2004 to implement the EU Directive of 24 October 1995.

The Internet is more specifically governed by Law n°2009-669 of 12 June 2009 favouring the diffusion and protection of creation on the Internet which adapted to the Internet the standard legal protection of copyrights for literary and artistic works set in the Intellectual Property Code and by Law n°2004-575 of 21 June 2004 regarding Confidence in the Digital Economy (called “*LCEN*”).

---

**1.3 List the government ministries, regulators, other agencies and major industry self-regulatory bodies which have a role in the regulation of the: (a) telecoms; (b) audio-visual media distribution; and (c) internet sectors in your jurisdiction.**

---

The Electronic Communications and Postal Regulatory Authority (*Autorité de Régulation des Communications Electroniques et des Postes – ARCEP*) is the independent government agency that oversees the electronic communications and postal services sector.

The Broadcasting Authority (*Conseil Supérieur de l’Audiovisuel – CSA*) is the state agency responsible for the audio-visual distribution sector.

The National Frequencies Agency (*Agence Nationale des Fréquences – ANFR*) insures the planning, management and control of the use, including for private use, of public domain radio frequencies. As such, the agency is in charge of allocating frequency bands to the ARCEP and the CSA for their allocation respectively to the telecom and broadcasting operators.

The Data Protection Authority (*Commission Nationale de l’Informatique et des Libertés – CNIL*) controls automatic personal data processing and ensures the protection of personal data.

The High Authority for the Distribution of Works and the Protection of Copyright on the Internet (*Haute Autorité pour la diffusion des oeuvres et la protection des droits – HADOPI*) is dedicated to the protection of intellectual property rights on the Internet. The HADOPI has been greatly challenged since it was created in 2009. Its dissolution is currently under discussion but the decision keeps being postponed.

The Competition Authority (*Autorité de la Concurrence – AdC*) also plays a major role on the TMT sectors in the enforcement of general competition rules and is notably in charge of sanctioning anticompetitive practices and controlling merger operations.

The government also plays an active part in the telecoms, media and Internet sectors through the Ministry of Economy, Industry and the Digital Sector, notably the General Directorate for Competition Policy, Consumer Affairs and Fraud Control (*Direction Générale de la Concurrence, de la Consommation et de la Répression des Fraudes – DGCCRF*), as well as through the Ministry of State for the Digital Sector and through the Ministry of Culture and Communication and notably the Directorate for the development of media (*Direction du Développement des Médias – DDM*).

---

**1.4 Are there any restrictions on foreign ownership or investment in the: (a) telecoms; (b) audio-visual media distribution; and (c) internet sectors in your jurisdiction?**

---

Law n°2004-1343 of 9 December 2004 and Decree n°2005-1739 of 30 December 2005 which introduced new articles L.151-1 *et seq.* and R.153-1 *et seq.* in the Monetary and Financial Code establishes that there are no restrictions on foreign ownership and investment in France.

However, if all restrictions have, in principle, been lifted, foreign investment in business sectors considered to be “sensitive” still require a prior authorisation. In accordance with article L.151-1 *et seq.* and article R.153-1 of the Monetary and Financial Code, the investor must submit a formal application to the French Ministry of Economy for prior authorisation. This authorisation is provided within two months from when the application is received by the minister responsible for the economy (tacit agreement to be assumed if no reply is received).

These restrictions apply when a foreign (EU or non-EU) investment is made in a strategic sector. Decree n°2014-479 of 14 May 2014 has expanded the list of sectors in which foreign investors must seek prior authorisation by the French Ministry of Economy. The list is broader for non-EU/EEA country investors than for EU or EEA Member States investors and now includes for the latter one activities deemed crucial to France’s national interests (*i.e.* relating to public order, public security and national defence), encryption and decryption, communications interception and activities relating to integrity, security and continuity of electronic communication services and networks.

Any transaction concluded in violation of these rules is null and void and the investor is subject to criminal sanctions (imprisonment of five years and a fine amounting to twice the amount of the transaction).

Furthermore, regulation also provides for specific restrictions for foreign investments in the media sector. Unless otherwise agreed in international agreements, a foreign investor may not acquire shares in a company holding a licence for a radio or television service in France and that uses radio frequencies if this acquisition has the effect, directly or indirectly, of raising the share of capital or voting rights owned by foreign nationals to more than 20%.

## 2 Telecoms

### General

---

**2.1 Is your jurisdiction a member of the World Trade Organisation? Has your jurisdiction made commitments under the GATS regarding telecommunications and has your jurisdiction adopted and implemented the telecoms reference paper?**

---

France has been a World Trade Organisation (WTO) member and a member of GATT since 1 January 1995. It is a Member State of the European Union and all EU Member States are WTO members, as is the EU in its own right.

The EU has made commitments regarding telecommunications relating to unfair competitive practices, interconnection, universal service, licences and the allocation of scarce resources (notably in the document untitled GATS/SC/31.Supp13).

The principles of the WTO telecoms reference paper have been implemented under French law.

---

**2.2 How is the provision of telecoms (or electronic communications) networks and services regulated?**

---

Telecoms activities are regulated under the CPCE.

The operation of public networks and the provision of electronic communication services to the public are subject to prior notification to the ARCEP. However, the use of radio frequencies and numbering resources requires an individual licence to be granted by the ARCEP.

---

### 2.3 Who are the regulatory and competition law authorities in your jurisdiction? How are their roles differentiated? Are they independent from the government?

---

The telecom regulator (*Autorité de Régulation des Communications Electroniques et des Postes – ARCEP*) is in charge of the regulation of the postal and electronic communications sectors. It ensures the implementation of a universal service, defines *ex ante* regulation applicable to operators that have significant market power on certain defined markets, is involved in defining the regulatory framework, allocates scarce resources (radio spectrum and numbering), imposes sanctions in case of infringements to the sector-specific regulation and settles disputes arising between operators.

The Competition Authority (*Autorité de la Concurrence – AdLC*) enforces general competition rules. It is the result of Law n°2008-776 of 4 August 2008 on the modernisation of the economy (*LME*), passed on 4 August 2008, which transformed the *Conseil de la Concurrence* into a new *Autorité de la Concurrence*. This reform created a single agency with strengthened powers and means. The Competition Authority carries out all activities of competition regulation (inquiries, antitrust activities, merger control, publication of opinions and recommendations).

The two authorities interact a lot as each can solicit the other's opinion on the subject of its competence. For example, when conducting market analysis to identify operators having significant market power in a relevant market, the ARCEP must solicit the opinion of the Competition Authority.

Then both authorities provide opinions to the government.

The ARCEP and the Competition Authority are state agencies but are independent from the Government, and this independence is statutory. A draft law is currently under discussion before the Parliament to institute a general legal framework applicable to all independent regulatory authorities. This should reinforce the independence of these institutions.

---

### 2.4 Are decisions of the national regulatory authority able to be appealed? If so, to which court or body, and on what basis?

---

ARCEP's administrative decisions are enforceable but can be appealed before the Administrative Supreme court (*Conseil d'Etat*) for decisions made by the Executive Board or before the Paris administrative court (*Tribunal Administratif de Paris*) for decisions made by the Chairman under his own powers.

ARCEP's arbitration decisions relating to disputes can be appealed before the Court of Appeal of Paris (*Cour d'appel de Paris*). The chamber of Court specialised in regulation and competition litigation can cancel, confirm or amend ARCEP arbitration decisions. The decision of the Court of Appeal can be challenged before the Judicial Supreme Court (*Cour de cassation*).

---

## Licences and Authorisations

---

### 2.5 What types of general and individual authorisations are used in your jurisdiction?

---

The French telecommunication sector is now based on a general authorisation regime. According to Article L.33-1 of the CPCE, the establishment and operation of networks open to the public and the provision of electronic communications services to the public are free subject to prior notification to the ARCEP by completing

a form available on its website. No notification is required for the establishment and operation of internal or independent (dedicated Closed User Groups) networks.

Based on Law n°2015-990 of 6 August 2015 to promote the economic growth, activity and equity economic opportunity (*Loi Macron*), the ARCEP is now entitled to force any actor which infringed the notification obligation to compulsorily declare itself to the ARCEP.

By abrogating section VII of article 45 of Law n°86-1317 of 30 December 1986 (Finance Law for year 1987), article 27 of Law n°2015-1785 of 29 December 2015 (Finance Law for year 2016) withdrew provisions relating to the administrative tax owed by operators to the ARCEP.

Operators have to contribute to the financing of universal service. To this end, every year they have to declare their turnover for the previous year after deduction of access and interconnection revenues (article L.35-3 of the CPCE) and after deduction of €5 million (R.20-39 of the CPCE). A decree is currently under discussion which would increase the amount of this deduction from €5 million to €100 million.

The use of scarce resources (frequency and numbering) is subject to individual authorisations, the number of which can be limited by the ARCEP and which can be granted through competitive procedures.

---

### 2.6 Please summarise the main requirements of your jurisdiction's general authorisation.

---

The general authorisation to establish and operate networks open to the public and to provide electronic communications to the public is subject to a prior notification to the ARCEP. Following the ARCEP's receipt of such notification, the applicant is eligible for certain rights and is bound by various obligations. The main requirements associated with the general authorisation are as follows:

- compliance to standards and specifications for the networks and services offered;
- quality and availability;
- compliance with regulations in respect of health and the environment, occupation of the public domain;
- sharing of infrastructures and local roaming;
- interconnection and access;
- contribution to universal service and payment of taxes;
- compliance to public order and national defence imperatives;
- confidentiality and neutrality in respect of transmitted communications; and
- payment of an annual administration fee.

---

### 2.7 In relation to individual authorisations, please identify their subject matter, duration and ability to be transferred or traded.

---

Individual authorisations relate to the use of radio frequencies or numbering resources. The allocation decision defines the usage conditions in particular the authorisation's duration. According to article L.42-1 (for spectrum) and L.44 (for numbering resources) of the CPCE, their duration cannot exceed 20 years.

GSM mobile operators' licences were initially awarded for a period of 15 years, and have been renewed in 2006 for the same duration. In June 2010, UMTS licences were granted for 20 years and, in December 2015, 700 MHz spectrum was allocated for 15 years.

Individual authorisations can be transferred, subject to the fact that such transfer has received ARCEP's approval (for spectrum allocated through a competitive procedure or used for public service mission) or was declared to the ARCEP (for spectrum allocated

based on the rule of “first come, first served”). The ARCEP must make a decision within three months in the first case and within six weeks in the second case. In case of spectrum assignment, the benefiting operator has to fulfil all conditions imposed on the operator initially holding the licence and take responsibility for all the commitments contracted by the former operator.

By way of derogation, certain frequencies can be assigned on the secondary market (see *infra* question 3.6).

## Public and Private Works

### 2.8 Are there specific legal or administrative provisions dealing with access and/or securing or enforcing rights to public and private land in order to install telecommunications infrastructure?

According to article L.45-9 of the CPCE, public network operators have a right of way on public land roads and on public networks that are part of the public domain (for example underground pipes), except for electronic and communications networks and infrastructures. This right is granted by a unilateral administrative authorisation (*permission de voirie*) provided by the public authority in charge of that public land.

Regarding other parts of public land, operators have to negotiate a right of way and to enter into a contract (*convention d'occupation du domaine public*) with the public authority in charge of the considered public land.

Public land occupation can give rise to the payment of fees that are capped by a decree. The competent authority makes a decision within two months from the request.

The competent authority is the authority in charge of managing the considered public land, *i.e.* either the one which owns the considered public land or the one to which the management of such public land has been delegated (*i.e.* another public entity or a private entity such as a concessionaire, for *e.g.* for highways).

Regarding private land occupation, operators of networks opened to the public benefit from easements on private properties allowing network installation and operation.

## Access and Interconnection

### 2.9 How is network-to-network interconnection and access mandated?

Public network operators have the obligation to negotiate with all other public network operators requesting access and interconnection. Operators are free in their negotiation on this subject. Access can only be refused if justified.

The technical and financial conditions of interconnection and access are agreed upon between the two operators and formalised by a private law agreement which must be transmitted to the ARCEP.

In case of dispute, the ARCEP can impose interconnection and access conditions on objective, transparent, non-discriminatory and proportionate grounds.

### 2.10 How are interconnection or access disputes resolved?

In accordance with article L.36-8 of the CPCE, the ARCEP has the competence to settle disputes in case of refusal of access or interconnection, failure of commercial negotiations or disagreement

on the conclusion or execution of an access or interconnection agreement to an electronic communications network.

The ARCEP has to render its decision within a maximum of six months as from the referral by a declared operator and define the fair technical and tariff conditions for access and interconnection. In case of emergency, the ARCEP is entitled to adopt interim measures.

The ARCEP's decisions can be appealed before the Paris Court of Appeal.

### 2.11 Which operators are required to publish their standard interconnection contracts and/or prices?

Operators that are designated as having significant market power (SMP) in a specific market are required to publish a standard interconnection offer. The ARCEP conducts rounds of market analysis and then decides which operators have SMP for each relevant market.

### 2.12 Looking at fixed, mobile and other services, are charges for interconnection (e.g. switched services) and/or network access (e.g. wholesale leased lines) subject to price or cost regulation and if so, how?

Only the charges for interconnection or network access of operators exercising significant power can be subjected to a price or cost regulation. The ARCEP conducts analysis of the markets and can impose various obligations on SMP operators, including cost-orientation of their interconnection tariffs based on a long-run incremental cost model.

### 2.13 Are any operators subject to: (a) accounting separation; (b) functional separation; and/or (c) legal separation?

a) In France, a first accounting separation of France Telecom was set up by the regulatory authority from the opening of the competition. It was broadened in 2006 by the ARCEP decision n°06-1007, further to the implementation of the new regulatory framework.

It requires France Telecom to distinguish, from an accounting point of view, its various activities in accordance with the segmentation of the relevant markets and to make sure that its retail activities are consistent with the wholesale offers it produces, in conditions equivalent to those granted to alternative operators when they position themselves on the retail markets. This supply leans in particular on the formalisation of internal transfer protocols on which the regulator can exercise a control.

b) In March 2011, the Competition authority invited the ARCEP to begin preparatory work related to the possible functional unbundling of monopolistic activities of France Telecom from competitive activities but the project was put aside.

c) No operator has been required to separate parts of its business into separate legal entities.

### 2.14 Are owners of existing copper local loop access infrastructure required to unbundle their facilities and if so, on what terms and subject to what regulatory controls? Are cable TV operators also so required?

The incumbent operator is the only one having a copper local loop and is subject to an obligation to give access to its local loop in the technical and tariff conditions defined in its reference offer issued annually under the control of the ARCEP.

Cable operators are not subject to a local loop access obligation.

**2.15 How are existing interconnection and access regulatory conditions to be applied to next-generation (IP-based) networks? Are there any regulations or proposals for regulations relating to next-generation access (fibre to the home, or fibre to the cabinet)? Are any 'regulatory holidays' or other incentives to build fibre access networks proposed? Are there any requirements to share passive infrastructure such as ducts or poles?**

In order to remedy the slowness of the deployment of fibre optic networks in France, Law n°2008-776 of 4 August 2008 on the modernisation of the economy (*LME*), organised in-building sharing of the terminal segments of fibre networks and the ARCEP was brought to take regulatory measures to encourage fibre deployment in particular through mutualisation. This regulation distinguishes dense zones and less dense ones.

In addition, Law n°2015-990 of 6 August 2015 to promote economic growth, activity and equity economic opportunity (*Loi Macron*) includes provisions that aim at facilitating the roll-out of high speed networks.

## Price and Consumer Regulation

**2.16 Are retail price controls imposed on any operator in relation to fixed, mobile, or other services?**

Since 2008, retail price controls imposed on France Telecom have been lifted. With the exception of the European "roaming" regulation, there is no retail price regulation in France.

**2.17 Is the provision of electronic communications services to consumers subject to any special rules and if so, in what principal respects?**

The Consumer Code sets a certain number of rules specific to the provision of electronic communication services to consumers (amongst which information obligation, minimum commitment period, reimbursement of advances and deposits) which were reinforced over time. Notably by Law n°2008-3 of 3 January 2008 on competition and consumer protection (*Loi Chatel*), according to which technical assistance and customer care services cannot be premium-rated and the waiting time for connect-calls to those services should be free-of-charge and which also set strict rules regarding cancellation fees, notice periods for termination and maximum contract duration.

The CPCE also organises specific protection such as the right to be listed or not in directories and the right to a detailed invoice.

The Commission of unfair clauses regularly declares abusive clauses contained in the operators' general conditions.

More recently, Law n°2014-344 of 17 March 2014 (*Loi Hamon*) also impacts the telecom sector by setting limits to phone marketing and specific rules regarding portability, information on value-added services, etc.

## Numbering

**2.18 How are telephone numbers and network identifying codes allocated and by whom?**

The operators ask the ARCEP to award them numbering resources based on the National Numbering Plan (such as prefixes, short numbers and blocks of numbers) according to their needs. These operators can reserve these numbering resources which are then

awarded to each customer of the operator. In case of scarcity, the ARCEP may decide to limit the number of licences and to implement a call for tender procedure. In case of absence of scarcity, the rule of the "first come, first served" applies.

**2.19 Are there any special rules which govern the use of telephone numbers?**

The ARCEP defines, manages and controls the National Numbering Plan which awards the various types of numbers to the electronic communications services (fixed-line, mobile, value-added services).

**2.20 Are there any obligations requiring number portability?**

Each operator has to answer to a customer portability request wishing to subscribe to an offer from another operator within three working days maximum for mobile phone operators and, since Ordinance n°2011-1012 of 24 August 2011, one working day maximum for fixed operators.

## 3 Radio Spectrum

**3.1 What authority regulates spectrum use?**

Spectrum use is regulated by the national agency of frequencies (*ANFR*) which defines the frequency bands awarded to each service (broadcasting, electronic communications services, defence, etc.).

The frequency bands assigned to these services are respectively awarded to the operators by the ARCEP and the CSA.

**3.2 How is the use of radio spectrum authorised in your jurisdiction? What procedures are used to allocate spectrum between candidates – i.e. spectrum auctions, comparative 'beauty parades', etc.?**

Frequency allocation depends on the nature of the frequencies. Pursuant to article L.42-2 of the CPCE, in case of scarcity, the ARCEP may decide to limit the number of licences and to implement a call for tender procedure (comparative submission or auctioning). In case of absence of scarcity, the rule of the "first come, first served" applies.

**3.3 Can the use of spectrum be made licence-exempt? If so, under what conditions?**

In general, the use of frequencies requires an allocation decision issued by the ARCEP. Nevertheless, certain frequencies are exempted from authorisation of use but have no guarantee against interference. This is notably the case of spectrum used by low power and small range systems such as RFID, WiFi frequencies, anti-intrusion alarm, medical devices, etc.

The ARCEP can also decide, within the framework of an experiment procedure, to temporarily exempt certain technologies from frequencies authorisation of use.

**3.4 If licence or other authorisation fees are payable for the use of radio frequency spectrum, how are these applied and calculated?**

Spectrum being part of the public domain, the use of radio-frequency spectrum gives rise to the payment of a fee, the amount of which is

set by ministerial decree or by the allocation decision according to the frequency band used and the expected operator's profitability resulting from this use.

### 3.5 What happens to spectrum licences if there is a change of control of the licensee?

Any change of control must be declared to the ARCEP in order to allow it to verify that the conditions under which the spectrum licence was initially awarded are still respected.

### 3.6 Are spectrum licences able to be assigned, traded or sub-licensed and if so, on what conditions?

It depends on the type of frequencies.

Transfer of spectrum licences is subject either to notification to the ARCEP which may oppose it or, when frequencies are used for public service missions or were granted within the framework of a selection process, to the prior approval of the ARCEP.

Ordinance n°2011-1012 of 24 August 2011 introduced a greater flexibility in spectrum assignment by giving the operators the ability to trade frequency licences on the secondary market. The list of frequency bands which can be traded was set by ministerial order of 11 August 2006 pursuant to article L.42-3 of the CPCE and Decree n°2006-116 of 11 August 2006. The spectrum licence holder may transfer all of its rights and obligations to a third party for the entire remainder of the licence (full transfer) or only a portion of its rights and obligations (geographical region or frequencies).

Spectrum licences can be sub-licensed, subject to ARCEP prior approval. The ARCEP must make a decision within two months.

## 4 Cyber-security, Interception, Encryption and Data Retention

### 4.1 Describe the legal framework (including listing relevant legislation) which governs the ability of the state (police, security services, etc.) to obtain access to private communications.

Interceptions of electronic communications were instituted as part of the effort to fight serious crime and terrorism. In the context of the increased terrorism threat, this subject has become a major issue.

Regulation regarding technical measures for lawful interception is the result of various successive legal texts. Regulation varies depending on the authority (either judicial or administrative) from which the interception operation originates.

See *infra* question 4.2 for the description of the administrative interception regulation.

### 4.2 Summarise the rules which require market participants to maintain call interception (wire-tap) capabilities. Does this cover: (i) traditional telephone calls; (ii) VoIP calls; (iii) emails; and (iv) any other forms of communications?

#### a) Regulation of judicial interceptions

First, interception of electronic communications can be ordered by judicial authorities pursuant to article 100 of the Criminal Procedure Code resulting from article 2 of Law n°91-646 of 10 July 1991 regarding correspondence secrecy. Electronic communications which can be intercepted include voice, videoconferencing, mobile

data (Short Message Service [SMS] and Multimedia Messaging Service [MMS]) as well as internet data.

Secondly, connection data can be required through judicial requisitions issued based on articles 60-2, 77-1-2 and 99-4 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Connection data which can be gathered include data retained by electronic communications operators pursuant to articles L.34-1 and R.10-12 to R.10-14 of the CPCE and by hosting service providers and ISPs pursuant to article 6-11 of LCEN and Decree n°2011-219 of 25 February 2011.

Since the enactment of Law n°2011-267 of 14 March 2011 relating to domestic security (*LOPPSI*), it is also possible to capture in real time keyboard entry data (via key loggers) and data displayed on the screen as part of the fight against serious crime and terrorism, upon authorisation of the examining magistrate.

However, these provisions proved to be largely insufficient as they did not address VoIP.

Law n°2014-1353 of 13 November 2014 strengthening anti-terrorism provisions addressed this shortcoming by introducing the right to also capture data sent to or issued from peripheral audio-visual devices (article 706-102-1 of the Criminal Procedure Code). This regulation was designed to give the possibility to monitor the private conversations between Skype users.

However, article 226-3 of the Criminal Code prevented this new provision from being implemented as technologies allowing for such capture were still banned as a result of the Ministerial Order of 4 July 2012 which had not been amended to take into account this new provision. The new regulation was completed when the Ministerial Order of 17 July 2015 added technologies allowing for the capture of data sent to or issued from peripheral audio-visual devices to the list of authorised technologies.

As a result, electronic communication services such as VoIP services are now subject to interceptions through the implementation of spyware.

More recently, Law n°2016-731 of 3 June 2016 reinforcing efforts to fight organised crime and terrorism, provided additional investigative powers to magistrates, notably by allowing the use of technical devices to directly capture connection data necessary for the terminal equipment or the user subscription number (IMSI catcher). In addition, data access is not limited to data displayed on the screen or that are sent to or issued from peripheral audio-visual devices but now includes data stored on the user IT system.

Interception decisions are taken for a maximum duration of four months and can be renewed without exceeding one year (two years when in relation to major infringements).

#### b) Regulation of administrative interceptions

Used without any legal basis before 1991, administrative interceptions – like judicial ones – were regulated by Law n°91-646 of 10 July 1991 after France was condemned by the European Court of Human Rights (CEDH, 24 April 1990, Huvig and Kruslin c/ France) which organised that they could be implemented subject to a Prime Minister decision under the control of an independent authority (*CNCIS*). Law n°2004-669 of 9 July 2004 extended the scope of these interceptions beyond telephony interceptions to include all electronic communications.

Law n°2006-64 of 23 January 2006 providing for anti-terrorism measures allowed police forces to access electronic communication services access to which was initially restricted to judicial authorities. Data includes all data retained by electronic communications operators pursuant to articles L.34-1 and R.10-12 to R.10-14 of the CPCE and ISPs and by hosting service providers pursuant to article 6-11 of LCEN and Decree n°2011-219 of 25 February 2011.

Law n°2013-1168 of 18 December 2013 on military programming (*LPM*) gave various state agencies the right to access Internet users'

communications data, including data issuer, data recipient, time of the communications, websites visited and real time geolocation outside any judicial proceeding.

Law n°2015-912 of 24 July 2015 relating to intelligence reinforced the anti-terrorism legal arsenal by legalising and providing a legal framework to practices implemented by intelligence services (namely *Direction Générale de la Sécurité Extérieure – DGSE*, *Direction de la Protection et de la Sécurité de la Défense – DPSD*, *Direction du Renseignement Militaire – DRM*, *Direction Générale de la Sécurité Intérieure – DGSI*, *Direction Nationale du Renseignement et des Enquêtes Douanières* and *Trafjin*).

The law organises the conditions of a broad administrative surveillance by granting intelligence services the right to use various technology such as online correspondence’s administrative interceptions, IMSI catchers and devices geolocation.

Furthermore, the law enforces the use of “black boxes” within Internet service providers and telecoms operators’ network aiming at collecting suspicious connection data in order to detect a terrorist threat (article L.851-3 of the Domestic Security Code). Although this text gave rise to strong reactions, these provisions were validated by the Constitutional Council (Decision n°2012-713 DC of 23 July 2015).

Following censorship of the international surveillance provisions by the Constitutional Council, French Parliament adopted complementary legal provisions by passing Law n°2015-1556 of 30 November 2015 relating to the surveillance of international electronic communications.

#### c) *Obligations incumbent upon operators*

To comply with these interception obligations, operators have to fulfil the following obligations:

- to retain certain data pursuant to article L.34-1 and R.10-12 to R.10-14 of the CPCE (see *infra* question 4.5);
- to put in place all necessary means to enforce interceptions requested under Law n°91-646 of 10 July 1991 (article D.98-7 III of the CPCE); and
- to appoint qualified personnel to conduct interception operations in compliance with Decree n°93-119 of 28 January 1993.

The use of technology such as spyware and IMSI catchers does not require any actions to be taken by the operators. In contrast, the implementation of black boxes should be the responsibility of the operators.

### 4.3 How does the state intercept communications for a particular individual?

Before resorting to surveillance technologies, intelligence services must obtain prior authorisation from the Prime Minister granted after opinion of the National Commission of Control of Intelligence Techniques (*Commission Nationale de Contrôle des Techniques de Renseignement – CNCTR*) (derogation for “operational urgency” to this principle was censored by the Constitutional Council). The use of these technologies is subject to a “strict proportionality test”.

See *supra* question 4.2 for the description of the administrative interception regulation.

### 4.4 Describe the rules governing the use of encryption and the circumstances when encryption keys need to be provided to the state.

Pursuant to article 30 of Law n°2004-575 of 21 June 2004, the use of encryption means on French territory is free.

However, unless exempted based on Appendix I of Decree n°2007-663 of 2 May 2007 and category 5 Part 2 of Appendix I of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1382/2014 of 22 October 2014, supply, import and export of cryptology means in and from France are subject to a prior declaration or a prior authorisation of the French National Cybersecurity Agency (*Agence Nationale de la Sécurité des Systèmes d’Information – ANSSI*), depending on technical functionalities and commercial operation (provision or import) based on Decree n°2007-663 of 2 May 2007.

Export of encryption means can also fall under the regulation of dual-use items and, in certain cases, can require prior authorisation from the Ministry of Industry through its Dual-Use Items Department (*Service des Biens à Double Usage – SBDU*). By exception, export is free for encryption means used for consumer purpose that are certified “*grand public*” by ANSSI through the process organised by Decree n°2007-663 of 2 May 2007 (no ANSSI export authorisation and no SBDU licence).

These formalities are specified by Ministerial Order of 29 January 2015. They are incumbent upon the provider of the encryption means.

However, please note that this regulation will soon be impacted by the implementation (which shall take place before 9 May 2018) of the Directive (EU) 2016/1148 of 6 July 2016 concerning measures for a high common level of security of network and information systems across the Union (“NIS directive”).

In addition, pursuant to article 230-1 of the Criminal Procedure Code, certain magistrates can request encryption/decryption keys to be provided if necessary for the investigation. Infringement of this obligation is punishable by imprisonment for up to three years and a €270,000 fine (article 434-15-2 of the Criminal Procedure Code) which sanction can be brought up to five years imprisonment and a €450,000 fine if complying to the obligation could have avoided a crime being committed or could have mitigated its consequences.

The use of encryption means can also fall under foreign ownership restrictions (see *supra* question 1.4).

### 4.5 What call data are telecoms or internet infrastructure operators obliged to retain and for how long?

The French government instituted an obligation of retention of the data relating to electronic communications (Daily Safety Law n°2001-1062 of 15 November 2001), codified under article L.34-1 of the CPCE. On a purely exceptional basis, operators were authorised to keep this data for one year for billing needs and for the purpose of research and infringements proceedings. A new exception was created by Law n°2003-239 of 18 March 2003 (Home Safety Law) which made these provisions perennial, while they were supposed to last only until December 2003.

In 2006, the new French anti-terror act (Law n°2006-64 of 23 January 2006) extended the provisions concerning retention data in two ways. Firstly, not only the judicial authority but also the police forces may now access the retained data. Secondly, data retention obligations now apply to Internet cafes, hotels, restaurants, and more generally to any person or organisation providing Internet access, free or for a fee, as a main or side activity. These provisions were lastly completed by Law n°2013-1168 of 18 December 2013 on military programming (*LPM*).

Decree n°358-2006 of 26 March 2006 on electronic communications data retention and Decree n°2012-436 of 30 March 2012 specified the retention and anonymisation obligations of traffic data which are incumbent upon operators pursuant to article L.34-1 III and IV of the CPCE.

According to article R.10-13 of the CPC, operators must retain the following data:

- user identification data;
- the terminal equipment used to make the communication;
- the technical characteristics, the date, time and duration of each communication;
- any associated services requested or used by the user, and the suppliers of those services;
- the recipient of the communication; and
- for telephony services (in addition to the above) geolocation data.

Retention of content is strictly forbidden (article L.34.1 VI).

The data must be retained by the operator for 12 months (article R.10-13 III).

These data retention obligations apply to all ECN operator and all ECS providers.

Costs incurred by operators are reimbursed by the state.

Failing to comply with data retention obligations is punishable by imprisonment of up to one year and a €75,000 fine (article L.39-3 of the CPCE).

## 5 Distribution of Audio-Visual Media

### 5.1 How is the distribution of audio-visual media regulated in your jurisdiction?

The distribution of audio-visual media is regulated by Law n°86-1067 of 30 September 1986 on Communication Freedom under the supervision of the Broadcasting Authority (*Conseil Supérieur de l'Audiovisuel – CSA*).

This regulation applies to both radio and television and provides, as a core principle, that “*any communication to the public via electronic means is free*” (article 1).

However, this communication freedom is restricted by various obligations imposed on audio-visual media companies from the public and private sectors such as:

- child protection (article 15);
- advertisement, teleshopping and sponsorship (Decree n°92-280 of 27 March 1992);
- product placement (article 14-1 inserted by Law n°2009-258 of 5 March 2009);
- film works broadcasting quotas (Decree n°90-66 of 17 January 1990); and
- french songs broadcasting (Law n°94-88 of 1 February 1994).

Public audio-visual companies are subject to additional rules notably in terms of programs to be broadcasted and advertisements.

### 5.2 Is content regulation (including advertising, as well as editorial) different for content broadcast via traditional distribution platforms as opposed to content delivered over the internet or other platforms? Please describe the main differences.

Pursuant to article 2 of Law n°86-1067 of 30 September 1986:

- “*A television service or a communication service to the public via electronic means, means a service intended to be simultaneously received by the whole public or by a category of the public and for which the program is comprised of emissions including sounds.*”

- “*An on-demand audio-visual media service means any communication service to the public via electronic means, allowing for programs viewing at the moment chosen by the user and upon its request [...].*”

No differentiation is made between traditional broadcasting and broadcasting over the Internet.

### 5.3 Describe the different types of licences for the distribution of audio-visual media and their key obligations.

The formalities of audio-visual media broadcast differ whether the operator falls within the public or private sector.

Private companies are subject to the CSA prior authorisation to operate television or radio services. Key obligations are then formalised in a contract entered into between the CSA and the company which has been granted the authorisation to operate.

Public sector companies (public TV channels namely channels of the group France Télévisions, Arte, LCP, Assemblée Nationale and Public Sénat and the three public radio stations namely Radio France, Réseau France Outre-mer and Radio France Internationale) are not subject to the CSA prior authorisation but have to draft specification requirements (*cahier des charges*) taking into account the obligations resulting from the public missions assigned to them, notably regarding education and culture, and submit them to the CSA. They are also bound by the terms of the contracts signed with the government with regards to their goals and means (*contrats d'objectifs et de moyens*).

### 5.4 Are licences assignable? If not, what rules apply? Are there restrictions on change of control of the licensee?

The CSA can withdraw any authorisation in case of substantial changes in the conditions according to which the authorisation was initially granted (share capital, executive bodies, financing arrangements, etc.).

The CSA can agree to an assignment of the authorisation if the assignee is the legal person controlling or controlled by the initial holder.

## 6 Internet Infrastructure

### 6.1 How have the courts interpreted and applied any defences (e.g. ‘mere conduit’ or ‘common carrier’) available to protect telecommunications operators and/or internet service providers from liability for content carried over their networks?

Article L.32-3-3 of the CPCE protects telecommunications operators and ISPs from both civil and criminal liability for content carried over their networks by stating that they cannot be held liable save if (i) it requested the communication, (ii) it selected the addressee of the communication, or (iii) it selected or modified the transmitted content.

The courts have, on several occasions, exonerated telecom operators and ISPs from all liability in respect of content. However, ISPs can, to a certain extent, be under the obligation to restrain access to certain websites (see *infra* question 6.4).

---

## 6.2 Are telecommunications operators and/or internet service providers under any obligations (i.e. provide information, inform customers, disconnect customers) to assist content owners whose rights may be infringed by means of file-sharing or other activities?

---

France was an early adopter of a graduated response approach, understanding it as a way to protect creation. In 2007, the Minister of Culture ordered a report regarding online copyright's protection which led to an agreement signed by copyright holders as well as network operators.

This report led to the enactment of Law n°2009-669 of 12 June 2009 for the promotion of broadcasting and protection on the Internet (*Loi Création et Internet*) which created an independent administrative authority, the Supreme Authority for the Broadcasting of Works and the Protection of Rights on the Internet (*Haute Autorité pour la Diffusion des Oeuvres et la Protection des Droits sur Internet – HADOPI*).

In cooperation with ISPs, HADOPI is in charge of identifying online copyright infringers and implementing a graduated response (codified under L.331-12 *et seq.* of the Intellectual Property Code).

First, HADOPI requires ISPs to send warning notices to online copyright infringers. Second, if the same Internet user continues its illegal downloading activities within six months, HADOPI shall send a warning mail and a registered letter. In case of a repeated infringement after this second warning, HADOPI shall transfer the files of repeated infringers to criminal courts for prosecution.

If the Internet user is prosecuted by criminal courts for copyright infringement, the judge will be empowered to pronounce a complementary penalty which may lead to the suspension of the infringer's Internet access as well as to impose a range of criminal penalties. Article 7 of Law n°2009-1311 regarding penal protection of intellectual property foresees that the judge may pronounce the suspension of the Internet access for a maximum one year period. During such suspension, the subscriber is still under the obligation to pay his Internet subscription.

Pursuant to this law, ISPs are also under the obligation to provide their subscribers in customers' contracts with specific information on various subjects such as:

- the obligation of vigilance which is incumbent upon the subscriber;
- the existence of legal content offers;
- the means of securing connections;
- the criminal and civil penalties incurred in case of copyright violation; and
- the dangers for the renewal of the artistic creation and for the cultural sector's economy of practices not respecting copyright.

---

## 6.3 Are telecommunications operators and/or internet service providers able to differentially charge and/or block different types of traffic over their networks? Are there any 'net neutrality' requirements?

---

Pursuant to article L.32-1 of the CPCE, the ARCEP must ensure "that no discrimination exists, under analogous circumstances, in the relationship between the operators and providers of publicly available online electronic communication services in traffic routing and access to these services" and "end users' ability to access and distribute information and to access the applications and services of their choice".

The European Regulation (UE) 2015/2120 of 25 November 2015 laying down measures concerning open internet access entered into force on 30 April 2016.

The text introduces the guiding principles of open Internet access and net neutrality into European legislation: on the one hand, equal and non-discriminatory treatment of Internet traffic and, on the other, all end users' (*i.e.* consumers and content providers) right to distribute and to access the information and content of their choice.

The text provides for the following rules:

- Reasonable traffic management by ISPs is acceptable in only a limited number of circumstances, and must not be based on commercial considerations.
- ISPs are prohibited from degrading or blocking traffic (or certain categories of traffic), except under clearly defined circumstances. These practices are justifiable in only a small number of instances: to comply with court orders; to protect the integrity or security of the network; or to prevent impending network congestion that occurs temporarily and under exceptional circumstances.
- In addition to providing Internet access, ISPs can offer services that need to be transmitted in an optimised fashion to meet certain specific requirements, provided that these practices do not have a negative impact on the availability or general quality of Internet access services.
- ISPs' commercial practices are now subject to scrutiny, notably their promotion of bundled online services. The national regulator has the right to monitor the features of these products.
- Operators are subject to strengthened transparency obligations. In particular, these pertain to providing more detailed information in customers' contracts: the possible impact of traffic management techniques used by the ISPs; the concrete impact of the (traffic, speed, etc.) caps or allowances attached to the plan; information on connection speeds, etc.

Within nine months of the regulation entering into force, the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) must "issue guidelines for the implementation of the obligations of national regulatory authorities under" (article 5.3 of the regulation) to set out the concrete implementing procedures for the regulation. The guidelines will ensure that the principles contained in the regulation are implemented in a harmonious way across the European Union. The ARCEP actively contributed to the work done by BEREC to prepare these guidelines.

On 6 June 2016, the BEREC launched a public consultation on draft guidelines whose objective is to support national regulator in monitoring of net neutrality.

BEREC's guidelines were adopted on 30 August 2016. They ensure a high level of protection for net neutrality.

The law "for a Digital Republic" which is currently under discussion before the Parliament will also impact net neutrality as it contains some provisions giving the ARCEP authority to oversee net neutrality and open Internet access.

---

## 6.4 Are telecommunications operators and/or internet service providers under any obligations to block access to certain sites or content? Are consumer VPN services regulated or blocked?

---

Law n°2004-575 of 21 June 2004 (*LCEN*) provides that ISPs cannot be subject to any general monitoring obligation. Content suspension and access can only be decided by courts under specific circumstances. As an example, Orange, Bouygues Telecom, SFR and Free were recently ordered to prevent access from France to the music downloading website T411 (TGI Paris, 2 April 2015).

However, telecommunications operators and/or ISPs may be under obligations to block access to certain sites or content under specific circumstances such as:

- Terrorism:
  - Law n°2014-1353 of 13 November 2014 for strengthening anti-terrorism provisions increased criminal sanctions for apology of terrorism on the Internet and authorised the blocking of Internet sites “*encouraging or making apologist arguments for terrorism actions*”.
  - Law n°2016-731 of 3 June 2016 for strengthening the fight against organised crime, terrorism and their funding, and improving the efficiency and warranties of criminal procedure creates a criminal offence for obstruction to blocking web sites encouraging or making apologist arguments for acts of terrorism.
- Child pornography:
  - Since the enactment of Law n°2011-267 of 14 March 2011 (*LOPPSI*), the websites obviously publishing child pornography can be blocked by ISPs upon request of the administrative authority in charge, the Central Office of Anti-Criminality Committed with Information and Communication Technologies (*Office Central de Lutte contre la Criminalité liée aux Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication – OCLCTIC*).
  - If the child pornographic nature is not “*obvious*”, the administrative authority can bring the matter before the judicial authority.
- Online gambling:
  - Law n°2004-575 of 21 June 2004 (*LCEN*) provides that ISPs cannot be subject to any general monitoring obligation. A temporary monitoring obligation can only be decided by judicial courts under specific circumstances.
  - However, all ISPs must prevent online access to gambling services that have not been granted an authorisation by the Online Gambling Authority (*Autorité de Régulation des Jeux en Ligne – ARJEL*) in order to prevent French residents from gambling on blacklisted sites.

Decree n°2015-253 of 4 March 2015 for the delisting of websites encouraging acts of terrorism or broadcasting child pornography organises the delisting of illicit websites through a purely administrative procedure which does not require a judicial decision. In accordance with these new provisions, the OCLCTIC directly addresses search engines the URL links of the websites to be delisted.

Search engine companies then have 48 hours to make the search results disappear and operate the delisting. The decree also specifies the conditions under which expenditures resulting from the search engines' obligation to delist may be supported by the government.

By contrast, hosting service providers are subject to a broader liability if they were actually aware of the illegal character of content and did not act promptly to withdraw this content or make its access impossible (article L.32-3-4 of CPCE and article 6 of LCEN).

As for consumer VPN services, they are neither regulated nor blocked for the time being.

---

## 6.5 How are 'voice over IP' services regulated?

---

Electronic communication regulation is governed by the principle of the technological neutrality. As a result, VoIP services are not regulated as such by the CPCE: their regulation depends on how they qualify based on the definitions of electronic communications services provided under article L.32 of the CPC.

VoIP services do not qualify as ECS as they are providers from software to software, based on the Internet end-to-end. By contrast, if providers have control over the broadband infrastructure over which the signal is emitted and/or manage routing or switching functionalities, they qualify as ECS and fall under obligations incumbent upon operators providing ECS. In such a case, VoIP providers must notify the ARCEP of their activity and comply with the associated obligations, such as the contribution to the financing of the universal service, the quality of service, the routing of emergency calls, data retention and cooperation obligations for lawful interceptions.

On several occasions, the ARCEP asked Skype to notify its activity as a telecom operator but the company did not act. In 2013, the ARCEP asked prosecutors to investigate Skype over its failure to notify. As of today, we do not have any further information about the outcome of this initiative. We can only guess that the proceedings are still in progress. As these proceedings were initiated in 2013, they are not conducted based on the provisions of Law n°2015-990 of 6 August 2015 (*Loi Macron*) mentioned in question 2.5 above. However, it can legitimately be assumed that the former proceedings proved to be inefficient and that these specific provisions were intended to facilitate the qualification as ECS of services such as Skype, Hangouts, Viber and Whatsapp.


**Anne-Solène Gay**

BEHRING - Société d'avocats  
10 rue de Presbourg  
75016 Paris  
France

Tel: +33 1 53 64 70 01

Email: [asgay@behring.fr](mailto:asgay@behring.fr)

URL: [www.behring.fr](http://www.behring.fr)

Founding partner of BEHRING, Anne-Solène Gay is an attorney at law of the Paris Bar since 1997. She specialises in telecommunication, media, information technology and emerging technologies, with substantial experience in contract law, competition law and IP law.

Anne-Solène Gay advises governments and regulators as well as telecom operators on regulatory and transactional matters. Anne-Solène Gay has worked on a wide range of projects. Anne-Solène Gay has notably provided legal assistance in liberalisation processes, M&A operations, granting of licences, privatisation of operators, restructuring of incumbent operators and adjustment of the regulatory framework applicable to the telecommunications and information technology sector.

Prior to establishing BEHRING law firm, Anne Solène Gay worked in various international law firms (Jeantet & Associés and Bird & Bird) in Paris and London.

International legal directories (*Chambers & Partners* and *The Legal 500*) every year name her one of the leading lawyers in TMT (telecoms, media and technologies) in France.



BEHRING is a law firm specialising in Telecoms, Media and Technology with a particular focus on telecoms, outsourcing/BPO and internet. The firm was founded by Anne-Solène Gay, a leading legal expert on this sector for more than 20 years.

**TMT focus:** With an in-depth knowledge of the TMT sectors, BEHRING advises both French and foreign companies, from start-ups to publicly quoted companies, on transactional, regulatory and IT/IP matters.

BEHRING has notably provided legal assistance in numerous liberalisation processes, M&A operations, granting of licences, privatisation of operators, restructuring of incumbent operators and reform of the regulatory framework applicable to the telecommunications and information technology sector.

BEHRING supports its clients for contractual and regulatory matters, both in France and abroad.

**International practice:** BEHRING is notably involved in Africa and Asia:

- BEHRING provides legal advice in many African countries to governments and regulatory authorities through World Bank assignments as well as to private sectors companies.
- BEHRING has a strong expertise in satellite procurement contracts.
- BEHRING is also frequently active on international submarine cable matters.

**Recognised TMT expertise:** BEHRING's expertise in TMT is recognised by the *Chambers & Partners* and *The Legal 500* international rankings.

## Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: [sales@glgroup.co.uk](mailto:sales@glgroup.co.uk)

[www.iclg.co.uk](http://www.iclg.co.uk)