**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE
FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION
OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS**

**Ninth ordinary session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
14 - 16 December 2015**

Summary of the exchange session

The diversity of cultural expressions in the digital age

**9 June 2015
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris**

EXCHANGE SESSION

The diversity of cultural expressions in the digital age

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris
9 June 2015

Opening the exchange session, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, **Alfredo Pérez de Armiñán,** welcomed the participants gathered for this session on the diversity of cultural expressions in the digital age within the context of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. He explained that two panels would question, in turn, firstly the impact of digital technology on cultural policies and their role in ensuring access, and secondly, the best way to stimulate the creativity and participation of civil society with the help of new technologies.

Cultural policies in the digital age: how to ensure access to diverse cultural expressions and the sustainable development of small and medium-sized enterprises working in creative industries?

The moderator, Françoise Benhamou, first emphasized that the role of new technologies is essential to culture. This transformation is a true industrial and cognitive revolution. She took the example of the need to drastically develop economic models, the question of the monetization of uses, and disintermediation which challenge previous models (author-reader relations, publisher-bookseller relations). These constitute threats and difficulties to contend with. Nevertheless, she considers that digital technology also represents promises, particularly the growth of access (subject to the availability of infrastructure), the circulation of works and ideas, cultural democratization, easier entry to cultural industries for small structures (due to the reduction of distribution costs), the acceleration of research advances, the increased life-span of works and even a second life for works.

The first question concerns access within the context of the Convention. She asked G. Dupont to talk about the fact that the game has completely changed with regard to infrastructure and the question of connectivity, telephony, and networks.

The representative of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), George Dupont, gave an overview of what is the ITU, notably a specialized institution of the United Nations which deals with telecommunications and which is headquartered in Geneva. It allocates frequencies, develops standards at the international level to allow everyone to connect, ensures the connection of Internet networks, and endeavours to establish facilities where possible so that the most disadvantaged can access these tools. He said that today there are over 7 billion mobile phone users, which represents the same number of people as the world population. He added that 3.2 billion people are connected to the Internet, of which 2 billion are in developing countries. He pointed out that the penetration rate for technologies has increased sevenfold since the 2000s. He underlined that these figures are highly revealing. Much remains to be done, and the ITU endeavours to achieve this through agreements between agencies. The ITU has had a cooperation agreement with UNESCO since 1982, in these areas in particular. He recalled that the World Summit on the Information Society held the previous week in Geneva had once again insisted on the fact that cultural diversity should be an important factor for sustainable development and the social economy.

The moderator asked Guy Berger if the digital divide is still very present today within countries and between countries.

The Director of Freedom of Expression and Media Development at UNESCO, Guy Berger, said that it is important to know whether we are talking about the digital divide, the information divide, or the knowledge divide. Over the last few years, UNESCO has explored a very interesting concept from the point of view of the diversity of cultural expressions and from the point of view of the divide that exists within this domain. This is known as Internet Universality. UNESCO endeavours to be truly universal. He addressed the four identified principles resulting from the decisions taken by the governing bodies. The R – O – A – M principles (Rights, Openness, Accessibility, Multistakeholder) correspond to the four principles of Internet Universality. He noted that it is interesting to analyse the question from this perspective, as it is not simply a technical or information problem, but above all it is a question of knowledge. It is a simple but also extremely powerful model as it exposes all of the nuances of the diversity of cultural expression.

The moderator supported this point of view by adding that it is not enough to merely have technology, above all you need to know how to use it. It is a question of digital literacy, a question of use. She asked the publisher if he felt that digital literacy was progressing. Are users increasingly aware of what the Internet is, are they able to use it virtuously?

Octavio Kulesz, digital publisher and researcher in Argentina, said that with regard to the question of access, digital literacy is a decisive factor. Literacy must go hand-in-hand with advances in infrastructure. He pointed out that there are still equipment problems in infrastructure, as connectivity is poorer in the global South and the connection speed is very low. Nevertheless, there are two billion people in the global South who are already connected thanks to mobile phones, and therefore an absolute number of users to take into account. This involves a real paradigm shift and creates the issue of digital literacy. As a publisher in the global South, he noted that there are many projects concerning digital literacy run by foundations such as Mozilla. The aim is to educate users and not only to give them access, in order for them to be able to create. Creation must always be an element, otherwise the user remains very passive. O. Kulesz clarified that digital literacy, considering the advances in mobile technology, means giving the user independence not only to consume but also to create.

G. Berger said that UNESCO offers a global concept for all literacy that incorporates the digital dimension. There is also a degree of awareness regarding security, privacy and the confidential nature of data. He added that this makes it possible to encourage access, by including these concepts. He talked about the importance of considering literacy comprehensively and in combination, a key factor of any policy to promote the diversity of culture. He also underlined the importance of empowering people so that they can benefit from the advantages that the digital age has to offer. Policies can go a long way toward helping "*start-ups*" with regard to infrastructure and content. He said that beforehand, we tried to promote cultural diversity by imposing regulations on public and official media. Today, regulation is much more difficult, and thus we can no longer impose things. This is the paradigm shift, moving from one policy to another. He wondered how we could raise awareness and encourage local, regional, and national content. He concluded by saying that digital technology opens a whole host of possibilities and that it is important to explain to people that they can produce this content themselves.

The moderator clarified that the initiatives concerning best practices can come from non-governmental organizations, UNESCO or other organizations. She then addressed the question of challenges and opportunities for the freedom of expression that digital technology represents. Next, she highlighted the question of political censorship and the revolutions that have used the Internet as a means to disseminate ideas. There can also be cultural censorship, self-censorship, hacking, and then conversely, an extraordinary dissemination of works.

G. Berger explained that UNESCO had recently published a study entitled "Keystones to foster inclusive knowledge societies: access to information and knowledge, freedom of expression, privacy and ethics on a global Internet". He clarified that this study goes into the details of this question, as well as into the challenges of accessibility, privacy and ethics. He defined freedom of expression as the right to publish and receive information. In the digital space, it is not enough to receive information; it also needs to be disseminated. What is not prohibited, in terms of freedom of expression, is authorized. For this, it needs to be inscribed in international standards. He was

saddened by the fact that we are now seeing more restrictions on freedom of expression on the Internet. This is what he considers as the willingness of the State to dominate one aspect of the Internet, which brings the entire system to a halt. Any desire to overstep this ban is seen as a very serious breach. As the Convention states, the diversity of cultural expressions depends on the freedom of cultural expression. The same is true for digital technology. He invited the audience to consult a work entitled "Digital Safety for Journalists", also useful for artists. He talked about the importance of knowing how we can express ourselves freely, but also safely on the Internet.

The **moderator** noted that Internet giants raise a huge number of questions. Countries try to pursue policies and sometimes with great difficulty since the major geographical areas require harmonization in order to respond to the power they represent today. She referred to O. Kulesz.to introduce this issue.

O. Kulesz said that the problem of digital giants is key to diversity. Firstly, he noted the problem of taxation. It is much easier for an Internet giant to pay little taxes than for a small, more local company. Then, there is the problem of market concentration. He emphasized that Amazon represents significant challenges since it concentrates a tremendous amount of power and resources. He referred to Anderson's Long Tail theory and explained that in terms of supply, digital technology makes it possible to increase diversity. There is an increasing concentration of actors of supply and fewer and fewer actors who can benefit from this long tail. Then, in value chains, these great players are moved by the same trade logic. They begin by occupying a niche in the value chain: online search, retail sales, materials, etc. Then, they take over other places and finish in vertical integration. Amazon thus occupies the entire chain, which means that many actors end up being ejected from this same chain. He added that algorithms play a decisive role for supply based on the criteria we are offered (books, films, etc). He believes that that is where the challenge of diversity is found.

The moderator questioned whether the diversity of supply leads *in fine* to effective diversity of consumption or if there are more and more "*best-sellerisation*" phenomena?

G. Dupont confirmed that several billion people are devoid of any means of communication. They are in rural areas completely deprived of water and food. He said that when we talk about seven billion telephones, that also implies seven billion potential content creators. There are much more pragmatic and interesting approaches. He said that our children spend more time looking at their tablets and telephones than they spend at school. This is another problem that needs to be addressed. We need to review education, for which UNESCO and ITU work together, in order to find an appropriate stopgap to use these tools correctly.

The moderator explained that they had spoken about giants, but the Internet also makes it easier for small cultural enterprises to enter cultural markets toady because there is a barrier to remove that is product distribution. The Internet represents giants on one side, but also the possibility to enter these markets and potentially occupy what we call niche markets, whether in the field of music, cinema, video, books, etc.

O. Kulesz confirmed that digital technology in Argentina, in reality, had made it possible to access the entire Latino-American market. Thanks to digital technology, they now have almost immediate international distribution. Nevertheless, several publishers, music and cinema producers do not have the knowledge required to take the leap. Then, there are few links between small and medium-sized producers and the Internet world. They do not have a relationship with major video game programmers and there is not enough research and development. As such, he questioned what to do for new media. He underlined the existence of the international alliance of independent publishers, a group of 400 independent publishers particularly from the global South and which have established their own research and development. He added that the network of bookshops is much more than just points of sale, it is the living and social circulation of culture. It is not acceptable that it close. This is a major risk resulting from digital technology. Amazon is the main language translator in the United States. Amazon has 14 publishing houses of its own. It is possible to know who is the author the most in demand on such or such a market and thus know what to translate. He said that the Internet giants are very positive, but all of the power should not

be in their hands. It is a good thing that data is disseminated. Finally he asked what could happen with this market that has established itself sometimes by destroying other small markets which disappear in turn.

The moderator asked if there were any questions from the floor.

The representative of the French Coalition for Cultural Diversity, Guillaume Prieur, emphasized that true effectiveness needs to be restored to regulations, because the question of cultural diversity is even more important in the digital age. He affirmed that until now, the media, particularly in Europe, when broadcasting, had to establish themselves in countries and often request authorisation. Then, they were subjected to the rules of that country in terms of support and financing for creation. He added that competition is being established by global operators, multinationals who often establish themselves in countries where they pay substantial taxes and where the obligations for cultural diversity are not at all at the same level. It is a real challenge, but regulations can also provide a response to this. He spoke of the European example, indicating that today there is a flaw in European regulations, as an operator can broadcast across the entire European territory while simply complying with the rules of the country in which it is established. Netflix established itself in the Netherlands for tax reasons, but also because in France, when offering even video on demand, you are required to reserve part of your catalogue for both French works and European works. The problem for Netflix was not the obligation to invest in European works, but rather the fact that its catalogue had to include a minimum section reserved for French and European creation. According to him, we simply need to apply the principle of destination country, which means that operators have to respect all of the rules in a country. Thus, this poses the question of local, regional, and European regulations. Furthermore, previously existing regulations are also designed to control and regulate digital media.

The **moderator** confirmed that there are indeed tensions that we can surpass, but it is not always easy between national regulations and the fact that digital technology makes it possible to benefit from the transnational dimension and to relocate companies so as to pay as little tax as possible, but also in order to circumvent regulations. She added that regulations must evolve and are progressive. She asked if there were any other questions from the floor.

G. Burger felt that we are witnessing a paradigm shift and that we will increasingly regulate to promote openness. Regulations will focus less on obligations, as is the case today. Netflix, for example, does not offer local content. He believes that this represents a great opportunity as there are many people who prefer local content in general.

The representative of Sudan, recalling that there are over 7 billion telephone users, clarified that the "global South" is a very volatile expression as it starts from Arab States, crosses Sub-Saharan Africa, and continues on. He said that the opportunities provided recently by these new technologies in terms of digital diversity are not as rich as we might imagine. There is no call for the optimism that some people seem to feel. In 2005, at the time of the Convention, the situation was entirely different. Today, most populations of the "global South" are faced with fundamental problems of housing, water, food, etc. He explained that he does not think we can generalize in terms of time, in terms of space, because the conditions were much more favourable in 2005 than they are now for the populations of this region. In a certain number of countries, this question is probably less important than other difficulties that these populations face on a daily basis.

A participant confirmed that digital technology is starting to permeate the global South. He used the example of Sub-Saharan Africa. There are many problems that were previously impossible to resolve, which now seem to be finding solutions thanks to cell phones. Africa is a pioneering continent in terms of payment by mobile phone. Digital technology is not a universal remedy, but developing countries are finding solutions thanks to these new technologies. He said that there are payment platforms, that allow people to pay their bills by phone. For these countries, innovation is not for tomorrow, it is happening today.

The representative of Lithuania explained that when we talk about cultural diversity, it is very important to emphasize quality. Everyone publishes anything and everything. He added that in Lithuania, with the help of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and with money from the State Foundation, they have been able to transform its libraries into Internet laboratories for people to use. Lithuania has modified all of its infrastructure. He highlighted that there is much to be done from the point of view of the Convention, and from UNESCO's point of view to help new generations that are passionate about quality content online.

Another participant indicated that small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) encounter great difficulties in becoming sustainable, clarifying that the music and press industries also have challenges to overcome, and explained that we are living in a time of model experimentation for all of these companies working in the digital sector. The indicators established by UNESCO for the media make it possible to measure sustainability and can be an effective tool in this context. He said that according to recent research, people with smartphones check their phone less than fifteen minutes after getting up, even before turning on the radio, television or any other activity. There are therefore excellent opportunities. For example, he participated in a crowdfunding activity in South Africa where participants used their smartphones. He indicated that there is tremendous potential for business models to develop: including mixed models, some paid, others free and financed by advertising, using data. In his opinion, there are a wide variety of exciting possibilities which will no doubt ensure the sustainability of SMEs in the cultural sector, not to mention the role of the State and cities which can also contribute to the collective development of such applications.

G. Dupont said that there are nonetheless 4 billion people without access to the Internet and who want to promote their cultural expressions. He indicated that it is in this respect that UNESCO and ITU work together. For example, ITU has the advantage of having 700 participants, industrial professionals who focus on new standards, particularly on the development of tools. He finished by reiterating the need to provide these means, by helping students become literate so that they can use them wisely and become future creators.

To conclude this theme on cultural policies, **O. Kulesz** affirmed that it is essential to try to guarantee the diversity of supply. It is a huge challenge, for the public and private sectors as well as for civil society organizations and schools. He said that their objective should be to construct a sustainable digital ecosystem. He believes that this can bring great stability to the system. Nevertheless, we need to guarantee the existence of this middle class of producers and creators over time. He said that there is not one single digital language. In his opinion, it is very important to maintain this multiplicity to ensure the diversity of cultural expressions.

How to stimulate the creativity and participation of civil society with the help of new technologies?

The moderator, Sophie Rochester, *Literary Platform* **(United Kingdom),** explained that the panel would identify how to stimulate creativity and participation thanks to digital technology. It aimed to put the emphasis on content, content creation, and identify the difficulties that may be encountered in ensuring diversity in this environment. She asked the panelists to present themselves and explain what they do.

Alice Wiegand, *Wikimedia Foundation* **(United States),** is a member of the *Wikimedia Foundation* board of directors, the organization that manages Wikipedia. She explained that it is an American foundation one of the most important objectives of which is to ensure that the sum of all knowledge is accessible to the widest possible audience, to everyone.

Vincent Ricordeau, KissKissBankBank, (France) is the CEO of this crowdfunding platform.

The moderator stated that panel's aim was to demonstrate the challenges and opportunities of the digital environment. She referred to A. Wiegand and asked what she does to ensure diversity?

A. Wiegand confirmed that it is indeed a major problem, one of their difficulties, as it would be fantastic if they could ensure diversity. Furthermore, she said that they have a great many contributors. They need to try and determine who these individuals are who contribute to Wikipedia. She explained that what they have noticed so far is that there is not as much diversity as they would like among their contributors.She specified that most contributors come from the Western world. Wikipedia exists in 250 forms in 250 different languages, but for lesser-used languages there are very few contributors. There is also gender inequality, with men being the main contributors to Wikipedia. It is clear that the *Wikimedia Foundation* would like greater diversity in order to have a more representative point of view of diversity. She added that they did not want to represent a masculine world or a vision of academic knowledge. What they are looking for is the sum of all human knowledge, and that is not the case today.

The moderator asked how this works for a crowdfunding platform.

Vincent Ricordeau explained that diversity is a very broad term and that it can be understood in many different ways. In 2014, almost 3 million projects worldwide were funded by KissKissBangBang platforms and over 15 billion US dollars handled. He added that all categories of creators are represented and that there are also many micro-enterprises with a social dimension that are set up on their platforms. He underlined the serious shortage of traditional funding for small projects, resulting in a phenomenal diversity of multi-projects on their platforms in six or seven years, with reasonable gender parity. In terms of socio-professional categories, he added that this is one of the great victories of crowdfunding, as the creators come from all backgrounds, without exception. He said that their platforms are primarily French-speaking, but that the contributors come from 178 countries worldwide, which represents almost the entire planet. There is enormous potential and he hopes that it will soon be possible to target the rest of the planet with this formidable tool.

He then said that throughout the world, governments have played a key role in making it possible to work outside of bank monopolies, where they exist, and to create their own space alongside traditional finance systems. Now, a regulatory framework is being created and set in place to enable them to exist, but also to regulate what needs regulating, particularly the management of flows for money laundering. V. Ricordeau explained that there is a strong link with regulators and politicians, particularly in France, but also in most Western countries. As for content, he explained that he is always careful of the role that States can play when it comes to the production of content itself. In his opinion, the State is there to ensure infrastructure. He is much more dubious of what the State can do when it comes to content. He does not consider content production to be a problem, but rather a lack of infrastructure, recalling that two-thirds of the planet are not covered by infrastructure and that he expects governments to play a role in this respect.

The moderator added that States and cities create their own content and large amounts of knowledge and want this to be free, open, accessible, and to be re-used by contributors so that it can be added to Wikipedia, for example. She asked what the line is that separates protection for the rights of creators and information for all. Where is the dividing line?

A. Wiegand said that Wikipedia, for example, uses *creative commons* licences and to use a name, they contact the creator. Freeing knowledge means also making it accessible to those who do not have the possibility to access knowledge in various ways. If you live in a city like Paris, there is a bookshop or library on every street corner and you can find knowledge and books everywhere, which is not at all representative of the world today. We need to find a way to share knowledge, to make it accessible to all.

V. Ricordeau explained that intellectually, if we extend the notion of intellectual property to property alone, we know that today the widespread violence between individuals exists since the invention of property. With property comes inequality and with inequality comes violence and with violence comes the stagnation in which we live today. He specified that this notion of property, if we reduce it to the notion of intellectual property, we are left with the same distinction. Protecting, with an exclusively individualistic rationale, an advance that could potentially benefit the many has no rhyme or reason. And yet, we are used to it and we have grown up with this system. We all

want to benefit from the income from something we have created, but it is entirely contradictory to the rationale of common goods. He added that some people want to release a product so that humanity in general can benefit. Then, there are others who take the very classic, very liberal, and very current approach and want to protect their goods at all costs. There are two opposing ideologies with two typologies of creators that are completely different, that do not have the same aspirations. And yet, they find funding in the same place on the platform. The relation between the creator and their contributors is free from any political notion. He indicated that their platforms serve exclusively as a tool to fund projects and after, according to the typology, the project will pan out differently.

The moderator questioned how creators are protected with regard to Wikimedia. She asked if content becomes the property of the organization and if they have previously experienced problems in this context?

A. Wiegand confirmed that it becomes the property of the organization. She said that it is this collaboration itself that generates better content and that this content is not in a single set of hands, it is collective property and so is the responsibility. She also asked if, through necessity, digital content will be free or if we need to conceive new types of remuneration for creators and artists.

V. Ricordeau explained that the problem with book and disk prices is not the artist's fault, but that of the publisher, distributor, or production company which have been getting rich off the backs of creators for centuries. With the Internet, producers have barricaded themselves behind copyright and unit sales. In this battle between the free and the paid unit due to copyright, a type of monumental chasm has emerged between the young generations and content professionals. The problem is not the relation to money. He believes that everyone is willing to pay a certain amount per year for everything and to access all of the world's content. He thinks that if this model had been developed or supported by traditional producers there would not be this divide today between the free and the paid. It is a confrontation between the old and the new model. The problem is that today, in this distribution of content, high-speed and by subscription, the contracting part is so badly done that even artists today only find little interest in being on these platforms because they are very poorly remunerated, while record labels and publishers continue to receive much greater remuneration. There is a complete misunderstanding due to an industry which is hiding behind its basic economic model and which has created conflictual relationships, with its consumer public and with the people it "defends", that is the artists and creators of content. According to him, it is a good example of an industry that has refused technological advances to protect a business model that it did not understand and which has created a significant distortion within the market.

The moderator reiterated the point of poor remuneration from platforms and confirmed their difficulty in surviving, above all in the music sector.

A. Wiegand underlined that each world has its specific difficulties. She explained that painters, for example, have their own challenges and they are not the same as those of creators who live in the digital sphere. She asked how we can bring these worlds together. They are very different but at the same time very alike. As such, if we can build bridges between these worlds, it will facilitate access. The main question is who will benefit, who will play their cards right thanks to the Internet.

The moderator addressed the theme of the convergence of the media. She asked if there were interesting crowdfunding projects that would illustrate new forms of digital art. She took the example of a debate currently ongoing in the United Kingdom, brought about by *The space* project, a collaboration with the *BBC* and the *Art Council of England*, where the question being asked is: what is digital art?

V. Ricordeau said that there are many artists today that use digital technology, not as something typically personal, or with a vision, a purely digital use or behind a computer, but which serves as an ornament to a much more global work. Digital technology can provide another vision of a potentially fixed work. Yet there are very few artists focused on transmedia. In general, it is per discipline or silo. He said that it is the simplest transmedia format. This is what we call the web documentary which provides a linear view of a subject, but also a perfect connection via the web

with moments within the documentary that cannot be interpreted linearly, but which should be interpreted in a more in-depth manner on the web and which help provide more detail on a subject. He explained that this provides a different perspective and that this perspective is purely web-based, that is it has no borders neither in time nor space. It helps get to the depths of content and information on this planet.

The moderator asked if they thought that part of the problem of transmedia projects had to do with categorization? She asked if it was possible to do something that would enable people to understand that there are transmedia projects that do not correspond to an exclusive experience. People looking for a specific art form do not look for transmedia. She asked A. Wiegand what she thought of this categorization and how content is categorized.

A. Wiegand said that it is done rather frighteningly since Wikipedia buffs are very concrete and very difficult people and that there are thousands of categories in which you can find their articles. She specified that their technical platform today is not at a level where it could offer different forms of content. The contributors try to improve things on the technical front, but a way needs to be found to ensure convergence so that it appeals to young people. Wikipedia is knowledge, but the conception of knowledge changes over the years. In the past, we had encyclopaedias, but today knowledge comes from videos, music, and this all needs to be brought together and we need to find a way to do so.

The moderator asked how a State can ensure that different voices are heard.
A. Wiegand replied that this is indeed a difficult question. At the same time, it is one of the truly important questions for the future of projects like theirs, she emphasized. Diversity is not just a question of numbers, diversity is a question of presence, it is having your voice heard. She added that voices not only need to be heard, but we also need to create a platform where these voices can discuss and express themselves.

The moderator asked whether digital technology represents an opportunity for these voices. Could it enable these voices to be heard?

V. Ricordeau emphasized that today the Internet and Wikipedia are good examples, they are formidable tools in accelerating the transfer of knowledge between individuals. It is no longer people who decide to produce content *top-down* towards the population, but on the contrary the population is taking back the power over the tool and disseminating the content it wants to see disseminated. We have moved to a rationale of interconnectivity between individuals. And yet, nothing is perfect and it is a slow process. He added that it still excludes many people on the planet. Nevertheless, the day we resolve the problems of infrastructure and the entire planet is connected to the web, we will have resolved a major problem - global education, for all humanity. He feels that we are emerging from an era where voices made themselves heard through the highly controlled media. He added that the Internet is changing things. Of course, we continue to hear the loudest voices, but there are millions of voices making themselves heard. This is very good news for humanity. It is better to generate too much noise, too much content, than the opposite and remain behind age-old ramparts that prevent humanity from advancing. You just need to look at the speed at which children take on these tools and at which they succeed in browsing these content libraries. Beyond sorting, it is access to this information that is important. After, of course, we need to fight for Net neutrality, we need to fight so that our data is not constantly monitored. Once again, our governments need to play their role, not in the rationale of Internet and content contrition, but of openness.

The moderator wanted to look at how digital technology helps find new audiences for existing content.

A. Wiegand explained that it is one of the bridges between analogue and digital. This does not merely concern Wikipedia, but all those interested in culture and cultural heritage. She said that they are working with archives, libraries, bookshops, and museums. They are trying to see how they could digitize objects, find the best way to promote them among the public, without putting these works in danger. Of course, it is not the same experience as being in a museum a metre

from an exceptional and unique painting or sculpture. Everyone should have the possibility to live this extremely distinctive experience. But, she also considers that we must be able to access all information on this piece of art anywhere in the world for those who do not live nearby, so that they can also access these works.

V. Ricordeau explained that there is no opposition between the real world and the digital world. For example, cinema theatres have never been as full as they are now because film trailers are disseminated by the millions on the web. The digital world is a way to have a grand platform providing access to all existing content and access to real life. He referred back to crowdfunding by explaining that a project creator on this type of platform will not talk about money straight away, but rather about the number of connections he has made. He said that we can clearly see the opportunities this tool provides in every sense. However, it needs to be understood and mastered by individuals. Of course we can also be lobotomized by the web and by a constant flow of information. According to him, pitting this limitless digital world against a real world, which by nature will not disappear, makes no sense. Links and bridges are formed naturally. We are in a zone where this is a very new tool which is taking on a huge dimension. We should not be afraid. We need to let it grow. Once again, governments need to play their role without disturbing the connection between individuals to too great an extent.

The moderator felt that young people have a perfect understanding of what has been said and how they can remunerate work by including the public. She asked V. Ricordeau if he thought that there is a difference between old and new technologies. Do these older artists and creators have a poor understanding of things and have they remained in the Old World of remuneration?

V. Ricordeau said that the attitude of musicians and their untimely remarks should not lead us to believe that it is a question of generation, but rather a question of an almost legal understanding of their contract with the record label. As long as a musician has not understood that they are not boxed into a contract format, if they want to increase the royalties from digital technology, particularly through *streaming*, this only concerns themselves and their lawyer. He added that the problem for musicians today is that record labels put so much pressure on *streaming* platforms, with minimum guarantees in order to have the right to play tracks, meaning that in the end, it is the platforms that are obliged to raise millions of dollars every two or three years in order to continue to expand and which are trapped between a race for an audience and a race for minimum guarantees which must be given to record labels. The artist does not exist in this relationship. Nevertheless, today, several artists have understood that you do not need a record label to make a living from your art. There can also be a distortion between the image artists have of their career in show business and the artist who has a real desire to be listened to, seen, and heard. It is not at all the same perception of the profession. He emphasized that today, there are several groups of young people on their platform. They are looking for funding in order to stay in direct contact with their community and to avoid using a record label for direct funding. These artists have a community spirit. They are not just thinking about signing a million-dollar contract with a record label that will wager millions of dollars in marketing and publicity. He added that there is a huge distortion between the final perception of what a person wants to do with their art and the means offered to them in terms of technology to take on this profession. He concluded by saying that it is above all a sort of legal/marketing maturity, rather than a question of technology.

The moderator agreed with this and explained that it is indeed not just a question of generation. She also asked what the importance of social networks for Wikimedia in reaching out to audiences and communities. She asked how they use these social networks as an organization and what difficulties do they experience?

A. Wiegand believes that what happens on social networks, the main Internet actors, primarily depends on their communities. It is a way of promoting yourself, but that depends on contributors or small regional groups which explain, for example, how to write an article. The aim for these small groups is to get as many people as possible interested in what they do. She added that discussions primarily tend to take place on Wikipedia. There is a tremendous amount of interaction between contributors on Wikipedia. Indeed, there are people who criticize projects, ideas, content, and what happens on Wikipedia. Is Wikipedia a social network? She specified that they are a free

knowledge platform or a platform for free access to knowledge. Much of what happens on Wikipedia involves social interactions between contributors. She explained that they talk about fusion, mixing, and convergence. On Wikipedia, it is not just a question of publishing. Some contributors are looking for a community. Without a community, there is no Wikipedia.

The moderator asked V. Ricordeau how to develop communities, how to find funding?

V. Ricordeau recalled that the theory of three circles is vital and very simple to understand. He explained that if you are a musician, the first people you play your composition with are your family and friends. Mechanically, the Internet makes it possible to build a community more quickly. You have to make sure that the first circle of this community trusts you. According to the size of the project, KissKissBankBank will try to determine an objective to achieve on the platform. Crowdfunding is not a heaven-sent miracle where money pours in, but a tool making it possible to reach out rapidly to the community and to replicate it in various stages. It is this community that enables the artists to grow and which grows naturally. The creator can also call on this community regularly to continue funding other projects after. This is the foundation of its future for a project on a crowdfunding platform. As such, the artist pays great attention to it. He explained that their role is to teach them to use it as skilfully as possible.

The moderator asked if there were any questions from the floor.

A participant asked how those participating see a return on their investment?

V. Ricordeau replied that there are three types of crowdfunding platforms. There are platforms that function via a gift or gift/counter-gift system. Most artists use these platforms. He explained that there is no return on investment. There are so few artists who will generate revenue with this project that the promise of royalties is false. Cultural crowdfunding was established because we work on a gift system. The return on investment is 100% emotional. If you take away this rationale of financial return on investment, replacing it with a rationale of emotional return on investment, you win on all fronts, since the projects are always born. This is the true DNA of platforms. However, for other sectors, particularly the business or *start-up* sector, where people contribute not in the form of gifts, but in the form of interest-bearing loans or shares, there is naturally an underlying rationale of return on investment.

The moderator noted that technology facilitates things. When we see that these instruments are within everyone's reach, does that change things?

V. Ricordeau affirmed that what has really changed in recent years in the artistic community is the means of production related to audiovisual industries. Today, most children and teenagers create their music with a home studio. Then, people are increasingly called on to handle each of the disciplines necessary for creation. Employment, as it exists today, will disappear almost entirely and divide into a multitude of independent workers who will be highly specialized in a domain and who will communicate among themselves.

A participant wondered whether scientific knowledge was entirely open access and free and raised the question of domains still concerned by protection.

Another participant said that there are silos that collect scientific knowledge. According to him, it will take a long time to free knowledge, but we must be patient as several changes are looming on the horizon.

The moderator finally summed up the discussions by identifying several of the many challenges that are emerging, particularly: How to enable different and diverse voices to be heard? Does technology really facilitate things? Is technology a facilitator? How to ensure that traditional creators are not lost in this obscurity?

CONCLUSION

O. Kulesz summarized the discussions of the exchange session by identifying ideas for the future. He mentioned four major aspects of the digital age: (1) access to culture and to new technologies, (2) creativity in the digital age, (3) cultural industries and new business models and (4) the participation of civil society. Digital technology offers as many opportunities for the diversity of cultural expressions as it does challenges.

Among the challenges are those that he considered barriers preventing access to these opportunities and the new dangers that the digital age introduces. With regard to access, it is clear that new technologies enable a democratization of access to culture. Nevertheless, there is a major obstacle that is the digital divide which separates industrialized countries from developing countries. Within each country, disparities exist between rural and urban populations, between the more favoured and the most disadvantaged sectors, and between genders. Regarding threats, there are a large number of traditional channels which feel threatened by their existence. Then there is the question of recommendation algorithms. Do these constitute threats to fair access? In the domain of creativity, the digital age makes it possible to shift social and geographical barriers, which represents a huge opportunity. Many artists must update their technical knowledge and artists wanting to make a living from their creation are at risk of not receiving sufficient remuneration and are therefore limiting their freedom of expression. Digital technology allows greater efficiency, lower costs, and new funding models for culture. Nevertheless, small companies do not have a huge amount of interaction with the web world and there is not enough investment in research and development. Finally, there is a risk of concentration in the hands of a certain number of actors, which could be detrimental at local level. As for the participation of civil society, social networks provide an exceptional opportunity. However, this is linked to the question of access. More than half of the world's population is not yet connected, hence the risk, the threat that a social group risks being excluded from citizen participation.

He added that these four components build on one another and feed into one another. To understand the elements of Parties' reports, he suggests a four-level framework: access, creativity, cultural industries, and participation. He is fascinated to see the relations that can be established. He added that we need to launch all possible initiatives in order to have a cultural ecosystem that is as diversified as possible. Much still remains to be done. More information and more data on new trends are needed. Cultural policy needs to be modernized and some policies need to be digitized. He explained that when establishing a plan for information and communication technologies, he feels that it is essential that the variable of cultural diversity be taken into account and not just economic considerations.

****