# Momentum

# Journalism
and Artificial
Intelligence

## Impact on Brazilian publishers

Journalism and Artificial Intelligence – Impact on Brazilian publishers
A publication by Momentum – Journalism and Tech Task Force
October 2024

Authors: Daniel Buarque and Paula Miraglia
English translation: Nana Soares
Spanish translation: Gabriela Hipólito

**if** **International Fund**
for Public Interest Media

# Index

# Introduction

- AI is transforming journalism, presenting challenges and opportunities for media companies around the world.

- Research based on interviews with Brazilian publishers analyses the impact of digital technologies on the sector, with an emphasis on the relationship between news companies and digital platforms.

- Brazilian news companies and organisations are at different stages of AI adoption. Collaboration stands out as a promising horizon, as does the constant monitoring and local adaptation of global trends.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the way Brazilian journalism companies and organisations operate, creating challenges and opportunities both in terms of the editorial process and the business model of these media groups.

The effective implementation of AI can significantly increase productivity, improve the personalisation of content and open up new market opportunities. However, it can also be an existential threat to journalism, as it challenges current business models – there is, for example, an objective risk of drastic losses in traffic, revenue and, ultimately, the media's relevance as a source of information. In this sense, the matter is associated with a debate on intellectual property, ethics, quality of information and the very sustainability of journalism, amongst others.

Brazilian news companies and organisations are at different stages in their adoption of AI, but it is clear that they recognise the need to adapt to this new reality to guarantee their survival and relevance in the digital market. The possibility of collaboration and the exchange of information between teams emerge as elements that can define the success of this transformation, as well as the continuous monitoring of technological trends and developments at a global level.

This report aims to analyse the impact of digital technologies on the Brazilian news ecosystem, emphasising the relationship between media companies and organisations and digital platforms, the so-called Big Techs. The study was develped within the 'Momentum – Journalism and Tech Task Force', a global initiative based in Brazil and dedicated to the relationship between journalism and

technology on its multiple fronts.

The 'Momentum – Journalism and Tech Task Force's aim is to carry out research, events and other activities linked to the relationship between the journalism ecosystem and technology companies. The idea is to produce information and visions that contribute to a less asymmetrical relationship between news companies and organisations and technology platforms.

'Momentum – Journalism and Tech Task Force' is supported by the International Fund for Public Interest Media (IFPIM), a multilateral organisation focused on the sustainability of public interest journalism in the Global South.

This report is the project's first activity, presenting a diagnosis of perceptions regarding the impacts of the rise of AI on the national journalistic ecosystem.

This study is based on 13 interviews conducted with representatives of various journalistic companies, organisations and associations in Brazil. The interviews provided valuable insights into how AI is being incorporated into operations, the challenges faced and the opportunities perceived[1]. Amongst other topics, the interviews cover the use of AI tools, the effects on productivity, business transformation and the ethical and economic issues associated with this emerging technology.

At the time the research was completed, no licensing agreements between media companies and organisations and AI companies had been signed in Brazil.

Although all companies and organisations recognise the importance of AI, the way they are dealing with this technology varies significantly, reflecting the level of priority given to the matter, as well as investment in knowledge. Although some traditional media companies are more advanced in implementing AI in their everyday operations, there are also 'digital natives' with very innovative projects who have shown to be very familiar with the tool. This is a relevant finding because technology has always been an element of distinction between traditional media and the so-called digital natives. For a long time, the complexity of implementing certain resources meant that smaller companies and organisations didn't always have access to cutting-edge technologies, which hampered their competitiveness.

It is also worth noting that some of the publishers contacted chose not to take part in the survey, pointing out the absence of any initiative related to the topic in their company or organisation.

[1]The complete list of interviewees is presented in the methodological note at the end of the report

# A brief context: The Brazilian media market and technology platforms

Brazil has a traditional and extremely concentrated media ecosystem when considering the private sector, an industry that until now has been mostly financed through advertising. In the case of regional and local media, state advertising plays a particularly important role.

The so-called 'digital transformation' has brought significant challenges to the business model of media companies, impacting not only the news distribution and reach but also the consumption patterns of different audiences.

In this context, sustainability has been an issue for large, small, young and traditional media outlets. As in the rest of the world, this is an ecosystem that is looking for new ways to finance journalism.

In the last 15 years, Brazil has seen the emergence of many 'digital native' outlets, which has contributed to the diversification of this ecosystem and of the public debate itself. Technology and digital platforms have played an important role in this market diversification. However, in recent years it has also become a threat to the existence of news organisations and the plurality of the digital news ecosystem. Opaque rules and standards define how content is distributed, compensated and moderated – and have become fundamental to the life of a news organisation, large and small.

# AI as a reality transforming the journalism business

- AI is unanimously recognised as an unavoidable reality for journalism, compared in impact to the internet.

- AI tools such as Chat GPT, translators and data analysis are being used to increase productivity.

- There is a need for journalistic companies to adapt significantly, above all to protect the production and publication of high-cost news that is essential to society from unpaid misuse.

The recognition of AI as a reality is unanimous among the publishers and representatives of news organisations in Brazil interviewed for this study. All those interviewed pointed out that it is already present in everyday life, whether in editorial processes and/or in the businesses of the country's journalism companies. For all the interviewees, there is no way back.

*We've been using Artificial Intelligence as citizens for a long time. I find it curious that it seems that we started with Chat GPT, but we've been using it for a long time, even at the newspaper. And now it seems that the world is going to end, everyone is panicking, and it's a tragedy for newspapers. Chat GPT is an important milestone, but when you begin to understand it, you realise that it's just another chapter in a story that didn't begin in 2022. Before Chat GPT, we used AI within the company to find out from where we were being read. We've been using AI for a long time to define the best titles and images for our digital products. To help the text be more appealing. So we already direct our attention and content investment based on information from Artificial Intelligence. Chat GPT was like switching on a transformative trigger. And the reaction has varied from apocalyptic to integrated. For some, the world is over, and for others, it's going to be all happiness. You have to be moderate and calm and analyse it from a historical perspective. It's a historical process, many things are going to happen. The new world is coming. It's a transition, but it comes as part of a historical process. That's reassuring because that's the way history works. We have to be calm to get through it. Change comes faster. We can't say that we won't jump on this train. If we don't get on the train, the train will run over us. But it doesn't have to be a careless climb or without thinking about it.*

(Interview 2)

One of the interviewees compared the impact of AI to that of the internet, emphasising that this transformation could define the survival or extinction of many companies in the sector.

> *It's a movement with a huge impact, similar to the emergence of the internet in a time when most work took place in the physical world, in print. It's a wave of comparable magnitude and, as a consequence, it brings about a transformation or a need for transformation of equivalent effort.*
>
> **(Interview 9)**

Most of the consulted companies have already begun to incorporate AI tools into their operations. An example is the widespread use of Chat GPT, translators and data analysis tools, as well as in internationalisation strategies, creating content in several languages and testing performance in virtual reality. Other companies have already begun experimenting, initially prioritising productivity, such as transcribing audio and video.

> *Artificial Intelligence is more of a tool rather than a competitor. Artificial Intelligence systems are things we have to use, they have to be more useful. There's a certain market reserve thing that we can't put ahead of development. It's the same as being against buttons in lifts not to take jobs away from lift operators. From the moment the first guy put a button in the lift, and it allowed they could press the button themselves, with no need for another person to manoeuvre the lift, that person's job was threatened. I don't think we're at that point in journalism and we have to use this resource, this button, and put these tools to work for us, in our favour, automating a lot of things, doing the boring chores of proofreading grammar, spelling, of summarizing. Obviously, always with human supervision, with human editing, but setting the tools to work for us.*
>
> **(Interview 8)**

> *The big challenge, the big mountain we have to climb is to know how to use the maximum possibilities of Artificial Intelligence without losing what we have as humans in the journalistic production, in the dissemination of advertising, which is our big business, in selling products*
>
> **(Interview 5)**

The digital transformation driven by AI is compared to the emergence of the internet, bringing a significant need for journalism companies to adapt. For many of the publishers interviewed, it is still unclear how journalism's business model should look in this new scenario. The first step would be to think of ways to protect news production and publication, which are costly and fundamental to the functioning of society.

> *We've been asking ourselves a lot about the business plan with AI. What are we going to do with it? And I've said a lot that it's impossible to do this now because we don't have a benchmark. But the way people communicate will change. To where it's going, I don't know. This tool allows you to get information more easily and more objectively in search of what you want. We think this is a very feasible path.*
>
> **(Interview 4)**

For some interviewees, however, it is clear that the traditional business model applied until now, whether it is the sale of physical newspapers or the sale of ads and programmatic media, is destined to change, and it is necessary to think about ways of monetising journalism – although there are no clear solutions to this challenge.

> *What we are witnessing is in fact a paradigm shift in how news will be distributed, how content will be generated, how tasks within a newsroom will be distributed. It's a complete structural change within industrial journalism*
>
> **(Interview 3)**

Most of the interviewees' points of view focused on the relevance of AI for journalism from the perspective of newsrooms, but in the context of analysing the news business, some of the publishers interviewed emphasised the need for the entire company to be fully prepared for the transformations brought by technology.

> *We discuss a lot about whether newsrooms are ready, but we have to see whether media corporations in other areas are ready for this. This is a business, not an NGO. I can have a newsroom that's evolved in the new ecosystem, but if the other areas of the company aren't at the same level, it gets complicated. The print newspaper business has changed. We need to integrate all areas of the company. Other areas, such as sales, need to be at the same level in order to sell this new business. This is a big knot because people need to understand that Jornal Nacional is no longer the audience of those who switch on the TV. Distribution in the multiplatform ecosystem has changed and includes all of this. Our business is no longer to sell adverts on pages. If we think that still exists, we're doomed. The audience we have today is different. We need to get to know our audience, and AI is going to help us do that. This is important for our business. We're late to start looking to the near future.*
>
> **(Interview 4)**

The attitude of seeing AI as part of reality is especially important to help companies adapt in their negotiations with Big Techs, as has happened in the past with the popularisation of the internet and the emergence of social networks.

> *The Big Techs want to wipe us out, and we were very scared. We approached Google and worked a lot to understand that the content production experience, plus programmatic media, plus audience, generates revenue. In Brazil, we thought this business opportunity was a business model. When Google changed without consulting us journalists, we were completely lost. Because Google changed the algorithms and didn't ask these partners anything about how we were treated. They do what they want. And then our revenue plummeted. We argue that this isn't Google's problem, the problem was that we turned someone else's business into our business model.*
> *We're lost because we turned the Google model into a business model. This all has to do with AI and how it indicates paths.*
>
> **(Interview 2)**

The interviews with publishers revealed that AI is already present in the reality of Brazilian journalism and that companies are paying attention to try to prevent it from becoming just a problem and that it can be used to bring fresh air to the communications business in the country.

> *The impact on the business is: accept it, do great business with giant companies, preserve the human side and try to get the best out of this facilitator for your business. Because if you see it as a facilitator for your purpose, you'll use it in the most intelligent way. It's about turning challenge into opportunity.*
>
> **(Interview 5)**

# Risks

- Key concerns include unauthorised use of journalistic content by AI, ethical issues and intellectual property.

- Fear of the rapid evolution of AI and its inappropriate use, as well as the potential for disinformation and violation of human rights.

- The replacement of journalists by AI is seen as unacceptable; there is an emphasis on the need to value investigative and in-depth journalism.

- Publishers worry that they won't be able to block Big Tech from using their content and that it will be delivered to readers without generating traffic for their publications.

Despite the opportunities, the interviewees also identified several risks associated with AI use in journalism.

*The risk for the end activity is easy to understand because you can generate content from [chat]GPT, then it hallucinates or takes information from third parties, which can lead to copyright problems. The risk for the business is knowing if Google search will end if it becomes clear to people the importance of a curatorship or not. How people will deal with training in the future using these tools. So we started talking a lot about this and imagining what we could do.*

(Interview 4)

One of the main concerns about the impact on the journalism business in Brazil is the possibility of AI using journalistic content and not paying for it, which is already happening and is being questioned by publishers in several countries. A recurring theme in the interviews was the concern about ethical and intellectual property issues associated with AI use.

> *The most problematic issue is how the data is used. All the publishers are anxious to know what this is going to be like with Google. With Chat GPT, companies are managing to block them from coming and searching through your content (which is content that you're spending money to produce) and simply delivering it in a generalised way, with data that you've searched, that you have. Regarding Google's AI, the big fear is that you won't be able to do any kind of blocking and that this will be delivered in the form of texts with no links, and people will simply stop visiting your site. Unfortunately, we already end up being hostage to the algorithms, we've experienced significant drops in search engine traffic over the last two years, and now with AI, we want to understand better how this is going to work*
>
> **(Interview 6)**

There is also the fear that AI will evolve faster than newsrooms can keep up, which could lead to inappropriate use of the technologies.

> *The risk is that Artificial Intelligence, which is evolving at a much faster rate than we can even dream of keeping up with, will start using our content without monetising it at all, without paying for anything. This is already happening in many cases, and that is indeed concerning*
>
> **(Interview 1)**

Another mentioned risk is that AI can be used in disinformation and violation of human rights, and because of that, these technologies should be used with great caution.

> *Regarding the risks, there is the one most closely linked to our editorial production, which is the use of these tools to create disinformation on a large scale*
>
> **(Interview 3)**

Although AI can help in daily processes, the interviewees argue that replacing journalists with AI tools is not an acceptable practice and that investigative and in–depth journalism must be valued. With the advance of technology, they say, this could problematically change the entire way journalism is produced and consumed by society.

> *With the emergence of Chat GPT, which switched on all the spotlights on the impact of AI in a much more accelerated way, we began to identify an existential threat to professional journalism. In the end, the acceleration of the process of disintermediation, the disconnection between the production of journalistic content and the audience, the brands, the original sources and the recipient due to the brutal disintermediation that is being configured by the LMS (Learning Management System). The key issue for us is a process of disintermediation, and the lack of recognition, the lack of compensation for content production.*
>
> **(Interview 12)**

The interviewees expressed concerns about generating content that could violate copyrights or present inaccurate information, emphasising the need for rigorous processes to mitigate these risks. Questions were also raised about the monetisation and dissemination of generative AI culture within newsrooms. In addition, there is concern about how journalistic production might be affected by the demands of information dissemination through AI.

> *It's important to understand how much the adoption of these technologies will accelerate the platformisation of journalism. We've already seen this with Facebook in the 2010s, with all the media outlets creating their audiences within these social networks and then being completely at the mercy of these companies. If Facebook changed one thing in the algorithm, it affected the audience of the news outlets. And we're at a moment of defining how these technologies will be adopted by the media. On the one hand, it's a much more open environment because it's not a social network it's a more interchangeable technology. You can use a Google model one week and switch to an Open AI model the next. I think there's a chance that it won't happen again, but I think we're seeing a lot of indications that the same thing could happen, of media outlets being led to build their audiences within these platforms and becoming dependent. Ultimately, this could lead to a dilution of brands by building audiences in these closed places, and search engines, which are an important source of audiences for media outlets, could stop taking users to the outlets' websites. If it can collate the results of several media outlets, you don't have to leave Google, for instance.*

**(Interview 3)**

Publishers also point to the lack of governance and strategic thinking in the use of AI as a significant risk. They emphasise that the pressure to adopt AI can lead to hurried decisions without a proper assessment of the long-term impacts.

> *There is a process of concentration in journalism, in the media. At the end of the last decade, we saw companies like Meta and Google very concerned about a sort of more democratic journalism ecosystem, encouraging digitally native outlets to become more sustainable, but today we see different behaviour from other companies like TikTok and Open AI who basically choose who they want to partner with, they have no interest in fostering the journalism industry, they basically want to do business with one, two, three companies, usually very large, usually transnational, and this definitely threatens the survival of smaller outlets and increases the technological dependence of journalism in general.*
>
> **(Interview 3)**

In general, the publishers' concerns relate to the transformation of journalism on a broad scale, which totally changes the market and even affects the social function of communication.

> *We are in a business that is becoming ethereal. It could be that people's interaction with this ethereal thing will impact journalism forever. From the moment you start talking more to the machine and asking it for a context of information from specific publications, where will journalism be? We're going to be a source. We're going to be a reference.*
>
> **(Interview 5)**

# Opportunities

- AI can increase productivity by automating repetitive tasks and allowing journalists to focus on more creative and analytical activities.

- AI tools are used for recommending content, formatting newsletters, chatbots and monitoring large databases, and can become sources of revenue with new products developed based on Artificial Intelligence.

- AI is seen as a continuation of previous technological transformations, emphasising the importance of the credibility of media outlets.

AI has also been seen as a means of increasing productivity in newsrooms. Artificial Intelligence tools are already being used, for instance, to recommend content based on users' reading habits, which also helps shape newsletters with a customised profile tailored to the interests of specific groups of readers. In the context of editorial production, publishers tend to see AI more as a tool than as a competitor, which suggests significant potential for improving operational efficiency.

> *We can have two major fronts for Artificial Intelligence within the company. The first one is for production processes, regardless of the outlet, and the second one is for connecting with the audience. We always look at both to understand the opportunities we might have*
>
> (Interview 6)

The interviewees mentioned various opportunities provided by AI, highlighting its potential to increase efficiency in newsrooms. Different publishers mentioned AI as a tool that can automate repetitive and time-consuming tasks such as proofreading and correcting grammar, allowing journalists to focus on more creative and analytical activities.

> *We've been testing a number of things here. For instance, you can follow multiple live broadcasts using transcription and summarisation. That's just one example, there are a million of them, being able to make your video and create versions of your video in multiple languages. It's going to have an impact on content production, content distribution, I think it's also going to have a very big impact on personalisation and understanding what the user wants, and I think it's going to have an impact on being able to deliver the same content in different ways to people. I think it's also going to have an impact on almost every area you look at. If you're clever, you'll find ways of doing it in a better way or with new skills.*
>
> (Interview 10)

Besides, they are developing chatbots and using AI to monitor large databases. For the interviewees, AI can help with mechanical tasks inherent in journalistic work, such as transcribing interviews and navigating through large volumes of documents. From an editorial point of view, the majority of interviewees see AI as an ally for improving the quality of journalistic work.

> *We still have a long way to go, new tools appear every day, and we're always willing to have a look and move forward on this issue. Especially now with the arrival of the generative ones, it has truly accelerated [the process], so we have some potential uses that would help us a lot. For instance, collecting data from Diário Oficial[2], gathering that information and generating insights for the editorial teams - it could make the journey a lot shorter. We realise that we could increase our human capacity to produce and generate important insights. We began with this innovation project and it has to be a project of continuous improvement and within the environments in which we work.*
>
> (Interview 10)

[2]Daily official publication containing governmental proclamations such as new laws, executive orders, regulations, as well as listing job openings, lay-offs, promotions, etc.

Brazilian news organisations are already developing various products using AI. The Aos Fatos agency, for example, has developed the Fátima robot, which incorporates generative Artificial Intelligence and offers personalised answers to users' questions about fact-checking. The newspaper O Globo created the Irineu project to develop products using AI, which includes a button on each article on the newspaper's website offering readers a short summary of the text. AI tools are seen not only as ways of improving the efficiency and quality of journalistic work, in order to enable journalists to concentrate on more complex and analytical tasks but also as offering new and differentiated experiences for readers and customers.

> *We have divided the discussion into three fundamental axes: productivity, product and reader interface. Productivity is kind of obvious: how can this eventually help us write an obituary, for instance? Can we use it? Can we not? How can we use it safely and respect other people's right to information? Product is what we can create to increase what we have to offer for our subscribers and that AI can help with. For instance, creating different versions of our content for a children's audience, digitally, using AI. And the third, interface, is what we can have on the website that will help readers to read and find the information they want. This could be a bot or a summary button, a 'break into topics' button, etc.*
>
> **(Interview 4)**

For many publishers, the rise of AI must be considered within the bigger context of the evolution of technology, as a continuation of previous transformations brought by the internet and social networks:

> *Unlike the popularisation of the internet around the year 2000 and the massification of social networks, which I think were two moments when publishers missed their chance to have a slightly more equal relationship with these new players, I now feel a different mindset. Now I feel a mindset that we're not going to make the same mistake a third time. So I'm excited on the one hand because I think this revolution offers us very good tools for our work, and on the monetisation side, I see the traders more evolved than in the other two times'*
>
> **(Interview 1)**

Another relevant point concerns the importance of journalism outlets in investigating and publishing news, which is fundamental to the functioning of society and goes beyond the question of the type of technology and tools used to produce the information and get it to the reader. For one of the interviewees, the popularity of generative AI could lead to greater valorisation of the importance of the credibility of media outlets in a time of global crisis in this sector.

> *The first is the opportunity for credibility because a potential consequence in terms of content generation of this whole movement is to massively increase the volume of information that is available to people in general - but still the origin, credibility or intention of this information might be even more obscure than it is today. So if serious media outlets manage to strengthen their role in an environment like this. By comparison, by contrast, the work of professional journalism becomes even more valuable in a more dangerous environment of low-credibility, news, fake news or deliberate disinformation. At least the work done based on seeking the truth and focusing on the facts. So in theory this is a good thing. If you can exploit this well and manage to convey this value to audiences who value it.*
>
> **(Interview 9)**

Similarly, one of the interviewed publishers emphasised that quality journalism will be able to maintain its relevance even with all the transformations brought by AI.

> *There are always problems, there are always challenges, there are always people trying to turn this into something that could become a problem for journalism, but I think it's going to be a problem for those who aren't producing quality journalism. Quality journalism has been around since the 18th century. When a person does business with care, with good text… What is the difference between Artificial Intelligence producing content and organisations that only produce 'recycled' content, only replicate what is published elsewhere to gain SEO, gain referrals and bring traffic to them? What's the difference? AI does this on a larger scale. Maybe that's the problem, who is actually producing content. Those who are there developing reports, investigations, providing explanations, doing actual journalism, I think the competition problems will be smaller.*
>
> (Interview 8)

# Blocking Data Collection by Big Techs

- There is growing concern about data collection by Big Techs, leading some companies to block the use of their content for AI training.

- Blocking the use of content aims to protect intellectual property rights and ensure fair compensation, but there are concerns about the impact on viewership, revenue and the risk of retaliation from Big Techs.

- The approach to blocking varies between companies, reflecting the challenges of balancing rights protection with maximising the reach of content.

- Publishers emphasise the importance of regulation so that contracts with Big Techs guarantee transparency and control over the use of data and journalistic content.

- A balance must be found between protecting intellectual property rights and maximising the reach of content.

- Proper regulation and fair compensation agreements between media companies and digital platforms are seen as essential steps towards creating a fairer and more balanced media ecosystem.

The interviews reveal a growing concern among Brazilian media companies about data collection by Big Techs. One of the most discussed solutions is the idea of blocking the use of this data. Implemented by some organisations, it aims to protect journalistic content and ensure that it is not used without due financial compensation. However, there are significant variations in the way different companies deal with this issue.

> *When outlets block, the most important insight is to tell these companies that if they are using our content to make money, they need to pay for it. Open AI talks about doing this for the good of humanity. Sort of, right? Actually, for the good of its shareholders. Microsoft isn't going to buy Open AI because it simply wants the good of humanity. We've seen in the past that technology companies aren't nice. We've believed in them in the past, we've had this illusion and we've defended the freedom of the internet, and we've seen that it hasn't worked out very well. So we use blocking as a message to them, to show that the content has an owner and that it is costly. If they need our content, they have to pay for it. We know they won't want to pay that easily. We've seen it in the past. We know that, for them to pay, it will probably take some kind of regulation, some kind of pressure from the government or some kind of pressure from society in general that leads to some kind of regulation, so the blocking ends up being pressure. They need to understand that content is expensive to make. You can't steal it. Ultimately, they're stealing content that isn't theirs to make a profit. This is very important to us.*

(Interview 4)

Most of the larger Brazilian media outlets have blocked their content from being used for training AI tools, inspired by examples from major international press outlets such as The New York Times. This decision was motivated by concerns about the unauthorised use of journalistic content, which could be used by these companies without offering any compensation to the media organisations that produce the original.

*Our vision is that the most valuable thing about what the outlet does is that it combines words in a certain way. If that can be swept up by a system like this and modified or even combined with other sources and generate a third product, people don't know what ingredients are in that recipe. In our case, it's a recipe made with just our ingredients, predominantly with them. So, in theory, we own the recipe. If the recipe is different from what others make, the value is there. If our recipe is taken away from us and mixed with other recipes, we no longer have the recipe and become an ingredient. And an ingredient that you can't even tell that the origin is our outlet. And those who benefit from this are the ones who put a new recipe together, using what used to be our recipe as an ingredient. It's clear from the beginning that if we give this away, there's practically nothing left to differentiate. And because of this, right from the start we have put mechanisms in place that prevent these language models from sweeping up the content and taking it to train other products at this point. So we don't have anything, except one that's a bit impossible to control, which is Google itself. Because we voluntarily leave our content to be indexed by Google. Potentially, all the content that's indexed there is potentially available for Google's language programme, as well as all that's on YouTube and so on. Blocking this would mean practically not participating in Google search. It's a dilemma, a painful decision, but not a difficult one. We can't give it up now, but we know that it can't stay that way, otherwise, the value and distinction of the product will deteriorate through this process too.*

(Interview 9)

Interviewees argue that, as much as AI can offer opportunities to improve the efficiency and quality of journalism, it is crucial that media companies maintain control over the use of their content to avoid unfair exploitation by Big Techs.

The blockade is seen as a defensive measure to protect intellectual property rights and ensure that media companies can negotiate fairly their content use. Publishers also emphasised the importance of regulation so that contracts with Big Techs guarantee transparency and control over the use of data and journalistic content, especially in a digital environment dominated by large technological platforms. There is great concern that the blockade will be answered with some form of retaliation by the Big Techs, which could have an impact on the audience and revenue of Brazilian media outlets.

> *If it's possible to block, if Google simply doesn't show my links, then the AI can't search my content. If all serious newspapers do the same thing, what will appear in the search is fake news, rubbish. So there's also a concern not just for my business, but a social concern. Humanity searches on Google all the time, that is a fact, and understanding how a change is going to affect society itself is a concern that everyone has to be aware of. If reliable newspapers manage to block these searches, what AI will deliver is probably a lie.*
>
> (Interview 6)

Brazilian publishers are also concerned about the effectiveness of this type of blocking. For many, the scraping of data by the Big Techs has already been done in an unrestricted way and does not necessarily respect the indications that the outlets prohibit them from doing so.

> *We have implemented some blocking protocols, they are very incipient, but the extraction itself, technically, is in a grey area, because we can't guarantee that the data won't be used to train AI. We have put on our website that this is not allowed. In other words, if you're doing it, you're doing it against the terms of use of our property. But technically, making sure that this data isn't being used for certain purposes... it's not clear. We make certain blocks that we believe are necessary. And then this also became a trade policy, right? Because, for instance, I can be penalised in the search engine, which is my biggest source of traffic, because I'm not releasing this content to train AIs So you sort of generate this interdependence.*

**(Interview 6)**

However, the blocking proposal is not unanimous, and some media companies choose not to block data collection, believing that the visibility and reach offered by digital platforms outweigh the potential risks of unauthorised use of the content. These companies adopt an approach that recognises their dependence on Big Techs for the distribution and monetisation of their content. Some large media organisations, which heavily rely on the traffic generated by digital platforms, choose not to implement strict blockings. These groups say they believe that allowing Big Techs to use their content increases their visibility and engagement with audiences, generating additional traffic, which is their priority over protecting information through blockades.

Another issue that leads to reservations about blocking is that using journalism data to train AI tools should have been seen as wrong from the start. When discussing ideas to block data collection, there is an inversion of logic, assuming that the Big Techs were free to use media groups' data as they wish and that it is the news organisations and companies that must act to protect their products. For some of the interviewees, using data to train AI is a diversion, and shouldn't be seen as the norm. Instead of simply saying that data can't be used, it would be important to discuss the idea of using this information more broadly.

> *The moment we block it, it can be interpreted as if it was free to use [the data] until the day before. And if we think about compensatory policies, this can have an impact. The central issue is that it's not the vehicle that has to block. This is politically assuming a burden, the field is politically assuming a burden, because there is no authorisation for this use. Why do we have to prohibit the use if there is no express authorisation? This means an inversion of the burden of proof, assuming that, in principle, the Big Techs can scrape whatever they want, use any type of content, and the outlets have to say no. This has a political impact.*
>
> **(Interview 13)**

The different approaches reflect the challenges faced by media companies when dealing with Big Tech. While blocking data collection can protect the short-term interests of media companies, it can also limit the visibility and reach of content. The decision whether or not to block data is influenced, amongst other things, by factors such as the size of the organisation, the dependence on digital advertising revenue and the long-term strategy for sustainability and growth.

In general, the interviewees agree that a careful balance is needed between protecting intellectual property rights and maximising the reach of content. Proper regulation and fair compensation agreements between media companies and digital platforms are seen as essential steps towards creating a fairer and more balanced media ecosystem.

# Content licensing

- Content licensing agreements are seen as a potential new source of revenue, but there are concerns about the asymmetry of power in negotiations with Big Techs.

- Need for clear criteria for licensing, including brand preservation, use of links and fair financial compensation.

- Discussion of international models and the feasibility of replicating such models in Brazil, with an emphasis on collective bargaining to strengthen the position of news organisations.

- There is a common challenge that unites organisations and companies with different profiles and sizes: assigning value to their content.

The interviewees expressed a complex and multifaceted view of content licensing agreements for Big Techs, with no uniform and unanimous position and no standardised minimum criteria and requirements for negotiation. All the publishers interviewed believe and defend that companies that want to use content to train and feed Artificial Intelligence tools need to pay for that and give credit to the sources, but the way this should happen and the amounts involved are not yet clear even to the companies.

> *The standard is that they obviously have to recognise that they have captured raw material that doesn't belong to them, that isn't in the public domain. We're facing a situation that is the biggest plagiarism in history, collective plagiarism. This is the equivalent to the people breaking into our house, taking the paintings, the carpets, the cutlery and the furniture and then saying, 'Look, I didn't realise the door was closed, but here's a lock, you can use it. Next time you should put a lock on the door so we can't get in', which is what the tools they gave us are now saying*
>
> **(Interview 12)**

Many interviewees see licensing agreements as potential new sources of revenue, especially in a scenario where Big Techs are increasingly interested in using journalistic content to train their language models and offer personalised content to their users.

However, there is significant concern about the lack of transparency and negotiating power in these agreements.

> *Nobody knows what the negotiating levels are. All the agreements that have been signed by Open AI, we don't know the amounts involved. There are speculations, apparently they are small amounts, which don't reach two digits of millions of dollars. And I think it also takes into account that there are two aspects, it's not necessarily a package of direct money, but it's a package that involves a fixed financial resource and then a variable depending on the audience, on the use of that content so the more it's used, the more the outlet will be paid. Apparently you're looking at a combination of a fixed amount and a variable amount, plus a third aspect which is the providing of tools, training and the introduction of Artificial Intelligence tools in these outlets. The Big Techs say they're not just sticking to agreements with the big media outlets.*
>
> **(Interview 12)**

One of the main complaints is the asymmetry of power in negotiations, where big platforms tend to impose their conditions, leaving little room for news companies to define more favourable terms.

> *The only reference we have are the leaks of negotiations that have already been made with big names in journalism, such as the Wall Street Journal, the Financial Times and others, but they are leaks. We don't know if these are official figures or even the negotiations that have taken place. The parameters that these media outlets used to make their own negotiations were not shared with others. They could have shared with their peers what the parameters were, what the criteria of the negotiations were, so that there would be an international benchmark that the less influential media outlets in the global arena could use for their own negotiations. Unfortunately, this has not been done so far. These companies have not been supportive in this respect.*
>
> **(Interview 1)**

The interviewees emphasise the need to establish clear and robust criteria for any licensing agreement. This includes ensuring that the media outlet's brand is preserved, that links are used to reference the original content and that there is fair financial compensation for using the content. There is a perception that, without these criteria, Big Techs could devalue journalistic content and jeopardise the financial sustainability of media outlets.

> *Firstly, of course, there has to be payment to the outlet. They're using your product, so for us it has monetary value. The second is that it's a two-way street, it's not simply that we license, it's that we exchange the content for knowledge that can help us do what we were talking about at the beginning of the conversation: automate several of our things that are about parity or enrich several of our things that are about building distinction and value. So that would be the second, it's a two-way street, we license the content and then we receive money and knowledge that allows us to reinforce our value proposition. Specifically, we don't have any deals signed with anyone. We've had a few conversations, but there's been no progress on what this negotiation would be. Everyone keeps wondering how much it's worth. And I think part of it is monetisation, but part of it is what we can bring or acquire from this potential partner. This partner who would help reinforce what we do best, what's different, or make simpler and cheaper the tasks we need to do, but which don't make a difference.*
>
> **(Interview 9)**

Some interviewees mentioned international models, such as Australia's and Canada's , where regulations have been implemented that oblige Big Techs to pay for journalistic content.

*The ideal would be to have collective agreements, not direct agreements with organisations, because otherwise Google or Open IA will choose to negotiate with Globo, for instance. And then it will be an absurd amount, and with other smaller organisations it won't be very fair. So I think they have to be collective agreements with clear and transparent criteria.*
(Interview 7)

These examples are seen as potential references, but there is still scepticism about the viability of replicating such models in Brazil, given the complexity of the regulatory environment and the diversity of actors involved.

*We have a certain difficulty even with thinking about scale. These agreements are very recent. We don't know if they've already happened in Brazil, for instance. We don't know how advanced the negotiations are and what is included in these licence agreements, whether it's by scale, news quantity, or theme. It would be important for these contracts to have established how this content will appear on these devices. The brand could not be deleted, the link should always be used for referencing, authorship should not be deleted. The fundamentals of the text, the style, should be preserved. A series of things that we know probably won't happen.*

(Interview 3)

In addition to the discussion on data licensing, there is also no consensus on how a possible negotiation should take place.

*Basically, there is a division into two main currents: those who are starting to prepare actions for compensation or those who are going to take the negotiating position. The two are complementary if they combine, and can be part of the same process. It is inevitable that there will have to be a negotiation on unprecedented scales because it is unsustainable from a moral and ethical point of view that they have captured this content from the media and then there is no recognition that they have used third party raw material to produce a business."*

(Interview 12)

Brazilian media outlets are alert to what is happening in the rest of the world in order to define their strategies.

*There are two possible paths according to how things are currently going: the New York Times path or the Financial Times path. The NYT way is for you to go to court: 'You don't use it, and I'm going to sue you because you keep using it and I want you to pay me for it'. And the FT way is to demand payment for a negotiation. And there's a third way that so far hasn't been achieved anywhere in the world, which is the sectoral agreement.*

(Interview 1)

The idea of collective bargaining is advocated especially by smaller outlets, which believe they don't have the strength to deal directly with the Big Techs.

*Brazil does not yet have a coalition to deal with Artificial Intelligence. There is no formal or even informal coalition. As negotiations are often directly between companies, the association obviously does not interfere in these negotiations, nor does it comment on these business decisions. Negotiations are according to the strategy of each business. Each channel, each platform, each market has its own business moment, there is no one-size-fits-all formula.*

(Interview 1)

For them, it would be important to have an agreement between several outlets to approach content licensing in a way that meets everyone's interests.

*We still don't have an organised, systematised approach to possible negotiations with Google or other platforms regarding these payments. This is also something that is being conducted very much by ANJ. The ANJ currently represents all Brazilian newspapers, so this discussion has been very much carried out by this organisation. There's no point in me wanting to do one thing, the people in Fortaleza doing another, and O Globo another. We have to be on the same page so that everyone can win and not be harmed. I think that ANJ's approach will lead us down paths that all the other sites will also follow.*

**(Interview 12)**

Any discussion on licensing is influenced by the fact that the relationship between Brazilian newspaper companies and Big Techs is marked by significant dependence, especially in terms of traffic distribution and generation. Many interviewees recognise that while blocking data collection is a necessary measure to protect the value of content, there is an inherent dependence on search platforms and social networks to reach audiences. This duality makes the issue of licensing even more complex, as it involves balancing the need for monetisation with preserving autonomy as organisations and businesses.

# Asymmetry of Power and Dependence on Big Techs

- Clear perception of a profound asymmetry of power between journalism companies and Big Techs, revealing a significant and practically inevitable dependence on digital platforms.

- Big Techs control audience and programmatic advertising, making it difficult for smaller outlets to negotiate and increasing the complexity of the debate, which is generally not representative of all the interests at stake.

- Technology companies have a significant advantage when it comes to financial and technological resources, as well as having access to a large amount of user data. Brazilian news companies, on the other hand, have limited access, exacerbating their technological dependence and making it difficult for them to compete.

The interviews collected in the study reveal the perception of a profound asymmetry of power between Brazilian journalism companies and Big Techs. This imbalance manifests itself in various aspects, from the negotiation of programmatic advertising to the use and control of data.

*There is a huge asymmetry of forces. Even if you take the New York Times, which is the most powerful and financially viable media outlet in the world, it's no match for a company that has Google, Meta, Apple behind them. When you descend to other levels, you see that the asymmetry becomes even greater. Theoretically, yes, the opportunity is better to negotiate than it was before, because the same mistakes don't have to be made. But on the other hand, the asymmetry is still very large*

(Interview 1)

The interviewees indicate that the dependence of journalism companies on Big Tech is significant and practically unavoidable. One of the interviewees said that denying Google's leading role in the digital media business is like denying that the Earth revolves around the Sun. They emphasised that the Big Techs' control of advertising and of the audience forces publishers to embrace this reality or face severe difficulties.

Others pointed out that every news organisation is to some degree dependent on Big Techs.

> *Today every news organisation is dependent. Perhaps the degree of dependence will change, but today there is no one who has an independent relationship, for example, with Google or the Big Techs of social networks. It's a challenge all over the world. The way forward is for us to build closer relationships with the user, to try to create more direct contacts with our audience.*
>
> **(Interview 6)**

Many mentioned that, ideally, traffic should come directly, but the current business model depends on the audience amplified by platforms like Google, Facebook, YouTube, and TikTok. They emphasise the lack of control and knowledge about the external origins of traffic, which raises concerns about the generative AI exploited by Google.

The interviews point out that Big Techs control not only the audience, but also a large part of advertising through programmatic advertising. This control creates a scenario where smaller media outlets have little negotiating power. Publishers emphasise the complexity of discussions with Big Techs, which are generally unilateral and come standardised from other countries, with no room for adaptation or local demand.

> *We are dependent because it's a relationship that involves monetisation. And who controls advertising, a large part of advertising, which is programmatic advertising, are the same Big Techs that control the audience. For the publisher, it's cruel. Then you see the rise of publishers totally focused on traffic, who have no content and only advertise, sites created to generate advertising revenue. So the reality is: embrace it or die alone. Denying Google's prominence and its importance to a digital media business is like denying that the earth revolves around the sun. Denying Google's existence is like being a flat-earther in the digital media industry.*
>
> **(Interview 5)**

We are dependent because it's a relationship that involves monetisation. And who controls advertising, a large part of advertising, which is programmatic advertising, are the same Big Techs that control the audience. For the publisher, it's cruel. Then you see the rise of publishers totally focused on traffic, who have no content and only advertise, sites created to generate advertising revenue. So the reality is: embrace it or die alone. Denying Google's prominence and its importance to a digital media business is like denying that the earth revolves around the sun. Denying Google's existence is like being a flat-earther in the digital media industry.

> *API doesn't allow us to have 100% independence. We depend on their API. Developing our own language model is unfeasible, very expensive. It would be a dream, but we know it's unfeasible because of costs, for everyone. I don't think there's going to be a newspaper that develops its own language model. That's not going to happen. You'll need their technology, so we can't be independent. We also don't know where things are going, we don't know what's going to happen with search engines, but people are going to have to get information somehow, so we don't imagine that overnight we won't need a social network, won't need Google, won't need a GPT prompt, etc. So we'll continue to depend on them. The dependency will end the day we have a very large volume of people going directly to our website, more direct access from readers. And what we've seen in the recent world is the difficulty of succeeding directly. There's a huge competition for time, for the reader's attention. So I think it's very difficult for any of these tools to generate independence. And these companies are no fools. They want to create tools that will help us, but that we will also be stuck with for a long time or forever. Unfortunately, I don't think it will lead to independence.*

**(Interview 4)**

Another critical aspect is control over data. Big Techs hold a colossal amount of user data, which they use to train their AI algorithms and continuously improve their offerings. Brazilian news companies, on the other hand, have access to a much smaller volume of data, limiting their ability to develop their own competitive AI solutions. This imbalance in access to data amplifies the power asymmetry between media companies and Big Techs.

Interviewees also argue that Big Techs have significant power to influence the market and public policies. They have a global presence and lobbying resources that allow them to shape regulations and policies in their favour. Brazilian companies, on the other hand, have less influence and face additional challenges to compete in a market where rules can be moulded by Big Tech interests.

Concentrating power in the hands of Big Techs has direct economic implications for news companies. The monetisation of digital content often goes through platforms controlled by these large corporations, which capture a significant part of the revenue generated by ads. This reduces the share of revenue available to media companies, which are already facing significant financial challenges in their transition to digital.

Intellectual property and copyright issues are exacerbated by the dominance of Big Techs. News companies often find it difficult to protect their content in a digital environment where Big Techs control the main distribution platforms. The reproduction and dissemination of content without due financial compensation further damages media companies.

Part of the dependency is explained by mistakes on the part of the media companies themselves.

> *The dependency was created by a strategic mistake on the part of the communications companies, which counted their chickens before they hatch. We've created a close relationship with Google and were wrong to be dependent on it. We made the wrong decision, we got intoxicated with this business, and we went after it. Now we're going to redefine our strategies to pursue what matters. We had a drop in revenue because of Google's new algorithms, but we still have a strong brand, which we are now revalorising.*
>
> **(Interview 2)**

Despite their dependence, there is a perception that there are opportunities for journalism companies to develop more independent ways of operating. One of the solutions mentioned is to strengthen relations with users, creating more direct and predictable contacts. Although dependence on platforms is inevitable, diversifying the sources of incoming can mitigate the risks associated with relying on a single platform.

> *Big Techs are like frenemies. Friends and enemies. It's a duality, it's a bivalence, it's a contradiction in many cases, but it's a reality. We can't be dogmatic in this business, or on the one hand be seduced, enchanted by the fact that they're technological, that they're international, that they're rich, that they're on the frontier of knowledge, so we throw ourselves into their arms and are seduced by that. And you can't be on the other side thinking that they're going to destroy us and put an end to our business. It's a very fine line, we try to do a lot of things with Google and you can do a lot of things that you wouldn't be able to do, or wouldn't be able to do so well, if it wasn't for Google's support. On the other hand, from a business point of view, in a very critical way, the history of a search engine, which we depend on a lot. It's a very strong distribution channel over which publishers have zero control. And that's a case of dependency. This is a case of dependence, and a relatively voluntary dependence. You could depend less on search, which would mean choosing to have a smaller business. And that's something that people generally don't want. But you can't blame Google alone either. Search is a distribution channel.*
>
> **(Interview 9)**

*It's a coopetition relationship. This relationship is flawed from the beginning. We've always had the vision that, historically, advertising has always been the main source of revenue for media groups. This began to change at the end of the 1990s and into the 2000s, with the emergence of digital products that often brought new revenue monetisation challenges. Our relationship ends up being that the Big Techs have stolen our media or our media revenue. You have a turning point and two possibilities: either you change your business model or you wait to see what happens and try to use all the forces you can to generate survival for the previous business model, which may still be viable for a number of players, but perhaps for the masses it may no longer be viable. So when it comes to this relationship with Big Techs, I think we have to have this coopetition bias, because when we talk about Advertising I don't think we can have a dialogue. But when we talk about leveraging business models using them as a basis to create this new business model that will sustain us in order to pay the bill... I think you re-signify this relationship*

(Interview 11)

# Asymmetry of power amongst Brazilian media companies

- Large media groups have a significant advantage linked to financial resources, negotiating capacity and investments in AI, contrasting with the difficulties faced by smaller companies and organisations.

- Larger companies have more strength in negotiations with advertisers and Big Techs, guaranteeing better terms and more stable revenues, while smaller companies and organisations face limitations on favourable deals.

- Interviewees note a lack of solidarity between larger media outlets, which prefer individual negotiations with Big Techs, perpetuating the asymmetry of power and limiting the cooperation that could strengthen the sector.

Although the asymmetry of power between media companies and Big Techs was one of the main themes brought up by the interviewees, publishers also expressed concern about the difference in power and influence between Brazilian media companies themselves, indicating that larger groups have great advantages in negotiations with technology companies, which further threatens Brazil's already concentrated media ecosystem.

> *It's natural for larger companies to have legal and commercial departments that are a little more robust and better able to take legal action, but that doesn't stop a smaller outlet from eventually taking legal action. When it comes to litigation, the capacity of a small or large company doesn't make that much of a difference. When it comes to negotiation, the formula that has been adopted around the world is collective negotiation for the smaller ones. In Australia, for instance, there are a number of coalitions of smaller media outlets that have obtained proportionally higher amounts than in individual negotiations. The formula is going to be a combination of companies collectively negotiating in order to actually face those that think it's worth negotiating.*
>
> **(Interview 12)**

Major Brazilian journalistic groups, such as Globo and UOL, are seen as having a significant advantage in terms of financial resources and negotiating capacity. These companies have greater bargaining power when negotiating advertising contracts and partnerships with Big Techs. In addition, they are more capable of investing in AI technologies, hiring specialised staff and adapting their operations to incorporate new technological tools in a faster and more effective way.

*The idea of collective bargaining is totally detached from reality. There are two actors that are playing a different game: UOL and Globo. I don't see any conditions for collective bargaining because it's basically a commercial issue. If you take UOL, it's a gigantic titan with two billion pageviews a month. Globo and UOL are in that league, and then you go to a league, the league we're fighting in, which is 100 to 250 million pageviews. Terra, R7, IG, Metrópoles. How are you going to have any market unity with two titans and this bunch of tiny players? This is a historical problem in the Brazilian media industry. It's a legacy media group, and UOL is a combination of an industry and a family business that knew how to reinvent itself and pulled an extraordinary rabbit out of the hat, which was that IPO, which injected an absurd amount of money into PagSeguro and turned UOL into what it is today. UOL has no inventory available for programmatic advertising. That makes them independent. The inventory is already taken by direct clients. So they're completely independent, and they're not going to sit down with Google. They're not going to call anyone else to sit down with Google to talk about the Brazilian media industry.*

(Interview 5)

Large media groups have more leverage in negotiations with advertisers and Big Techs due to their greater audience and influence in the market. This advantage allows them to negotiate better terms and agreements, guaranteeing higher and more stable revenues. Smaller companies, on the other hand, often struggle to get such favourable deals, which limits their revenues and ability to invest in new technologies.

The disparity in resources between the large groups and the smaller news companies is evident in the interviews. Interviewees from larger groups revealed that they are in constant talks with large companies as they develop strategies to negotiate content licensing, while smaller companies revealed that they depend on associations such as ANJ or AJOR to represent several companies and think collectively.

*The scenario that is unfolding, which is what worries me the most, is similar to what happened in Australia, where payment for journalistic content happens on a scale of licensing negotiations with a language model, which is to allow individual negotiation. And then there will be the New York Times, Globo (in Brazil), the Economist, who will be able to get paid for content. It's going to create a huge gravity centre on these platforms and everyone is going to be forced to make content available for free because the entire audience is there. So a small company can't avoid a place with a huge audience, as happened with Facebook, WhatsApp and so many other platforms. So I think this is the worst-case scenario, the top outlets getting money and licensing, and the rest being forced to make content available for free on these platforms because they need the audience.*

(Interview 3)

Whereas large companies are able to invest in training and continuous development programmes for their teams, smaller companies and organisations rely more on informal collaboration and knowledge exchange. In addition, the interviewees noted that there is a lack of solidarity from big Brazilian media outlets, which could be sharing negotiating parameters and criteria to strengthen everyone's position. Instead, they often opt for individual negotiations, which perpetuates the asymmetry of power and restricts the possibility of a more far-reaching collective agreement.

# Updating and
# Team Building

- Rapidly evolving technology makes it difficult for journalism companies to continually update and build teams.

- Publishers emphasise the importance of the continuous exchange of information about AI within teams, even in the absence of formal systems, in order to use the new tools effectively and ethically.

- Interviewees mention a culture of secrecy in Big Techs, limiting access to information and making negotiations even more difficult.

The need to keep companies and their teams informed and up-to-date on AI technologies was another concern raised by the interviewees.

One of the problems is that the speed at which technology is developing is too fast for companies to keep up with and update their teams.

> *It's very difficult to be sufficiently informed because it's an avalanche. Every week, every month there are a series of new tools. You test one tool and find that it's not very good, but there's another one that's better, but it also lacks this, it lacks that, and then another one comes along that solves the problem. We're living through the Artificial Intelligence gold rush, so I don't think we can ever be sufficiently informed, but we know what's going on, we follow it to the best of our ability, because I think the difficulty for all publishers and for society as a whole is that you have the world going on, everyone's everyday work, and you simply can't stop everything and create everything from scratch again. This difficulty of balancing the way things are with the way things will be is a perennial challenge for everyone.*

**(Interview 10)**

Publishers mentioned that even when there is no formal system for exchanging information, there is an ongoing effort to discuss and share knowledge about AI within the team. This exchange is essential to ensure that everyone is aware of the new tools and can use them effectively and ethically.

> *Discussing with Big Techs is very complex because there is a prevailing discourse - the general behaviour of people working in Brazil is to always be the last link in the chain in any kind of development. Everything comes ready from the United States or Israel, and they say 'We just implement it'. That's the game, accept it and play. Then they decide to change the algorithm, they make the change and we're taken by surprise. That's their discourse, you know? We don't have any kind of creative discussion or demand that can be taken forward.*
>
> **(Interview 5)**

At the same time, interviewees mentioned an atmosphere of permanent secrecy in Big Techs, limiting access to information for journalism companies, which makes negotiations even more difficult.

> *We are informed about what they want us to know or about what leaks out. It sounds contradictory, but Big Techs act a lot like China. It's a one-party dictatorship. Both information and the dissemination of that information is controlled very closely and you only know what they want you to know. If they don't want you to know, you won't know. The secrecy in this industry is perhaps paralleled in the military industry. Nobody ever says anything. We've had contact with all these companies, at all levels, in all situations, from formal visits and formal meetings to informal and even social ones, and the secrecy is at the level of the Chinese politburo.*
>
> **(Interview 1)**

# The importance
# of regulation

- The attempt to pass legislation to regulate digital platforms is seen as necessary, facing significant resistance from Big Techs.

- A law for remunerating content is an important step, but implementation faces challenges in a volatile political scenario.

- The absence of clear rules on relationships between media companies and Big Techs complicates the scenario, increasing the need for robust governance.

The attempt to pass legislation to regulate digital platforms in Brazil, including requirements for transparency and compensation for journalistic content, is seen as a necessary measure but faces significant resistance from the big tech companies. The recent elaboration of a separate bill for content remuneration may be an important step, but its approval and full and effective implementation are still challenges in a volatile political landscape.

> *Of course, we think it's important to have some sort of regulation, we've been following everything that's been going on in Brasilia since Pacheco's project a long time ago, which finally saw some modifications. We believe that regulation is essential for this technology. Technology isn't good or bad per se, the problem is how we use technology, what people do with it. So regulation will help us to make sure that it is used as correctly as possible*
>
> (Interview 4)

Until regulation takes place, however, the concern of many of the interviewees is that there don't seem to be any clear rules in the relationship between Brazilian media companies and Big Techs, which complicates the overall scenario.

*There's still no VAR[3] in this game. There are no rules. We have to appeal and believe in people's common sense and ethical judgment. We know that there are small websites that have been stealing our content for decades on the Brazilian internet. 'Somewhere's Gazette' copies and pastes an article from UOL and adds: 'source - UOL'. It's bang-bang, it's a land with no law. So it's complicated. How are you going to tell the guy not to use your data to produce content with Artificial Intelligence? It's complicated, it's a difficult ocean to navigate.*

(Interview 5)

[3]Reference to the Video Assistant Referee, a refereeing system used in football that uses video images to review decisions made by the referee during the game in order to avoid mistakes in important decisions.

# Conclusion

- The impact of AI on Brazilian journalism presents significant challenges, linked to the dependence on Big Techs and the difficulty in determining and negotiating the values attributed to journalistic content. At the same time, AI is perceived as an opportunity, which can bring, among other things, increased productivity.

- Investing in high-quality journalism and adopting an ethical approach to the application of AI are essential for the sustainability of the sector.

- Amongst the recommended measures are implementing blocks or restrictions on data collection until agreements are reached, developing partnerships that favour collective bargaining, diversifying content distribution platforms and relationships with the audience, and greater engagement in debates between key players to promote a regulation that takes into account the needs of the media ecosystem.

This report highlights the growing impact of AI on Brazilian journalism, identifying both significant opportunities and challenges. Media companies in Brazil face a duality when trying to balance the fact that they rely almost entirely on digital platforms to distribute their content with the need to protect their content from unauthorised use.

There is a perception that AI can potentially increase productivity and positively transform the news business. At the same time, the unauthorised or unpaid use of journalistic content and the scenario of reduced traffic are concrete risks that raise concerns about the sustainability and plurality of the Brazilian digital news ecosystem.

Even in the face of such risks – and a subsequent crisis in the industry that is even more pronounced – almost all of the interviewees made it clear that they do not lose hope for a positive breakthrough for journalism.

> *We see it as both an opportunity and a risk, and I'd like to emphasise that the opportunity is huge. We have a very optimistic view of the opportunities that Artificial Intelligence brings to journalism and journalists. From the beginning we worked hard on these two fronts: risk, involving legal and other areas of the company; but on the issue of opportunity, we quickly embraced the opportunities for the performance of the profession, we have publicised it in the newsroom and quickly offered tools, many of them produced internally, for the newsroom to use, showing that it's not a problem, it's a real opportunity. It seems like a schizophrenic or antagonistic relationship in some aspects, and indeed it is, but the part that is positive for us we have embraced very rigorously, very methodically and with no fear.*

**(Interview 1)**

One of the central points of this approach is that the problem is not Artificial Intelligence itself, but the way it is applied.

> *AI has problems like any other technology, and like any technology, the problem arises in the way we use it. So the problem isn't caused by technology, it's caused by human beings. Let's not demonise technology. Let's think about the best use for it and let's demand the best use for it. And this obviously involves regulation and things like that. Although I understand that there are risks in our business, there are risks for humanity. We're much more focused on understanding how this can help us accelerate processes. I'm not simply looking to save time, I'm looking to improve procedures. I want to make a better story out of this, to improve my procedures in order to provide a better result for the reader. I think the tool can help a lot. We're thinking much more about how it can help than how it can get in the way.*

**(Interview 4)**

Lastly, although the focus of the discussion presented here has been the issue of AI's impact on Brazilian journalism business, many of the interviewees insisted on emphasising the importance of approaching this transformation based on ethical concerns.

> *I emphasise this a lot, which is ethical responsibility so that we don't lose sight of what we're doing. When we discuss generative AI and its effects on journalism, we need to philosophise a little. We have to imagine a little about how people will seek information in the future, but also [to] philosophise about how this might affect what we do ethically. I think this discussion is very relevant. We have to discuss all the time whether the use is responsible, and whether it changes people's perception of journalism. We're coming out of a period of a very big crisis of confidence, a generalised crisis of confidence in society, in social contracts, in the social pact, but also in the press. I'm concerned and I work and fight so that under no circumstances everything that we have to do and actually do with AI doesn't increase this crisis of confidence. You can't take the journalist out of the equation; I always have to have a journalistic mindset at the beginning of any generative AI process and there always has to be a journalist's review as well, to make this process more correct and responsible. So I think the ethical discussion is very important and can't be left aside*

**(Interview 4)**

# Methodological Note

This study was undertaken using a qualitative methodology based on semi-structured interviews with publishers from Brazilian communication companies.

In total, representatives from 13 journalistic companies and associations were interviewed: Agência Pública, Aos Fatos, Associação Nacional de Jornais (ANJ), Folha de S.Paulo, IG, Jornal do Commercio, Núcleo Jornalismo, O Estado de S. Paulo, O Globo, O Povo, Rede Gazeta and UOL. All interviewees agreed to the terms of the research and participated of their own free will. To create an environment for interviewees to feel comfortable and speak freely, their names will be kept confidential, and we do not impute any direct quotes.

The interviews lasted between 20 minutes and one hour, with questions focused on the journalism business and licensing expectations. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analysed for this report.

Below you will find the basic questions from the semi-structured interview protocol used in this research.

# Questions:

1. How does the company you work for see the rise of Artificial Intelligence and its impacts on the business?

2. Do you see AI as an opportunity or a problem for journalism? And for your company/organisation specifically?

3. How is AI impacting your business today? Do you think it will have an even greater impact? How?

4. Are you currently blocking AI data collection from your website? Do you plan to do so?

5. Do you have expectations regarding licensing agreements? Based on what principles and criteria?

6. Are you developing any new AI-powered products that could be monetised? Do you plan to do so?

7. Do you consider your company/organisation to be independent in terms of technology?

8. Do you think you and your team are sufficiently informed about AI and its implications for journalism, options, tools, etc.?

9. Do you feel you have adequate channels to stay up-to-date on developments in this subject?

10. Is there any other point related to the use of AI in journalism that you think is important to add?

# Momentum