

ПЕТЕРБУРГСКИЙ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ ФОРУМ
18–20 июня 2015

МЕДИА VS БИЗНЕС: ПАРТНЕРЫ ИЛИ СОПЕРНИКИ
Саммит информационных агентств

18 июня 2015 — 17:00–18:15, Павильон 4, Конференц-зал 4.1

Санкт-Петербург, Россия
2015

Модераторы:

Михаил Гусман, Председатель, Российский комитет по международной программе развития коммуникации, ЮНЕСКО; вице-президент, Всемирный совет информационных агентств

Клайв Маршал, Генеральный директор, Press Association

Выступающие:

Арам Ананян, Генеральный директор, информационное агентство «Арменпресс»

Пол Инграссия, Главный редактор, Thomson Reuters

Малькольм Кёрк, Президент, Агентство Канадиан Пресс

Александр Макинтайер, Вице-президент, Агентство Ассошиэйтед Пресс

Сергей Михайлов, Генеральный директор, Информационное агентство России «ТАСС»

Хироки Сугита, Исполнительный директор, Kyodo News

Джузеппе Чербоне, Генеральный директор, ANSA

М. Гусман:

Уважаемые дамы и господа, дорогие коллеги! Мы начинаем нашу дискуссию в рамках ежегодного Петербургского международного экономического форума, который вновь гостеприимно встречает своих гостей из десятков стран мира. Насколько я знаю, более ста стран принимают участие в Санкт-Петербургском диалоге в эти дни.

Одна из тем, которую организаторы Форума, да и мы с вами, посчитали важным и нужным обсудить, — это тема, связанная с профессией присутствующих за этим столом, с профессией людей, которые работают в медийном, информационном бизнесе. Это разговор о том, насколько новости и бизнес являются партнерами или соперниками в современном мире, как взаимодействует сегодняшняя медийная индустрия с современным бизнесом, насколько мы нужны друг другу, враждебны ли мы друг другу. Именно этому будут посвящены сегодняшние выступления.

Вести эту дискуссию было предложено мне и моему старинному другу — Клайву Маршаллу, руководителю крупнейшего британского информационного агентства. Меня зовут Михаил Гусман, я работаю в агентстве «ИТАР-ТАСС» (в агентстве «ТАСС», как мы уже больше года именуемся). Мы начинаем дискуссию, и я хотел бы попросить Клайва сказать несколько вступительных слов, а также представить участников нашего круглого стола.

С. Marshall:

Thank you very much, Mikhail, and thank you very much to our hosts and to our panellists, who are going to assist us in the discussion today. Media versus business: partner or rival? Perhaps before we get some opening remarks from everybody, we could just go around the table and have a brief introduction from each of our panellists, starting on my right with Sergei Mikhailov from the Russian News Agency TASS. Sergei.

С. Михайлов:

Thank you.

Сергей Михайлов, генеральный директор агентства «ТАСС».

M. Kirk:

Thank you; good afternoon. Malcolm Kirk, President of The Canadian Press, based in Toronto, and we are the leading news agency in Canada, celebrating our 100th anniversary in 2017, so we have been around a little while.

P. Ingrassia:

Good afternoon, everyone. I am Paul Ingrassia, Managing Editor of Reuters News Agency, part of Thomson Reuters, and I am based in London. Thank you.

G. Cerbone:

Hello, I am Giuseppe Cerbone, Chief Executive Officer of ANSA, the leading Italian news agency.

A. Ananyan:

Good afternoon, I am Aram Ananyan. I lead Armenpress, Armenia's oldest and largest State news agency, located in Yerevan.

H. Sugita:

Hi, good afternoon. I am Hiroki Sugita. I am the Executive Director of Kyodo News, Japan's largest news agency.

A. MacIntyre:

Good afternoon. I am Sandy MacIntyre, the Vice President of Global Video for the Associated Press.

C. Marshall:

Thank you, everybody, for your introductions, and it is clear from those introductions that just about every corner of the globe is covered by the representatives on the panel: a fascinating subject for us to discuss over the next hour or so. I would like to invite Paul Ingrassia from Reuters to kick off the discussion.

P. Ingrassia:

Thank you, Clive, and again, thanks to everyone who is in the audience here. One of the reasons I found this to be an interesting topic is that, for most of my career, I have actually been a journalist covering business and industry, not covering politics or markets or other things, and, in my particular case, it was the motor industry that was my specialty. I have gone to a lot of press conferences over the years, and, as a journalist, when you ask people questions at a press conference, sometimes they do not always answer the question you asked them; they sometimes change the question a little bit to give you the answer about the subject that they wish to discuss, if you will.

I am going to take a little bit of a page out of their book, and I will address the question, but maybe in a somewhat different way. The title of this panel discussion is “Media versus Business: Partners or Rivals?”, and in truth, I would say – although I can only speak for Reuters – that we are neither: neither a partner nor a rival to business. Our role is rather more subtle and really rather different. The very best thing we can do – and this is for both the businesses that we serve as readers of our news and the business that we are part of (the Thomson Reuters financial and risk business, mainly, but we also serve other parts of Thomson Reuters, and provide news to other parts of Thomson Reuters) – is to provide timely, deep, accurate reporting that customers can use to make good decisions.

The target of our news really is decision-makers. That is our intended audience. We strike to do this the best we can with objectivity, fairness, and integrity. I am not being naive here; we of course have full knowledge that the people and the organizations we write about – be they companies, be they executives, be they governments, et cetera – will sometimes take exception to articles that we write, the pictures that we move to our clients or run on our website, or the video footage that we distribute to our broadcast clients. And, of course, sometimes they will also applaud our articles as well. People like them or do not like them on different days: different articles for different reasons. We are guided in our efforts by what are known as the Thomson Reuters Trust Principles. I would like to spend just a minute discussing those. They were established in 1941, and by that time, Reuters was already 90 years old. But the impetus to adopt the Trust Principles was that company ownership was restructured that year, and, in agreement with the Newspaper Publishers' Association and the shareholders of Reuters, the Trust Principles were adopted to assure the standards and independence of our news.

In 1984, Reuters became a publicly listed company, and what was known as the Founders Share Company was created at the same time. The Founders Share Company has a controlling vote on many major corporate decisions, and its purpose is to assure adherence to and compliance with the Trust Principles, and in 2008, Thomson acquired Reuters (creating Thomson Reuters, of course), and the Trust Principles were not only continued, but were extended. They applied to all Thomson Reuters' employees, not just editorial employees.

What are these Trust Principles? There are just five. One: that Thomson Reuters should at no time pass into the hands of any one interest, group, or faction. We do not exist to serve a cause, other than the cause of accurate and timely news information. We are not advocates for any point of view. Two: that the integrity, independence, and freedom from bias of Thomson Reuters shall at all times be fully preserved. Three: that Thomson Reuters shall supply unbiased and reliable

news services to newspapers, news agencies, broadcasters, and other media subscribers and to businesses, governments, institutions, individuals, and others with whom Thomson Reuters has or may have contacts. Four: Thomson Reuters shall pay due regard to the many interests it serves in addition to those of the media. We have a lot of readers and clients and subscribers outside of the news media world. And five: that no effort shall be spared to expand, develop, and adapt the news and other services and products so as to maintain its leading position in the international news and information business. Now, I love that phrase, “No effort shall be spared.” I have to tell you we remind our finance people of that every year right around budget time, sometimes with more success than others, of course.

The key question, honestly, is whether we adhere to those principles, and I think the best judge of that comes from readers, frankly, and I think specifically the readers in financial markets are the ones that have a lot at stake. Every day, they put their money on the line, and their decision, really, is whether to make investments, to make trades based on what they read from Thomson Reuters. The question then is: do people trust our news enough to make trading and investment decisions in which millions, or, in fact, billions of dollars are at risk based on our news? The answer is that this is exactly what happens thousands of times every day in the global business marketplace. I think I can say with some degree of confidence that the verdict of the global marketplace is that we do adhere to these trust principles. But having said that, I have to be careful here, because someone in my position – and indeed all of my colleagues – can never afford to be smug, to be self-satisfied, or to be complacent about the trust invested in us. Our credibility is our foremost asset. Indeed, it is the *sine qua non*: that without which nothing of Reuters News would exist. And we have to earn this trust over and over again, again and again, every single day. Thank you.

M. Gusman:

Thank you, Paul, for your very interesting remarks. I think they will be a good start for our discussions. That is why I would like to ask Malcolm to take the floor, who is to the right.

M. Kirk:

Thank you, Mikhail. Again, good afternoon, everybody. It is a great privilege and pleasure to be here with you today. You know, a lot like Reuters, my organization – which is actually a for-profit news agency – is not funded by the State in any way, so every dollar we earn, we earn it ourselves through the sale of our journalism and that, by and large, accounts for more than 80% of the business at The Canadian Press. And to echo, I guess, what Paul was saying, the integrity and the quality of the information provided to our clients has to be accurate, has to be not just *seen* to be, but *be* impartial, and be covered, I think, by the kind of reporters and journalists who are striving to find all sides of a story. If we do not find all sides of a story, I guarantee you there will be people out there who will put their hands up to say, “Hey, you have missed something; there is something you need to cover.”

The principles that Paul just talked about are the very same that we would abide by at The Canadian Press, and our journalists would need to ensure that we have covered the basis of the story and represented all sides of the story fairly and accurately. Much has been said already here today about the need for us to supply balanced and impartial news. That is the very heart of our business model. If we compromise that, we compromise in many respects what we do day in and day out at the news agency. In terms of covering business or economic news, our approach is no different than it would be for covering government or crime or any other general news. Everything we do must be honest; it must be unbiased; and it must be unflinchingly fair. These are words that are enshrined in our own stylebook that we publish and actually distribute to journalism schools, to

public relations firms, to anybody who is actually in the business of journalism, whether they are creating it or in the business, perhaps, of helping provide news and information to us. We never just go with one source in a story, for example, and that would be the same in the coverage of business or economics. In the sphere of business and economics, there are many well-documented examples of corporate malfeasance and poor governance. There are also many more stories about innovation and smart ideas and leadership in business that inspire legions of business owners to achieve great success in what they do. We strive to cover stories across the entire spectrum, factually and fairly.

Paul has mentioned as well, of course, that we are all out there trying to be first, and we all want to be right at the exact same time, so accuracy is always a top priority. I think this is amplified considerably when dealing with information about, for example, large publicly traded corporations. As I mentioned, one source is never enough and can potentially lead to mistakes that would cause us to risk damaging our own reputation. It would also prove costly to investors. It is very much our responsibility to correct mistakes immediately upon discovery, but we do a lot of diligence to make sure that what we publish in the first instance is accurate.

I think another interesting thing right now is that there is a tsunami of information and content, and I will use that word in quotes: “content”. There is journalism, and I think that there is content, and it is made available to people these days – obviously, as we know – through social media and through so many other platforms, and it can be overwhelming. A lot of it is disseminated by corporations themselves, and many times, the real stories can be lost in the noise of announcements and news releases and that kind of thing. The merger of two companies, for example, may combine the strengths and improve production efficiency of those companies, but it could also mean lost jobs, and good journalism would expose the facts that corporate announcements might not. That

is a key role an organization like ours plays. Good journalism shines a light on potentially false economic assumptions.

As it gets more difficult to discern real journalism these days, our future as news agencies is dependent upon our commitment to editorial independence and to insightful, objective, and impartial reporting, and as I said, that is really the heart of our business model.

Mikhail, Clive, if I may, a couple of other things. We would not see ourselves as partners or rivals of business from an editorial point of view in terms of the news coverage produced every day, but that is not to say that we do not work with corporations to provide them with services to perhaps monitor the news, to distribute their press releases, or to perhaps help them coordinate photography or videography assignments. We have a reasonably good business at The Canadian Press that helps corporations and governments create content for themselves. It is theirs; it is not ours, but we have expertise, and in many cases these days, whether you are a retail brand or a media company yourself, a lot of people come to us because of our expertise in the creation and production of content as well. In that respect, I do say that we can be partners with business in being able to provide useful services to them. Content is a very difficult thing to do well, and one of the things I think that news agencies like all of ours at the table today have is expertise that could be shared and that could also be provided as a service to businesses. I guess I would just like to hand it off back to Clive or to Mikhail at this point, but I just want to underscore the fact that, from an editorial point of view, we maintain our independence. It is critical to what we are, but it does not mean that we cannot provide our expertise to other organizations. This provides, I think, ultimately, a new revenue stream for businesses like ours at a time when our industries are also facing a considerable amount of disruption. Thank you.

C. Marshall:

Thank you, Malcolm, and thank you, Paul. I think both of your introductions have gotten us off to a great start and given the perspective from two news agencies that are for-profit, and stressed the importance of impartiality and independence and balance and freedom from bias. I would now like to introduce Sergei Mikhailov from TASS. TASS is a State-supported agency, so it will be very interesting to hear their perspective. Sergei.

C. Михайлов:

Спасибо, Клайв. Дорогие друзья, коллеги! На правах одного из организаторов наших мероприятий я хотел бы еще раз поблагодарить вас за приезд на Санкт-Петербургский экономический форум. Надеюсь, что вы получили удовольствие от прогулок по ночному Питеру, от белых ночей. Пользуясь случаем, хотел бы поблагодарить «Российские железные дороги» — нашего главного партнера и соорганизатора этого мероприятия. Спасибо большое!

Помня о теме нашей сегодняшней дискуссии, я хотел бы подробнее остановиться на отношениях, которые складываются сегодня между разными видами средств массовой информации — новыми и традиционными медиа. Поставлю вопрос так: являются ли традиционные и новые средства массовой информации партнерами или соперниками на сегодняшний день. Мне кажется, это очень интересная тема, в том числе в свете темы дискуссии о бизнесе и СМИ: это тоже бизнес, причем бизнес внутри СМИ. Сейчас это самая обсуждаемая тема на всех наших конференциях. Это вопрос, который больше всего волнует каждого сидящего за этим столом и в зале.

За последние десять лет мировая индустрия медиа подверглась очень серьезным изменениям, и с каждым годом эта трансформация происходит все интенсивнее и разнообразнее. Работа изданий, медиа по всему миру

существенно усложнилась в связи с видимым сокращением объемов печатной продукции, введением платного доступа к информации, а также из-за растущего стремления пользователей получать информацию на мобильных устройствах, планшетах, теперь уже и на смарт-часах, других гаджетах и так далее. Новые медиа и социальные сети играют все бóльшую роль в создании и распространении информации. На этом фоне едва ли не аксиомой стало утверждение о постепенном закате традиционных СМИ. При этом наиболее акцентированно этот тезис присутствует при обсуждении стратегии коммуникации бизнеса. Отмечается, в частности, что взаимодействие бизнеса с государством осуществляется главным образом через GR — инструменты government relations, а в коммуникациях бизнеса с обществом приоритетом называют интернет-каналы. Традиционным медиа приходится защищаться. Показательна борьба, которая развернулась в прошлом году между традиционными испанскими медийными брендами и корпорацией Google. Корпорации Google, как нам хорошо известно, пришлось закрыть свою новостную службу в Испании незадолго до вступления в силу закона, который потребовал бы от интернет-гиганта платить газетам за право публиковать фрагменты их контента.

Похожий сценарий мог бы произойти в Германии, где прошлым летом был принят закон, согласно которому Google должен получать разрешение для размещения контента других изданий. Но стоило Google прекратить публиковать на своих платформах фрагменты контента немецких СМИ, как консорциум, в котором объединились более 200 электронных изданий, объявил, что они разрешат глобальному поисковику размещать фрагменты своих статей. Дело в том, что они все были обеспокоены существенной потерей аудитории. Все это говорит о том, что в современном информационном мире может найтись достойное место и для традиционных, и для новых медиа, которые должны сотрудничать, а не пытаться «поделить поляну» или «отгрызть себе кусок» у других медиа. Это

уже происходит во многих странах, и начало этому процессу положили всё те же новые медиа, которые начали предпринимать попытки добиться максимальной интеграции с традиционными СМИ в качестве основных поставщиков контента.

Нам всем хорошо известно, что в мае этого года Facebook запустила новый сервис Instant Articles, позволяющий крупнейшим мировым изданиям целиком публиковать свои материалы через приложения Facebook для iOS. Среди первых партнеров социальной сети оказались сразу все гиганты медиа, такие как BBC, Guardian, New York Times, National Geographic и так далее. Они объединились в партнерстве с Facebook и будут получать дополнительные доходы — 70% от рекламных сборов Facebook. Пользователи социальной сети получают в результате этого партнерства доступ к оригинальному контенту лучших мировых изданий в наиболее привлекательном на сегодняшний день для них формате и в десять раз быстрее, чем при использовании стандартного мобильного приложения. Предоставляется им и возможность пользоваться опциями интерактивного контента, такими как встроенное видео или анимированные карты. Несмотря на неоднозначную пока реакцию некоторых других крупных мировых СМИ на эти попытки новых медиа к сближению, расширение подобного сотрудничества представляется все же неизбежным в довольно близкой перспективе. Это означает, что за достоверным, оригинальным контентом новые медиа всегда будут вынуждены обращаться к традиционным, зарекомендовавшим себя медиабрендам.

Примечательно, что для определения этих отношений традиционных и новых медиа в английском языке уже появился термин, который объединяет в себе два слова: «друг» и «враг», то есть «friend» и «enemy». Они говорят «frenemy». Это, мне кажется, очень интересный и своевременный термин, который точно отражает, что сейчас происходит в наших сближениях и наших толканиях друг с другом. Неотвратимость этого

сотрудничества новых и традиционных медиа обусловлена в первую очередь тем, что потребитель начинает теряться в гигантском потоке информации. На первый план начинает выступать фактор доверия и уверенности потребителя в объективности получаемой информации. Другим важным фактором является относительное удешевление информации для конечного пользователя, что вынуждает средства массовой информации искать разные пути снижения своих издержек.

Если обратиться к социологии, то, по данным российского аналитического центра Левады, 75% россиян получают информацию из традиционных средств массовой информации и только 24% для этого используют социальные сети. Это означает, что в нашей стране традиционные медиа по-прежнему продолжают играть ключевую роль не только в качестве производителя информационного контента, но и в качестве основного канала его распространения. Традиционные серьезные медиабренды сохраняющие за собой так называемый «мандат» на достоверную и верифицированную информацию, будут продолжать оставаться одним из наиболее востребованных каналов для построения эффективных коммуникаций между различными секторами общества, включая коммуникации власти и бизнеса. Однако это вовсе не означает, что эти медиа не будут меняться. Мультиплатформенность, максимальная кастомизация контента, узкая специализация — вот основные векторы, в которых произойдут ключевые изменения. Успех, например, информационных агентств, одно из которых я имею честь представлять, по-прежнему в первую очередь будет зависеть от исполнения их классической роли — поиска и выпуска общественно-политических новостей в интересах других, в том числе и новых, медиа и экономических новостей в интересах бизнеса для принятия бизнес-решений. В выигрыше в любом случае окажутся те медиа, которые максимально точно попадут со своим контентным предложением в запросы выбранной аудитории. По-прежнему

будет актуален тот слоган, который в свое время прописало для себя агентство Reuters, именуемое сейчас Thomson Reuters. Этот постулат звучит так: «We should be first, but first we should be right». Он всегда останется актуальным для всех нас. Как бы мы ни торопились быть первыми, мы все равно, даже стараясь быть первыми, должны быть правы, должны несколько раз проверять то, что мы публикуем. Мне кажется, это будет актуальным всегда — и для новых медиа, и для появляющихся и традиционных СМИ. Эти слова всегда будут нашим девизом.

М. Гусман:

Спасибо, Сергей! Судя по реакции, дискуссия выходит как раз на тот уровень, которого мы хотели достичь. Интересно знать, что думает по этому поводу — во всяком случае, по поводу слогана Reuters — Джузеппе Чербоне, генеральный директор агентства ANSA. Мы с удовольствием его слушаем.

G. Cerbone:

Thank you, Mikhail. Going back to the question of partners or rivals, the answer is that it depends, and I will tell you at the end why it depends.

A book written many years ago by Andrew Grove called *Only the Paranoid Survive* talked about the 10X revolution when Intel, the chip maker, used to make memory banks, and then Andrew Grove changed all the factories in six months, and they started making chips because they understood that the business was not there anymore.

In the news agency business, there is a 10X factor now. Everything is changing; what Sergei was saying before is totally correct. We are in a different context; we have to understand that we are not in the same business we used to be in five years ago or even three years ago, and much ten or more years ago. Ten years

ago, Sergei's predecessor would not have spoken the same way as Sergei did today.

This a great sign of evolution and innovation. Agencies have to be champions of innovation. Nowadays, our prime ministers probably do not give statements to news agencies anymore. They post a Tweet, and then we run after them to understand what they said about important political issues.

Why does it depend if we have to be partners or rivals with companies and businesses? Well, we certainly have to be rivals when it comes down to information. We have to be free to say what we need to say about the business, what the thing is supposed to be in our interpretation because of the principles that were spoken about before, the light under which we have to work. In that case, we have to be rivals. If they do not agree, then too bad. We will just have to do whatever we feel like doing. We have to be partners because without business, we would not be in business. We have to be partners because we said we also need to help companies, make them understand their markets better through services, through pictures, and so on, but with certain rules that when it comes to information, there is no debate. There is no mediation. One does the agency and the other one does business, and these are two different businesses. That is why it depends. We can be partners, or we can be rivals, and the bottom line is that businesses are still our clients, and are still our customers. This means that they appreciate the business we are doing, because when it comes down to the bottom line, we have to follow our principles. Agencies, under these huge changes that are happening, have to understand that businesses are focused on sound principles that are written down as statutes. It is not enough that we say we follow them. If the customers buy your services, they acknowledge that you are following those principles, but not just because you say you are.

C. Marshall:

Thank you, Giuseppe. I think you made a great comment at the beginning of your remarks about the amount of change going on in our businesses but also the amount of change going on in our customers' businesses. I think the fact that you suggested only the paranoid survive is probably a great thing to take away from this debate today. I would now like to travel east from Italy to Japan and invite our dear colleague from Kyodo, Hiroki Sugita, to give us his comments now. Thank you.

H. Sugita:

Thank you very much for holding this very interesting and challenging discussion. I will speak about what is going on in Japan on this subject of the news versus business partners and competitors. I would like to talk about how Japan's traditional media outlets are now overwhelmed or overshadowed by digital media operated by information technology (IT) companies, rather than journalism companies. They pursue profit rather than journalism, and their business model is to buy news articles and video clips from traditional media and post articles and videos on their news sites. They post them according to the criteria of which news can be viewed and attract the most viewers. They are called aggregator sites; I think you know this term. The sites are one-stop shops and very useful, viewers do not need to check all the papers and broadcasters to read necessary news. There are ten billion total monthly page views of those websites in Japan. Forty-seven million Japanese people routinely check one of the aggregators. One of them is the Yahoo! News Japan site. The *Yomiuri Shimbun*, a famous newspaper in Japan, sells nine million copies every day, so we can assume that Yahoo! News Japan is now the most influential media outlet in the country. Japanese IT businesses started the aggregator sites in the late 1990s. They first posted articles supplied by small media companies, not by the major ones like Kyodo News, but with a high purchase price. One by one, traditional media

outlets agreed to supply their news to aggregator sites. Seven years ago, the Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association built an informal alliance to counter the aggressive business behaviour of the aggregator sites, but they could not lessen the attractive proposal put forward by the sites, and eventually agreed to supply news. Yahoo! News Japan, which, as I said, is the most influential in Japan, buys the news from 150 traditional news media sites – mostly all of the newspapers and news broadcasters in Japan, including Kyodo News – and posts 4,000 articles every day. But just 26 news selectors do the job of selecting the news from all of the news that is provided by the traditional media outlets. So you see the top 20 stories that are accessed, and they are entertainment news items such as celebrity marriages in Japan. The operators of those sites say they post hard news on politics, the economy, social issues, and international affairs in order to maintain their credibility as news sites and show sponsors that they are serious, but in actuality we do not see that much.

The news selectors are very powerful, but they do not write the articles, they just choose news from providers. The average selector is in his or her mid-30s, and most of them do not have a career in journalism at all. The lack of experience in journalism causes many problems. First of all, their staff selectors make mistakes in factual checks and judgement. With regard to the factual checks, they post articles with misspelled names of famous politicians and business leaders in Japan. They make more serious mistakes in choosing articles: they tend to post light news instead of hard-hitting national news, due to their lack of understanding of important news events. The other concern is possible connections, or real connections, with the aggregator sites and private companies. Japanese private companies say they issue press releases with the request to be posted on the aggregator sites. An executive of a big private Japanese company who is my friend said the posting on the aggregator sites is more valuable and appreciated than front-page articles in the major Japanese newspapers. Inevitably, public relations (PR) staff of private companies try to

contact news selectors at aggregator sites, providing expensive dinners or luxurious gifts. PR staff think that selectors of the aggregator sites are beholden to journalistic ethics codes. Another executive said that, after several dinners with one of the selectors, the news about his company was often posted in the centre of the aggregator site. This could turn into a bribery case involving news media and private business.

It is not only business executives but also politicians and policymakers who want to get mentioned on those sites, because, simply put, people or voters see the site. Articles are read more on the aggregator sites than at the traditional media outlet; some reporters said that they are pressured to write articles that will be viewed more on the aggregator sites, regardless of the importance of the stories. The aggregator may sell personal information calibrated to each viewer without the permission of the individual viewers. Information about viewers who always read the news is highly appreciated by medical companies, because they are potential buyers of new medical services.

When the sites get protests about mistakes or distortions of the story, they simply relay the message to the original provider of the article. They do not show a sense of responsibility. Correction is a core obligation to be carried out by the traditional media. Intellectuals and experts do not view aggregator sites; it is ordinary people who look at entertainment news on aggregator sites and do not scroll to the hard news section. When they always check the entertainment news, they lose interest in politics, policies, and international economic affairs, and weaken their ability to think about national policies and social problems. One of my friends, who is an expert on international affairs, says that the aggregator sites simply denigrate the democracy of Japan.

We have to answer the hard question of what is news. Do we mean that news is what people like to read, or what people *should* read to sustain healthy systems in the country and in the world? I believe that media companies should use IT tools and knowledge of business and take maximum advantage. We should not

be used by IT business companies just to provide sensational news to bring them profits. With that, I will stop here.

М. Гусман:

Спасибо большое, дорогой наш друг Сугита, за интересное сообщение. Мы продолжаем выступления наших спикеров.

Должен сказать, что мы достаточно хорошо идем по времени. Думаю, что у нас будет время для вопросов и ответов из зала, и, возможно, для кратких выступлений, если у кого-то будет желание выступить. Я хотел предоставить слово Араму Ананяну, генеральному директору «Арменпресс», моему старинному другу. Пожалуйста!

A. Ananyan:

Thank you, Mr. Gusman. I will try to follow the tradition and be very brief, and leave time for our colleagues in the audience to respond. First of all, I would like to congratulate and extend my gratitude to the Forum for this warm hospitality and for these ideas. I have already written six pages of theses that need further elaboration, and I suppose it is a common understanding that this Forum and this media summit is becoming an interesting area to discuss new ideas and trends.

First of all, talking about this media versus business, to me, we are also a business. News is doing business, and I will talk from the perspective of a media manager, although my company is not a private company, but rather a public company, and it belongs to the State. All of us, or most of us, are, in our information businesses, guided by business incentives, because we as media managers are frequently guided, in the case of agencies, by the interests of our subscribers or readers; in the case of newspapers and magazines, by the circulation number; in the case of TV and radio, by the ratings; and in the case of all our websites, by the visitors, or what we call “traffic”. These indicators reflect the amount of our traditional sources of income, which are content and

advertising sales. In this regard, we have a huge ethical element, about which my colleague from Japan was talking about just now.

Furthermore, we journalists were not solely guided by economic motivations when we chose this profession. Our motivation was much different: it was to report, to tell the truth, to make communication easier. The economic realities and the critical phenomena we see were reflected even last year, and my colleague Giuseppe noted that global economic situation will keep media income under serious pressure. Regardless of the form of ownership, all media outlets in emerging markets are feeling pressure from economic hardship. This means that we are all reviewing our budgetary structures, cutting expenditure, and thinking about revenues at the same time as we are thinking about media, with a view to businesses as a chance to acquire additional funding. For businesses, it means media outlets are becoming increasingly interesting places in which to invest.

In the modern world, when we see rapid changes and transformations, with changing more quickly than we can imagine. It is impossible to talk about new media anymore. I will just say a few sentences about this. Blogs and social networks are not known as “new” media any longer. The phenomenon of user-generated content does not belong in the category of new media anymore. To some extent, this toolbox of social media and social networks already belongs to the traditional media category, and we all use it in our activities. Traditional media are taking bigger opportunities from new media tools and taking advantage of the opportunities of modern technology. One year ago, we were saying that people are surrounded by information everywhere, and it is more obvious today that people are literally wearing information as an accessory of their everyday life, like a smart watch or smart glasses. What is fascinating is that we, as news producers, are closer to human beings than ever, both physically and in a matter of timing, because everyone checks their smartphone within 15 minutes after waking up. It is quite an interesting phenomenon that did not exist some years ago. It seems that our interests with business coincide here, because we are the

means to get to the specific consumers a business is targeting, because search engines, social networks, and all the other analytical tools give us information about customers. When we use these instruments, they give us the opportunity to have a distinct image or a distinct portrait of our readers. Business is very interested in reaching out to the consumer very directly, but we have an ethical issue, as my colleague mentioned with regard to privacy issues, the protection of the private data, and so on.

Another concern – and I will try to be brief – is that businesses are starting to abuse social media and social networks. Popular bloggers and commenters are at their disposal, and sometimes we cannot see the line: they are crossing the red line of reporting and of ethical norms, and becoming a hidden advertising platform for business. Therefore, having these financial constraints, there is a temptation on the business side to try to get control over the media. This is something we have to fix here.

On the other hand, news and media are now enjoying better opportunities in the case of strong capital markets, as my colleague from Reuters mentioned, because each and every piece of information posted on the Internet and on news wire services that is more or less reliable has an influence on business decisions. These trends are apparent not only in macrocosm but also in the microcosms of the agencies, one of which I represent. It is maybe the smallest one around this table: small but proud.

But there is another trend. Small agencies represent the vast majority of market players. This opens up new opportunities for us as small newsrooms. We are more adaptive to market changes; we can go with those changes on a rapid track and use the opportunities that technologies provide, with their cheaper, faster Internet and ultra-high-speed video content broadcasting.

None of these things I have mentioned are one-way traffic; they are two-way traffic. It goes the other way as well, and, while small agencies are adaptive, we have a harder time competing on the global market. But we have local expertise,

and if we can create the necessary, critical mass of volume, of quality content, it will raise our self-sufficiency and strengthen current capacities, as well as our editorial independence.

Armenpress, as you know, is a State-run organization. We are approximately 70% publicly funded, and now earn around 30%. This, on the one hand, gives us an opportunity to work without unnecessary scandal. The accuracy of the information we provide is very, very important to us, because our reputation and credibility is all we have. We have financial transparency: we do not hide who our stakeholders are. We have regulations that provide us with editorial independence, and this stability gives us an opportunity to work with businesses as a reliable partner.

As my colleagues already mentioned, we cannot avoid working with businesses. We are now realizing serious projects, predominantly with social content and social elements in it to avoid the influence on our editorial policy. Our colleague from TASS suggested a very comprehensive topic. We could sit and talk for hours, but this is the place I will finish, with the last point that was written in the programme, but was not touched upon. When we are talking about editorial independence – and we know that it is a priority for us – we also have to be very ethical in covering business and reflecting the relations between integrational processes, because we see that sometimes, some political incentives are stronger in addressing those issues. Five minutes before I came to this panel, there was a discussion on the Eurasian Union, and one of the panellists said that first it was neglected, and then they felt the threat, and now it is considered as a partner. It would have been better from the media perspective to think positively about the new developments in this part of the world.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude once more and thank you for this wonderful opportunity.

C. Marshall:

Thank you, Aram, and thank you also as the smallest agency in the room to remind everybody that we are also a business, but also that the motivation of journalists is not primarily for profit: that people came into this business mainly for other things. I think that is a very important comment as well. Before I hand it over to Alexander MacIntyre from the AP for the final address, I would just like to remind our audience that as soon as Alexander – or Sandy, I think, as he prefers to be called – has said his few words, we are going to open it up to the audience to make comments and ask questions. I know, looking across at my dear friend Branka Đukić from the Serbian National News Agency Tanjug, she also has something to say, but first of all, over to Alexander MacIntyre.

A. MacIntyre:

Thank you. I think we can allow ourselves to inject some real optimism into this conversation, because we are all in danger of seeing some doom and some gloom around the news business. I think actually we should rejoice that more people are consuming more news and more information than ever before. The disruptive consumer technologies – smartphones, tablets – have allowed more people in more places more access more of the time to news and information. I think those folks, like we as consumers of news, are making no distinction between old media and new media, and I would echo very much what Aram says in that regard.

But I think there is one thing that we all know to be true, and that is that there is no button you can press on a smartphone or a computer that separates fact from fiction. Therefore, while fact can be reached quite easily by crowdsourcing what is stated, there is still a real role for professional journalists to get to the truth, and I think that is our job. It builds, frankly, on what the news agency did from the get-go. They need to be the searchers of truth.

If we go back to our original question, I think the role of the press is neither to be a partner nor a rival to business, nor a partner or rival to government. Instead, it is to stand apart, to report on how business is being conducted. If you like, it is to be the upholder of public trust, and to do that successfully in the public interest, journalists must be allowed to operate freely. They must be able to operate without hindrance from the State; they need to be able to operate free of commercial interests.

What lies at the heart of this is, in fact, press freedom, and certainly at the Associated Press, we believe our mission today is the same as it was 170 years ago. It is to inform the world, and that means seeking out the truth; it means reporting facts, not opinion, and it means, on behalf of the public, holding those in elected office and those running corporations responsible for their actions. I think in that regard, those disruptive consumer technologies, be they the Internet or the smartphone, are a great tool and a great help in doing that. I am very optimistic that the future is bright for media companies, and that businesses themselves, who can now tell their story and reach the public directly, will actually come to the media to look for partnerships. Because I think the content that we have in our archives is compelling content that helps them tell their story, and I think equally, we will continue to hold those businesses to account, especially in areas where they are dealing with finances that the public have put in to make those businesses successful or otherwise. For businesses to enjoy public confidence, there must be trust, whether it is trust in the sanctity of the product they are making, whether it is trust that the customer is paying a fair price, whether it is trust that the company is operating legally and ethically. That is all part of the role of a free press: to hold that to the light. I think we really should be quite optimistic that so long as a free press can flourish, then business too will flourish.

М. Гусман:

У нас выступили все спикеры. Думаю, всем было интересно их выслушать. Это были интересные, разные выступления из разных стран мира, из разных агентств, больших и малых. Это был очень интересный обмен мнениями. Сейчас предлагаю присутствующим в зале задавать вопросы. Есть такая возможность, и наши спикеры с удовольствием на них ответят. Пожалуйста! Только представляйтесь и уточняйте, к кому обращен вопрос.

В. Соловьев:

Добрый день, меня зовут Владимир Соловьев, я главный редактор «Петербургского телетекста».

Вопрос к Вам. Уважаемые представители информационных агентств прекрасно изложили свою позицию, позицию государственных информационных агентств, имеющих значительную долю финансирования со стороны государства...

М. Гусман:

Это не так. Государственное агентство здесь только одно, это ТАСС, все остальные не являются государственными.

В. Соловьев:

Хорошо. В любом случае возникает очень серьезный вопрос. Подготовка любой объективной информации стоит весьма дорого. Если ориентироваться на сбор и обработку этой информации, а потом на ее продажу, возникает вопрос о рентабельности этой работы.

М. Гусман:

Понятно. Я попрошу Клайва, он еще не выступал. Он возглавляет крупнейшее британское информационное агентство. Клайв Маршал!

C. Marshall:

I think it is a fascinating question, and I think that part of the confidence and the optimism that Alexander MacIntyre introduced into the discussion is that it is difficult, but the market for news is now greater than it has been in human history, with all of the devices and all of the different ways of consuming news. I think a well-run news agency that focuses on meeting the needs of the public or its audiences and providing compelling news – sometimes entertaining news that is well-run – can balance the books at the very least. Some of my colleagues here are not-for-profit. Others, like my agency, like Reuters and The Canadian Press, are trying to make a profit, maybe a modest profit; I think you can make the numbers work, but it is something you have to work at each and every day.

A. MacIntyre:

I think that is exactly right. The honest truth of the matter is that the technologies people use to consume news are moving faster than the business models of most of the people around this table. The problem is not with news; the problem is with us, and we need to be more imaginative and change our business models, because the interest in news has never been greater, particularly factual news. I go back to being optimistic about this. But we have a bit of catching up to do, and I think what we will also need to be very cognisant of is that however we change those business models, they will not be everlasting. Change will keep coming, and it will keep coming at warp speed, and we all need to be very much more agile than we have ever been before if we are going to have a place in this new ecosystem.

M. Gusman:

Thank you, Sandy. Your question, please.

HE J. Oratmangun:

Thank you very much. My name is Jauhar Oratmangun. I am the Ambassador of Indonesia. My question is very simple. What the AP and Reuters said is too naive, because you both quote independent Thomson's principles. For me, news now has become more pragmatic. Take for example this current situation. If you read AP or Reuters or TASS, or watch Russian television, you will see reports on the current situation from very different perspectives based on their interests. For me, the news approaches current events now in a much more pragmatic way. Thank you.

M. Gusman:

First of all, Ambassador, thank you for your participation in our conference. It is a great honour that ambassadors take part in this audience.

Может быть, я попытаюсь ответить на этот вопрос. Итак, новости собираются и передаются разными агентствами. Новость такая, какая есть, событие такое, какое есть. Но у журналистов разные взгляды, разные точки зрения. Следовательно, и агентства представят эти новости по-разному. Это нормально. Так было, так есть и так будет. Думаю, что в этом ничего страшного нет. Это взгляды людей на события, на то, что они видят. Каждый видит это по-своему. Очень часто взгляды не совпадают, иногда расходятся, я здесь не вижу ни драматизма, ни конфликта. Когда то или иное событие видится разными людьми по-разному, это нормальный информационный процесс. Повторюсь: так бывает далеко не всегда. Очень часто я внимательно слежу за новостными потоками, которые создают наши коллеги в разных агентствах из самых разных углов мира. Часто мы сходимся в понимании того или иного события, той или иной новости, иногда расходимся, но, в моем понимании, это совершенно нормальное информационное явление, и здесь я не вижу никаких проблем.

C. Marshall:

Giuseppe, you had a comment?

G. Cerbone:

Yes. I had a comment for His Excellency, the Ambassador. Think of it the other way. What if you only had one interpretation of things? I would be more scared of that than having ten interpretations of things. Having only one is extremely dangerous, and we have had lots of examples in history of having only the same interpretation of the facts. Also, believe me, that in the news business, if you give the same news at 3 o'clock in the afternoon that you gave at 11 o'clock in the morning, you get two different pieces of news.

C. Marshall:

Can we take an intervention from Branka? Do you have some comments?

A. Коваленко:

Добрый день, уважаемые коллеги! Анна Коваленко, «Телевидение без насилия» (ТБН), Россия. В рамках сегодняшнего мероприятия хотелось бы кое-что узнать. СМИ называют четвертой властью, и хотелось бы поинтересоваться вашим мнением: они объективно могут повлиять на экономическую ситуацию? Спасибо.

C. Marshall:

Would any of my colleagues like to answer that? Paul Ingrassia.

P. Ingrassia:

It depends on what you mean by influence, I guess. But if you look at what is happening today, right now, even as we speak in this room – and this also goes to the gentleman's point about the expense and the cost involved of gathering news – one of the biggest financial stories in economic events in the world today

is the Greek financial crisis. Where is that news coming from? It is coming from right here in Saint Petersburg. Just a little while ago, Mr. Storchak, the Deputy Finance Minister of the Russian Federation, had some newsworthy comments to make that are out on the news wires right now. Some of that news is coming from Athens; it is coming from Brussels; it is coming from Berlin; it is coming from International Monetary Fund (IMF) Headquarters in Washington; it is coming from the banking and investment communities in London, New York, and around the world. Clearly, people are watching their screens and their mobile devices for the latest development on what is going on in Greece and about Greece. So to that extent, I think the answer is fairly self-evident.

М. Гусман:

Я хотел бы предоставить слово Бранке Джюкич, нашей дорогой коллеге из Сербии, она генеральный директор сербского агентства TANJUG. Это агентство сохранило за собой имя, которое раньше носило агентство всей Югославии, но сейчас это только сербское агентство. Пожалуйста, Бранка!

В. Đukić:

Thank you, but that is not only the name. I share Clive's sympathy with the idea that only the paranoid survive, so the former Yugoslavia does not exist anymore, and Tanjug is still alive.

I would like to come back to our topic because it is very interesting to me and my agency. As Mr. Gusman has said, I come from Serbia, from the Balkan region, and media in my country and in the whole region are predominantly focused on politics. It is not the case with Tanjug. Three years ago, we started a new independent portal named Tanjug Biz, and it is focused on business and economy in the whole region. We believe that economic growth – or, more precisely, economic recovery – has had a great impact on the stability of the region, and it is very important to share economic news within the whole region.

From Tanjug's point of view, partnership with large companies aims at improving the quality of our business in the economic information service, but also expansion in the media market, and there is neither reason nor room for any rivalry with respect to that. Therefore, it is in Tanjug's interest to provide its users with information about everything that is important in the corporate world, to which our agency belongs in a certain way. Large companies, both Serbian and foreign, doing business in the western Balkan region are almost certainly interested in informing as many people as possible about what they do, and are interested in being informed themselves. The most appropriate, the most serious, but also the most receptive way for such information to reach its end users is a project in which Tanjug has invested significantly over the past years by strengthening its technological base, especially in the IT sector, training staff, and recruiting new, young people and educating them. We have created a team capable of independently handling the most demanding media tasks and organizing high-level meetings or setting up media partnerships at major business conferences in the region that are specially dedicated to business in all ways, and, of course, not just in Serbia. This way, we have proven to be equal partners to large economic systems and to influential international institutions and organizations. Tanjug was, for example, the main media partner of the China and Central and Eastern European Countries (China+16) Summit, then the Summit of Capital City Mayors of Central and South East Europe, the Belgrade Security Forum, the Summit100 Business Leaders of Southeast Europe, and so on.

On all these occasions, Tanjug has proven not only that it can do the work efficiently, but also that it can be a dependable partner, and that has opened the door for us to major corporations and organizations, primarily within the region.

We, as the national news agency, find the regional aspect of our activities, where we endeavour to connect companies, institutions, and organizations and help create opportunities for successful cooperation in the vast international arena

equally important as the media aspect of our work, which we are taking care of in an extremely, I believe, professional, responsible, and dedicated manner. Thank you.

Е. Кохановская:

Здравствуйте, меня зовут Елена Кохановская. Я хочу задать вопрос о еще одном новом медиа. Недавно компания МТС, крупнейшая телекоммуникационная корпорация в России, запустила на своем сайте новое медиа — «МТС-медиа». Уникальная аудитория сайта МТС — 15 миллионов человек. С одной стороны, это сайт-агрегатор, с другой — у них собственные корреспонденты, которые делают новости по инновациям. Профиль этого медиа — инновации для жизни. За первые две недели существования их нового медиа у него набралось около 30 тысяч уникальных пользователей. У меня вопрос к аудитории. Это абсолютно новое СМИ. Какие угрозы или, быть может, возможности вы для себя видите в появлении вот таких как бы корпоративных медиа, направленных на масс-маркет? Спасибо!

М. Гусман:

Для меня-то вопрос простой...

А. Ананян:

Для нас каждое новое медиа — это новый клиент. Мы радуемся, что...

М. Гусман:

Какой-то особой опасности присутствующие за этим столом точно не видят. Я могу это с уверенностью утверждать — несмотря на все различия между ними, несмотря на совершенно разный уровень и аудиторий, и новостей, и

их качества и количества. Правильно сказал Арам: это для нас просто возможный дополнительный подписчик. Пожалуйста!

В. Бойко-Великий:

Василий Бойко-Великий, президент агрохолдинга «Русское молоко» и президент «Русского культурно-просветительского фонда имени Святого Василия Великого». У меня такой вопрос: как вы относитесь к угрозам, возникающим в условиях обилия недостоверной информации, которой так много в так называемых «новых медиа»? Для примера могу привести так называемую электронную энциклопедию «Википедия». Взять ее исторический раздел: преподаватели исторических факультетов вузов жалуются, что студенты часто берут знания не из учебников, а именно из исторических разделов «Википедии», где содержится масса недостоверной информации. С виду это плюрализм, разные мнения, а на самом деле — недостоверные факты, даты, цифры. Как традиционные медиа относятся к таким новым электронным энциклопедиям и к перспективе монополизации знания, которую предсказывал известный английский писатель Джордж Оруэлл в известной книге «1984»?

М. Гусман:

Спасибо за Ваш вопрос. Если коллеги позволят, я кратко выскажусь о том, что я лично по этому поводу думаю. Я просто не хотел открывать большую дискуссию, которую может вызвать сейчас мой комментарий, но я вообще не считаю социальные медиа средствами массовой информации как таковыми. Я считаю, что это форма коммуникации, а не форма медиа.

Традиционные медиа — это совершенно другая история. Для меня именно присутствующие здесь коллеги представляют мировые медиа. Социальные же медиа в моем личном понимании — это не медиа вообще. Это форма коммуникации с использованием современных технологий. Лично я провожу

принципиальную границу между ними. Это похоже на сравнение профессиональных театров и домашних или студенческих театров. Это как сравнивать людей, по-настоящему умеющих играть на гитаре, и знающих несколько аккордов. При этом мы не должны брать в расчет критерий популярности. Упомянутые Вами опасности действительно существуют, и это вызов не только и не столько нам, профессиональному медийному сообществу, сколько всему обществу в целом. Повторюсь: определенная опасность существует. Коллеги не дадут соврать: это предмет наших серьезных дискуссий на многих международных форумах, потому что в этом есть серьезные опасности.

Наша задача, как представителей профессионального информационного сообщества, профессиональных информационных структур, — всячески противостоять этим мутным и абсолютно недостоверным информационным потокам, которые существуют сегодня в мире благодаря современным технологиям. Да, это один из вызовов нашего времени, и мы, здесь присутствующие, как раз и должны ему противостоять. Надеюсь, что коллеги со мной согласны и в своем ответе я выразил наше общее мнение.

A. Baykov:

If I may ask a question of Clive and Sergei, please, because I assume that you might have different perspectives: what do you think are the three major challenges that Russian business should address in the global arena at the moment, or maybe within the next couple of years?

C. Marshall:

The challenges for Russian business? I would have to ask Sergei to respond on that, because he is the expert on Russian media.

С. Михайлов:

Мы с вами читаем сообщения информационных агентств и видим, что ситуация чуть-чуть поменялась. Не мы это начали, но в последнее время с нами разговаривают языком санкций. Мы отвечаем тем же. Я думаю, за последний год Россия показала, что мы можем и в условиях санкций существовать и развиваться. Это не так страшно, как казалось всем год назад. Это реалии, в которых мы сейчас вынуждены существовать. Конечно, хотелось бы, чтобы восстановилось взаимопонимание. Мы бы вновь существовали в атмосфере доброжелательности, спокойствия и взаимного уважения интересов как нашей страны, так и других стран. Чем быстрее это время вернется, тем лучше. Россия этого очень хочет, и мы все время об этом говорим. Сложившаяся ситуация стала главным челленджем не только для нас, но и для всего земного шара. Пока мы вынуждены приспосабливаться к этим условиям, но хотелось бы побыстрее пережить эту ситуацию.

М. Гусман:

Спасибо, Сергей! Уважаемые коллеги, закончилось время, предоставленное организаторами для этой встречи. Если нет никаких сверхсрочных и сверхважных вопросов, то я предоставлю слово Клайву, а всех за столом и в зале благодарю за участие в нашей сегодняшней дискуссии.

С. Marshall:

Thank you, Mikhail, and I would also like to give my thanks to all the panellists. I'm trying to put some thoughts together, drawing on comments from some of my colleagues around the table. I think the key message is to be optimistic, but to remain paranoid as well, as Giuseppe reminded us. Let's also remember that we are a business, and a business that has independent, impartial journalism at its

heart. If we take those three messages away then I think that we have a fantastic future. Thank you again to the panellists and thank you to our audience. Thanks everybody.