



MUSIC IN THE DIGITAL AGE

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE | DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES AND ARTISTS' RIGHTS

ATHENS, OCTOBER 22-24, STAVROS NIARCHOS FOUNDATION CULTURAL CENTER

CONFERENCE REPORT

Music in the Digital Age: Streaming & Artificial Intelligence has been a three-day international forum organized by APOLLON (Greek CMO for musicians' neighboring rights) and FIM (International Federation of Musicians). Against the backdrop of **AI-generated content and the dominance of streaming platforms**, the conference examined how **revenue models, legal frameworks and artistic labor are being reshaped** in a digital economy that prioritizes scale over sustainability.

Bringing together artists, journalists, industry professionals, legal experts, academics, policy makers and technologists, the event focused on three core questions:

- How to build **sustainable and equitable compensation** models in a saturated streaming market?
- How to protect creators' rights when **AI is trained on and competes with their work?**
- What role should legislation play in **securing ethical AI and fairer digital markets** without stifling innovation?

The three-day conference did not stop at observations. Through rigorous dialogue between legislators, technocrats, and creators, it produced concrete outcomes and a clear roadmap for the day after.



APOLLON
GREEK MUSICIANS'
COLLECTING SOCIETY



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | STRATEGIC ROAD MAP

The Athens Consensus

1. KEY FINDINGS

- 1.1. **Market Failure Confirmed:** It was unanimously agreed that the free market and self-regulation have failed to fairly distribute the wealth of the digital economy. Pro-rata models and individual contracts have led to wealth concentration and the exclusion of the vast majority of creators.
- 1.2. **The Exclusion of Non-Featured Artists:** It was highlighted that session musicians (non-featured artists) are effectively removed from the streaming value chain. Unlike broadcasting, where equitable remuneration applies, streaming generates zero residual income for this vital class of performers.
- 1.3. **The Legal Void:** The "Making Available Right," upon which streaming was built, proved inadequate for ensuring remuneration, as it was designed to combat piracy, not to monetize usage.
- 1.4. **AI as an "Existential" Threat:** Artificial Intelligence is no longer viewed merely as a tool, but as a direct competitor. The training of models with protected works without license was characterized as "massive infringement" requiring immediate regulatory intervention.
- 1.5. **A two-tiered compensation structure:** Input Fees to compensate for the ingestion of works during model training, and Output Fees to address the fact that AI-generated content now competes directly with human creators in the marketplace.
- 1.6. **The Impossibility of "Unlearning":** It was established that AI models technically cannot "unlearn" data once ingested. Therefore, retroactive "Opt-Outs" are futile, making financial compensation the only viable remedy for past infringements.
- 1.7. **The Failure of "Opt-Out":** The opt-out system was deemed insufficient and technically unfeasible for individual creators facing the "black box" algorithms of Big Tech.



2. THE ACTION PLAN

Based on the "Athens Consensus," the following actions are prioritized at both national and international levels:

2.1. FOR STREAMING: Moving to Mandates

- 2.1.1. **Establish Unwaivable Remuneration:** Push for legislative regulations (following the Spanish and Belgian models) that establish an *unwaivable right to equitable remuneration* for streaming, mandatorily collected via Collective Management Organizations (CMOs).
- 2.1.2. **Defend Cultural Diversity:** Demand transparency in recommendation algorithms and implement quotas or visibility mechanisms for **local repertoire**, preventing national creativity from being drowned out by globalized playlists.
- 2.1.3. **Revisit Payment Models (User-Centric):** Maintain pressure for a shift to **User-Centric** payment systems, which are viewed as fairer and more transparent for fan-artist connection, while acknowledging that model-switching alone does not solve the low overall share attributed to performers.
- 2.1.4. **"Third-Party License" Legal Strategy:** Explore judicial avenues to reclassify platform licensing deals as "Third-Party Licenses," potentially triggering 50/50 revenue split clauses in legacy contracts.



2.2. FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: Transparency & Compensation

- 2.2.1. **Implement a Levy System:** Recognizing that tracking every input is impossible, the proposal is to impose a lump-sum levy (“forfait”) on AI companies and devices as compensation for the use of works in model training.
- 2.2.2. **Reversal of Burden of Proof:** Legislative adjustment requiring AI companies to prove they *did not* use protected works, rather than placing the burden of proof on the creator.
- 2.2.3. **Personality Protection (No Fakes):** Strengthening moral rights and personality rights (image, voice) to ban unauthorized creation of digital replicas (Deepfakes).

3. CONCLUSION AND GLOBAL CALL TO ACTION

- **Bypassing International Inertia:** Adopting Brazil's aggressive strategy of unilateral national legislative interventions, rather than waiting for global consensus (WIPO) which is unduly delayed.
- The conference concluded that the era of negotiating on equal terms with tech giants is an illusion. The only viable path forward is **state legislative intervention** and the **empowerment of collective management**.

