

Submission # 84

Name:Roger Roberts

Organization:TITAN

Country/Region:Belgium

How would you define the stakeholder community or communities to which you belong?

Civil society

Are there any suggestions that you wish to make in respect of the proposed themes, questions and indicators which are included in the framework as it stands?

This contribution attempts to clarify the framework for specific areas:

- Management of evolution of criteria in temporality
- How to formulate a generic UNESCO definition of the Universality of the Internet
- Definition of the current framework (Web 2.0) but also its future developments (Web 3.0 ... 4.0)

■ the need to address interoperability (temporal, systemic, historical, cultural)

■ the importance of a fair distribution between public and private services

1. Facilitate over time the management of different versions of the evolution of the project criteria

In fact, the current project mainly concerns the "editing and publishing information" level, without taking into consideration criteria such as the sustainability of the data! Most of the indicators deployed concern pages published in the languages of the Internet (HTML and XML).

The general impression that emerges is that the current indicators mainly concern publication, dissemination and network access at the information level. Only a few questions about "Open Source

software" and "Open Data" open the way for the evolution of the Internet for knowledge transmission that involves the management of systemic, temporal, cultural and historical interoperability to ensure exchange (in space) and preservation (over time).

Suggestion: the project should have the title: "DEFINING THE UNIVERSALITY INDICATORS OF THE

INTERNET 2.1" This makes sense in that the objective is well targeted and this opens the door to an

evolution of the project within the framework of an INTERNET 3.0 and its future indicators.

2. Formulation of a generic UNESCO definition of the Universality of the Internet:

For UNESCO, the wording of a generic definition of the Universality of the Internet could be written as follows:

■ "The creation, collection, management, dissemination of information requires a representation of the INFORMATION (the signifier) in the form of DATA.

■ The transmission of knowledge requires access to the meaning of Information (the signified), in order to allow the COMMUNICATION (the exchange of meaning) of these data in an open,

interoperable (in space) and persistent (in time) between HUMANS, between Humans and Machines and finally between MACHINES.

■ The fluid transition between the information level and the knowledge base implies an explicit representation of the structuring of the content”.

This definition clearly distinguishes two levels of intent:

■ The Internet as a publication and community-based tool that allows everyone to learn, contribute in a site, enrich its content or integrate a social network. These are the blogs, social networks, or the possibility of leaving a comment, .. that have evolved from Web 1.0 to

2

web 2.0. In this context, it is the edition aspect that prevails, there is no intention of sustainability of the data!

■ the internet as a tool for the production and transmission of knowledge: in this case it is necessary to take into consideration all the essential steps in order to make the content "machine-readable and linkable! ", To extract explicit data" proprietary content, especially because of their shared historical and entangled or as part of the reconstitution of original documents scattered, ... ". We are going full foot in what the community today refers to as Web 3.0.

However, the transition from “the information level” to the “knowledge level” can’t be done in the absence of an expression of the structure. In order to ensure a smooth transition between the first and second level, it is essential that the producer introduces at the "information" level an explicit representation of the structuration of the content.

3. From the publication of information to the transmission of knowledge:

The Web 3.0 technology offers the fact to express and represent easily the content (s) of a document, indicate the place (or places) in the document where the subject is evoked, plot the presence of this subject in space / time, in order to highlight continuities or breaks / thematic distances via 2D or 3D graphs. The tool offers filtering possibilities according to criteria defined by the user (ie activity, event, location, natural or legal person, theme, category, ... visible, mentioned in

the soundtrack, evoked, ...). The result is no longer a list of pages published on the network and displayed according to a statistical tool, but a set of segments (chapter for text, ... plans, scenes or sequences in video) structured highlighting links and hierarchical dependencies (from the set to the particular, and from the particular to the set via Boolean operators).

It is the explicit representation of the structure which allows the enrichment of an asset during its life cycle. It is the definition and the explicit representation of an asset which allows its destruction (indispensable function in the case of an avalanche of data). The structure gives the search and navigation tools both the shape and the meaning of the contents, it makes it easier to focus the zoom (the depth required in a asset) ... it's a permanent compass to create, enrich, explore, archive and destroy content.

4. Indicators of the presence of Web 3.0 technology (semantic grounding)

Semantic grounding is a means of linking a model representation to something that defines the concept (s) represented by the model. A semantic basis helps automated or manual integration of models, the conversion between model representations and the linking of linked models with different representations of identical or similar concepts. Semantic grounding does not require a 1.1 relationship between concepts because anchoring can involve any variety of relationships, simple or

compound. Semantic grounding does not assume that a model need only be grounded in one concept or that there is only one source of grounding concepts as would be the case in a universal hub. Grounding only assumes that there is a least one relation from a model to the concept(s) that ground it. Semantic grounding does not require a 1/1 relationship between the concepts as the grounding may involve any variety of relationships, simple or compound.

3

As part of a Web 3.0 tool, several indicators could be used to identify the type of semantic link:

■ the use of a formal logic to define “meaning”. Formal logics have a basis in mathematics and logic

(eg OWL - Ontology Web language or Common Logic).

■ a reference to a description of the concepts (such as a dictionary), based on a model or formal (Example: use of wordnet or BFO as reference vocabulary).

■ a controlled vocabulary, perhaps using several terms to define a concept (Example: ISO 11179: a classification scheme for data elements).

5. the need to address interoperability (temporal, systemic, historical, cultural)

The need for interoperability detection has already been described in our first contribution. It seems important to us to come back on the four dimensions required by this concept.

In order to try to clarify the importance of the subject, we propose to compare the generation of data packets to metal cans with an inventory number (the link with the label) 1 . These cans are either

files or boxes/folders. For each can or box, there is a label that specifies the content. All this is generated in a totally heterogeneous universe and the technological evolution increases its disparate

character! In addition all these cans or boxes are subject to multiple uses, repackaging, reuse, destruction, ... But to access this content, it takes a box opener!

In our example, we must ensure the availability of four types of can opener:

■ Temporal: the label has been represented according to the changes induced by ICT. This is to ensure the persistence of technological migration within an organization.

■ Systemic: This is a higher level of exchange between heterogeneous organizations and IT systems, without loss, although using different technologies.

■ History: it is necessary to be able to interpret the contents by taking into account the historical dimension (evolution and modification of the statutes of an organization in time)

■ Cultural: the expression of data strongly depends on cultural or social contexts, in particular languages, usages,

Ideally the indicators of the Internet should be able to detect the presence of such a can opener!

There is no universality without interoperability!

6. Public Broadcast services vs. Interactive Private Services

The importance of transparent and equitable management between "public" and "private" interactive services in the light of the demands of diversity and democracy.

The major shift in consumer uses of audiovisual content questions the conditions of access and visibility of public interest content (information programs, cultural and audiovisual works, etc.) which are considered as essential diversity issues (such as promoting local, cultural, linguistic creation).

What about the exposure of information programs, essential to the formation of opinion, when their access and "findability" are confronted with a virtually unlimited abundance of content?

How to adapt the concepts "Must carry", presentation on EPG, service numbering, rights to extracts and major events, broadcast quotas, protection of the right to the image ... » to interactive devices and their impact on the user. Faced with "de-massified" online content offered for consumption and individualized marketing, access and visibility of the offer remain a challenge to meet the need of the

user / consumer to find a guide and the company of promote its democratic benchmarks. This challenge must be adapted to the new multi-platform and multi-purpose environment.

How to measure qualitatively:

■ the concentration in the hands of a few major global players of the bulk of data and tools, partially inherent to the needs of a large number of data to become relevant;

■ the safeguarding of pluralism in the face of the potential risk of restricting the diversity of choices, by the reproduction of past or similar behaviours and the excessive marking of the proposition made to the user ("filter bubbles").