
data on the BF side and on the MARC side is produced and converted on the same platforms and thus has a lot more uniformity. This certainly makes experiments and testing on conversions simpler. The scale of the efforts, and the creation of the HUB, a LC local implementation of the more abstract LRM:Work that BIBFRAME does not currently acknowledge in the BIBFRAME:Work, is ambitious and impressive. But, we are all curious about how LC's BF work will interoperate with outside utilities and, of course, the future of LSPs (ILSs). Time is required here as well.

2. LD4Ps BF2MARC converter is also a repo on GitHub as RDF2MARC (<https://github.com/LD4P/rdf2marc>), is built on Ruby, can be run internally in the Sinopia editor while logged in, and can be cloned and run locally from the command line (CLI). I have been testing both options, but with more time being given to the CLI version. It is fundamentally the same, running internally behind the scenes, grabbing the URI of the Sinopia:Instance currently open, and looking for associated Work and Administrative Metadata. It then provides an opportunity to download a decent MARC record that can be upgraded, get Call#s, and expand things like Genre/Form or other subject vocabularies. The CLI version is technically doing the same thing, but as described in the directions at <https://github.com/LD4P/rdf2marc#usage>, runs a single command on a specific URI and produces what is being called an 'operational' MARC record in the directory from which the command is run and the repo is cloned.

This context for this conversion tool is the RDF Editor Sinopia, the LD4P built fork from the LC BIBFRAME2MARC converter. This editor is described by the Stanford team, who is primarily the lead organization on the Sinopia development front, as an RDF editor, not a BIBFRAME editor. Even though it is clearly and obviously a fork from the Library of Congress BIBFRAME2MARC editor, LD4P is simultaneously using it as a BIBFRAME editor and an RDF editor. If anyone saw the 2021 'Midwinter' ALA CORE IG Week Virtual session of Bibliographic Conceptual Models IG, some folks from the University of Washington libraries have been specifically editing their Resource Templates (the base organizational model for format-specific aspects such as monographs, serials, 2-D/3-D objects, etc.) as RDA in RDF, which has a much more granular structure and is clearly more intended to handle entities than BIBFRAME – which is not mapped so clearly to RDA or the LRM. I think this approach is a good one, but because it is one library working so intentionally with RDA in RDF and LC seems to be putting its eggs in the BIBFRAME basket, there are clearly some 'forked' intentions out there in library-land regarding how to create metadata in RDF. I could go on and on about this subject, but I simply want to draw attention to the Sinopia track and its current status, as of Winter 2021.

Conclusion: I like being involved in the LD4P community. I like it a lot. My rational for my involvement is about learning and contributing to the community, not because I think that BIBFRAME or Linked Data is absolutely 'better.' What these elements do is work better with current web technology and open the metadata to browser friendly technologies and can be operable with other applications using state-of-the-art serialization operations. My humble opinion is that we should contribute our knowledge to the community as widely as we are able. In fact, these changes need as many persons to engage as are able. The changes coming are significant; not everyone will be happy with those changes, yet they are underway right this moment. I hope with this column to quickly draw attention to some of those changes in a very limited way.

THE INTERNET

The Standoff in Australia over Links to News Articles: Australia Versus Google and Facebook

*Wilhelmina Randtke
Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative*

Introduction

Australia is currently considering a law which would require large market dominant websites that link to news articles to pay a fee to the news publishers in exchange for being able to link. Initially, the law would apply only to Google and Facebook, based on findings that these two companies dominate the market, but could potentially apply to other companies or websites if there is evidence to show a bargaining power imbalance. As a result, Google threatened to pull out of Australia entirely (but now seems to have begun contractual negotiations with publishers in anticipation of the new law), and Facebook has blocked users in Australia from posting or viewing links to material from news organizations.

This clash is significant because the proposed law is a big step in regulating internet content providers under antitrust and might serve as a model for other countries to follow.

Background: Australian Competition and Consumer Commission showing market dominance of Google and Facebook in internet advertising revenue and news consumption

The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) is Australia's government agency tasked with enforcing regulating monopolies and with consumer protection. In July 2019, the ACCC released a 623-page report regarding the impact of online search engines, social media, and digital content aggregators on competition in the media and advertising services markets.¹ The report covered news among many other topics, including privacy, spread of misinformation, and data collection about users.

Key findings from the report regarding market dominance include: Traditional broadcast media is more heavily regulated than is media delivered through digital platforms. Google and Facebook are the two major digital platforms in Australia. Advertiser funded digital platforms tend to be based on collecting user data for highly personalized marketing. More than 70% of websites have a Google tracker, and more than 20% of websites have a Facebook tracker. This highly personalized marketing is the way that Google and Facebook make money. Just under 40% of time spent online by Australians is spent on sites operated by Google or Facebook. 95% of general searches in Australia are performed using Google. Almost 96% of search advertising revenue in Australia goes to Google.

While the report is about market dominance in Australia, it includes some additional speculation about future changes in market dominance, including the possibility that Amazon might become a dominant digital platform in Australia but currently has low market penetration there. The report is a detailed examination of just how consolidated internet use has become in websites and services run by a few big companies. At 600 pages, and with significant efforts at large scale data collection, it is a uniquely detailed glimpse into usage patterns on the internet.

Findings from the report regarding news include: News websites rely on incoming traffic from Google and Facebook and benefit from this traffic. Meanwhile, Google and Facebook benefit from being able to provide news in search and the news feed. However, excluding any one publisher from search results or the news feed wouldn't have a significant impact on Google and Facebook, because news come from multiple publishers. So, there is a bargaining power imbalance. From 2006 to 2016, Australia had population and economic growth. Meanwhile, the number of people employed in print journalism fell by 26%. Social media can be used to spread disinformation. The report considers ways to fund news, including giving tax deductions for subscriptions to news, and concludes that these likely would not have a big impact.

Once again, while the report covers Australia, aspects of the report regarding news are parallel to the situation in the United States, where news has lost funding for decades and local news is often greatly reduced or unavailable. The need to fund news is a small part of the report and covered by an exploration of possible paths to providing funding for news creation, most of which are analyzed to be unviable and without enough impact to make a difference.

The proposed law: News Media and Digital Platforms Mandatory Bargaining Code

The News Media and Digital Platforms Mandatory Bargaining Code flows directly from recommendations in the ACCC's report. The proposed law would require Google and Facebook to pay news publishers a fee in exchange for being able to link to news content. The law initially would apply only to Google Search and Facebook News Feed, based on criteria regarding what digital platforms would be regulated. Other websites could be added if there is evidence to show a bargaining power imbalance.

The proposed law regarding payments by Google and Facebook for linking to news seems to be driven by a combination of financial woes in news, how dramatically search advertising revenue goes to Google, and the bargaining power imbalance between publishers and Google/Facebook, with news sites needing the traffic but the dominant digital platforms not being dependent on any one news source enough to need it.

The goal of the law is to provide a new revenue stream for news companies. News has taken huge financial hits with the internet. 30 years ago, subscription fees and advertising fees paid the bills at news companies. Now both are greatly reduced because the transition to the internet changed how people access news. People search and find news here and there, and advertising fees work differently.

The full text of the proposed law can be found at <https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p?page=0;query=BillId:r6652%20Recstruct:billhome>. The law has an administrative agency designate digital platforms to which it would apply. (Initially, it would apply only to Google Search and Facebook News Feed, based on the scale at which those services are used by the public.) The proposed law defines news broadly and would require news organizations to register with the government. All news sources must comply with a code of conduct in order to remain registered. It has a framework for setting up contracts for fees and sets up an arbitration process for contract disputes. Alternatively, a news organization could contract directly with a digital platform, and fees could flow outside of the fee splitting arrangement set up by the government. There are some minimum requirements listed that the contract would have to meet, and the offer would have to be available to all registered news publishers. The law doesn't specify fee structures or dollar amounts beyond requiring that payments be "fair." The law also requires advance notice from digital platforms about algorithm or interface changes anticipated to have a significant impact on traffic to the news publisher.

Misinformation is covered by provisions allowing a registration to be revoked based on misleading or false information provided as news.

A possible elephant in the room regarding misinformation is that the law adds procedures around the relationship of linking to news, while linking to other types of content is not regulated by the law. The purpose of the law is to fund high quality news rather than to address misinformation online.

At this time, the proposed law seems likely to pass.

As might be expected, both Google and Facebook oppose the law. It is both a financial cost and a precedent for regulation by governments globally.

Google's response: Threatening to pull out of Australia, meanwhile contracting with major news organizations in anticipation of the law passing

Google initially threatened to pull out of Australia² but has now begun making contracts with news publishers in anticipation of the law passing.³

Facebook's response: Removing all links to news in Australia

As of February 18, 2021, Facebook removed posts linking to news sites. Analysis of this change showed that traffic to news sites dropped, and people did not seek out alternative sources for news. That is in contrast to times when Facebook has been down entirely, when search traffic shows that people went elsewhere to research news and traffic remained constant.⁴ Because the proposed law defines news broadly, Facebook took a broad definition and removed a wide variety of content, including posts by government agencies, such as fire and health department information, emergency services information, and weather information.⁵ This emphasizes a possible danger in regulating high quality news without regulating the rest of internet content.

Possible implications for the United States

The Australian proposed law requiring mandatory payments from dominant digital platforms is a major step toward regulating search engines and news aggregators. What happens in Australia may set a global precedent and model for regulating search and the news feed. How to fund news is a small issue compared to the precedent for regulating

search engines and social media. At this time, Canada, France, and the European Union have shown interest in following Australia's model. Even if the exact model of payment for content does not carry over to other countries, the idea of much stronger regulation over search content and presentation of news in social media may spread. Especially with recent Section 230 hearings, which weren't about Section 230 but were heavily about how news and misinformation are treated on social media, the United States has the political will to begin stronger regulation of digital platforms.

Endnotes

1. Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, *Digital platforms inquiry - final report* (2019), available at <https://www.accc.gov.au/publications/digital-platforms-inquiry-final-report>.
2. BBC World, *Could Google really leave Australia?* BBC World, Jan. 22, 2021, available at <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-55766429>.
3. Sara Morrison, *Why Facebook banned news in Australia and why Google is actually going to pay news publishers*, Vox, Feb. 18, 2021, available at <https://www.vox.com/recode/22287971/australia-facebook-news-ban-google-money>.
4. Sophie Meixner, *Facebook news ban drops reader traffic to news stories by 13 per cent within Australia, Chartbeat data shows*, ABC News, Feb. 19, 2021, available at <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-02-19/facebook-referral-traffic-down-news-ban-morrison-frydenberg/13171568>.
5. Mitchell Clark, *Facebook's Australian media ban is taking down official government pages*, The Verge, Feb. 17, 2021, available at <https://www.theverge.com/2021/2/17/22288256/facebook-australia-news-ban-governmental-agency-accounts>.
6. Morrison, *supra* note 3.

MANAGEMENT

Beth Farrell

Let's Discuss

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law Library

Many library managers are middle managers, precariously balancing their dual roles of subordinate and supervisor: regularly receiving direction from upper management and then trying to translate that direction into a message that makes practical sense to their team. After hearing from the team, the middle manager may have to go back to upper management with the team's feedback. Rinse. Repeat.

Fortunately for stuck-in-the-middle managers, Wharton organizational psychologist Adam Grant's new book *Think Again: The Power of Knowing What You Don't Know* supplies many practical tips for negotiating up and down the org chart. This genuinely engaging exploration of the value of open mindedness also seems especially important in today's polarized society.

Before beginning any negotiation or discussion, Grant states that we must recognize we're unlikely to change other people's minds if we aren't willing to change ours.¹ Framing a potentially difficult discussion as a debate, and not an emotional disagreement, signals that you are receptive to considering opinions and changing your mind and can result in healthier participation from the other side during the debate.² As you schedule the meeting, saying something like "Let's explore this issue together" or "I look forward to digging into all sides of this issue with you" can set the stage for a more productive, less emotional discussion.

As you prepare for the discussion, some experts recommend focusing on The Steel Man, the best arguments of the other side, and not The Straw Man, the weakest arguments. In fact, research shows that successful negotiators devote more than one-third of their planning to finding common ground with the strongest points of the other side.³ Referring to Steel Man arguments early in the discussion immediately demonstrates to your debate partner that you value their