MYCELIA

MYCELIA

CREATIVE PASSPORT WORKSHOP
9th May 2018
@ Somerset House

NOTES

MYCELIA

INDEX:

MYCELIA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This second Creative Passport workshop was both following up of the one held in January thanks to the participants who managed to attend again, as well as opening up new topics and questions thanks to new participants.

After a brief introduction of the day, Imogen and our head of tech Mark Simpkins showed the participant the first Creative Passport Prototype, a mobile based app able to verify artists p2p welcoming them in the Creative Passport Network. After that the table leaders quickly gave a round of introduction of the main topics of the tables (Music makers, Services, Business, Design), allowing the participant to decide which discussion to join.

List of participants:

Andy Carne	Elena Ware	Jake Morley	Paul Craig
Annabella Coldrick	Emma Houston	Josh Gledhill	Pedro Fernandes
Avi Ashkenazi	Erik Beijnoff	Jules Herd	Peter Harris
Awsa Bergstrom	Eugenie Arrowsmith	Keith Hill	Peter Jenner
Brian Dubb	Finbar Mostyn-Williams	Kris Halpin	Reece Daniels
Carlotta De Ninni	Frank Hamilton	Layla Rutherford	Sara Farina
Chris Wray	Gary McClarnan	Lucie Caswell	Sara Leigh Shaw
Claire Tolan	George Bacon	Lydia Gregory	Sebastian Gaeta
Claudia Schwarz	Graham Davies	Mark Simpkins	Terri Walker
Crispin Hunt	Ian Kendrick	Matt Phipps-Taylor	Thomas White
Daniel Harris	Imogen Heap	Miri Hersh	Tim Exile / Tim Exile
Darren Mothersele	Istvan Fulop	Neil Queen-Jones	Tom Nield
David Hamilton	Jack Gourley	Nick Ryan	Tommy Darker
David Sugar	Jack Horner	Ninja Egenamba	Wolfgang Senges

MYCELIA

MUSIC MAKERS

Table Leader: Imogen Heap (Mycelia)
Notes: Tam Tran (Event Team)

1.   Creation of connected database

Currently, the publishing of information about songs and artists by PRS or PPL is not proper as artists want it to be, e.g. incorrect information or inadequate information format. The existing systems of PRS or PPL do not enable artists to correct information by themselves. It is also time consuming for artists to request for restoring their information from those databases. In addition, there are so many intermediaries, each of which has its own database. This may cause inconsistencies and confusion for people to find true information.

It is necessary to have a platform which can verify information and enable artists to track and have information about how their data is processed or used and how they get paid for their data and songs. With the application of blockchain, CP can be of help to resolve such difficulties by creating one single database for everyone to access, which is desired to become a standard across the EU. This would serve the following purposes:

• CP will operate as an identification services which verifies data and enable people to access accurate data;

• CP will facilitate the registration of a song and the administration of data by publishers or record labels;

• CP will enable the availability of information so that artists can access and monitor their data anytime;

• CP will be a channel for artists to interact with the world, i.e. having information about how their songs are used in different countries;

• CP will be a hub for artists to network, share their data and products, earn money for their data and products, find people to work with, support each other and find job opportunities and sponsorship for their projects.

To do this, artists' details should be embedded in the songs. There may be technical link in one song which connects different databases, so that the data

of the song is identical although it is stored in different places. Accordingly, when a song is published in one database, other databases (e.g. PRS, PPL) will link to it so that people can know that is the correct and definitive information, such as Auddly. As the registration with PRS or PPL is time consuming, signing up for CP is an easy way for the artists to manage their data and payment. When data is inserted to CP, Mycelia will verify the information or pay other intermediaries, such as PRS to verify the information.

2.   Control of data

Management of fast-growing database would be difficult as it requires huge resources. In addition, the enforcement of the obligations imposed on data controllers and processors by the newly introduced General Data Protection Regulation ("GDPR") is also a big concern. Accordingly, direct management of data should rest with the artists. It means that artists should be able to insert, amend, withdraw, restore, get information about the process of data anytime and decide the level of confidentiality of their data. There should be features which allow artists to decide which information is visible and to whom information is visible, give permission for access to their data and decide the period of time during which data is visible.

For instance, an artist may have different names and details in different fields and have separate social network accounts. CP should only connect to the accounts and display the information determined by the artists.

Artists should also be able to decide the format of data. They should decide to include biography, timeline, videos, images, their achievements, other information and how they are presented. CP should also enable artists to monitor users' activities in relation to their data so that they can block or restrict access to data by those who misuse search tool and data.

3.   Notification mechanism

To keep artists updated with what is going on with their songs, data and enable them to exercise their control, CP should have features to send notification to the artists, either to mobile phone or email.

The contents to be notified may include when someone on social media or a CP member mentions or uploads information concerning the artists or their songs, when a song is played/performed/sampled or when a cover of song is made, sync, collaboration, milestone (e.g. number of fans on social network), performance/live request, request for extra data and payment process.

MYCELIA

To avoid annoying notifications, CP should enable the artists to decide the priority of contents to be sent to them, decide when to receive or stop notifications or adjust the notification volume.

4.   Fan interaction

In addition to data and songs of the artists, CP should allow fans' input and interaction for the following reasons:

- Fans may contribute useful information to verify artists' data and songs;

- Artists can keep people aware of them and their songs;

- Growing fan base is an opportunity to create and develop personal brand;

- Fan interaction via CP gives artists for more leverage in building online presence as it is similar to artists' personal website.

Accordingly, CP should get fans involved by allowing them to insert data, comments, pictures and find information about the songs. In addition, artists may give reward for fans who contribute useful information.

However, it is important to distinguish between the official information inserted by the artists and other people. In addition, it is ideal to keep CP simple. Thus, fan interaction should be made by linking CP with other social networks, such as Facebook or LinkedIn. Currently, there are applications which enable fast and user-friendly management of social media, such as TFTTT. Accordingly, CP may also be a tool which allows artists and users to connect different channels and manage everything in one portal. For example, when fans access to artists' information in CP, they can find a link to artists' Facebook official account.

To link artists' social network back to CP, there should be a logo and link of CP attached to such social network. This also helps people to distinguish between verified and unverified information. To that end, each artist should have one identification number and display such identification number on their social media page so that they can be easily identified.

5.   Legal consideration

It is difficult to prevent people from copying data to their own pages or ensure that people use data in a proper manner. It is also difficult for artists to manage

and protect their intellectual property rights ("IPR") in relation to their songs at present as there is no way for them to monitor how their songs are used.

To reduce such risks, again, all of the data and songs must be consolidated in one database so that data and songs must be used via CP in order to ensure transaction trace and payment for the artists. Accordingly, Mycelia should consider all the legal issues in relation to data and IPR to ensure the proper use of such data and IPR on behalf of the artists.

It is suggested that any access and use of anything in CP by users will constitute a legal binding contract between the artists/Mycelia and users. To that end, a shrink wrap contract with terms and conditions should be packaged with the data or songs so that any access or use of them should be considered as an acceptance of the contract, which mandates legal obligations. CP should record the information of such transactions.

In addition, Mycelia should represent artists in ensuring legal compliance and educating people to respect the legal rights of the artists in relation to their data and music.

6.   Payment

The system of CP should be paid for maintenance. The source of payment may be from artists and/or users on a subscription basis. Whether artists are willing to pay for the services may depend on how much the fee would be. However, from a commercial perspective, a consideration for the payment for CP is that the artists may get paid for their data/songs in a more transparent manner and may benefit from the opportunities to obtain support and sponsorships in the CP community.

It is necessary to require users to pay for data and songs. There may be separation of personal users and business users so that the use of data or songs for business purposes will be charged at a higher rate. For example, Google has to pay Mycelia to obtain information about artists.

The payment mechanism can be presented in the format of a checklist of services, whereby users can "click" to download data/songs and "click" to pay for it.

It should be noted that technology and users' demand are ever-changing, which constantly transforms the way people use social networks. For example, Facebook frequently introduces new features or changes its interface. Accordingly, while the benefit of CP in managing data, songs and the relevant legal rights of the artists is

● MYCELIA

undeniable, there is no reason for it to stop at one mechanism, method or technology. It would be sensible to test and learn on the way in order to find out a viable business model.

MYCELIA

SERVICES

Table Leader: Peter Harris (Resonate)
Notes: Sara Ruini (Event Team)

The problem with blockchain technology is that there's no way to prove identity.
It has been said that 25% of the bitcoin money supply is unusable because people lost their key, which is a problem.

Question: How do you do identity on blockchain? There are currently some initiatives on self-sovereign identity.

We need to imagine different ways to plug in music services (e.g. touring support) on the blockchain. We also need to consider how to solve problems with the GDPR.

On a technical level, you have a basic profile information and keys ("technical connection points") when interacting with a blockchain. That stuff is shared with the network. Other users validate your identity in real life.

Question: What happens when you lose your phone?
You can be "revalidated" and gain access to the system again. In a decentralised, networked solution you don't need any authority providers

Point of reflection: Can there be different types of "identity validators"? e.g. mother -> 100% validity, acquaintance -> 10%?

Questions:
How might existing services be replaced?
Would a fingerprint be tight to identity? The problem with this process is that it is possible to fake that process too. On the other hand, you cannot "fake" identity in real life.
Are these approving structures good for the future?

Point of reflection: There might be different layers of validations -> e.g. passport, national id

Mattereum: legal smart contracts -> leverages the real world and digital world with contracts. The social graph validation of identity (the way in which identities are validated) relates to the data that artists need to transact which isn't going to create any practical legal implications.

⬤ MYCELIA

Question: What if you need to send £1m to somebody (on Mycelia)? There should be a process by which PRS, or GEMA can verify identity.

For this reason, the process that verifies artists' identities should be rounded. There should be no concern about identity.

Point of reflection:
What about the strength of trust? Is it based on the usage of the platform? (Would reputation matter?)

It starts to shift towards that network (network externality) -> it's self-reinforcing

What happens when everyone joins the network (Mycelia) at the same time when starting? You would have a rating - can you connect your existing reputation from existing services? Because otherwise everyone would start from day 1.

Important thing to remember: Authority (entity verifying identity) is different from trust (reputation based on previous activity e.g. Amazon, amazing reseller).

It is important to verify the scope of the services on Mycelia. (Services) are looking at social validation of trust as well as authority.

For instance, if I'm part of Resonate, and I'm sending money through the system, there needs to be trust.
Another point of reflection: Identity as an interoperable unity. It's based on "who is the artist?" -> Identity over the services to also act on the artist's behalf. Ease of interconnection and business protocols.

Aim: to look at open protocols and what they mean. Any functions within a certain network can create standards (e.g. messaging system by buying and selling rights and obligations), and trust and reputation would be part of this protocol. These are functions. Service providers are a function that does a particular thing with data that someone gives to it.

Problem: Music industry is archaic. What are the barriers for adoption which may prohibit this from going forward?
   -   Those who benefit from "not having efficient systems" within organisations, people that benefit from that. Some people are holding on to the old way.

Lack of education for artists. There's a lack of trust amongst existing music industry stakeholders.

● MYCELIA

How can the current music industry ecosystem be made more efficient?
Important to analyse and make current methodologies more rigorous in a messaging system: DDEX?

We need to work with the existing system rather than build a new one.

Artists make money from music using traditional systems -> these systems need to transition into a more fluid world.

Conversations around artists: adoption of new thinking. Once this model (Mycelia) is validated, when artists start using it, they are likely going to spread the word. The power of Creative Passport is that.

There has to be a way to integrate different services. Problem: potential loss of data control from these services. How much do you trust that data (from a service/ business point of view)? If you're moving all your services away to a decentralised model, this may pose a risk to the industry.
A lot of the music industries struggle with emerging technologies. Bigger organisations are stuck in the current way they are doing things. It is artists who can control nodes: for instance, If Resonate goes out of business, the data remains.

Question: What's in it for services?

Question for users: Do you want to remain anonymous or do you want these connections to be known (e.g. music that I am streaming) to services? -> there's a limited sharing of data that fans may want the service to know. You are incentivising the use of data in fans' hands. It's about empowering everyone to be in control of their own data.

Services may be afraid that they might be displaced.
Problem with Mycelia: it would be irrelevant if only small services and the music community interacted with the network, but not the big players (e.g. Live Nation).

Question for services: There has to be a way to push these services to use the system? We build (by working closely with the initial service partners, then we iterate a few number of times.

Possible answer:
Wherever there's "a line", there can be a service connecting different people because there's data and it's valuable. It's about building a model. Then services will follow. You can see businesses going that direction. It's about connections.

⊕ MYCELIA

Business needs: social media, information sharing. It's also about finding resources which artists may benefit from

Transactions on the network are going to be free or paid (freemium model).

Business needs will drive the privacy issues that CP (Creative Passport) is going to encounter. Licensing? Identification needed?

How can fans interact with CP ? "Life ID" -> an initiative happening on in R chain. There might be to be the ones handling the fan-identity managing

There's a lot of motivation behind.

E.g. Spotify for Brands. If we have so much data, when are they gonna be open to advertising? Is it a case of data has been collected, then data is in a useful format? Data will be anonymous by default -> there can be an opt-in to be able to use a music service?

Possible threat: Is there a danger that if not enough people decide to share the data with services, these services would be useless?

Some artists have a deal with a particular brand and may not be willing to use certain services.

Importance of GDPR: who is in charge with that data, how can you communicate with fans (personal)? There might be massive GDPR issues. Who controls the data? (Central governance)

There has to be one set of terms of sharing the information in order to make it more accessible for the users.

Would mycelia obtain a user's information about the amount of streams, etc.
Would all these services that are plugged in give the data back to Mycelia?? What if a fan opts outs of sharing data with all services?

Streaming model of Resonate: it is about fair play. The identity of the person can be protected. The play happened, and this can't be disputed, but users' identity is safe.

Idea: There can be an incentive: e.g. fans being able to communicate with Imogen -> or a communication service. The more data Mycelia has, the more services will want to interact with it.

● MYCELIA

It's about building trust in the services plugged in to mycelia: the person using the network remains anonymous if they don't want to share data. The data on mycelia would prove that a stream has happened.

Point of reflection/ Question: how to connect brand and consumers while making consumers in control of their own data? -> It could be the whole process.

Centralised ownership of the data by mycelia? If a user has to decide whether to opt in or opt out, there might be a problem with the UI/UX of the platform.

Solution: If you're a fan, you can allow certain services. Opt-out of sharing data can be solved.

Would you use the creative passport as authentication? It is fans? Or consumers??

Big problem: getting up-to-date imagery and description for artists. Services that can update automatically (APIs). Some services want to use mycelia. Ability for an artist to come in and update their information (image + bio) for services to feed back in.

Mycelia would have to trust services, for services to act on behalf of somebody.

There's a lot of music use cases which would benefit from the passport -> e.g. Youtube: how much money is going to creators?

For services who are selling and using music there's a lot of benefit from in CP. E.g. Curation of the industry: labels need new talent (artist discovery) Sometimes you don't get the right information, or you can't find the artist (For licensing).

Point of reflection: How can we help record labels discover new talent? Can mycelia become a gatekeeper between record labels buying data for the services?? (for the curation)

Creators are not going to be empowered to run analytics and businesses from data on CP.
It would be a platform for people that are running the business -> people that are working for an artist making use of the data.

(Mycelia) is putting the artist where it should be. How do you want to run your business? Problem with the current system: Artists don't own their own data. It's about giving artists access to their data. Artists can benefit from services.

⊙ MYCELIA

Architectural question: Is it centralised data? (GDPR issue) or is it actually your own data (owned by you, the user), and you have the possibility of giving others access? If a fan follows an artist's data, that sits outside of the service.

Mycelia's front-end experience: how many followers does an artist have? -> that's the front end. Data may be going to different places across the services.

There's a difference between USAGE DATA and fan-to-artist DATA.

Huge benefit of a control of the accounting as well: band splits. Artists never had this type of control.

Question: how to control payments on the blockchain.

How to incentivise new artists to sign up for mycelia and its services?
For users, there has to be some free data -> e.g. image, biography (because it helps an artist promotion) -> basic bio. An artist's interests, inspirations, etc. may be "premium".

What's the process for onboarding a new service into Mycelia?

What if artists don't want to share some information with anybody? There's an amount that by being a public entity some bits are "forfeit"?
Collecting societies are service providers.

You can't remove the intermediaries. It's the goal to make PRS so efficient. Reconfiguring the idea of interaction. Artists need to have efficient data-management system. An artist signs to Mycelia, then looks for a label. A signed artist couldn't do it because their data is owned by a label. Signed artists lose control on the data owned by labels.

The world is changing because artists are becoming more conscious of their data and their rights. A long time ago the conversation about knowing your rights would not happen.

When do you bring services in? If it's too early in the roadmap, these services may influence the way in which mycelia is built. If it's too late, the risk is that nobody will want to adopt Mycelia.

Pilot project: blockchain catalogue system. Propagation: system for artists to go and update to use the passport.

◆ MYCELIA

Mycelia should be "something in the background" - Its functionalities are limited to make edits. Artists should be encouraged to have a passport created on mycelia created automatically.

Artist-relationship may be helped. Some artists may want to be able to credit people (e.g. artworks, session musicians). Isn't that through a service to allow that? Mycelia would be similar to the IMDB for music.

Are services paying to make their value proposition "richer"? (through data)
Is mycelia a back-end service? Currently, Spotify and iTunes should add more data to their UX/UI in order to credit stakeholders others than the performers. The provenance of this information is important. Data is validated by the artist. E.g. Right of the work, author: publically available.
Info for payment services: it's made accessible to certain user groups.

E.g. If we were feeding back setlists, PRS and PPL would benefit from there -> for payment services. Artists can have access to this data.

Question: When is the launch of a new payment structure?

Reality: if you're indie, distribution is made better. For Mycelia, it's about bringing artists in at the right time. If labels are not on board, publishers are also not going to work with CP.
Artists individually sign up to be part of mycelia through PRS for example.

Question: If you're just focused on the creative passport, if you say as an artist that you're published by EMI, how is that piece of information validated? (Who says it's actually true?) Creators have an incentive. PRS also might do that too because they want to help.

Only 100% matched mechanical and performing songs -> people who perform the track are the ones who wrote it. That creates an incentive.

Issues: How can you deal with two bands with the same name? How do you validate the data that goes in?

Possible solution: you can use Machine Learning to "clean" that. With user generated process, the crowd can clean that.

Needs clarifying: What's the business context that's being used by Mycelia?

Question: would PRS payments be based on authority (real passport) or reputation built on the network? Would you trust a blockchain for payments? It's great to think that

there's one identifier. There's always going to be different passport numbers for instance. Cross-references may work (Machine Learning)

Also, there are different players that are "authority nodes"- e.g. PRS and PPL validating songs.

Auddly – registration for artists. Interesting service: it's driven by the artists or the creators associated with the studios. -> can interface with PRS and PPL.

What happens with disputes on the blockchain? It depends on the business context. -> splits of musical work. Most industries have ways to deal with that. Sometimes artists agree something verbally then they say something different to publishers.

Opinion: Artists can't have control over everything. Some information may have come from authorities.

Idea: PRS can be getting something wrong, or IPI and publishers can be wrong. There has to be ways to challenge artist-fed information through authority.

Visibility: artists need to know that they have to join these organisations and have right to access their data (artists may often ignore the existence of collection societies).

Sources are members and publishers. If there was another source of truth (besides artists), an environment like CP to use as an additional ecosystem. It can send back submissions to solve disputes.

If something can be organised, CP could be used as a way to challenge views -> conflicting information. CP is not limited to music but could also be applied to the rest of the creative industries.

Big question of IP claims. How are they rewarded?

Point of reflection: How can you quantify how much money has been lost? Leakage: money that isn't going to the right place in a timely way. There's no way to identify these "missed" payments for unidentified for performing royalties, also organisations internationally moving at different times. If you're trying to encourage adoption, you can use figures that certify the leakage of information / money not going to the right people. In the world of streaming, a lot of rights are unclaimed. PRS can only invoice for what it identifies. It would be paid out if it was paid. Artists may not be getting paid because they are not signed to PRS for music.

Who is creating the use cases for mycelia? Who is to incentivise these?

⏩ MYCELIA

This year: beta. Adoption will be slow.

There might be a critical mass problem. Artists need to know how they're going to benefit from Mycelia before signing up. Also, the mass needs to know that services are gonna interact with CP.

Problem: Mycelia has to compete in that world. It's PR, it's about recognising the right people to send messages to, and evangelising what companies do. People are becoming more careful on how they share their data.

Company: VARO: social media: doesn't share data, no direct advertising. From a CP point of view, they need to carefully consider how that would work in practice.

No single party should control another. How does decision-making happen in a decentralised system? It's about giving board members a voice.

Messages insides organisations matching what's going outside: transparency.

CP is centred around debates around identity. The way to connect the identity to another creators' identity is what's core.

Question: What type of services can ride on the back of it? Answer: From a scope perspective, scope seems limitless. That's scary because there's a lot of issues added with it.

Where's the value proposition for different parties? It's amorphous.

MVP -> identities between different artists.

From a Resonate's point of view, the process of being added to the network is still being shaped: it will be easier for other services.

Questions that need clarifying: What service is mycelia providing for services? Is it verification? What's the product? How is it being sold to them?

Idea: To be implemented in the wider world, you need to "convenience" services that are not mission-driven.

Question: what about the policy roadmap?
The value chain - The way you manage partnerships across the ecosystem (Mycelia): it will be up to artists and the community to approve and disapprove certain practices. It's only attractive if the network works and the community has power.

⏺ MYCELIA

Will Mycelia become an industry body that services pay a membership to? (e.g. an approval service?) Or is it an artist community?

Mycelia is a non-for-profit organisation.

> Mycelia provides standards on how data is moved around.
> Technical: where are data stored? Who pays for the basic expenses of mycelia
> Mycelia is building trustworthiness and transparency

Philosophical question: Is mycelia building a movement (because users finally own their own data).
Opinion: Just because you're a non-for-profit it doesn't mean you're doing it right.

Would having an industry standard help? A lot of the mainstream music industry will have to change their practices according to CP.

Opinion: It's beginning from now. You can theorise about a lot of things but it's what happens that matters.

If one of the outcomes of this is that correct data is used, that's a universal benefit for the whole of the music industry. You'd find it hard to raise an objection to something like CP (improving stuff)

> Campaigns for fairplay

What benefits do you see being available to services interacting with mycelia? If a service pays, what happens to other startups?

Question: Who determines what kind of services can be used within the platform?
Answer: It's going to be discussed after the initial phase.

There has to be some "core service" features: (Streemliner, Resonate). Important factor: How quickly can we link things up and do a proof-of-concept?

Issue: First market advantage? What's going to happen? This is a broad architecture looking to host multiple services (Mycelia). Nobody is thinking of blockchain as connecting different APIs (Mycelia is innovative). Comment: Mycelia working as a LinkedIn for music would be ideal if that's what they are trying to do.

Problem: How VCs operate, putting money to a project to get widespread mass adoption is destined to fail. Artist-centric side of mycelia -> that's not going to mean that they succeed if somebody with a lot of money looking to do that could.

● MYCELIA

Legitimacy barrier of entry to other people. You need credentials.
The music industry is global. One of the reasons that GRD fail is that it come out of
Euro and the US were driven by it.

Point of reflection: Mycelia should be adopted universally. Imogen needs royalties
globally. If music is not shared globally the problem persists.

Mycelia won't act as a content-catalogue.

The major obstacles?
-   Evolution of the technology -> that's designed for mass-adoption
-   Time
-   Validating people at a physical state -> one level of trustcore
-   PRS validating identity

For the first time, it's going to be artists managing their creative passport for ease of
use, then allow the artist's team to interact with CP. -> A novel approach to data and
identity
How are service going to integrate with it?

Identity validation: If you got a few artists that can validate one's profile, the same
would go for managers.

Validating in real life:
It's a mobile app, the process of scanning in is in physical space.
Alternatively, there will be a web call.

Permissioned accounts: artists can get their account managed

Streaming data is going to be sent to people, artists are going to update their own
information. Without the services being there, passport is not going to do a lot.
There should be things in the roadmap that authenticate things that support services.

There needs to be a few core services that have to be there in order to enable other
non-core services. That's going to be discussed on 09.05. What kind of data needs to
move around?

Any projects that wants to come in, will come in: the platform is self-validating. It's not
like everything can be built by mycelia.

Question: Is there gonna be a record store on Mycelia?

◗ MYCELIA

Do you see this infrastructure (CP) being used by other services? Resonate is working with Life ID to work on that.

If Mycelia is going to be run by a foundation, there's some values/credo defined by the organisations. Would there be that some services wouldn't pass the ethical standards to join Mycelia? You need to work with everybody in terms of regulation.

Problem: Artists may be put off by that if some big services with a lot of money are not on the platform because they do not apply to the 'value' standards.

Would it be putting boundaries? Yes. Mycelia would then be controlling and not artist-led.
If the incentives are built in the network correctly, Mycelia wouldn't need to act.
Opinion: If Mycelia stops organisations from joining that's problematic because it prevents some services from joining - >e.g. like PRS, it can't take a political statement.

Mycelia will be bigger than anyone. Artists need a creative passport -> individual memberships.

Opinion: Mycelia has the potential to become a central service. It shouldn't get into moralities.

Mycelia can interact with other organisations to have a political stance in that sense. Not for individual artists -> they are who they are and nobody should be banned.

Issue: What happens when some bands promote hatred against some ethnic minorities for instance?

Question: Mycelia is supporting for artists, what would other music-blockchain music platforms be something to tackle?

Summary:
Benefits:Empowered fan experiences, Correct data for services, Service to service endorsements

PROBLEMS: Ease of use for artists, Black box/ leakage., Adoption by incumbents,Trust across sector

MYCELIA

DESIGN

Table Leader: Andy Carne (Streemliner)
Notes: Stefan Schieber (Event Team)

Andy was initially mentioning that there is only limited area to discuss in regard to design as it is heavily based on the outcome of the other groups. However, during the discussion there were aspects mentioned that might need some consideration. One of the most compelling points during the discussion was the role of live shows in the creative passport. The questions asked in it is summarized in the second paragraph of the information part.

Logo

Andy starts off the conversation by communicating the basic principles of the Mycelia logo. It should illustrate the fair trade in music industry that correlates with Mycelia's vision. The white triangle should represent the play button, which stands for the music industry. In the back of the triangle is a triangle going into the other direction. The triangles opposing each other should represent the exchange

Regarding the exchange the white triangle is basically an arrow representing the music going to the consumer and the other triangle is the revenue coming back to the artist. The backwards triangle holds all primary colours, which illustrate the diversity of the different revenue sources but also the diversity of the artists.

As the brand moves forward the logo might change and introduce secondary colours.

Elements of the passport

The next part of the discussion was the explanation of the elements that the passport should include.

Verified Identity

The USP of the creative passport is the validity of the creative passport through peer to peer. In the first place, the registration is only allowed through an invitation of a friend through a scan of a QR-code-esque logo. Subsequently, the registration can be done through the usual process of email verification etc. The user has to generate a code that is based on email, phone number and date of birth. Furthermore, the account will be linked to other accounts like Facebook and Twitter. Through Magic Password the user can just use the link of the other accounts instead of retyping a password in case of a lost login.

⊙ MYCELIA

People can verify the validity of the data inserted in the creative passport and therefore the level of validity is determined. The more people confirm the data the more valid it is.

However, George Bacon raised the point of a hierarchy of validators. At PPL for example the producer of an album who was involved throughout the whole process of the production has a hierarchy in the validation process than a session musician for example, who has less touch points with the production process, and therefore less information.

Information

The passport should be a collection of all sources of information like Discogs, Wikipedia, Spotify, etc. From this collection the artist can search for data and determine which is relevant and valid, select it and add it to his creative passport profile. The data can range from, collaborators, discography, to inspirations and so on. Also, different aliases can be added to the profile, e.g. Matthew Herbert as Herbert, Doctor Rockit, Radio Boy, Mr. Vertigo, Transformer and Wishmountain.

A point raised by Gary McClarnan and that has to be looked into more deeply is how future activities, therefore non-historic not yet available data, are handled in the creative passport. Currently, past activities can be inserted through a search among all information relevant platforms. Gary was specifically mentioning live tours and what might be the value of the creative passport in this aspect. How will announcements of such tours happen? Will there be a draft for these data? Furthermore, it was raised which data of live tours will be included in the creative passport. For example, will light engineers be included? Also, how will venues be handled in the creative passport? Should there be information about the rooms they have or who used to play there etc.?

A significant point during the discussion was also the aspect of conflict resolution. Carlotta was specifically mentioning that the creative passport clearly does not see itself as a foundation for legal conflict resolution about contribution issues. Smart contracts do not represent a valid legal document. This led into a discussion of how to track activities of a song and who is considered as a contributor of the creative outcome. Ableton and Cubase are already working on plug-ins that track activities inside their DAWs, hence who contributes how in the moment. Also, who is considered as a part of the creation process and who is not. Even though someone might not be directly involved in the creation of sounds etc, s/he might still be a part of the creative outcome. Some people might have been involved in the moment that inspired this piece of music and they should also be recognized.

Further points discussed were the implementation of gamification elements such as an experience bar similar to LinkedIn might provide a useful tool to incentivize users to add information. This also makes the platform visually more exciting. Apart from that, it has to be discussed how to motivate people to enter their data. Also, even though the initial focus lies on the music industry, the application might organically spread into other fields of creativity like movies, which of course is strongly connected to the music industry, and consequently include platforms like IMDb as well.

◉ MYCELIA

<u>Action</u>

This point focuses on the aspect of what to do with information of the creative passport. Obviously the creative passport has potential to credit people involved in the creative process. Similar to LinkedIn third parties can look up people that were involved in activities these third parties like, and connect with these people. For example, if somebody likes the mastering of a recording s/he can simply look up who did it on the creative passport and contact the person. However, it has to be mentioned that chatting is only possible with people that are at least 2nd degree connections.

Mycelia sees itself as the fundamental infrastructure that is underneath upcoming applications. Start-ups might emerge that develop application based on the data set provided by Mycelia. For example, there might be an app that provides interesting information based on the location of the user, and might show the bench where Bob Dylan wrote a song, based on the data provided by Mycelia.

MYCELIA

BUSINESS

Morning Session – 'The Value / Audience / Revenue Triangle'

Table leaders: **BD :** Brian Dubb (Mycelia / MPAL Pro)
                          FMW : Finbar Mostyn-Williams / London Contemporary Orchestra
Notes: **KC** : Karen Carne (Event team)
Participants: **DS** : David Sugar : Writer / Producer
                          IF : Istvan Fulop : Sound Engineer / Vulcan Inc
                          TW : Thom White : Yoti / Music Manager
                          CW : Chris Wray : Mattereum
                          PF : Pedro Fernandes : 7Digital
                          JH : Jack Horner : Joiner of Dots
                          AB : Annabella Coldrick : MMF
                          CT : Claire Tolan : Resonate
                          TD : Tommy Darker : Whiise
                          PC : Paul Craig : Nostromo Management
                          EB : Erik Beijnoff : Repertoire Network
                          WS : Wolfgang Senges : Contentsphere
                          LC : Lucie Caswell : FAC
                          KC : Karen Carne : Mycelia Scribe
                          TW : Terri Walker : Music Maker
                          DM : Darren Mothersele : Developer / Kendraio
                          CS : Claudia Schwartz : MusicTech Germany
                          TN : Tom Nield : Landmrk.it
                          TS : Tim Shaw : Endlesss
                          DH : Daniel Harris : kendraio
                          GM : Gary McLarnan : Sparklestreet
                          AB : Awsa Bergstrom : Music Maker
                          IH : Imogen Heap : Music Maker
                          FH : Frank Hamilton : Music Maker / Bedroom Indie

FMW : In a centralised system, costs can limit growth. A decentralised system is a way of realising the dream.

CW : This raises can Intellectual Property be defended? Who'll be the custodian? How to achieve consistency?

MYCELIA

FMW : Data has to be monetised. Who decides how this is done? Who decides how the data exists? Who uses the data? How is it distributed?

Currently, different platforms show different info and identities. If fans want to listen, how do they find the music? There is a huge disparity between the data available on imdb and Spotify. Metadata is a problem for Spotify - it is very behind on data gathering. Artists give Spotify the latest info but it doesn't get updated, therefore it's difficult for fans to find music online.

Why is data valuable? Because it can lead to more listens and more discovery and then more income.

EB : What is the problem at Spotify that Mycelia is looking to solve? Metadata is wrong, or not visible enough?

FMW : Discoverability is one of the problems looking to be solved. The LCO doesn't record albums so it is usually difficult to find them.

EB : Crowdsourcing metadata isn't going to solve the payment issue. It currently comes from one of two sources, either labels or aggregators, and it must be correct at source! Payments to artists can't be based on crowdsourced data.

FMW : Wants to point out that Spotify aren't the only DSP facing this issue.

LC : Data from the publishers is usually inconsistent, so they don't provide it at all. Source data is usually patchy at best so needs a lot of work to be fixed.

CW : From a lawyer's perspective, would a DSP be sued if they didn't pay to artists? Currently no. There has to be an incentive to pay up! Enforcing payments is expensive but if the threat is real, then payments are more likely to be made. It will depend on who is holding the stick!

PC : It is difficult to track who is in the studio during a recording! He currently relies on a google doc to keep track but there is currently no incentive to go any further to get the data right.

Data should only be entered once to be efficient and ensure it's correct.

TW : Artists need to be made aware that this data is valuable to them as artists.

PC : There is less incentive for managers to gather accurate data for everyone involved if those people aren't being managed by them.

MYCELIA

TN : Services need to understand the importance of data to artists but they can find that confusing. Users can find the concept confusing too.

PF : Wrote a dissertation on streaming companies and how they can become profitable. Features are the differentiators for services and data can become that differentiator, so helping music discovery. Algorithms can only help in music discovery if they are right.

EB : Curating content from a new angle is important. The DSPs currently don't have the composition info but they also don't have any liabilities to the wider members of an artist's team. If Mycelia were to exist, this could be the stick to beat the DSPs with! Record labels provide the info to the DSPs currently - if Mycelia were to exist, record labels and aggregators may not be needed and could be missed out, leaving more money for artists.

CS : There will be a manpower waste to figure out and clean up the data. Lots of companies currently have to hold back payments in escrow. They can't pay it out because they don't know who to pay it to and they can't spend it until they find who to pay. Spotify receive bad PR for not distributing funds but they rely on the information given to them by the labels and aggregators.

Many consumers are concerned by this issue and are becoming more interested in fairtrade and ethical music.

LC : Mycelia won't only be talking to the DSPs. Wider data will be available for other organisations too…

FMW : (Drew diagram of Artists feeding info into Mycelia, Mycelia providing data to Services, Services paying money into Mycelia and Mycelia paying out to Artists)

Why use a blockchain database rather than a standard? So that one organisation does not own all the data. A database is like a filing cabinet. A blockchain database is like lots of filing cabinets and data become locked once it is put in there.

PC : The ledger will have back-ups that can't be changed, only added to.

FMW : This is an advantage but also a disadvantage.

Hypothetically, what is Mycelia? Could it be a collection of decentralised data?

JH : The Creative Passport and Mycelia are two different things. The CP is a data standard.

CT : The system can then be used by other artists, eg photographers.

MYCELIA

FMW : Artists will make their CPs by entering data. Services then have access to that data. Who determines how much those services pay for access to that data? Who determines any disputes?

BD : Services can also add data, for example Ableton will be able to add data gained during a song's production.

FMW : Yes, it will be able to communicate contributions too.

BD : Labels and Publishers are also 'creators'.

EB : What 'money' is being referred to here?

FMW : If a company wants to run a search query, they will have to pay to buy that search.

EB : Is it not open-data and therefore free?

FMW : Yes! A process is needed to decide what gets charged for. It will need to be an ever-evolving process and for dispute resolution too. Who will run that system? What interactions are needed?

DS : Will there be a cost to store data...

FMW : ...and update it?

EB : So we are not talking about money streams coming out?

BD : Yes, money will travel in both directions.

FMW : As an example, if the LCO were to upload all their info on their recordings, services will pay Mycelia to access that data.

EB : There is an inherent problem in 'selling' data that is 'open'.

CW : Blockchain is not the best for this!

EB : Someone owns the data but the technical layer is distributed, not the data within it.

CW : If companies aren't paying for access, is there another way? Data is IP, which can't be enforced. There is a system that's possible where data is free but has enforceable IP rights. But this gives the owner a 'stick'. An economic system does not have to exist around the metadata.

BD : There will be costs of maintenance and storage etc etc.

CW : Dispute resolution looms large. If an artist, manager or label disputes the data, who wins? Currently it is usually the artist!

TN : Why do labels exist?

CW : Artists have more right to change the data. It is usually simple for artists to change existing data, for labels and managers it is more difficult.

TW : Is Mycelia to be a distributed network?

CS : We are assuming that anyone can enter data. Why not design a system that needs all party's input before it gets entered?

FMW : If making a database on the blockchain, how does any money go into the system?

EB : It is about building a stick for individuals to enforce their rights. It doesn't have to be expensive, maybe £500k. If the value is for the individual artists, may them pay!!

CS : Other groups are also building similar things, with different angles. Will this be building a parallel system with KENUP? Rightsnow.eu is a pan-european initiative to build and run a database on a Not For Profit basis. Probably using data on a Day Zero basis. Once built, Mycelia can dock into this database. It could solve the problem of building another expensive database.

JH : Who else is doing this and are they all NFPs?

CS : Mixture for an example.

JH : Mycelia needs to work towards a standard.

DH : We should divorce data from the application and have all data standardised. There is another route in Open Protocol. Mycelia should work towards using the same methodologies.

PC : A high level blockchain protocol is needed. Is that under discussion here?

DH : It won't necessarily all be built on the blockchain…

CS : So many resources are going into doing the same thing. Benji has applied for a patent for adding data to the blockchain!!

⊙ MYCELIA

FMW : High level question - what is the Creative Passport?

CS : The CP is a core base level of data that needed.

FMW : Is the CP not a collection of metadata?

LC : Mycelia is the seedbed for services, a&r etc, from which to grow a business, maybe with a coin-based product share. The Artist's CP, provides a focal point of how that data is disseminated and monetised. It must have one data entry point only.

JH : Mycelia is a 'system'. Will there be other systems?

LC : It is a framework in which data will exist.

EB : Mycelia is not a metadata system but an identity system. This is much cheaper as data sources can be brought in from other services.

TW : It needs to be for the artist, by the artist, plus additional services too.

CT : It should store as little data on the blockchain as possible as it is very expensive. Some kinds of data must be totally off the blockchain. There are data rules to bear in mind. Sees the CP as an artist's digital ID, which organises data from all other services as a layer of verified data.

TW : Under new GDPR rules, personal information can't be on the blockchain due to the 'right to remove'. If CP is a 'wallet', for example with the number 101, this verified ID can be on the blockchain. Then other services, eg PRS can apply to wallet number 101 on the blockchain but then off chain, data can be shared through distributed identifiers. Centralised systems are having to be used for now but in future, phone or raspberry pi will be able to be used as identifiers.

FMW : Any time data is added to the blockchain, it must be paid for.

DH : New blockchains are arriving all the time, for example new personal ones. Tomorrow there'll be more!! Mycelia and the CP need to decide on their business functions first, then find a blockchain later!

FMW : If data is being added, still someone has to pay!

DH : Some services are free…

MYCELIA

CW : There is no shortage of ID providers providing competing services. Mycelia can't out-compete these. It is best to provide something that is useful to all of these systems, meaning interoperability is key and common standards are needed. Authority of data is important too - if data is conflicting, which data is to be used?

FMW : Where will the data be stored? Wherever it is, it costs money…

DH : The market will decide how much it will cost. As with some email services now, some are free, some cost a subscription.

DH : If Mycelia tries to 'landgrab', we don't yet have standards for the music and media industries. If Mycelia tries to create a system, then the big companies will squash it. How does it standard 'requests' to the database? How does it deal with dispute resolution? The CP concept could be replicated by lots of other services.

BD : Mycelia needs to work out a business model where it pays for itself.

CW : Make organisations pay…

TW : In other areas, Yoti are currently building new standards for ticketing for festivals and airlines as in the future, your face will be your ticket. Similarly in Mycelia's case, it needs to gain traction with the big players and then move on…

DS : Is standardisation the winning feature?

LC : This is the Business Group, not the Technical Group! There is another route, by charging other services to find musicians and artists.

FMW : If the data is accurate, Mycelia can charge for it.

LC : Mycelia has to assume it will work, then make it work!

TW : What can Mycelia offer to managers, as well as artists? There needs to be only one entry point of data…

FMW : What data is already being built?

CT : Rchain has fees for storing data.

FMW : Then it can't be a free system. Mycelia must pay to store data, who pays? The Artist?

CT : Monetisation will come from services using the system to find artists. It should start off by storing small amounts of data and importing other data from other services or

MYCELIA

gathering newly entered data. It can then use this data as a basis for talking to other services. Going back to TW's point from earlier, if verification is stored on phones, what happens if it gets lost?

FMW : Who pays for this data to be stored?

CT :   The only blockchain part of the system is the actual user ID - will it be paid for by Mycelia or the user? If there are any changes to the ID, then a whole new ID is needed.

FMW : Entered data will go to pockets, following the protocols set.

CT :   What if two services are offering the same thing?

FMW : Then the data is not owned by the individual!

DS :   Currently, our social media accounts are paid for by advertising. There will have to be a cultural shift into paying for it ourselves.

CT :   What is data 'ownership'? We will have to be able to prove it… If all data is stored on the phone, then it will be a nightmare if the phone is lost…

DS :   What is the value proposition? One is the potential for syncs and new commissions. In her line of work, being able to quickly find, for example, a harmonica playing vegan, is super important. As a music supervisor, being able to find people, particularly new people, quickly and efficiently is key.

FMW : So how will artists add 'choice' data, rather than simply 'service' data. Might this be via another company that springs up?

CT :   Who will store this choice data and who pays for that?

CS :   Currently, music supervisors have to pay an imdb pro subscription to access deeper information on artists. Mycelia could operate in the same way.

FMW : If verified ID info goes onto the blockchain, maybe that info is paid for by the individual, with access to data pools, for example the Creative Passport, offering a subscription model.

CS :   Yes, as a convenience fee! Welcome, if it helps to solve problems quickly.

WS :   An ID, which links to data, must have some standards. If all data is stored, then personal data can't be stored on a decentralised basis. The main value the CP can offer is the link to the data.

MYCELIA

BD :   Imogen wants to shift the balance of power from the labels to the artists but that also means shifting the responsibility.

LC :   Various assumptions are being made about disintermediating the data and ownership of the data. The salient point is who is the fulcrum in this situation? The CP can become this fulcrum. The owner of the CP or editorial content etc is the artist or creator.

FMW : The distributed ID is to be stored on the blockchain, and only that, and services communicate with it using that DID.

LC :   We should be looking at this from the viewpoint of the CP downwards.

CH :   Imogen's model works for lots of independents, where lots of contributors are very common. But are we recreating collective licensing?

LC :   CPs will be a focus for existing data.

CT :   The artist will be able to approve or disapprove data.

CH :   Currently, artists have to seek approval for things but Mycelia possibly risks recreating the wheel.

AB :   We need to remove the problem of permissions and put artists at the forefront of the conversation regarding syncs etc.

FMW : Sync services accessing the CP data will know that it is correct.

CS :   But the CP won't be mandatory! Some artists want a label and manager…

WS :   Collection societies will still be needed! IDs will have to be widely available and not just within music.

FMW : The ID layer of the CP is also a 'permissions layer'. Could it also contain a rights layer?

CT :   Resonate has a rights service built in.

FMW : The CP can reference another service for this information. Where will personal information go to?

LC :   Into the CP!!

FMW : OK - who stores and who pays for this?

CW :   Can the CP provide a set of pointers, with the verified ID working, similar to wikipedia?

FMW : The data needs to be structured properly and wikipedia's isn't…

JH :   The CP needs to contain pre-emptive data, for example which shoes I wear.

FMW : Where does this data live? Would personal likes and dislikes not be another service on Mycelia that links in?

CT :   Only small amounts of data will be able to live on phones…

CS :   If, as an example, YouTube reports back to the CP/ID layer that the artist has received 1m plays, would this information be useful to other services and would they be be able to publicise this?

LC :   The CP will give permissions as to how this data can be used.

FMW : To summarise:

Only the ID part of the CP goes onto the blockchain. Everything else stays offchain.

How will data be managed by the services? Shared? No

How does the individual update data in the 'services'?

The CP is needed for user's data, ie things they want to publish, becoming their version of their reality.

Different people will choose different ID solutions, therefore this must be kept separate from the CP info.

If the CP is a database, who owns it and who pays for it?

How to build, maintain and survive the CP database?

IH :   At which layer of usage? A service, or an individual looking for, say, a female cellist?

CS :   Individuals will need to be able to find one another to collaborate.

FMW : So could data be sent by services for the individual to 'clean'?

⏵ MYCELIA

CW : DSPs may not want to share all data, eg regarding play numbers.

CS : Where would the smart contracts come in?

IH : A database of songs doesn't exist yet but it will. It will either be new or it could be an opening up of existing databases.

FMW : A songs database will be a service on Mycelia.

BD : Then can we charge services to be part of Mycelia?

IH : There will be customisable public and private blockchains arriving. Or we can design our own blockchain in the future. We need to imagine it is a given thing and then work from there.

JH : There is a cost attached to editing blockchain data.

FMW : And GDPR?

TW : Whether data is anonymous or pseudo-anonymous makes the difference. GDPR is very much about the 'right to remove'. Blockchain is unchangeable but a 'super node' can be built with different permissions.

FMW : Who pays for the cost of this data to be uploaded and stored?

CW : It won't be a public blockchain? In that case, Mycelia will have to charge the nodes.

TW : Artists can pay initially?

FMW : A nodal system and the token economy come into play here. Mycelia could pay miners to clean and store the data, then pay back to artists. Who can be a node? And what about governance?

(Drew diagram of Data Adders uploading data, which has a cost involved, which then the Services use, which generates money, which then gets paid to the Data Adders)

So Mycelia can use income from the Services ahead of when it's received to pay the Data Adders.

If everyone is using the same system it is beneficial to get the data right. Who has voting rights on whether the data is correct? And are there rights to veto?

CW : Why not one user / one vote?

MYCELIA

BD :   Could tokens be sold to other artists?

CW :   There can be no delegation of rights.

IH :   Could the Artists' teams have rights?

FMW : Ideally, it would be good to allow other people to update data too. Mycelia could create penalties for those who enter bad data.

GM :   Use a carrot, not a stick by incentivising people to get it right in the first place.

IH :   If a user is showing signs of misusing data, then that user's costs to upload data could be higher than others?

TW :   Any data disputes could bring your reputation down.

IH :   And if there is a contest, that money is held in escrow.

FMW : Maybe only certain people are allowed to edit an artist's data. The net could be wide or tight. And yes, data adders should be incentivised to get it right.

GM :   Re data contention, what happens if people spuriously attempt to claim rights? There will need to be limits in place to stop people doing this.

IH :   This system is not just about songs. There are other needs for the CP and Mycelia. Other apps for music makers could help develop standards for other uses.

FMW : In that case, Mycelia either needs to start with cash to build the system or charge people to access the data contained within it.

IH :   The CP has to function for the benefit of music makers. We'll need to encourage more users and develop smart contracts for collaborations etc.

FMW : There are two reasons for the CP to be separate to Mycelia.

IH :   Is is not that blockchain and smart contracts are what is needed?

FMW : Governance of the system and smart contracts aren't linked. Whichever entity needs to develop the CP will have one set of questions and whichever entity is to develop the smart contracts will have another set of questions.

◆ MYCELIA

CW : The CP can become one of several oracles. Other things are needed to fill into the smart contracts. Will these have different business objectives? Will the be distinct or separate to the CP?

FMW : The CP needs to be uncompetitive.

LC : Who owns the data? Some deals can't be on smart contracts.

GM : It needs to have the ability to filter down to do the transactions. It needs to make things easy. The filtering has to take a user to a trusted source of collaboration. There is a transactional benefit there.

FMW : If an ID is claimed and a CP made, then this has to be validated by the network. Services will be able to see this validation and will pay to access the data and initiate a contract.

GM : Having verified info on the system can generate tokens for the artist, who can then spend these tokens to generate more work or collaborations for themselves by finding other verified info in the system.

FMW : Again, someone needs to pay to store the data.

TW : The original data-adder can receive an incentive if they input correct data.

CT : This can help filter out bad data-adders.

FMW : Rules will need to be created to add and store data.

GM : Adding data may well come from a small percentage of an artist's fanbase who will do most of the work. There could be an open forum to enter but someone closer to the artist can validate. They're the people who will need to be rewarded! We can't trust the services to get it right!

FMW : Governance should include deciding who is rewarded and who is charged. This can be delegated to the system. But the fundamental question remains, how much will it cost to add data to the system?

GM : At what point does the 'value point' of the data arrive? How much will it cost to reach this point?

BD : A philanthropic grant could help in the beginning but soon the project's sexiness runs out!

◆ MYCELIA

GM :   How much effort is needed to raise this grant?

DH :   Is this the way truly entrepreneurial people make money? There is lots of passion here but is the 'what do we need' putting a blocker in the way?

FMW : Mycelia and the CP must represent to existing services a level of maturity. If it doesn't it won't be taken seriously. This can change over time but they must be able to have mature conversations or the services will pick up on this and not risk involvement.

DH :   People will get involved but self-sustainability could be a blocker.

GM :   Sustainability? Does it need to be answered?

FMW : You have to set out with a view on how to be sustainable.

GM :   Some of this is answered by 'is this game changing?'

FMW : We need to be respectful to those who are making an input. Sustainability may not be a specific amount but we need to find an ultimate cost. The token economy could be paid in valueless tokens, asking users to hold on to the tokens for a future increase.

DH :   What is FMW's own perspective?

FMW : A DAO (Decentralised Autonomous Organisation) can franchise everyone in the system to take part.

FH :   Is there any hard research into this field?

GM :   The value is in the data but no value if the data has not been quantified. Does the 'social' relationship in the blockchain have more value? It carries more value if it facilitates collaboration.

LC :   The network effect is what is important.

FMW : Perfection of the data is what becomes valuable. If what is raised via funding isn't enough for all of the data to be entered, then what happens when those funds run out? Can Mycelia agree to pay people 'in the future' to clean the data as it's entered, meaning less risk upfront?

GM :   Large cash resources are needed to sustain clean data.

⊳ MYCELIA

Thanks to all the participants who were so excited in being part of the development of the Creative Passport, especially to our table leaders who guided the groups through the discussions, and the scribblers for the documentation.

Mobilium and Ralph Simon
for being our main sponsor for the event.

Jonathan Reekie and the Somerset House staff, who offered the venue and assisted us over the event preparation.

Looking forward to next one!

Mycelia Team