

# **Guide to Best Practices for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Editorial Activities at FMM**

## **Adopted in November 2023, revised in May and December 2025**

### **Preamble**

**It should first be emphasised that generative artificial intelligence tools can under no circumstances replace the editorial work of journalists.**

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are developing and becoming more prevalent every day, across all fields. Some of these tools can already be used to collect, format, or disseminate information.

However, it is important to establish the principles and limits for the use of these tools, particularly generative AI, within the scope of our companies' various editorial activities.

This document has been collectively developed based on a proposal from the relevant departments (editorial, digital, technical, legal), in consultation with the editorial committees (SDJs) and submitted for review to the CHIPIP (Committee for Honesty, Independence and Pluralism of Information and Programs).

This document is subject to periodic review in light of ongoing technological and legal developments. The present text is its second version.

This text listing FMM's commitments regarding the use of AI has been made available to our audiences via the France Médias Monde corporate website and our channels' websites and apps.

These recommendations are in accordance with the rules of ethics and editorial security contained in the "Compendium of texts defining our editorial framework" ("Recueil des textes définissant notre cadre éditorial") and in particular with the "FMM Journalists' Code of Ethics" (dated July 12, 2017).

Editorial productions that make use of these tools fall within the missions of the FMM group and its public service media: to provide people around the world with free, independent, verified, honest, balanced and expert information produced by professional teams who prioritise field reporting and journalism in French and 20 other languages.

It is essential, as a preamble, to recall the nature of these generative AI tools and thereby to define their limitations, and thus their possible, desirable, or prohibited fields of use. Two main points should be noted:

### **1 / A major distinction must be made between generative AI and search engines.**

At this stage, results obtained using generative AI tools are based on the frequency and probability of a given response and not on the relevance, credibility, or authority of sources, as is the case with search engines. This is thus not a technology to be used for searching for information. It is a language processing tool, not a knowledge tool.

It is also important to keep in mind that a query made to AI consumes much more energy than a query made to a search engine.

## **2 / Providing information to a generative AI tool is akin to publication**

Any sensitive or confidential information that must remain so cannot be processed by such open tools, except when their use strictly abides by the framework defined by FMM (see point 4: Confidentiality). Furthermore, any information processed by a public generative AI tool cannot be withdrawn, unlike what is possible with a search engine. Generative AI tools amalgamate data without necessarily referring to sources in their results.

### **Key Principles Guiding the Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools in Editorial Activities:**

#### **1. Systematic Human Supervision**

The model for AI use must always be: Human > Machine > Human.

In other words, the use of artificial intelligence must always be decided by a human, and the result obtained must be validated by a human.

No publication or dissemination of content created by or with AI may take place without review, verification and editorial validation.

#### **2. Reasonable Use**

**In general, the use of AI should be to assist editorial production (in preparation, during production itself, or in dissemination).**

**It can help to improve quality and originality and to reduce the time needed to process and analyse documentary sources, the reliability of which must be first be established by the journalist. In no case can it replace the editorial work of journalists, and especially not the work of source verification and cross-checking with sources in the field.**

**Within this framework defined by FMM, AI may be used for:** spelling and grammar correction; transcription of interviews to identify the most relevant passages; automatic translation of texts or interviews for documentation or as a working database; summarising texts or complex files for documentation; editorial exploitation of large datasets (data journalism); assistance in writing optimised posts for different social networks or SEO-optimised headlines; assistance in identifying information circulating on social networks; assistance in detecting false information using specific, validated tools; indexing and enhancing archive content; extraction and suggestion of keywords; automatic subtitling and synthetic voice reading to address accessibility for visually impaired audiences; editing assistance via sequence identification; reformatting assistance via automatic video cropping; automatic and simplified improvement of sound quality; assistance in generating illustrations and infographics.

**At this stage, we strictly prohibit the use of synthetic voices for dubbing. AI must not be used to generate images, sounds, or videos whose realism could mislead the public or leave room for ambiguity.**

**The generation of images and videos** is permitted only for illustrative purposes and as a last resort, without the use of photorealism, which could be misleading. Such output must be clearly labelled as having been generated by AI (see below) and comply with editorial validation processes.

A style and graphic guide for the use of AI is currently in development.

AI must **never** be used to recreate the **voice or appearance** of public figures or journalists.

### **3. Transparent Use**

Transparency must be total, **both internally and with the public**. The use of AI for certain tasks must be known to everyone on the team, particularly the editorial manager.

It is essential to clearly identify any content for the public generated by or with generative AI if:

- texts were written mainly by AI, even if they are always editorially validated
- texts were fully translated by AI, even if they are always editorially validated
- illustrative images or videos were created by or with the help of AI

When this identification cannot be made in a clearly visible manner (such as in text, image, or video), it must be indicated in the contextual elements (e.g., announced on air). If one item of content relays an image produced by AI (for example, to denounce a “fake”), the labelling must be even more visible, occupying a sufficient part of the image so that it cannot be erased by another tool (which could potentially allow us to be associated with the “fake” via a screenshot).

### **4. Confidentiality for the Protection of Data and Sources**

Great caution must be exercised when transmitting information to external platforms (e.g., ChatGPT) or using confidential content in generative AI tools. This is to protect the sources and sensitive information held by journalists.

For any professional use, it is necessary to use secure and dedicated platforms internal to FMM, especially when confidential and/or personal information or data is involved.

The current state of technology and the prospects for AI development make the traditional means of protecting/anonymising sources (blurring, voice alteration, etc.) less effective. More robust anonymisation methods must therefore be used which leave no room for later re-identification.

In the absence of a completely reliable AI tool to date for anonymising voices, our journalists should continue to read testimonies and original voices be erased.

It is also recalled that inserting content protected by copyright or related rights\* into generative AI tools is prohibited, unless the consent of all rights holders has been obtained.

*\*Related rights are rights granted to those involved in the creation of a work, but who are not considered the main author.*

### **5. Careful and Responsible Experimentation**

The constant innovation and progress in the field of AI is conducive to experimentation, curiosity, criticism and innovation. However, such experimentation must be conducted with caution to avoid the risks of data leakage and error.

Any use of AI beyond the principles set out in this guide requires prior validation by the editorial

manager and technical contacts.

Any experimentation intended to be generalised requires validation by the AI steering committee, which will consult the DAJ (Legal Affairs Department), the DPO (Data Protection Officer), and the CISO (Chief Information Security Officer) in order to carry out a legal and IT risk assessment and will require an evaluation of the project's social and environmental impact.

## **6. Training and Monitoring**

Training editorial teams on AI tools and the issues surrounding it is essential to mitigate the risks associated with generative AI and to promote responsibility and transparency. It is also essential for communicating these issues to the public.

Internally, information sharing and feedback are to be encouraged.

### **Revision of this text**

These “best practices” will be reviewed periodically, in line with technological developments and our editorial teams’ experiences. This revision will be conducted in the same framework as the initial drafting and the present version.