

FINISHED FILE

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM USA 2021

The Social Platform Dilemma: Governance Approaches to Moderate  
Legal But "Objectionable" Content

JULY 14, 2021

4:15 P.M. - 5:30 P.M. EASTERN

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
1 877 825 5234  
+001 719 481 9835  
Www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

\*\*\*

>> DUSTIN LOUP: All right. Hey, everyone. Welcome back from the break. We're going to move into our closing session of the day here, and I just want to remind you that we'll be having an informal happy hour in the Remo Room once we're done with this panel, so please stick around and talk with other attendees and participants. So, with that, I'll just go ahead and hand it over to Courtney Radsch to moderate this discussion. Courtney, I'm sorry about that.

Go ahead, now.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Okay. Great. Great. Thank you so much, everyone. It is a pleasure to be here. My name is Courtney Radsch, and I am an Independent Scholar, a freelance journalist, and former advocacy director at the Committee to Protect Journalists where we've worked quite a bit on the issue of online content moderation and I'm really delighted to welcome everyone to this session. I want to ask everyone who is here watching, either on Twitter or here on the livestream to use the chat function to hopefully engage with us, ask your questions, and I will weave those in.

We are here for the panel, the Social Platform Dilemma, Governance Approaches to Moderate Legal but Objectionable Content and I think everyone here watching knows that content moderation has become a flash point in questions about how decisions are made, what rural government should play self-regulation works turned governance into a household topic of conversation. What should social media platforms be doing about content legal but objectionable, lawful but awful, and content that offends or considered hateful or violent and possibly misleading but isn't illegal in the United States. So, some want government to force social media to do more and better content moderation and others perceive a bias and want to force platforms to stop moderating. We are not going to get into the politics of these views, but rather their implications for content moderation and Internet governance more broadly. Even while policymakers are considering what if any role they should play in this issue, new models of public/private partnership, coordination have emerged giving rise to a host of self-regulatory and co-regulatory models with various roles for the private sector, Civil Society, and government.

So, this is the focus of today's panel. We'll kick off first, however, by hearing from two people on either side of the debate over government's role in this topic, which recently flared up in Florida with the passage of SB7072 which would have banned deplatforming of politicians and perceived viewpoint bias had it not been prevented from going into effect following a law suit

alleging it violated the first amendment and the Commercial Clause of the Constitution, so first we're going to hear from James Taylor, President of the Heartland Institute that supports the Florida approach followed by Steve DelBianco that filed a law suit and won preliminary. They'll respond for three minutes and have two minutes to respond and then we'll go to a stellar panel of experts and practitioners involved in industry and multistakeholder efforts. I'm going to weave the questions in throughout, and then, we're going to bring all of our panelists in to answer questions, including Steve and James, so we'll do an open Q&A after that. James, over to you for three minutes.

>> JAMES TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you so much, Courtney. First of all, the Heartland Institute a free-market public policy organization, and our objective, our mission is to discover, develop, and promote freedom-oriented solutions to the problems that confront society.

If you would have asked me a year ago whether we would be squaring off with Net Choice in state legislatures around the country, I would have thought you were crazy because we have for so long championed and defended the rights of Internet providers of tech companies, et cetera, where some folks have said that because of their sheer size and reach they need to be broken up. We've always advocated and we still do that size alone does not make an entity harmful, does not require breaking them up. However, during the past year, we have become very concerned, as have so many of the people that we work with within Heartland, about some of the big tech companies that have attained a dominant market share that have become, in effect, a common carrier for the way people communicate and exercise free speech rights and how they're, as you say, regulating content.

One of the things I would like to note is that we haven't come out in support of the Florida approach, as you said, but we do support state legislators looking at, and I think enacting protections for online free speech, but we haven't come out for or against specifically the Florida Plan but I think there are some

really important things in that legislation that other states can and should emulate and that I hope are upheld.

Now, one thing that really jumps out at me in the introduction, you mentioned how we regulate, we being tech companies and social media platforms, regulate, quote, objectionable content, and as you said awful but lawful. Now, if this were simply tech companies and media platforms, adhering to the spirit of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act I don't think we would have an issue right now because Section 230, explicitly, called the Communication Decency Act and has good samaritan provision in the explicit examples, the examples are related to sexual obscenity, violence, harassment, and it's not a situation where the tech providers who dominate the market can shut down people who question what the government says about the coronavirus origins, shut down what climate scientists can say about climate scientists and shut down conversations among users about social/political topics, et cetera. That's why we're involved. We're advocating for freedom. We would like to see the tech companies go back to the original mandate and we would be quite happy with that.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, James. Steve, over to you. Three minutes.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Courtney. Glad to be here. Several times I heard James talk about the need for public square, an online public square, and anybody who wants an online public square that desperately should want the government to create its own. Ask President Biden to create America's public square dot gov because that's a far better way to create the online public square that James wants than trying to nationalize private businesses like Facebook, Twitter and YouTube and make them instruments of the government. James likes to talk about the interplay between the First Amendment and Section 230, but the First Amendment is clear that Congress shall make no law establishment of provision, prohibiting the free exercise thereof or freedom of speech. The government cannot force newspapers or social media platforms to carry speech they don't want to carry. And as for the argument that

our First Amendment can be discarded because social media platforms are the public square, we've had Courts in America confirm over and over again as if Prager that the Court said despite YouTube ubiquity and role as public-facing platform, it remains a private platform and it is not a public forum subject to judicial scrutiny under the First Amendment. Look, the clear thing here is the First Amendment protects social media platforms from Congress and from the state legislatures and it's not the other way around. The First Amendment was 230 years ago today and Section 230 was a 1996 legislative remedy because the real-life character in the Wolf of Wall Street had a law suit against Project Bulletin Board and more on that later, but 230 is not what's going on here and the confusion is rampant. Even The New York Times had to correct the story last week, quote an earlier version of this article misstated what allows social media firms to remove posts that violate their standards. It is the First Amendment and not Section 230, quote. The Florida court as you described was not confused at all. When we sued to block that law on June 30th, the Federal Court enjoined Florida's law as violating the First amendment and intruded on social media and compelled private businesses to host speech they don't want to carry. So, if you quote the ruling, I think it's really instructive to James, quote, the state has asserted it's on the side of the first amendment and that the plaintiffs are not. It is perhaps a nice sound bite but the assertion is holding at odds with accepted constitutional principles. The first amendment says Congress shall make no law bridging the freedom of speech or the press and the Federal Court in Florida went on to block all of the content moderation provisions, so James, it's more likely that more of your recommended state laws will be blocked by the first amendment and we'll sue everywhere we need to.

You will only be encouraging, therefore, moderation standards that you want to eliminate because you'll simply confirm here what the Federal Court said that state governments cannot violate the first amendment by forcing social media to carry content they don't want to carry. So, I'll close by saying that James, if you really

want to create a wide-open public square, get busy on that and stop trying to nationalize private social media platforms that are just trying to create and foster the communities that they want to build.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Names, let's go to you for two minutes. One of the key issues here around the content moderation, raising the common carrier idea, but you know we do have requirements for broadcast and it sounds like is that kind of what the idea is here? You want more regulation that would permit these platforms be treated as common carriers?

>> JAMES TAYLOR: What we're looking for is unalienable free speech rights not to be trampled by entities that deliberately enter, capture, and then dominate the market for free speech. Free speech does not exist because government benevolently gave it to us for the first time in the first amendment. Our free speech rights supersede and precede the first amendment. The first amendment affirms government is not going to encroach upon those unalienable rights. Now whether it's the government or it's a multinational corporation that's stifling people's free speech rights, either way that is not permissible. These are entities that have deliberately entered into that market, a market of user-based platforms, and then have decided that rather than simply policing violence and sexual obscenity, now want to tell us that we cannot question government statements about the origins of the coronavirus, we cannot present evidence that hydroxychloroquine may be useful and question what the United Nations tells us about global warming and can't share with friends and neighbors our own beliefs. This isn't a matter of compelling private multinational corporations to say something they don't want to say, they can say whatever they want. They can paste it at the end of people's comments, but it's like if I were to buy the cell phone tower in my neighborhood, listen in to my neighbor's conversations and cut off anything I don't like. I'm sorry, that's just not acceptable in a modern society. This is the same thing.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thanks, James. Steve, how would you respond and taking into account that there are many people that feel

that their ability to communicate freely on tech platforms, especially on the dominant social media platform is restricted either based on viewpoints, whether you're a Palestinian activist or, you know, a variety of different points of view. Can you respond in two minutes?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Courtney. As you indicated at the beginning, this is a squeeze play. There are elements of our government at the state and federal level that want more content moderation by the social media platforms, and there are elements that prefer less content regulation. Neither because of the first amendment, neither can impose their will on private platforms like Facebook, Google, and Twitter. They are trying to build communities, and they will make value judgments over time in response to new and emerging threats, who knew the tied pod challenge was going to get teenager's attention, right, who knew we had to prepare for a pandemic, and frankly when you think about the kind of speech they want to force these platforms to carry, when I testified in Texas against a very similar law that Mr. Taylor is pushing, the only supporters other than Heartland were antivaxxers who wanted to be sure to face Facebook, Twitter and Google to carry lots of information about the dangers of vaccines to people on social media, and if those platforms don't want to carry that for their own reasons, if it doesn't fit their vision, then people are free to go to other platforms. There are zero barriers to entry to start a new social media platform. Rumble, Parlor, MeWe, they've all been able to achieve millions of subscribers and it's easy for people to join multiple social media platforms, and you can choose, therefore, to go to one that maybe has a light touch on content moderation, but beware because the more awful but lawful tent on a social media platform, the less likely it is for advertisers to want to see their ads displayed to that kind of content and when the advertisers go away, I don't know who is going to pay to make that free for subscribers.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Steve. That is the perfect intro to the panel because we actually will be hearing from someone

who is representing the advertising industry. So, look, this is just a teaser. We could debate this issue for the entire panel, but I'm going to ask Steve and James to go on mute and we're going to have a discussion with a group of experts because clearly in addition to these two that we've just heard from, because clearly there is no consensus about whether governments can or should regulate content moderation or even what the regulatory framework that should govern these companies is.

But as the two sides duke it out and courts have their say there are a plethora of other initiatives on the way arisen in the last few years aimed at providing a framework for content moderation through self-regulation, and in particular countering violent extremism online and combating hate speech have given rise to a number of such initiatives such as the global Internet Forum for counter terrorism or the GIFCT, the Christ church call to irradiate terrorism from the Internet, we heard mention of the pandemic and rise that's given to fight disinformation and inaccurate information and so we're going to hear from the panel, and then I'm going to invite the audience to submit questions in the chat, and I'm watching it both in the Q&A as well as the chat, and so if you have a specific question, do please put it into the Q&A. I'm going to weave those into the extent that I can and that they're relevant. And then I am going to -- we're going to hear from all of our panelists. First, Farzaneh. You're the Director of social media governance at Yale Law School and involved in the Christ Church call advisory network along with myself, serve on the advisory network and studied this issue for quite some time. We heard earlier about the government wants to regulate content and make these rules and meanwhile we're seeing all of these efforts to figure it out while the regulators are getting their house in order. Can you talk about or give us an overview of some of the key content moderation approaches, the models you've seen emerge recently and what we really need to keep in mind as we assess the models? Take about two or three minutes. Thank you.

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you, Courtney. So, we see a few



emerging trends in governance landscape of platform governance. One and these are in my opinion and of course it's not going to be inclusive within like three minutes, so one is governing -- instead of governing pieces of content, we actually can move to governing user behavior, so takedown is not the only answer, and the platforms have been slowly but surely paying attention to the fact that takedown might not be as effective as we think.

And there is also a return to community governance because in the past, we had community that -- we had communities online that would get involved with the governance and remove or flag various pieces of content, but then now we see kind of like platforms that are newer like Discord and Nextdoor and others and even Twitter has an experimental program called BirdWatch to give the community, not the full power of course, but to give the community a choice.

Then the third one is maybe related to number two, is the expansion of governance by including the elite, and I'm not calling them elite, it's not a key word, they have content advisory network, Tik Tok has advisory network, Match.com and also Tinder has one, and then we get to the multistakeholder governance which is kind of newer governance approach that we see and one prime example of it is as you mention is the Christ Church Call which New Zealand and France decided to come up with to irradiate online extremists and violent content, but it was in the beginning a bunch of commitments that took corporations and governments to come up with, but now it has slowly evolved into multistakeholder approach, various workstreams, advisory network as you mentioned, which Civil Society is active there, and then of course it's non-binding, and yeah that's about it, I think, and my time is up.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Great, well one of the things relevant also to mention is that it's linked with the Global Internet Forum for counter terrorism, the GIFCT which was an industrial-led approach to get rid of essentially ISIS and Al Qaeda content and since expanded to now include additional types of extremist and violent content and coordinate through the use of a hash database a database of digital fingerprints that link to the media videos, et

cetera, associated with the content. Before we move on can you tell us a little about that governance model, the idea of coordinating content moderation and in this case it is, you know, pure kind of take-down or leave up across platforms, and especially when the GIFCT was started by Facebook, Twitter, Google, some of the biggest companies in the world, and now you have many smaller companies who might be just using that as a way to shorthand remove content and as we know from the companies, there are -- there is no actual database of the content, so there is no way to audit what's being removed and whether it's valid or not. Can you talk briefly about what governance issues that raises?

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: Yes, and that's a very bad idea, in my opinion, to not only it reinstated the big corporation, tech corporation business model so everybody has to be like them in order to be able to succeed in the market and then we're just going to have multiple Facebook which is frightening. It does that, and it also has implications for freedom of expression, and imagine that you are making and mistaking by taking one piece of content down, and that mistake is kind of harmonized mistake across the platform, all of them make that mistake, and this is what I think GIFCT should prevent and not really work and not really kind of follow that approach.

The other problem with the hash database is that the concept of upload filters that we've been working on together, you know, they have this hash database and then also like affect the Internet architecture by having the kind of like harmonizing the hash database and also not having like making upload filters. Thank you.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Farzaneh, yes. And for transparency we're on the Christ Church Call network and also involved with the GIFCT transparency groups as I am in the groups and we're involved and has given us some inside input and we'll get to that later on. I want to move to Julia Owono and you're Executive Director of and Facebook Oversight Board, and we have a question here from Eric about how tech companies work with Civil

Society to create a code of conduct, and I think the Facebook oversight board is a really interesting example of that, so can you tell us, you know, what is this board and its approach to content moderation and who is involved and is it working?

>> JULIE OWONO: Thank you so much, Courtney. Hello, everyone. I'm very happy to be here. It's my first IGF USA so I'm particularly excited. So, yes, the oversight board is definitely part of all of this multi-faceted set of solutions that are required on the issue that we're talking about, which is content moderation, especially on social media platforms. And I would even go as far as to say that it's a -- it's a body, an initiative that takes into account two very important features when we talk about content moderation now, which is multistakeholderism and globality, and I apologize because I have some people who want to get in, but they will go away soon. Why are these two features important? First of all because we're creating a network, which is by definition interdependent, so there is no way that only one actor of the network will have the solutions to tackle these very complicated issues, and also globality, why? Well, because those platforms, many or all of them, virtually, are by design intending to be accessible everywhere around the world, to every user, any citizen around the world, and so this is required to understand -- I mean, these are two very important features right now when we want to do good content moderation. And how does the board fit into this, you know, this landscape and how do we respond to these two challenges which are multistakeholderism and globality? Well, first of all we make binding decisions and recommendations on the content moderation decisions that have been taken by Facebook and Instagram, two of the most important social media platforms. The binding decisions are extremely important because the company has to implement them, and then the recommendations, although non-binding, they're an extremely important and powerful tool to force open conversations about Facebook's content moderation decisions and also hold the company accountable because Facebook has to publicly respond to all the recommendations that we make and explain whether or not it will

implement them, and if it does not implement it, why it won't do so. So, this is extremely important and one of the reasons that I personally chose to join the oversight board.

The second thing that I think is important to mention is that collaboration between not only the board and the company in this open conversation that I was just mentioning, but also between the board, the users, and Civil Society organizations in general. How do we do that? Well, one of the ways we do that is through the public comments that we allow users and organizations to submit when we take a case. For instance, as we're speaking today, it's the deadline for public comment period that is open for a new case that we accepted, and that involves something that you were briefly mentioning and referring to, Courtney, which is a content posted in the frame of the Israeli and Palestinian conflict. It's an extremely important case that will certainly open up a lot of debate, and I really encourage everyone here who can and interested to submit comments today.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you. Nope, that's okay jewel jowl and transparency and published work at the end of the year and we have an implementation network tracking progress we make. thank you. Courtney.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Great. Thank you so much, Julie. That is incredibly helpful. One of the things that I think Farzaneh alluded to is there are opportunities to influence content moderation, but it's interesting when we were deciding, for example, the committee are we going to engage with the board, are we going to make submissions that is, essentially, unpaid labor. It's another body that you then have to somehow provide input and try to influence, and you know put that capital, whether you're an NGO or law firm or private company, I think you guys get submissions from all sorts of folks, but there are -- that is a form of unpaid labor for the most -- one of the wealthiest companies in the world which I think is an interesting dynamic that some panels should get into but probably not this one because I actually want to move on now to Rob Rakowitz because we heard earlier that, you know, if the advertisers

don't like the content that's on a platform, they're going to go off and leave. And we actually see that the global alliance for responsible media or GARM was created at the World Federation of Advertisers because I think in part you saw efforts to boycott the platforms because of hate speech, you saw advertisers trying to pressure for content moderation, and Rob, I want to ask you, you know, first of all, tell us a little more about GARM because I don't think people are that familiar with it, and is it fair to say GARM harnesses the power of advertisers to authorize content moderation policy, and to Julie's point about the globalism and multistakeholderism that is needed to like legitimize these efforts, this is very different because it's just the private sector, it's advertisers working directly with tech platform, and so give us your thoughts on that, Rob.

>> ROB RAKOWITZ: Yeah. Absolutely. So, thank you for having me, and I think it's really important for us to sort of clarify our creation story and truly what we're actually working on. So, look, brand safety has been around, brand safety, EG, the placement of advertising in places where it should not be because it's either sort of not suitable for the brands or it is considered harmful for society or users, has been around since you know 2004 when you had sort of social sharing sites of, you know, piracy, pornography, et cetera, et cetera, it's obviously sort of grown and grown because of two facets; because one, advertisers shifted over toward buying audiences and not buying content and the marketplace actually enabled that. Second thing is you have the rise of UGC-based social media networks that have their own policies. Now, what in essence has been created, therefore, is an asymmetry in the marketplace in terms of different policies that exist, clarity on policies, and basically, we ended up in a situation where consumers, users, were -- had a basic right sort of infringed upon which is the freedom to have an online experience free from harm and hate. And you had advertisers, most importantly, from my perspective because I represent advertisers, who were operating in a situation where they didn't have a right to determine where their ad showed up online.

GARM was started up prior to the live casting of the Cries Church Massacre and it had come from sort of certainly experience when I was head of media at MARS where we had a series of incidents on a series of platforms in a series of markets and we just kept on going into sort of the same model, which was a means of Wack a Mole where there was a problem here you wack it down, and then the problem would sort of pop up on a different network in a different way. And the industry wasn't sort of facing into it, and what we decided to do was that we said that multiple advertisers needed to work together, and more importantly, the platforms needed to work together to actually define a process and a codification that would allow for the understanding of what is truly harmful content in the view of advertisers, e.g., monetization, monetization and clearly contingencies in where we operate. We need transparency on moderation processes which is something that we have been working on, and more of what we see is that inconsistent enforcement of moderation, and so a lot of things we're even seeing in the UK now after the game is just really poor moderation because when you look at it, it is clear bullying, racist, hate speech, and so you know the industry continues to falter on this and it's just where we've been is sort of creating standards as well as controls that basically allow for a consistent approach towards what is harmful and how does that actually play into monetization that gives brands more visibility, more control.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Rob. I think it's interesting because in the Facebook oversight board decision on the deplatforming of President Trump they were discussing the importance of consistency and you are seeking the same for advertisers, thank you, Rob. I want to turn to the final panelist Alex Feerst the general counsel at head of legal and trust and safety at publishing platform of Media and Alex you've also been involved in the Digital Trust and Safety Partnership and trust and safety association and when it comes down to it it's the trust and safety teams who are the ones doing content moderation, the people you described as the Judges and janitors of the Internet, and of course they're also

helped by algorithms which have their own basket of challenges. So, but what are these new initiatives aiming for when it comes to content moderation?

>> ALEX FEERST: Yeah. Thanks, Courtney. So, I guess the digital trust and safety partnership which launched in March and I spent a good amount of time on, was an attempt to -- in a way that is like complementary but different from GIFCT, but trying to set the bar and raise the bar on questions of like what does it look like to -- for a company or for a startup, to have a trust and safety team that does this work with excellence? Right. I think it arguably, trust and safety, you know, what everyone thinks of its existence, it's sort of coalescing or maybe now coalesced into something that looks like a coherent or discipline for me as English major as opposed to as one of the few things I can do in tech, and so it has hit a phase of maturity where there are questions of rigger we're trying to arrive at around sort of best practices of what it looks like to have a mature trust and safety team anticipating risks well associated with any given product or feature, and how is it mitigating those risks by working with the product team well, and anticipating questions around monetization or around effects on communities and around the different human impacts. You know, are there clear governance documents that are iterated and made available to the public so that it is clear, you know, if a platform intervenes, you know, into a piece of content or into somebody's conduct, why is that happening? Is the application of the rule being made clear? Is somebody being given notice? As you said, what tech tools are you using? Are you, you know, using AI to make proactive decisions on whether something is going viral and very harmful or using, you know, maybe machine learning to flag something to bring it to human attention? And then, finally, can we arrive at some initial best practices around transparency of making clear what it is you're doing of logging things like this and making clear, you know, either through products or in the product itself or in through regularly published reports and how the work is getting done. And the hope here is several things. One of them, like I

said, is to try to establish a sense of rigour and consistency of how the work is done without necessarily arriving at consistency of how it gets done at each company, meaning like companies may have different views of hate speech, may have different definitions of hate speech, may take different approaches whether they want to take a light touch or not to mitigate what they see as harms, but maybe we can agree on best practices of what it looks like to have an appropriately competent group of people who are thinking about the issues and who are well trained, and who are making their work discernible to the public in a way that is still flexible enough that the content can tell the issue that Farzaneh alluded to we don't have companies making all the same decisions and same outcomes and we want standards of decisions to allow each of the companies and products to arrive at potentially different outcomes so the sort of diversity of the marketplace, that was alluded to earlier, can be preserved, and so that is sort of an effort right now but we're very encouraged by it and I think where it will arrive eventually is like having similar to social responsibility reporting, social media and companies and others having third-party assessors come in and sort of like inspect the kitchen and say like, is the trust and safety work here being done with excellence? Is it being invested in, is it meeting the standards? Where then we can start to have maybe more a trusting conversation about what work is getting done, how it's getting done, and what people's views are on how to improve it.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Alex. It's so interesting because I feel like I've heard the term of consistency used by several of the panelists, and it's not something that we have talked about a lot and we see it I think embedded, but it seems to be coming to the fora more often and I say even in the Florida Law and in the suit brought against some of the opinions about how governments should or shouldn't regulate is because of a feeling of inconsistency which can give rise to feelings of unfairness, and we have several questions in the Q&A from Milton Uler an esteemed colleague and academic and from Amir and I'm sorry I don't know who that is, but kind of several questions about moderation at the



international level and can one set of principle really scale across jurisdictions, and with Facebook can there be an inclusive board to decide what is appropriate across the thousands of languages, countries, et cetera, and how jurisdiction and legal frameworks apply. So, I want to first go to Julie, regarding the Facebook oversight board because I also know that this is something that I think you guys were cognizant of in the formation of the board but ultimately Facebook created the board so what is the idea of content moderation of scale across boundaries, and is it possible, is that how it should work?

>> JULIE OWONO: I mean we are in an interesting time where we can try experiments, definitely, and that's why this moment is particularly interesting, I find. First of all, to respond to I think Milton's excellent question, first the board itself is international, so we are 20 members so far aiming to be 40 who are coming from different backgrounds geographically, professionally, socially, gender, et cetera on the one hand. On the other hand, we're being conscious of that globality and being a product of that globality as well and make a lot of recommendations that encourage the platform as much as possible to take into account the context and to rely on expertise that knows the context. This is not impossible. It's a question of political and financial will. There have been lots of revelations, including very recently, that explained from insiders of Facebook, former insiders that explain that the company simply makes choices that are markedly -- I mean from a market perspective more interesting, and invest more in certain regions in the world compared to others because it's more interesting in the market perspective. This logic should end, at least that's the opinion of the board, and that's what we told Facebook on several occasions. The third thing I would like to respond to that is that when we make our decisions, we consult with local experts. We have policy briefs that help us to understand better the context of the publication that we'll have to oversee, and also, we commission translations, I mean anything really that can help us to have a better understanding of the context. Of

course, it's not enough.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Julie. I mean and the fact that Facebook is such a wealthy company and has the resources to devote to that sort of work is really important, and Rob, I want to ask you about GARM because I think that's a similar question there, right. It is a global alliance that you have brands and platforms from around the world and so how do you see this scaling and, you know, is this the right way to decide what's allowable? I will just add from my own perspective, working in journalism, are you guys looking at secondary effects on content moderation and, you know, yeah?

>> ROB RAKOWITZ: I mean, like look, it's monetization, 100%, right. I think everything sort of that we've seen is that bluntness is actually the enemy of diversity, and so I'll give you a sort of personal story, you know, in my days at Mars, we had an incident sort of roll up on YouTube in the UK where drill rap became a sudden phenomenon and if folks in the audience aren't aware of what that is, but it's a subgenre, specifically in the UK of rap that advocates for violence against police. And there were cases of that content being monetized, and it was you know profanity and insight into violence. There were a lot of scenarios where it was monetized and then brands run away and sort of say to ban all rap, right, because it becomes a sort of vote of confidence in terms of moderation, and failure of the platform to properly moderate and monetize, so then all of a sudden you end up on the opposite swing where you drop all rap. And now you sort of just think through that logically in terms of DE and I and suddenly you're looking at parts of the consumer landscape which is not a good thing.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: DE and I standing for diversity?

>> ROB RAKOWITZ: Diversity, equity, and inclusion, so all of a sudden you have a media plan which is white, which is not a good thing and not any brand manager would tell you or CMO would tell you that you would want that. So in essence what we've seen is that blunt is not a good thing in terms of content categorization for moderation and monetization, and then I actually say that the more

specificity that you actually have in the marketplace from a cell side, e.g. on a platform, ad tech provider, as well as agency as well as brand, you actually have the choice, and that is what we're trying to do is to restore visibility, restore choice, and fundamentally if you believe in free market economics, then we start to reward the right sort of content, the content that's right for brands individually, which is a good thing.

So -- so I think that then that sort of illustrates, you know, really what we're -- the tension there in in terms of monetization, specific pieces of content, as well as diversity, so we're not looking for homogeneity but specification which allows for diverse voices to rise to the top.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Rob. That was really helpful. I think at the root of some of these, we talked about transparency being important, about who gets to be part of this body and what the kind of implications of joining and exclusion are. So Farzaneh you characterized the Christ Church Call as government's text to quasi regulate media platforms not through legislative efforts but opaque cooperation with tech corporations. Could you expend a bit on that and also in light of what we've heard about kind of private sector, private sector cooperation as with the GARM, we've heard about the trust and safety kind of professionalization of this sector getting together, which is still ultimately private sector, and of course you know the Facebook oversight board and the GIFCT, both of which are private sector driven, so talk a little about the concerns with the quasi-governmental regulation and then also, you know, are these other models, do they pose the same challenges, are they better? Analyze this for us.

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: So that piece I wrote I think around a year and a half ago. (Laughing). So, a year ago, and, yes, at the time it was -- we were worried that this is going to end up being a quasi-regulator body that would actually work with the tech corporations and leave everyone else out of the discussion and come up with binding measures. And this is because, of course, in the beginning, and not because of malintent or anything like that, but

New Zealand or French government wanted to move really fast, and when you want to move fast, you forget that there are -- there has been like experts and Civil Society and academics that have been working on these issues. So, getting into the room with the tech corporations, they came up with this set of commitments, which frankly if you read the commitments, they are not a text from the standpoint of human rights, freedom of expression, various concerns about it. But then if it the government worked with us as you know with the advisory network and we came up with these work streams to be able to kind of come up with these policy positions, I guess and they're not binding at the moment, but the problem is when we actually want to make this binding, or if we think that this should be binding, then there will be a lot of legitimacy issues at stake. The who is deciding, why are you deciding, how are you deciding? And the governments, to New Zealand credit, they did try to be kind of inclusive, and this is a multistakeholder approach, but there will be a lot of -- a lot of considerations if the policies want to become binding, because to be honest, we are not really involved with the -- with the very important decisions, and we are trying.

But then the global issue is that however when the dictators want to get involved with it, the Christ Church Call initiative, are we going to have them like be on equal footing with the rest of us, can we discriminate, and I don't think the answer is, yes, we can discriminate. I don't think so in the international setting, unfortunately, we have to work with the dictators and that is the problem. And the other solution is to say, no, we just want to work with the West and democratic countries which is not a solution. And so that was one thing. And I'm sorry, do I have time to address the other one?

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Yes, quickly, yes.

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay. So, for the trust and safety, what I want to hear more in our discussions is, who are we talking about when we keep saying that oh, we need to protect them, we need to take content down, we need to bring -- who are we bringing this trust and safety to? And look at it from the user perspective, and

I think what we need to do, we need to put the users at the center, not necessarily have a bottom-up process because it is not -- it might not scale, but have hybrid that trust and safety works with the user to empower them because they understand better the setting and context that they're in. There are people that live in dictatorship and they have like channels, they know and understand the security issues that they might face, and also the hate speech and other factors, they understand that better than a person on trust and safety in San Francisco. And so I think we need to bring the user, and I think trust and safety departments are trying to do that as well.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Great. Thank you Farzaneh. I want to go to James since we talked about self-regulatory approaches and different types of collaborations and we have a question from Michelle who is founder of Trollbusters and talking about the algorithm harms of blocking and sharing imposter content and importance of not silencing some voices but wanting to silence others, you know, and similarly Farzaneh raising the fact that people live in very different types of contexts, so we do know that around the world, there are coordinated state actions being taken against women politicians, women journalist, journalists and politicians that aren't women, but especially women and any sort of public figure or public role, and I think that one of the -- there was a very diverse array of reactions to the deplatforming decision, so I guess I want to hear from you that do you think that the common carrier approach addresses this? Have you heard anything today that you feel like would be helpful in mitigating some of the concerns that you have raised and in addressing content moderation here?

>> JAMES TAYLOR: Great question. Thank you, Courtney. I think the common carrier discussion is very useful. I think it's very applicable. State legislators sometimes bring it up by name and others will be discussing the concepts. The reality is, and we could talk about how people have other options, but the three top social media companies here have captured 93% of the market and 98% among the top five social media companies. That is a dominant

market share. That is a dominant monopoly, and these companies work together. And then Paler comes along and Steve mentioned earlier Paler and I was telling folks a year ago, hey, trust the market, we'll have an alternative. And what happened? Parlor got destroyed, absolutely destroyed, and it's merely a shell of what it once was. Now, we're supposed to say that when tech companies, just a few, five of them controlling 98% of the market, that when they make a deliberate decision to enter this sphere, to control it, to dominate it, and then to suppress free speech, let's just sit patience enterally because maybe someday we'll have some alternative.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: So, but let me -- James, I want to then ask you. So, you heard these initiatives like GARM that bring together the industry players to coordinate even further. Would that -- do you see that as problematic? Should that be banned under this approach?

>> JAMES TAYLOR: I apologize for my long Preamble as I was just going there, but I'm actually a little bit more concerned than I was before. Because I don't think that the problem, certainly not the problem that I have and my friends on Facebook and elsewhere, but the problem is that standards are being applied inconsistently, and that somebody got away with this and somebody else didn't. The problem is that there seems to be this notion among the tech giants that dominate social media that they can and should become the arbitrators of all truth and they can and should become the infallible arbitrators of what is and isn't hate speech and to say what people should be able to share with each other. In the comments and questions section somebody posted an astute comment about our question about, are there technologies that can be developed or are being developed that allow the user to apply such filters? And I think that's wonderful. That's where we should be going. Indeed, in Section 230, in the section that talks about Congress explicitly saying what the policy is. Encourages the development of technologies that maximizes user control over what information is received, and so I would rather see us instead of

focusing on how to all get together and as the God kings of speech and truth and everything else on the Internet, and instead device ways that free speech can be encouraged and people on their own can set their own standards.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you. Thanks for that, James. Alex, I want to go to you with that. Medium is a user generated -- I know you're not there anymore, but you were, it's a user-generated content, models like Wikipedia which engage in a very different form of moderation on the content platform, so when you hear James talking about, and the question in the Q&A about cord sourcing or user generated content moderation, can you respond to that as somebody who worked, you know, on I think at a platform that initially didn't have a trust and safety, but then you know you guys have to figure out how to address content moderation, is that feasible at scale, is that doable for every company?

>> ALEX FEERST: Yeah. So, I think a helpful way to think about it is all the different forms of content moderation and forms of human risk that we think about, it's really not a problem, but it's really about 100 problems sort of yoked together under one category we think of as different types of harm. For example, there is in each of these solutions they may work to a point and any holistic solution is probably going to draw on most or all of them. So, for example, this principle of subsidiary to push to the edge as much as possible and let the use are control their own experience as much as possible because we should empower them, create tools, create ways for somebody to tailor their own social media experience and then you don't necessarily need a corporate or central authority. That's fine in some instances if you have an exchange with somebody that you don't talk with. If a bunch of strangers are raising a mod to send a SWAT team to your house, controlling doesn't do a lot for you. Decentralization and everything is better on the Blockchain but there are instances in which decentralizing decision-making so you can have a plurality of different stakeholder or different assessors making a decision about something and also finding less binary solutions so everything is not simply leave it

up or take it down, but something might be have more friction to reach it or be more obscure or have some other piece of information next to it. These are all sort of promising to their own extent, and I think people who do the work sort of try to cobble together different solutions appropriate for the exact type of harm and the exact type of issue that people are feeling. Because really what we're talking about is like a very disparate number of human conditions that are yoked together under content moderation. And I say content moderation is really just the problem of other people and their expression and there are myriad forms in which this takes and various solutions will be helpful and none of them is going to be the only answer and as a final thing I want to recommend to folks as you study and become experts on this, but for anybody who has never moderate add group, if you really I think, the best thing that you can do for yourself is to, as you put pen to paper about this, start a Facebook group or subReddit or Discord with your hundred closest friends and colleagues and moderate it and see how it goes. Because I think one of the things that you'll learn is that lots of folks want speech that is -- they don't like moderated and like their very true and unjust speech moderated, and the fact that we're all stuck in our own skins and sometimes universalize our own experience, it's part of what causes these very human problems -- you know, the very human problems of the human condition and expression to feel like things that can be solved by one or another form of tech. Things that will all be mitigated to some extent like a crime rate or something else, and we can make them better, but the notion there will be one or several things that can simply solve all of these problems, I think, is a misreading of how human beings and expression work.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thanks for that, Alex. And, you know, it does make me think that -- you mentioned putting the onus on the user and we haven't really talked much about online harassment but that is I think something that is always front and center in many of our minds, and even just thinking about the engagement on social media and in this panel.



One of the things I'm working with the International Women's Media Foundation in an organization of 30 other organizations trying to figure out how to address online violence against women journalists online, which is not just about that individual but also about the impact that it has on the public's right to know and the public interest in having journalistic coverage. And one of the, I think, pushbacks on the tech firms that we're constantly making is that, yes, you need to give the users tools to empower their ability to curate their experience, but if you hear from, for example, Maria Ressa, one of the world's leading journalists, the Co-founder of Rappler in Philippines facing a dozen charges and 100 years in jail. She's a target of online harassment on a scale that is not moderatable by her, by her news room, et cetera, and we hear that from women journalists a lot, that the scale and scope is very, very impossible to deal with. And so, I think there is tension I hear emerge on the panel between wanting to devolve content moderation and decision-making over what content people see and get access to moderate the individual, but also the tension, you know, where there are some aspects like terrorism where I think in general people seem to be less -- find that less problematic to have coordination around, and I think with the exception around people who are working in countries where activist content is regularly flagged as terrorist content, but you know for the most part people don't want terrorist content online, and there is a huge vast middle. And so, Steve, I want to come to you with a question about, you know, I think that the community has felt for a long time, or not the community because there is no "a community" because there are many communities, but many people have felt there is not enough being done by the tech firm to address the objectionable content, harassment, terrorism, extremist violence, et cetera. And that we want or need regulators and policymakers to step in and provide some impetus for them to actually do more because they're not doing enough. How do you address that?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Simplest way, Courtney. If the government makes a particular kind of speech and harassment illegal,

then all unlawful activity is acted possible right away for fear that the platforms themselves could become liable, and even Section 230 says nothing about criminal law. So the point here is that if the government wanted to say that Holocaust denial is illegal, you look at Europe and almost all nations in Europe make that an illegal form of speech, and it isn't in the United States partly because of the first amendment and Congress didn't enact something like that of the harassment in the U.S. is an awfully old statute that really only includes credible threats of physical harm, and we would need to expand that definition to cover something more than just credible threats of physical harm in order to capture harassments as an illegal activity. But if you can't do that, the only thing left is to raise concerns to the social media companies, my members, and they respond because they want to keep advertisers and users happy. That's all we do is bring advertisers and users together in an effort to create and build a business. The trick is that when we do that and we take action, we need to do so with our own judgment, try to be transparent and accountable, but with our own judgment, and that is inevitably going to create people that have a problem with it, people like James who have a problem with certain decisions that are made on pulling down misinformation, the antivaxxers don't like if we try to regulate medical disinformation so I think we're in a bad place being squeezed from both sides. So, keep up the squeezing and work the rest, but understand that there are forces pushing the other ways a well.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Steve. Farzaneh, I want to ask you, one of the kind of key principles of legitimacy in these initiatives, whether we're talking about government offer private sector or any sort of coordination here is transparency. And we're seeing, I think, a proliferation of recognition about transparency, transparency reporting, et cetera, within the industry around different efforts but much less so in the government. Where do you think transparency -- what does transparency mean in this sense, and do you think that that is part of the solution to content moderation legitimacy?

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: I am very skeptical about transparency now days because I believe, and Daphne Keller has a good blog about transparency and how we should actually ask for transparency from the tech corporations because frankly 100-page report which is quite vague about the content moderation and content takedown is not -- does not really give me enough information and might not be very effective. And also, transparency is important as who are we asking this transparency for? Are we asking it for these callers and researchers that wanted to look at this and help the platforms to come up with solutions? Or are we looking at transparency from the user point of view, the community's point of view that what do you mean by this action? Why did it happen? Not that I have some policy, okay, yeah, of course, I put it on the website, but it's like around 1,000 pages and so, but then what will happen to my content and what is happening? And so that's another transparency that we need to also tackle.

At the moment, the transparency that we see the tech corporations, the approach they take to transparency is more about enforcement, more about why do I -- not even why, but it's like this is the content I've taken down, this is how many I've taken down, and then they have different things and they call similar things different. Things like one calls it terrorist content and the other one says that, no, this is like harmful. We don't even see that, and so there are problems with the transparency reporting across the platforms. And transparency will bring legitimacy if it can be effectively used by the researchers, by the users, by the government to come up with policies and solutions and kind of inform themselves.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: I think your response, as always, is very important and also highlights that we often talk about transparency primarily with respect to the tech platforms but not enough with respect to the governments, and I see another point from Milton about the real aspect of state collusion where the government works with or pressures private actors behind the scenes and I think that is something that's -- that's one of the reasons I was very

interested in having this panel and IGF my colleague Rick Lane who helped to organize this as well, one of the co-organizers, really putting this up at the center is that we also need to think about the transparency of government actions and how we open up all of this so that there is greater level of legitimacy.

I think that Internet referral units, for example, we don't have anyone here representing Internet referral units but that is a very real example of a lack of transparency because on the tech company side they don't report Internet referral units as government referrals, and on the government side, governments are not producing transparency reports about their interactions with state -- with tech platforms, and I think I guess we would all like to see that, I think. Is there anyone, anyone on the panel who doesn't think government should be doing transparency reports? Please speak up.

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: I mean I think they should, but they will never do that, and there are two words that they use, national security. You know, because as long as, and they always, the law enforcement, you see how they cooperate with Apple, especially having been studying it, and it's very tricky and this is because of the culture of we have kind of bought into that these governments are doing us a favor and protecting us so they can just hide things from us for national security.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Let me go to Rob and Julie. I want to ask you, have your entities been, you know, been pressured by government or received communications from governments asking for any particular policies or content to be removed or addressed? Rob and then Julie?

>> ROB RAKOWITZ: Yeah, sure. I mean, look, we've engaged with the government in various markets where there has been a request to sort of understand and learn more. Generally, the -- you know, the way that we've been perceived and the way that we truly operate is industry self-regulation. You know, we haven't gotten to the point where we're looking at certification just yet. However, we're trying it come up with, you know, better visibility so you

understand what you're getting into, which in essence should be in everybody's interest. So, we've gotten, you know, good reception with the European Commission, we've gotten good reception with UK's Offcom as well as various parts of the U.S., and granted the U.S. is highly partisan about the issue and France as well, and so I think everybody realizes that we're trying to push things in the right direction of where there is more transparency in business-to-business interactions which sort of breaks down a nontransparent or opaque marketplace.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: And before I go to Julie, Rob, do you also meet with Civil Society.

>> ROB RAKOWITZ: Yes, we do. We do. We have a handful of NGOs that we consult at global levels as well as local market level as we look at sort of quote, unquote, solutions or standards. Because the last thing we want to do is end up having a whole bunch of advertising people operating in a bit of an echo chamber with zero sort of input that's, you know, that's something that we strive to make sure that we get out of our echo chamber.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thanks, Rob. Julie, same question to you about kind of government influence or intervention.

>> JULIE OWONO: Well, any Facebook or Instagram user can appeal to the board, so I mean we haven't received or taken a case that involves a public official -- I mean upon his or her request. We did have a case involving a request about the former U.S. President's account but a request from Facebook, but so far, we haven't taken a case involving a request from a government. But it's -- theoretically any user of Instagram or Facebook. But what I would like to -- I'm sorry.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Just as follow up. Have you seen submissions into the consultation process from government entities?

>> JULIE OWONO: From memory, no. Those documents, those submissions are very public, so everyone here can consult them. But what I do remember is that we have received submissions from international organizations, including special reports, UN special reports, and I believe also memory again, I mean, yes.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thanks. You wanted to make another point?

>> JULIE OWONO: About government transparency. I think that there have been some interesting examples, although, not all of them have come into effect yet. I'm thinking, for instance, about France's law against hate speech. So half of the law was completely dismissed by the Constitutional Court which was a great thing because there were very questionable provisions there, but one thing that was interesting in that law was the -- so the creation, first of all, of a regulator who was -- who is here in France, to make sure that hate speech is being addressed by platforms, but not only -- I mean how does this regulator do that, is by auditing, first of all, how the law itself is effective and how many times that the said hate speech law has been, you know, put forward in asking -- although that part has been dismissed, about you anyway what I want to say is that there are interesting baby steps towards government entities self-assessing the efficiency of the measures and the laws that they adopt. And I think this is, yes, this is interesting. Not widespread enough, unfortunately, but quite interesting.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you. Well, we are coming -- Alex, did you want to jump in on this?

>> ALEX FEERST: Just briefly. Say this partly as somebody who has dealt with governments as they've made these requests. I think it's totally wild that governments, especially democratic governments, do not have a publicly accessible database of everywhere they've ever made, it's baffling to me that they don't. If we received a subpoena for user data, we would absolutely tell the user unless we had a gag order, which prosecutors increasingly seek, so there are questions about the government role in transparency. The other thing I wanted to mention is that simply when you talk about the nitty-gritty of day-to-day transparency, it would be wonderful in some ways to publish a law of all the decisions that get made and takedown requests, but I think that part of the challenge of sitting in the platform is realizing the content

moderation and issues are intention with privacy law where the users data is secret and they say please take down the piece of content because the person is abusing me and then you make that communication public and in some instances maybe you have to make the address public, there is a million ways that I think the sort of overlap between people's privacy rights which are sacrosanct to folks in the platforms and different transparency demands of the public and government and for some folks who want to enforce a court-like standard for that, and the number of detailed ways that those need to be worked out are sort of myriad and I would say un contemplated by I think a lot of stakeholders who tend to care about one issue or the other but not the interaction in this case between transparency and privacy.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Great point. Thanks, Alex. I think we definitely heard that, for example, the GIFCT and the Christ Church Call where, you know, companies are referring to the EU's Global Data Protection Regulation, GDPR, as an excuse for why they can't, for example, create a database of the content that's link the to the hashed information in their database or preventing them from, for example, submitting information on takedowns to the Lumen database which is a collective run out of nonprofit kind of endeavor to try to make some of this more transparent.

So, I do see that we are hitting up on time, but I also think there has been a ton of engagement and 104 people still on the call. I invite every panelist to give us your one key takeaway you want people to think about when they think about how we should regulate content moderation, whether you're thinking about that from a government regulation, self-regulation, co-regulation, et cetera. What is kind of one of the one key principles that everyone should keep in mind? I'm going to go back to the beginning and start with James, and please keep your answers short so we can get people to the happy hour. James?

>> JAMES TAYLOR: All right. Thank you, Courtney. My advice would be in most cases do not do so. There is no need for content regulation in the vast majority of cases. Where there is a need,

Section 230 mapped them out and gives Steve and his colleagues there all the political cover they need to protect against violence, sexual obscenity, et cetera. So, yeah, if you're getting away from those topics, don't be -- don't be making decisions on political factors, on what you think is true or not true regarding science or whatever it may be, let the users decide.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thanks, James. To you, Steve.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: The way users will decide is they'll be able to choose among platforms that have differing approaches to try to keep their community safe, advertisers and users happy. And we do encourage innovation and experimentation by the platforms, and unfortunately, they're protected from government action when they do that and protected from a lot of law suits by Section 230. Now, at the same time, I do think that the platforms should adopt new principles and standards to be transparent about what their community standards are, should be accountable for decisions they make, and they should have a process of appeals, maybe not something as grand and global as the Facebook oversight board, but everyday decisions made at Twitter and YouTube, they ought to be able to give people an opportunity to appeal the decision and learn why their content was taken down.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Steve. Farzaneh?

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: I think that we need to be very objective when we talk about objectionable content and talk about what sorts of harm is actually caused and measured, and go away from punitive measures, takedown, blocking, and sanctioning people and govern their behavior without just taking down their content.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you. All right. Rob?

>> ROB RAKOWITZ: Yeah. I think that the topic of regulations is a sticky and I think a lot of the panelists have sort of pointed to it. So, you know, if anything, it's enlightened regulation, avoid partisan interfere appears, I think that's the big thing looking at the U.S. market, but there has to be a clear understanding of what is harm and making sure that we steer the Internet, which is a beautiful place, away from it.



>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you. Julie?

>> JULIE OWONO: I would say like I started multistakeholderism and making sure everybody has a place at the table and a word to say about content moderation. And the second thing is not losing sight of the globality of the platform, is of the network, and of the issues that effect it -- otherwise, I particularly agree with Rob that we might lose this beautiful space that the Internet is and border lessness of that beautiful space. Thank you.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Julie. Alex?

>> ALEX FEERST: Yes. I mean I think we're all just -- we're just beginning to grapple with the implications of issuing over a billion printing presses and over a billion movies to the people of the world and means for distributing them at scale very quickly, and I think technology and platforms are maybe the most visible manifestation of the novelty of this and the ways that we are interacting with each other at scale, but I think I also encourage folks to consider where a lot of these problems are, as I said, problems of human expression and at the end of the day, being human is not a problem to be solved but it is a condition to be managed. And I think we're on that road.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Thank you, Alex. I personally have found this a fascinating discussion. Thank you so much to the panelists for, you know, really engaging in discussion and keeping the responses short enough we could have I think a really dynamic debate. That's not a little thing when we have six really interesting and informed people. I want to recognize that, you know, this really focused only on social media, on the content layer, but there are these same questions about, you know, going down the stack. You mentioned earlier about denying access to say web hosting or that sort of thing, and so you know this is a multi-faceted issue, and we only touched on a small amount of it. There are many, many ways to follow up on this, but I think that some of the key things that we're hearing coming out of here is the importance about legitimacy, and that legitimacy we can get through

forms of transparency but those have to be meaningful and inclusive and they need to include a variety of different actors. We heard about the importance of multistakeholderism, about including the voices of the people effected, the users, the people who do the moderating, the companies, and the officials who are responsible for creating, you know, a regulatory environment that facilitates expression and privacy.

So, I want to thank all of our panelists. I want to thank our audience, and I want to thank you IGF USA for this panel. Please, give yourself a round of applause and enjoy the happy hour. Hopefully next year we'll be in person.

>> MELINDA CLEM: Thank you for joining us, folks. As promised, we've given you a vibrant informed discussion on a number of vibrant pressing Internet governance issues today and enjoyed interacting with you all on chat and social media. We also want to invite you to leave your thoughts on the Gathervoices Platform and there is a link that we provided in the chat. This is a platform that will allow you to record on video your reactions to anything from today, and it will also be open tomorrow or after to give us your view on how this impacted you and what some of the takeaways were. We're really excited to hear from you on that.

A quick reminder that tomorrow we're going to start a little bit earlier at 10:30 eastern time on another topic right from the headlines of Security of our Supply Chains. I'm going to be kicking us off with a very special fireside chat with FCC Commissioner Nathan Simington so don't miss that again it's at 10:30 tomorrow. Courtney said we have an informal happy hour starting now on Remo and don't forget the reception with a mixologist and trivia contest at the close of tomorrow's event. We have the cocktail menu posted here in the chat and it's on the website and we'll put it on Twitter for you. We look forward to seeing you all again tomorrow and hopefully later tonight. Take care.