

## Crisis Response Workstream

This workplan sets out the key objectives for improving processes around crisis response under the Christchurch Call (the Call).

Since its launch in May 2019, the Call has developed a dedicated Crisis Response Protocol (Christchurch Call Crisis Response Protocol). Other protocols at an international, domestic and organisational level have also been developed. Some of these protocols are geographically specific, whilst others are more global in nature and seek to coordinate a swift response.

Unfortunately, there have been many terrorist attacks since Christchurch, several of which have included an online component. As the multi-stakeholder community has dealt with these, we have come to understand that more work is required to achieve seamless integration of existing protocols that facilitates responses that meet the needs of all stakeholders.

There is an opportunity for the Call to support better alignment of protocols and continuous improvement to ensure they respond to the dynamic online environment. This work can come together to help others develop and refine their own geographically specific protocols.

The Call can also play a role in helping representatives from all sectors to better understand the purpose and process behind the various protocols. Part of this is working with civil society to ensure protocols reflect due process and human rights considerations.

The objectives laid out in this workplan are designed to address these various needs. These core objectives will be delivered without duplicating work currently in development in other fora. The Christchurch Call community recognises the independence of the GIFCT and will support the implementation of the GIFCT's enhanced Incident Response Framework and broader future strategic plan.

The workplan has been developed with attention to the following commitments under the Christchurch Call:

- **Governments to:** Ensure effective enforcement of applicable laws that prohibit the production or dissemination of terrorist and violent extremist content, in a manner consistent with the rule of law and international human rights law, including freedom of expression.
- **Online service providers to:** Implement, immediate effective measures to mitigate the specific risk that terrorist and violent extremist content is disseminated through livestreaming, including identification of content for real-time review.
- **Governments and online service providers to:** Develop processes allowing governments and online service providers to respond rapidly, effectively and in a coordinated manner to the dissemination of terrorist or violent extremist content following a terrorist event. This may require the development of a shared crisis protocol and information-sharing processes, in a manner consistent with human rights protections.
- **Governments and online service providers to:** Ensure appropriate cooperation with and among law enforcement agencies for the purposes of investigating and prosecuting illegal online activity in regard to detected and/or removed terrorist and violent extremist content, in a manner consistent with rule of law and human rights protections.
- **Governments and online service providers to:** Collaborate, and support partner countries, in the development and implementation of best practice in preventing the dissemination of terrorist and violent extremist content online, including through operational coordination and trusted information exchanges in accordance with relevant data protection and privacy rules.
- **Governments and online service providers to:** Respect, and for Governments protect, human rights, including by avoiding directly or indirectly contributing to adverse human rights impacts through business activities and addressing such impacts where they occur.

**Medium term objectives (achievable within 6-12 months)**

Objective	Rationale	Key stakeholders	Evaluation measures	Timeframes
<p><b>1. A comprehensive review of the Christchurch Call CRP (the CRP) and a full update of the CRP document based on feedback provided by members.</b></p> <p>Create a short document that clearly sets out the CRP’s objectives, initiating criteria and member obligations. This would be used to share with new members to help summarise the process for their awareness.</p> <p>Ensure the CRP is clear and that debriefs are included in the process - building on the work to determine a debrief process by the GIFCT Crisis Response Working Group (CRWG).</p> <p>Ensure that there is a clear role for civil society and that the review considers critical issues of human rights, due process, and transparency.</p> <p><b>Information sharing – the CRP should include a robust process for how executive level and operational level information is shared and outline clear responsibilities for members to share information in a timely fashion.</b></p> <p>Leverage the work of the GIFCT CRWG taking place to refine and agree the types of information to be shared among stakeholders in a real-world incident, including executive and operational-level.</p> <p>Multi-directional information flows are critical and should be defined with clear roles for each sector.</p> <p>Leverage the GIFCT CRWG directory as contacts who require notification in a crisis will be the same.</p> <p>Develop a framework/process for ensuring the awareness of public safety messaging, which is critical in a crisis scenario.</p>	<p>There is need to clarify the purpose of the CRP and the process for initiation, as well as defining stakeholder responsibilities.</p> <p>Civil society feels they have low awareness of where the CRP is at and how it is utilised.</p> <p>Civil society should play more of a role in the various stages of the CRP to ensure that governments and industry focus on transparency, human rights, and due process when carrying out crisis response actions.</p> <p>There is a need for situational awareness to an institutionalized list of contacts.</p> <p>Each sector has different needs when it comes to information flows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Executive - GIFCT CRWG is currently working on this via a new piece of work (to support executive information).</li> <li>Operational - ongoing work of GIFCT CRWG (led by the EU and focussing on operational requirements).</li> </ul> <p>Transparency-focused information sharing is a key aspect of fighting dis-/mis-information associated with terrorist and violent extremist content (TVEC).</p>	<p>New Zealand and French Governments</p> <p>GIFCT CRWG</p> <p>Christchurch Call Advisory Network (CCAN)</p> <p>Representatives from each sector, ensuring diversity of thought and needs.</p>	<p>Feedback from Call community members via survey that tests awareness and understanding of the CRP.</p> <p>Positive feedback from all sectors regarding information sharing before, during, and after a crisis.</p> <p>Activation and testing of the CRP.</p> <p>Clearly identified metrics human rights, due process and transparency (see objective 3).</p> <p>Establishment of clear guidance and expectations around information sharing that is endorsed by high percentage of members.</p> <p>Demonstrated increase in executive and operational level information sharing during and in the aftermath of a crisis scenario, while ensuring protections for individuals’ rights and due process.</p> <p>Issuance of periodic update to detail when the CRP has been activated, the atmospherics around the activation, the details of the impacts, and steps taken to review CRP procedures. Where the CRP has not been activated a statement will be released to say it hasn’t been activated during the period.</p>	<p>3-12 months</p> <p>Timeframe should be tight as it is foundational for delivery of other objectives.</p>

<p><b>2. A comprehensive mapping exercise of all protocols (Christchurch Call CRP; GIFCT CIP; EU CP; domestic, and law enforcement protocols) to identify where they overlap and where there are gaps.</b></p> <p>Building on the good work in the GIFCT CRWG, develop an overarching document that clearly defines the role of each protocol; individual thresholds for activation; and stakeholder responsibilities</p> <p>Note that even where only one protocol is triggered, there needs to be information sharing to/from other protocol owners. Protocols will not always be triggered on a synchronised basis.</p> <p>This exercise needs to be clear about the expectations of each protocol and what they don't do.</p> <p><b>Table-top exercise to test the efficacy of all protocols and identify intersections and gaps.</b></p> <p>Use this to update overarching principles document that summarises all protocols.</p> <p>Note Europol and GIFCT table-top exercises in late 2021 and early 2022 respectively, and opportunity to leverage.</p>	<p>This responds to widespread confusion, across sectors, about how the protocols currently work together.</p> <p>There is a publicly available data on how the protocols function together as they have only been enacted only a few times, and on an inconsistent basis.</p> <p>The need to test how all protocols work together in practice was a key theme raised in the feedback.</p> <p>GIFCT CRWG has a strong dynamic and diversity of voices. There would be benefit in utilising this group for this objective and using this opportunity to expand the group's membership to include more civil society</p>	<p>New Zealand and French Governments</p> <p>GIFCT CRWG</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>GIFCT CIP coordinators</p> <p>EUCP</p> <p>GIFCT member companies</p> <p>Additional, non-GIFCT companies</p> <p>Civil society</p> <p>Governments</p> <p>Aqaba Process</p>	<p>Utilise existing crisis response entities and borrow from their best practices.</p> <p>By late 2021 - baseline survey/ engagement with Call community members. Ensure understanding increases with mapping exercise output, measured in follow up survey.</p> <p>3 x multi-stakeholder workshops by mid-2022</p> <p>Document out for review by end 2022</p> <p>New members to understand the crisis response landscape – “well” or “very well”</p> <p>Greater alignment and efficacy of the main protocols during exercises. Where gaps are found, and stakeholders' needs aren't realised, these are addressed.</p>	<p>3-9 months</p> <p><i>Suggest mapping exercise takes place ahead of CRP refresh so gaps are identified</i></p> <p>Noting planned table-top exercises by Europol (November 2021) and GIFCT (early 2022).</p>
<p><b>3. Establish due process and human rights protections to ensure all protocols are developed in a transparent and robust way.</b></p> <p>Explore a human rights impact assessment at the outset to test the theories behind the CRP and ensure it meets due process, transparency and human rights expectations.</p> <p>Ensure that when new members join the Call Community, the protocols are clear and accessible, and new members understand their human rights responsibilities.</p>	<p>There is a need to develop procedures for transparency of crisis response protocols in all stages including development implementation operation and review.</p> <p>There is a need to develop a clear articulation of mandatory due process protections that must be present in any national legal framework or protocol. This is required for a national crisis response protocol to be considered interoperable or "layered" into the Call or GIFCT protocols.</p>	<p>Human Rights Impact Assessor</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>Other civil society perspectives</p>	<p>Human rights evaluation reports for the CRP is delivered and accepted by CCAN.</p> <p>Crisis Protocol owners should work with civil society to determine the timing, scope, and design of their human rights impact assessment that meets the needs of the protocol.</p> <p>Human rights reviews should be carried out by a/multiple third parties. Success includes the adoption and integration of human</p>	<p>Within 6-12 months</p> <p>Note that it is recommend an HR assessment is completed to test the theories behind the CRP.</p>

<p>Ensure these due process and human rights protections serve as an example to other existing protocols, and protocols that are yet to be developed.</p>			<p>rights recommendations into these protocols.</p>	
<p><b>4. Support and engage with the GIFCT in its approach to incident response, including activation criteria and timeliness of response.</b></p> <p>The GIFCT continues to engage with and welcomes feedback from civil society. We propose involving the Christchurch Call Community more extensively in GIFCT WGs to ensure work is mutually supportive.</p> <p>GIFCT is working to provide a more robust response to terrorist and violent extremist activity online associated with terrorist incidents offline (real-world/physical), including threats that do not involve video or live-streamed content. This objective supports this expanded response.</p> <p>GIFCT also welcomes the establishment of clear legal frameworks to balance information sharing and privacy protections as this Framework is expanded.</p> <p>Additionally, GIFCT is currently reviewing future options within its Operating Board to consider a 24/7 situational awareness. This objective supports this review.</p>	<p>There is concern that the threshold for activation of the CIP is too binary, which does not account for an evolving threat that does not involve livestreamed content.</p> <p>We note this is acknowledged by the GIFCT and the Operating Board are taking steps to address this concern. The Christchurch Call acknowledges the independence of GIFCT and its CRWG.</p> <p>Criteria review should remain centred on terrorist and violent extremist content to avoid scope creep.</p>	<p>GIFCT</p> <p>GIFCT member companies</p> <p>Members of the Call Community</p> <p>Civil society to provide sector-perspective</p>	<p>GIFCT Executive Director to update Christchurch Community on its approach to incident response, including activation criteria and timeliness of response.</p> <p>GIFCT's expanded Incident Response Framework assessed as part of comprehensive mapping exercise and table-top exercise (separate objectives).</p>	<p>6-9 months – to feed into a comprehensive mapping exercise.</p>

<b>Longer term objectives - (achievable within 1-3 years)</b>				
Objective	Rationale	Key Stakeholders	Evaluation measures	Timeframes
<p><b>5. Establish a community of practice to enhance capability of new member countries, companies and civil society organisations in responding to a crisis. We seek to broaden membership and involvement, particularly to civil society and academia.</b></p> <p>Build capacity of countries, companies and civil society in the Call Community. Start by capturing</p>	<p>There is a widespread desire to expand the crisis response network globally, and assist new countries/companies/civil society organisations to learn about the various protocols.</p> <p>Acknowledging the vital role of civil society, the network should include more</p>	<p>New Zealand and French Governments</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>Representatives from Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p>	<p>A group tasked with coordinating the community of practice is identified by mid-late 2022.</p> <p>Development of a clear matrix of which sector needs to do what during:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protocol initiation</li> <li>- During protocol</li> </ul>	<p>12-18 months</p>

<p>current practice, expanding to good/best practice – acknowledging that this is ever evolving.</p> <p>Support newer countries and companies to hold workshops to exchange best practices and help them develop their own domestic/internal crisis response protocol by sharing lessons learnt by those in the Call Community.</p> <p>Ensure the Call is truly global and benefits from diversity of thought. Include a more diverse set of governments, tech companies and civil society organisations.</p> <p>Utilise ongoing work in the GIFCT CRWG around requirements in the immediate aftermath of attack and defining operational excellence when multiple protocols are activated.</p> <p>Publish and share good practices from domestic-, region- or organization-specific protocols, and determine how to use them in other geographic areas.</p> <p>Develop a central repository to share these practices.</p>	<p>diverse types of civil society organisations that reach different populations.</p> <p>A consistent theme in feedback was the need to bring more members from all sectors into the various crisis response protocols, especially the CRP.</p> <p>Broadening the member base both increases its efficacy (the more involved the more can act) and increases the diversity of perspectives involved in enhancing crisis response.</p> <p>Include traditional media as they play a role in communicating in a crisis and are an important player in effective crisis response.</p> <p>Protocol notifications are currently limited to members and therefore their reach is also somewhat limited.</p>	<p>GIFCT</p> <p>European Commission/ Europol</p> <p>Aqaba Process</p> <p>Traditional media bodies</p> <p>Academic institutions</p> <p>Other countries, companies &amp; civil society with robust internal processes</p>	<p>- Post-crisis</p> <p>Matrix is used to develop good practice and guidance documentation.</p> <p>Tangible increase in civil society, academia, and social service providers' involvement in development and updating of protocols.</p> <p>The community of practice is geographically diversified.</p> <p>Good practice and guidance documentation is shared on a regular basis.</p>	
<p><b>6. Ongoing refinement of all protocols</b></p> <p>All protocols should be constantly evolving and improving to meet new challenges and reflect the changing threat and online environment.</p>	<p>The need to test protocols and help them evolve is a key theme of member feedback.</p>	<p>New Zealand and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers</p> <p>GIFCT CIP coordinators</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>EUCP coordinators</p>	<p>Recommendations and findings from post incident debriefs (already being led by GIFCT Crisis Response working group) are integrated into updated crisis protocols.</p> <p>Annual reporting of updates to the CRP.</p> <p>Periodic reporting of updates to other protocols.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>