

TRANSPARENCY & REPORTING: WORK PLAN

Transparency is a fundamental public good – the basis for an informed, empowered and active citizenry. Transparency is also of instrumental value. It helps build understanding and trust among stakeholders, which in turn underpins collective action to prevent and reduce harm from TVEC online while protecting and respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms. Transparency is also necessary for assessing the effectiveness of individual and collective interventions and identifying ways to improve over time.

| <b>Medium term objectives</b><br><i>(achievable within 6-12 months)</i>   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Objective   | Rationale  | Key stakeholders  | Evaluation measures   | Timeframes  |
| <i>What do we want to achieve?</i>  | <i>What is the need we are addressing?</i>   | <i>Who could help make this happen?</i>   | <i>How will the Call community assess success?</i>  | <i>When will this be done by?</i>   |
| <p>1. Ensure meaningful diversity and inclusion in multi-stakeholder transparency work on TVEC, on an ongoing basis.</p> <p><i>[See also related but broader objectives in the Community work plan relating to diversity and inclusion in Call work generally.]</i></p> | <p>There are gaps in representation within and across the various different multi-stakeholder initiatives on transparency, including the Christchurch Call (the Call) itself. For example, there are few non-Western organisations, journalist/media, or new/small tech company voices.</p> <p>Without everyone at the table, we will be less effective in our work, today and into the future, including as the threat environment changes. We also are less able to check our biases and risk producing unintended consequences/harm to others, which can only undermine trust.</p> <p>Making progress on this objective will require the Call community to identify and address barriers to participation, which could be around awareness/interest/access e.g. IT/resourcing or getting time off work.</p> | <p>NZ and French Governments- including for cross-fertilisation with work under Community work plan.</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>GIFCT Transparency Working Group</p> <p>OECD</p> <p>CCAN and other CSOs</p> <p>Researchers</p> | <p>Significant efforts are made to share information and bring underrepresented constituencies into relevant initiatives.</p> <p>Barriers to participation identified and addressed.</p> <p>Regular (informal) surveys of participation across transparency initiatives show that known gaps have been filled.</p> <p>Any new ones are identified and addressed.</p> <p>Engagement and participation rates for underrepresented groups in identified processes increase and remain high across all sectors.</p> | <p>Known gaps addressed by end Q3 2021.</p> <p>Regular (informal) stocktake of engagement and participation, on an ongoing basis.</p> |

|   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
|   | Achieving and maintaining meaningful diversity and inclusion also requires a high level of trust and confidence among the relevant actors (governments, companies, civil society, researchers). We in the Call Community need to do what we can to ensure that the multi-stakeholder model of mutual respect and collaboration is present in all discussions and initiatives on transparency.   | Journalist and mainstream media organisations<br><br>Network operators?                                 |  |  |
| 2. Raise awareness and improve transparency around the Christchurch Call. | <p>Keeping the Call website up-to-date, hosting regular (e.g. quarterly or biannual) stakeholder/public briefings, and taking opportunities to talk about the Call and related transparency work in relevant CSO fora (e.g. RightsCon, Internet Governance Forum, Freedom Online Conference) would help promote more diverse participation (see objective 1 above), and also provide greater transparency around the Call itself, for which there is appetite.</p> <p>It is in these fora where CSOs and NGOs are likely to feel most comfortable asking difficult questions that will help bridge the information/knowledge gap between sectors.</p> | NZ and French Governments.<br><br>Call supporting governments and online service providers.<br><br>CCAN | <p>A stakeholder engagement/ public outreach plan is developed and implemented.</p> <p>As part of that, the Call website is kept up-to-date to ensure relevant information about ongoing work and plans is publicly available in a timely way.</p> <p>Any evaluation of the Call's impact shows relevant stakeholders feel informed and able to engage with/participate in the Call if they so wish [see longer term objective 5 below].</p> | <p>End 2021</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>End 2023</p> <p><i>** This year GIFCT, NZ and FR will be participating on a panel at RightsCon hosted by Mnemonic.</i></p> |

|   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>3. Gather and make accessible existing and new resources and good practice guides that can help governments and companies improve their transparency and reporting practices in relation to terrorist and violent extremist content.</p> | <p>A lot of good resources already exist to guide actors' transparency and reporting efforts. Many existing ones undergo iterative development (e.g. recent update to the Santa Clara Principles) while new ones are being developed e.g. the OECD Voluntary Transparency Report Framework (VTRF).</p> <p>The GIFCT has created a Member <a href="#">Resource Guide</a> and its Working Group on Transparency has compiled an extensive bibliography.</p> <p>The OECD's benchmarking reports, "Current approaches to terrorist and violent extremist content among the top 50 online content-sharing services", 1<sup>st</sup> edition, and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (forthcoming) also shed light on good practice.</p> <p>Further work, e.g. by the OECD in the context of future benchmarking reports could (subject to further voluntary financial contributions) identify the key messages from existing resources and keep the repository up-to-date going forward.</p> <p>Creating a centralised repository would enable all stakeholders easily to access these resources, helping to avoid duplication of effort and improving effectiveness. It would also help the Call Community identify whether there are any remaining gaps</p> <p>Good practice guidance could also usefully address how to make transparency and reporting accessible by tailoring its delivery (format) to the needs of different audiences, including governments and researchers, people with disabilities, at different ages/life stages, and in different language communities.</p> | <p>NZ and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>GIFCT Transparency Work Stream</p> <p>OECD</p> | <p>Publication of OECD second benchmarking report.</p> <p>OECD VTRF 1.0 published and available for implementation on a voluntary basis.</p> <p>List of existing resources, summary of key points, and identification of good practice, available via a centralised repository, with a means to keep it (and stakeholders) up to date.</p> <p>OECD VTRF 2.0 published and available for implementation on a voluntary basis.</p> | <p>End of Q3 2021</p> <p>End of Q3 2021</p> <p>End 2022 and ongoing</p> <p>End of 2023</p> |
| <p>4. Better identify priority information needs of key audiences for governments' and companies' transparency and reporting related to TVEC.</p>   | <p>Stakeholders often feel they lack key information and/or understandings, even after receiving transparency outputs. This information may be needed for accurate reporting, policy development, or research.</p> <p>Without clearly understanding the information needs and priorities of key stakeholders and audiences, transparency efforts risk</p>   | <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN and other CSOs</p> <p>Media</p> <p>Public Audiences</p>                                | <p>An initial survey of targeted groups identifies specific information needs, priorities, and trust gaps.</p> <p>Those findings are disseminated widely, to inform iterative development of transparency guidance/tools/frameworks, within</p>  | <p>End 2021</p>  |

|  |  |  |   |                                  |
|--|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
|  | <p>ineffectiveness. By surveying these groups, actors (government, companies, media) can develop clear goals for transparency and reporting (including around crisis response and algorithms) to help efficiently target efforts and to ensure that all relevant groups receive the information they need to move forward, where appropriate.</p> <p>There may also be a need for some education and capacity-building so that stakeholders and the public can fully understand the technical details or context for transparency information and reporting.</p>   | <p>OECD<br/>Researchers</p>  | <p>Call Community, GIFCT, OECD and elsewhere.</p> <p>Ongoing periodic surveys identify any changes in needs and assess whether they are being met, to the extent possible</p>   | <p>From end 2022 and ongoing</p> |
| <p>5. Identify and channel small/new/different companies to Tech Against Terrorism (TAT) and GIFCT, for support and capacity-building to start transparency and reporting related to TVEC.</p> | <p>Small and new companies rarely have the capacity or infrastructure to set up transparency and reporting. However, transparency standards set early on will ensure that companies engage in good practice moving forward and avoid restructuring in the future.</p> <p>TAT and GIFCT provide support and capacity-building services for companies in this space. The CCTA Coordination Team and Call Community could be more systematic in identifying and channelling companies towards TAT and GIFCT. This would also help identify companies not taking up such services, and potential barriers. (Some may have adversarial motives.)</p> <p>Currently, there is limited funding available for organisations like TAT. There is clearly potential to scale up this support for greater impact.</p> | <p>NZ and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>GIFCT</p> <p>Tech Against Terrorism</p> | <p>New Zealand and French governments and Call Community look to identify and refer companies, to build pipeline for TAT and GIFCT..</p> <p>Delivery initiatives/organisations identified, and their capacity needs assessed and addressed for the medium-term, including through additional funding, where possible.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>End 2021</p>   |

|   |  |  |   |                  |
|---|--|--|---|------------------|
| <p>6.. Identify critical gaps in our knowledge and understanding.</p> | <p>Some priority areas for developing and improving transparency and reporting come with significant challenges or gaps in understanding.</p> <p>Challenges include legal prohibitions on sharing of information and data; ethical considerations that restrict transparency; and the need to protect proprietary/sensitive information.</p> <p>There are also methodological challenges for researchers and evaluation specialists - e.g. how to create transparency around decision-making in grey areas or in crises, how to measure trust, and how to evaluate impact (e.g. on harm from TVEC online, human rights, unintended consequences).</p> <p>Gaps include: understanding the who/what/when/how of different kinds of transparency and reporting; identifying what is an acceptable level of risk in respecting freedom of expression versus eliminating TVEC online (or how to minimise false negatives and false positives - both of which cause harm); how best to balance consumer/user rights, including data protection and privacy, with information disclosure; why trust deficits exist and why more transparency at the individual company level might paradoxically drive users to smaller, less transparent (and safe) platforms, a trend that may be growing across the online ecosystem.</p> <p>A number of organizations and networks are working to support or conduct TVEC-focussed research in these areas, but with limited coordination. Greater collaboration to identify a more focused research agenda in support of transparency would guide more effective investment in research while avoiding duplication.</p> <p>There is also good scope for productive sharing with/learning from broader (non-TVEC specific) research on these kinds of issues.</p> | <p>NZ and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>GIFCT Working Groups on Transparency, Research and Legal Frameworks</p> <p>GNET</p> <p>Third-party researchers and evaluation teams</p> <p>Research funding organizations</p> | <p>A shared research program developed in consultation with key sectors of the Call Community, as well as partners in position to fund and otherwise support/advance such work.</p> | <p>End 2021.</p> |
|---|--|--|---|------------------|

## Longer term objectives

*(achievable within 1-3 years)*

| Objective  | Rationale  | Key Stakeholders  | Evaluation measures<br>(including timeframes)  | Timeframes   |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <i>What do we want to achieve?</i>   | <i>What is the need we are addressing?</i>   | <i>Who could help make this happen?</i>   | <i>How will we know if we have succeeded?</i>  | <i>When will this be done by?</i>  |
| <p>1. More companies provide basic transparency (e.g. around policies, procedures, enforcement to prevent and eliminate TVEC online, and redress mechanisms) and issue regular transparency reports on outcomes.</p> | <p>Most companies currently provide zero or very little transparency, especially as relates specifically to TVEC online.</p> <p>OECD research showed that only five of the world's top 50 online content sharing services were issuing TVEC-related transparency reports in 2020, and the approaches and level of insight provided were variable.</p> <p>Medium-term objectives in this work plan aim to: better understand stakeholders' information needs; to support companies looking to begin and/or improve their transparency and reporting; and, to those ends, to make guidance and frameworks (on transparency generally and for TVEC specifically) more accessible. Work towards each of those objectives will help deliver this longer-term outcome (and 2 below).</p> <p>Important steps in that regard will be the publication of the OECD VTRF 1.0 in Q3 2021, which aims to establish a baseline for transparency reporting for companies of all sizes to implement on a voluntary basis, and the VTRF</p> | <p>NZ and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>GIFCT &amp; Working Group on Transparency</p> <p>TAT Mentorship</p> <p>OECD</p> <p>CSOs and academics, including those closely involved in Santa Clara Principles</p> <p>CIGI/GPGN</p> | <p>Number of GIFCT member companies increases, with update on new companies that developed transparency as part of that process with TAT mentorship.</p> <p>Overall, number of companies providing basic transparency and issuing regular transparency reports increases.</p> <p>The level and utility to stakeholders of TVEC-specific information and data in the transparency and reporting of companies of all sizes/capacity levels improves over time.</p> | <p>GIFCT &amp; TAT – ongoing.</p> <p>Segmentation of companies outside top 50 and baselines for those segments established by end 2021. <i>[Could be done by OECD as an extension of their benchmarking work, subject to further voluntary financial contributions].</i></p> |

|  |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
|  | 2.0 subsequently, which aims to support more granular reporting for greater insights.  |  |   |   |
| 2. Companies' transparency and reporting includes more TVEC-specific information and metrics, and that information and data becomes more granular and yields greater insights for stakeholders, over time. | As above.  | NZ and French Governments<br>Call supporting governments and online service providers.<br>CCAN<br>GIFCT & Working Group on Transparency<br>OECD<br>CSOs and academics, including those closely involved in Santa Clara Principles<br>CIGI/GPGN | The level and utility to stakeholders of TVEC-specific information and data in the transparency and reporting of companies of all sizes/capacity levels improves over time.           | Ongoing improvements in numbers/quality in each segment by end 2022 and end 2023. <i>[See comment about OECD above]</i> |
| 3. Capacity building for smaller/newer/emerging companies is structured/resourced to deliver at scale on a sustainable basis.  | Based on needs assessment in Medium-Term, as well as efforts to expand participation of a greater number and variety of companies, build off efforts like those of TaT and GIFCT to help address:<br><br>- Needs for smaller platforms to be supported in the development of transparency practices, including basic mechanisms and metrics.<br><br>- Support opportunities for smaller platforms to develop, implement and carry out transparency reporting of online harms (inclusive of TVEC) by leveraging the expertise of TAT and other key organizations/initiatives<br><br>- Support increasing and broadening GIFCT membership, and adoption of the OECD VTRF over the medium and long-term.<br><br>Tap into Call supporting governments' knowledge of emerging companies that could benefit from information/assistance. | NZ and French Governments<br>Call supporting governments and online service providers.<br>CCAN<br>GIFCT<br>TAT<br>Funders  | Initiatives/programme(s) to increase number and variety of smaller/newer companies doing transparency and reporting are set up to continue operating at scale on a sustainable basis. | End 2023/ongoing  |

|   |  |   |  |                     |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------|
| <p>4. Improve government transparency on laws, regulations, policies, processes to prevent and eliminate TVEC online and reporting on the outcomes of most interest to stakeholders.</p>  | <p>Government transparency is necessary to eliminate TVEC online and promote understanding and trust, including that action is consistent with international human rights standards.</p> <p>Many governments already provide transparency where they are able to do so, without prejudicing public safety, security and/or the legal rights and interests of third parties. But approaches to and levels of transparency vary, as does the capacity of different governments in this area. There is a need to identify good practice and disseminate it, primarily for Call supporting governments to emulate, but also other governments.</p> <p>Specific areas that stakeholders wish to see more transparency are around 1/flagging and content removal requests; and 2. internet referral units. The Call community wishes to see governments being more transparent about their own activities in these areas, and to enable companies also to be more transparent by removing legal/other obstacles.</p> | <p>NZ and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>GIFCT Legal Frameworks Working Group</p> <p>IGOs e.g. UNCTED, Freedom Online Coalition</p> <p>Other multi-stakeholder organisation e.g. World Economic Forum, Internet Governance Forum.</p> | <p>There is agreed good practice guidance and capacity-building for Call supporting governments on the aspects of transparency that are of most interest/need to the multi-stakeholder Call Community.</p> <p>Transparency around government flagging and removal requests improves.</p> | <p>By end 2023.</p> |
| <p>5. Undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder work under the CCTA at 1/ improving transparency and reporting; 2/ building understanding and trust; and 3/ eliminating TVEC online while respecting human rights and freedoms.</p> | <p>It behoves the Christchurch Call community to evaluate the effectiveness of its methods and work, to ensure that our collective effort and resources are being targeted for most impact, and that we are not producing unintended consequences.</p> <p>New Zealand and France published a report on Christchurch Call Community Consultation at the end of 2020.</p> <p>A systematic evaluation towards the end of this work plan would create a kind/level of transparency about the Christchurch Call itself and underpin the ongoing commitment and efforts of the Call community and other stakeholders. This could be undertaken by a trusted third party or by the Community itself.</p> <p>This evaluation could be done by the Community or by an independent third party. It would build on some of the medium-term work around</p>  | <p>NZ and French Governments</p> <p>Call supporting governments and online service providers.</p> <p>CCAN</p> <p>Third party research/evaluation provider?</p>  | <p>Results of evaluation published and acted upon.</p>   | <p>End 2023</p>     |



|  |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | information needs assessments and addressing critical gaps in research and understanding. |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|