2023 Issues Brief

This *Issues Brief* presents views from across the Christchurch Call's global multistakeholder Community about the progress we have made, individually, collectively, and in groups to deliver the Call's 25 Commitments. The *Issues Brief* looks at our achievements, areas where we need to adjust or increase effort, priority issues for the future, and difficult questions that require discussion or strategic guidance.

Introduction

Purpose

The *Issues Brief* will be used as a basis for the Agenda for the 2023 Leaders' Summit and the Summit co-Chairs Joint Statement, and discussion topics for our subsequent whole-of-Community Meeting. The process of developing this brief will allow us to collaborate between and across sectors as a Call Community, enhancing our dialogue about important issues.

How the *Issues Brief* was developed

The *Issues Brief* is based on input from our working group leads, from the Community through our 2023 Survey, through dedicated Town Hall meetings, and other written input.

The *Issues Brief* is representative of diverse perspectives from our Community. It is not necessarily the consensus view of every supporter, partner organisation, or civil society network member. The 2023 *Snapshot Report* provides information and perspectives from individual Community members and organisations.

How it fits with our commitments and work programmes

Call supporters fulfil their commitments to eliminate terrorist and violent extremist content (TVEC) through joint and individual efforts, and have undertaken to do so transparently, while upholding human rights and a free, open, secure internet. The 25 **Call Commitments** remain the enduring foundation of our activities.

In 2021, we launched **work plans** to help align our efforts in four areas where we saw particular importance and shared interest in working together:

1. Building a diverse, enduring, and effective Call Community,
2. Understanding user journeys and algorithmic impacts and creating a new generation of community-led online [positive]? interventions,
3. Delivering meaningful transparency about government and industry actions, and
4. Responding effectively to terrorist and violent extremist incidents whilst putting in place meaningful human rights and due process mechanisms.

For the 2022 Summit, the Community worked over several months to identify and understand new challenges, or issues affecting delivery. This helped develop an agenda and guiding questions to enable Leaders to address the most important strategic challenges and make a meaningful difference through their leadership.

In 2023, we face a different economic backdrop, a changed regulatory landscape, and the deployment of new AI models that are changing the nature of online services. Communities around the world continue to grapple with difficult questions over content moderation, the protection of human rights online, radicalisation to violence, and harm from TVEC.

The following issues formed the starting point for our 2023 pre-Summit engagement as a Call Community and have helped us to identify key actions and discussion questions for Leaders:

- The implications of new technology, particularly foundation AI models;

- Assisting small online service providers (OSPs) to eliminate terrorist and violent extremist content online and respond to crisis incidents;
- The evidence base on gender-based hatred, acts of gender-based violence online and offline, and radicalization to violence;
- Youth, algorithmic outcomes, and pathways to radicalization;
- The Christchurch Call Initiative on Algorithmic Outcomes;
- Sustaining and expanding the Call Community;
- Multistakeholder approaches to related issues.

This Community engagement process is important to identify areas that require focus, prioritisation, resources, adjusted approaches, or ongoing attention. This will help the Community stay ahead of changes in the environment and deliver our long-term vision and commitments.

Assessment of key issues

This section sets out in detail the key issues the Community is working on, to provide a common understanding of their significance, what has been achieved, and where there are challenges and opportunities ahead. This in turn has helped to identify the smaller number of specific topics that may usefully be discussed among Leaders at the 2023 Summit.

1. Implications of new technology, including foundation AI models.

Why it's important…

The nature of online services is evolving rapidly. A growing number of AI-driven tools and interfaces are embedded in the online services we use every day. This brings potential mechanisms for harm and exploitation, and new and potentially useful prevention and intervention strategies.

At the 2022 Summit, Leaders asked for guidance on how to support the adoption of new technologies, while addressing the impacts this may have for the elimination of TVEC, and the potential new forms of TVEC we may encounter and need to address.

The 2023 Summit is an opportunity for dialogue about new technology, particularly AI foundation models, the impacts and policy implications, and the views of communities and civil society.

This is one of the most complex problems confronting policymakers today. The Call offers a specific and practical lens through which to assess identifiable harms and risks, and frameworks for addressing them.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

The Call Community launched a New Technology Working Group to build its understanding of the risks and opportunities at the nexus of new technologies and TVEC.

The New Technology Working Group has identified key risks associated with generative AI, immersive technologies, and the decentralised web, and is now developing advice on strategies to mitigate these risks.

The New Technology Working Group has met with the Call Community and individual supporters to understand their new products e.g. the new Bing AI tool, gathering input about possible concerns and the safety features being deployed to counter TVEC.

At RightsCon, the Call Community hosted a workshop inviting civil society to discuss the implications of new technology for TVEC and ways to address this.

The Global Internet Forum to Counter Terrorism (GIFCT) and Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD) are both developing expert outputs on new technology, including approaches to red-teaming and how generative AI could affect content harms.

Difficult questions

How should industry, government, and civil society align and prioritise their expectations and priorities for safety? How can they distinguish genuine problems from perceived or theoretical problems and address them with an appropriately calibrated level of precaution and foresight?

How can we balance the desire for aligned approaches to safety with the importance of openness to competition and innovation, and access and autonomy for users?

How can we ensure that safety interventions fitted onto these systems are consistent with a free, open, secure internet and don't impede access and innovation for users around the world?

How should we address emergent harms that may arise unexpectedly as new products are commercialised and become widely available?

The blurring of content types and the lines between content, human and machine behaviour in a new technology environment make it increasingly difficult to establish taxonomies and define norms. How can we do so in a consistent way, and preserve our commitments to human rights, journalistic freedom, and freedom of expression?

Decentralisation of technology, tools, and platforms can make it more difficult to assign responsibility for moderation of harms, and potentially lead to arbitrage between the harms dealt with at a protocol level versus those addressed through user or community-based mechanisms.

How can we monitor and address the unintended consequences, biases, or side effects of safety features and ensure multiple perspectives, including those of marginalised groups, are considered when testing new features?

These technologies are often highly complex. How can users and regulators fill gaps in understanding so that transparency measures are meaningful?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

- Increasing dialogue between policy makers, civil society, and industry will be critical. Those making policies about new technologies and those creating them must be enabled to share information and concerns freely. The Call can help create trusted environments for those conversations to take place in a safe and open way.
- Members of our Community are already developing useful technical outputs which we can leverage, and promote, while injecting multistakeholder perspectives.
- The safety technology sector has been fast to adopt new technologies – particularly new AI tools. Bringing additional safety-tech companies and providers of open-source

tools into the Call Community could help to build relationships between safety providers and those who need assistance in countering TVEC.

- Other voices would also be useful to contribute to this conversation, including OSPs, experts in civil society, researchers with specialised knowledge, and young people (see section 4 below).
- The Community can provide a testbed and a place for dialogue on positive use-cases. These could include systems to more effectively detect TVEC for moderation purposes, use of models to identify gaps in existing moderation systems, support delivery of positive interventions, or contribute to media literacy by improving access to information.
- The Call Community can support risk identification and red-teaming activity. This will promote understanding of how new tools are implemented, where there may be unintended consequences for different communities, and how safeguards, transparency measures, and human rights impact measures can be effectively implemented when these tools are deployed.

2. Assisting smaller OSPs to eliminate TVEC online and respond to crisis incidents.

Why it's important

In 2022, the Call Community observed there had been significant progress in dealing with the proliferation of TVEC and with incident response, and that it needed to continue developing tools and mechanisms to address adversarial behaviour on smaller OSPs that may lack the awareness, capacity and/or willingness to respond.

We also identified that, consistent with our commitment to an open internet, we needed to ensure support and tools were accessible to new entrants and smaller OSPs so that responsible approaches to TVEC did not become a barrier to competition and innovation.

We identified that crisis response mechanisms were often out of reach of many smaller OSPs, significantly limiting their ability to effectively respond to an online incident that might originate on or spill over to their services.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

Canada's funding for Tech Against Terrorism to expand the Terrorist Content Analytics Platform (TCAP) has led to a significant improvement in practical alerting capabilities for OSPs, leading to TVEC being removed faster and in more places online.

Support for smaller OSPs, including around regulatory requirements (e.g., the EC's funding for Tech Against Terrorism and Violence Prevention Network to help with implementation of its Terrorist Content Online regulation, and the UK Home Office's Capacity Building Programme).

A new tiered alerting framework for the TCAP, which includes crisis response assistance and hashing of URLS to address instances where links to externally hosted TVEC are shared on platforms.

An increase in GIFCT membership, with six new members joining in 2022-23.

Recent and upcoming free tools from Call-supporting OSPs to assist smaller providers with content moderation, such as Meta's Hasher-Matcher-Actioner and Google Jigsaw's new content moderation tool.

Increased dialogue with commercial safety technology vendors that are serving the needs of smaller OSPs through sophisticated classifiers and new technologies OSPs.

Continuation on the Free, Open, Secure Internet workstream - with the objective of bringing further technical community expertise into this work.

Difficult questions

A complex, expanding global regulatory framework is placing new obligations on all OSPs. How can we ensure that smaller providers are aware of their obligations and have the capacity to take effective action against TVEC, alongside other types of illegal and harmful content? How can the whole community better support smaller OSPs?

Smaller OSPs are not as easily able to ensure 24/7 incident response capability, transparency, and human rights protections and oversight in their trust and safety solutions. Are there practical ways the Call Community can help?

What is the most appropriate way of responding to a minority group of OSPs that chooses not to address TVEC on its platforms? How can we promote responsible action, without exacerbating or amplifying bad practice?

In some circumstances, and as a last resort, interventions at the infrastructure layer have been deployed to solve problems of TVEC. This has generally been a decision made by OSPs, consistent with their contractual terms of service. What could the Call Community contribute to a shared understanding of best practice and principles around infrastructure interventions, consistent with a free open secure internet, due process, and transparency?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

The Call Community is a leader in supporting smaller OSPs; continued funding and development of tools and resources is vital.

Consider ways to fill the gap in access to useful operational information (e.g., around threat analysis and the tactics of producers of TVEC).

Assistance for community-based open-source intelligence and research capability and creation of a trusted network of practitioners ready to assist with crisis incidents.

Work with smaller OSPs, Call partners, and the commercial safety technology sector to improve transparency and respect for human rights.

Improve 24/7 incident response support for smaller OSPs, building on the Terrorist Content Analytics Platform (TCAP) alerting infrastructure and closely integrated with existing protocols, including an updated Christchurch Call Crisis Response Protocol.

Open-Source human rights impact assessment toolkits for smaller OSPs to use.

Support and engagement from venture capital to promote human rights impact assessments as an essential part of trust and safety service offerings.

3. Deepening the evidence base on gender-based hatred & radicalisation to violence;

Why it's important

Gender-based violence and gender-based online harassment and abuse (broadly gender-based harm / GBH) cause and are reinforced by individual and societal level harms on- and offline and can be a gateway to radicalisation to violent extremism.

There is a complex but correlated relationship between GBH offline and online - it does not exist within a vacuum. Rather, normalised sexism becomes magnified and amplified online. Acknowledging harm in this broader ecosystem of gender-based violence offline is important to understand and address this issue.GBH intersects with other forms of hate and processes of dehumanisation, such as racism and Islamophobia. In order to understand the drivers of GBH, an intersectional lens of gender is integral.

Misogyny and anti-LGBTQIA+ hate frequently operate as a common ideological connection across this spectrum of violence, and as a vector across different extremist ideologies. However, misogyny is also under-identified and under-prioritised as an ideological driver of TVEC in itself, reflecting an insufficient understanding of GBH, and violence towards women, girls and LGBTQIA+ people across societies globally.

Identifying how misogyny shapes ideological and corresponding algorithmic pathways to extremism enables earlier identification of, deterrence of, and interventions in radicalisation pathways, and better addresses GBH and gender-based online violence.

There is a strong policy interest from governments, civil society, and OSPs in how online harm translates to offline violence and vice versa including, for example in family violence, and harassment in professional and public environments.

There is a need to see accountability for victims.

Greater transparency and data access could make it easier to understand and address these questions.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

The Call Community and the Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD) led workshops and events, including at RightsCon 2023, on assessing gender-based online violence (GBOV) risks found across design and functioning of platforms, and on OSP responses to these problems.

ISD has drafted a paper based on these discussions that identifies the links between misogyny, GBOV, and TVEC and makes recommendations for OSPs to mitigate GBOV and intervene in misogynistic pathways to radicalisation. This paper builds on recent research completed by civil society and academia and will complement other findings and recommendations that deepen the evidence base on the linkages between GBOV and violent extremism.

The EU Internet Forum's handbook on borderline content includes some important analysis on GBOV, including examples drawn from Member States and OSPs that can be related to the violent extremism ecosystem.

The establishment of the Global Partnership for Action on Online Gender-Based Harassment and Abuse has helped to assemble expertise and institutional focus on these important issues, including supporting ISD's paper.

Violence Prevention Network's paper on Antifeminism provides insights into rhetorical strategies and connections to right-wing extremism.

Difficult questions

Misogyny and GBH are ideologically diffuse and manifest across a spectrum of actors, tactics, and harms, invoking varied community guidelines and policies. It is, however, linked to many categories of TVEC and research has canvassed how platform policies, approaches, and affordances exacerbate GBOV. What actions and mitigations can OSPs take to reduce GBOV on and across their platforms?

How can we differentiate between GBH that leads to radicalisation and that which does not? Where is the threshold for GBH in TVEC guidelines, given the broad spectrum of GBH? How can we address GBH and misogyny as a factor in radicalisation as part of viewing the broader ecosystem of GBH online and offline?

How do we acknowledge and disrupt the GBH and TVEC link through existing trust and safety tools, without compromising necessary data protection and rights to freedom of expression?

How can we achieve a higher level of standardisation and certainty when it comes to defining acceptable norms of behaviour online while maintaining a free, open, and secure internet?

To what extent are norms and policy settings for online platforms resilient to shifts in the extremism landscape (such as post-organisational violent extremism), and responsive to broader dehumanising narratives?

While misogyny has been identified as an integral component of many categories of TVEC, it continues to be under-identified by researchers and OSPs as a legitimate threat. How can we improve the identification of misogynist ideologies and GBH, especially when it is combined and embedded within other forms of online hate directed towards other marginalised groups?

How can the severity of GBOV be adequately assessed in content moderation and algorithmic pathways given the systemic under-prioritisation of GBH and of gender-based violence broadly?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

In TVEC policies, elevate the evidence that supports GBOV and misogyny as a driver for radicalisation to violence and identify clear impact goals for addressing GBOV.

Consider and operationalise existing recommendations developed by civil society (and especially victim-survivors of GBH) and academia to address GBH online and offline given research demonstrating its role in TVEC and radicalisation. Explore links with existing efforts to address dehumanising content, including CCAN's 2022 output.

Work towards developing multistakeholder recommendations, deepen understanding, and test new methods for discouraging and preventing GBH online, including, for instance, work through the Christchurch Call Initiative on Algorithmic Outcomes.

4. Algorithmic outcomes, young people, & pathways to radicalization.

Why it's important

The Call Commitments go beyond dealing with TVEC when it manifests, to address root causes, understanding how vulnerable individuals become radicalised, and how we can help prevent this from happening.

Many young offenders say they were radicalised online, suggesting there may be specific risk factors, and that interventions may need to be better tailored to the circumstances and interests of young people. This should include consideration of platform features other than recommendation/ranking systems.

There is a growing demand for data access and transparency, including through legislation.

Young people have important perspectives on new technology, its impacts on their wellbeing, and their autonomy and access to experiment and learn outside of their immediate environment. It is important that efforts to improve safety are carried out with consideration of their points of view, including their right to access and autonomy.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

Call supporters have carried out significant research, including on how recommendation and ranking systems influence user sentiment and behaviour. This includes the EU Internet Forum and TrustLab's report on algorithmic amplification, and the EU's handbook on borderline content.

Many Call-supporting OSPs have shifted towards quality-based content ranking systems (i.e. away from engagement-based ranking). There have also been improvements to the automated and human systems that flag potential TVEC which reduce the risk of users encountering it online.

There have been further advancements in algorithmic transparency, for instance Meta's publication of 'system cards,' which explain content recommendation systems and help users adjust their settings.

There is an increasing focus on 'red teaming' of online platforms and AI systems to evaluate for societal risks, including as a regulatory requirement.

Youth 'councils' and consultation bodies of different types are increasingly used to gather young people's perspectives on a range of tech policy and online safety topics.

The Christchurch Call Secretariat is setting up a Youth Reference Group to provide advice to the Call Community. A youth engagement plan is in development, to ensure the safety of participants and enable them to make a meaningful contribution.

Difficult questions

People freely choose what they want to interact with online and, consequently, play a role in shaping machine learning outputs. There is no simple or single chain of causality, and so addressing the risk of radicalisation to violence on platforms requires nuanced understanding and responses, and concerted action. How can we build the right kind of trust to work in this nuanced way?

In 2022 Call Leaders emphasised providing platform users with tools that facilitate user choice and responsibility. How do we ensure these are available and that we understand risk/harm factors to help encourage positive choices?

How do we create meaningful dialogue with young people and how can we reflect their ideas / perspectives in our work?

How can we best address these nuanced questions in languages other than English and for cultures and communities that are not currently well-served by trust and safety efforts - including Indigenous, ethnic, disabled, or migrant and refugee communities?

How do we best ensure the public good and social responsibility are factored into our deployment of AI? Radicalisation of young people and GBH are important factors in that.

How can we equip users, particularly young people to be proactive about their own safety online?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

Identify clear impact goals for preventing violent extremism in specific areas relevant to young people, including e.g. the gaming sector.

Build expertise and community input into our work on the Christchurch Call Initiative on Algorithmic Outcomes (CCIAO – below)

5. Christchurch Call Initiative on Algorithmic Outcomes (CCIAO)

Why it's important

The Call Community, policymakers, and academia share a strong desire to know more about how human/AI interactions on platforms affect behaviour, especially through content recommendations, and what role they may play in the radicalisation to violence of at-risk users.

As AI becomes more prevalent as a feature of online services, we need new ways of delivering meaningful transparency and public understanding.

There are limited options for third parties to research, compare and assess human/AI interactions on platforms. The process of doing research on user interactions can be expensive, complex, and difficult to replicate across time or between platforms.

Important user safety, privacy, and research ethics concerns need to be accounted for in any such work.

The CCIAO aims to develop new tools to empower research and help the community fulfil its objectives in this area. This includes building the evidence base around risks to young people, and impact measures for GBOV.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

The US, New Zealand, Twitter, and Microsoft, working with OpenMined, DailyMotion and LinkedIn, have built and tested a system for remote researcher queries to be carried out securely and safely. This includes the rigorous testing of privacy tools by the data custodians and working through legal, ethical, and policy commitments.

The proof of function test has now been successfully carried out on multiple platforms, demonstrating that these tools could be used to support research about algorithmic outcomes.

Georgetown University's Center for Security and Emerging Technology (CSET) has provided further support to this work, with a specific focus on on-chip transparency.

Key to the next stage will be working with the Call Community, building appropriate governance and ethics frameworks, adding more participating social media platforms, agreeing initial research priorities, and piloting initial research making use of this tool.

Difficult questions

How can we better connect cognitive and developmental experts into this work, e.g. to understand the apparent ubiquity of gender-based hatred and abuse in radical extremist groups?

There are new legal frameworks and voluntary measures promoting researcher access to data. Can the CCIAO make a positive contribution and, potentially, deliver better and more meaningful transparency outcomes as part of implementing those measures?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

Development of an ethics framework for researcher access, funding, and research priorities that reflect our commitment to human rights, privacy, and freedom of expression and association, to develop and enable use of new tools developed in CCIAO and better understand the progression of radicalisation to violence.

Expanding and scaling the CCIAO for use across the Call Community, involving members closely in direction and priority setting.

Engaging relevant experts to ensure research carried out in the next stage is rigorous and ethical, follows best practice, and contributes to our shared objectives.

6. Building, sustaining, and expanding the Call Community

Why it's important

The ongoing commitment of the Call Community, and investment in the process and its outputs, is vital to fulfilling the Call Commitments.

Expanding and diversifying our Community can help further the mission of the Call and ensures the Call continues to deliver on its commitments as our environment continues to change.

Our work needs to be meaningful to affected communities and engage the expertise of people who understand these issues from diverse perspectives, including those of young people, women and girls, and LGBTQIA+ communities.

It is also vital that we continue to engage the technical community in our work, to ensure we live up to our commitment to preserving a free open, secure internet.

Transparency and trust are essential elements of an effective community; they enable us to share information and engage in good faith on shared problems and solutions.

Effective multistakeholder work requires sustained effort and commitment, and in turn helps us to make a positive impact. In a time of constrained resources, a collective approach can help us get more from our time and effort.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

The Call Secretariat and Christchurch Call Advisory Network are onboarding new supporters, partners, and network members.

Over the last 12 months, we have hosted discussions on government transparency and reporting, and delivered guidance for our government supporters, building on the work of experts in the Community.

The Call also supported the Action Coalition on Meaningful Transparency to develop its Transparency Initiatives Portal, to connect members of the community to existing resources, reports, and upcoming events, as a basis for ongoing multistakeholder efforts to improve both technology company and government transparency.

New research outputs on the hybridisation of the threat landscape, e.g. ISD's recent paper.

Call Community dialogue sessions on significant policy issues and engagement with the Community have been a useful means of addressing new challenges individual supporters might face.

We are assessing options for a Call Community platform to enable and build engagement among Community members.

Difficult questions

How can we expand while continuing to build strong Call Community relationships and a sense of trust and understanding between and across sectors?

How can we improve and professionalise the monitoring and evaluation of outcomes, and the fulfilment of Call Commitments by supporters?

What can the Advisory Network and the rest of the Community do to help encourage supporters in cases where they are acting contrary to their commitments?

How do we avoid or manage our way through conflicting measures that may make it more difficult for us to act globally, e.g. regulatory, or other developments? Can multistakeholder work help us reach better common understandings, and enable innovation in developing solutions?

How should the Call Community re-tool to confront the growing complexity and intersectionality of violent extremism, where other harm areas such as disinformation and child sexual abuse overlap with TVEC? How do we avoid scope creep, but also build a coherent approach to this evolving threat landscape?

How do we continue to centre in our work people and communities affected by TVEC?

There are growing attempts to discredit or politicise trust and safety practices. How do we maintain an inclusive conversation and maintain transparency and public trust in these efforts?

What are the best ways to meaningfully engage more diverse regions, cultures, and language communities in our work?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

Commission and deploy the Call Community platform to help promote better interaction, including information on accountability for delivery of commitments, and to promote and enable community-led efforts.

Promote dialogue on regulatory coherence, to better understand how we can support effective efforts to eliminate TVEC globally and avoid conflicting incentives or outcomes. This should include regular exchanges between different regions and interest groups, as well as better information sharing on new developments.

Reinforce the role of the technical community in the Call, to promote a free, open, and secure internet for good as a vital part of delivering our commitments.

Encourage adoption of the Call Community's guidance on government transparency and reporting, alongside continued efforts towards improved industry transparency.

Work across the Call Community to develop community-wide benchmarks to assess, measure and evaluate our work to fulfil the Call Commitments and to build greater transparency, dialogue, and trust.

Build on the existing guidance by identifying and addressing known barriers to transparency and knowledge – in collaboration with the Action Coalition on Meaningful Transparency. This could include researcher access to data for the purposes of assessing and managing risk.

Create more resources to support smaller OSPs and civil society organisations to engage with the Call and deliver outputs meaningful to them.

7. Multistakeholder approaches to related issues

Why it's important

There is an increasing effort by institutions, groups of governments or firms, and civil society groups, to define international norms and rules for technology. This is happening in the context of competing approaches to technology – ranging from an embrace of human rights and competitive, open global frameworks through to systems of top-down control and, at the extreme, authoritarian approaches to technology.

All sectors face questions about how they allocate resources to support different strands of effort internationally, and about the optimal models for making progress on complex, shared problems.

The Call takes a multistakeholder approach based on shared commitments and principles, executive-level leadership, and cooperative, community-led development of solutions and methods of implementation. This approach may be useful for addressing other, related digital technology challenges.

All stakeholder groups are stretched at present and are looking for ways to maximise their impact with the limited capacity they have.

Recent progress and efforts by the Community

Call Leaders asked for work to consider this issue, including the possibilities for the Call model to contribute in related areas.

France has drawn on the Call model to set up the Children Online Protection Laboratory to develop practical solutions to difficult problems. Working alongside existing multistakeholder frameworks including the Tech Coalition and WeProtect Global Alliance, it has embraced a collaborative, multistakeholder governance model for the initiative.

The Call Secretariat works to support linkages with other initiatives with aligned values and objectives, including Tech4Democracy, the Freedom Online Coalition, and the Global Partnership for Action on Gender-based Online Harassment and Abuse.

Some Call Community members have expressed a desire to reduce the transaction costs for stakeholders of engaging across multiple initiatives, and to support efforts on related or 'Call-adjacent' online safety issues in ways that draw upon the Call model and contribute to safety, freedom, and human rights online.

Difficult questions

What issues can/should be handled at a multilateral level? Will those be handled in a way that sufficiently includes civil society and private sector stakeholders?

How can multistakeholder initiatives like the Christchurch Call best relate to and contribute to multilateral efforts (including, e.g. the proposed Global Digital Compact)?

What approach should the Call Community take when such institutions or processes do not take an inclusive approach, or appear to have a lower level of ambition and efficacy than multistakeholder efforts?

What should be the role of multistakeholder approaches, like that of the Call, in helping address issues with the responsible deployment of technology in a way that brings together governments, the technical community, civil society, and industry? Are there suitable opportunities in specific areas? How do we best ensure these are effective, efficient multistakeholder processes?

How do multistakeholder perspectives contribute to improving regulatory work, including as codes, standards, and benchmarks are developed in different jurisdictions?

Can we bring greater coherence and accessibility to these topics?

Possible new approaches or ways forward

New institutions or structures to help coordinate multistakeholder efforts, share information, and make it easier for small institutions, governments, and organisations to participate in shaping technology norms.

Information sharing for situational awareness across the Call Community on processes we are involved in. Supporting advocacy for multistakeholder approaches in diverse processes and issues and coordinating multistakeholder input where needed.

Other issues raised

As part of the Town Hall meetings, and through written input, Community members raised some additional issues to be considered. These included:

- Dehumanisation as an overarching theme of harmful content / conduct.
- A continued focus on testing, updating, and implementing the shared crisis response protocol, and integrating transparency, oversight, and due process protections across all the protocols active in the Community; interoperability of crisis response mechanisms; and
- The imperative of communicating the outcomes and achievements of the Call.

Conclusions

The supporters of the Christchurch Call have committed to fulfil the vision of eliminating terrorist and violent extremist content online, consistent with human rights and a free, open, secure internet as a force for good. The Call is supported by a strong Community that includes civil society and partner organisations working alongside the supporters and the Secretariat to achieve these goals.

Continuing to build a strong, cohesive, diverse, and effective Call Community remains the most important enabler across all the Call work. The trust and commitment that resides in our Community is our most precious resource. Delivering and being accountable to our Commitments and engaging the expertise from across our community helps to build trust and commitment. We have outlined actions on which there is broad agreement about how to proceed, including adding new voices to our work, developing monitoring benchmarks, and making additional efforts to build meaningful transparency and dialogue.

There is a clear priority attached to improving our incident response systems, lowering the barriers to participation, and improving the capabilities available for smaller OSPs to participate in the task of eliminating TVEC. In the context of a growing safety technology ecosystem, the Call Community should help to promote human rights standards and ensure a sufficient mix of commercial, open-source, and pooled capability is available, and that this is effective, up to date relative to the technical challenges, and enables all actors to play a constructive role should they wish to. This work will need to engage the technical community and to uphold our commitment to a free, open, and secure internet. It will need to adapt as new technologies become widely available and the thread landscape continues to hybridise and evolve.

Looking at this year's Summit, and its implications for our work in 2024, the Call community has identified important challenges that require discussion:

1. There is a strong consensus from across the Call Community that we should devote time to considering how new technology and, particularly, new foundation AI models affect the effort to eliminate TVEC online. Working within the Call Community, these issues can be addressed with specificity in a trusted environment that includes industry, government, and civil society expertise. These efforts will need to be carried out with reference to other international efforts to develop commitments and safety measures for AI more generally.

2. Call supporters are committed to understanding algorithmic outcomes, including platform features and interactions that can lead to real world harm, radicalisation to violence or exposure to TVEC. A discussion of these issues requires an understanding of how user behaviour and offline inputs factor in, and it requires consideration of other contributing elements, such as GBOV (including anti-LGBTQIA+), as drivers of radicalisation to violence. New transparency requirements and tools can assist in deepening understanding of these issues. To fulfil Leaders' objective of developing a new generation of community-driven online interventions, the Call Community will need to agree on ways to support and deliver targeted interdisciplinary research, enriched dialogue with young people, and deeper technical collaboration. This will require additional effort and resources, and a bigger coalition to lean into the work.

3. Civil society, governments, and industry are all struggling with the crowded international agenda. There is no clear alignment about where to go to develop norms and rules for the responsible deployment of technology. It is desirable to promote multistakeholder engagement on these topics and to support initiatives that bring stakeholder groups together and operate

based on a common commitment to human rights law. Where existing initiatives, such as the Christchurch Call, are playing a useful role, it may be desirable to consider ways they can be made resilient to change, and whether they might usefully support multistakeholder work on related issues. The Call Community would like to consider ways to increase mutual support of, and coherence across, related initiatives to provide greater visibility and the ability to coordinate our efforts for impact, and may wish to consider a small number of related issues on which to focus next.