

## Facebook / Dispatches Interview Transcript

Attendees: I: Interviewer  
RA: Richard Allan

### ***\* Start of Interview \****

I: Lord Allan, thank you for joining us. During the course of Dispatches filming, we feel that we have shown that Facebook's standards are not up to scratch; you're not managing to live up to your own standards and several mistakes have been made along the way. Would you like to take this opportunity to apologise?

RA: Yes, I mean you have clearly shown in the film that there are instances where we have failed to meet the high standards that we set for ourselves and the expectations of people who use our service. So we have looked at the issues you have raised with us, we have retrained the staff in the centre that you had your reporter take part in and we are making sure that whatever errors that were picked up, that we will address those expeditiously.

I: You have retrained them already?

RA: We've retrained the trainers and the trainers are now retraining the staff. But the trainers is a smaller group of people and they have been retrained now.

I: What did you train them differently? Since Friday when we gave you the letter.

RA: We've been through all of the material that you shared with us and some of that was wrong, frankly. It should not have been in those training decks. They were old training decks using wrong examples, wrong material, so we have gone through that. But also I think some of the way in which people have been talking about content on the service was clearly not appropriate. We shouldn't be talking in that way about the content that's there, and so the trainers have been retrained to make sure that at all times they are responding correctly, accurately in terms of the standards, but also sympathetically and understanding how we should be referring to content that circulates on the site and the way that people ...

I: {coughing}. Excuse me. How appalled are you that your trainers were letting through this content?

RA: Again, just to be very clear. Most of the time, the staff that we have – and there are many thousands of people working on this around the world. In fact, this year we'll be going from 10,000 people working safety and security to 20,000. Most of those people are dedicated professionals who do operate the standards correctly, who care about their work, which is keeping people safe and secure on Facebook, and they deliver. But clearly the system is not perfect. You have identified weaknesses. I mean I hope that the reporter while they were on site also saw people doing good work, which we expect from them most of the time, but you have picked some examples where clearly the work was not up to standard and it's on us, it's our responsibility to fix that.

I: I mean this was just one site. You have sites all over the world. You have sub-contractors all over the

world and this was just a short period of time, within weeks. So the numbers of mistakes that must have been made worldwide must be huge.

RA: We look at this very carefully. There is quality control over the report, so there's various aspects of that. One is making sure that we enforce the standard as it's written. We have actually put our standards out in very great detail to the public so that they can also double check whether we're meeting the standards, but also whether the individual centres are performing at the right level. And our experiences actually, in the main, those services are performing very well and that's why, again, over 2 billion people who use Facebook I think, in general, neither post the kind of content that is problematic, nor do they see it on a regular basis. But when they do, we need to act.

I: Can you justify the video of the young boy who was being beaten up by the adult that was posted on video and shared tens of thousands of times. Why was that on Facebook?

RA: An individual shared it, that material has now been removed. I want to be clear that that's not acceptable. And what we have also done, which we are increasingly doing, is take material like that, try and create a digital fingerprint of it and then use those digital fingerprints to try and prevent upload. Now there will be people who re-cut the video, who will try and recirculate it and in those circumstances, that's precisely why we have the review centres, so that we can get reports of that and get the content out.

I: So when you say it has been removed, why is it still on Facebook right now?

RA: Again, I would need to look at that specific incidence of the video and we can take that away and have our reviewers look at it, but that shouldn't be there. That material should have been taken down ...

I: So that's another example of your systems not working.

RA: Again, somebody has re-shared that video. I need to now understand why that's not been caught by the automatic filters which should be capturing material that we already know about and understand...

I: They don't work..

RA: Again, you could look at the data that we've just published in the first quarter of this year. For example, we've removed I think around 2 million pieces of ISIS and Al Qaeda content precisely through that digital fingerprinting system when ... got a terrorist propaganda video, we identified it and we prevented the upload. Now, it is not perfect. Artificial intelligence is still developing, but we are confident that over time, we can both save people from seeing that kind of content they shouldn't see and save our reviewers from having to review it by removing it automatically.

I: But why do you think this kind of content gets marked as disturbing rather than removed automatically by your people?

RA: So content will be removed if it breaches our standards. I want to be clear that on the site that you went to, the CPL site, you see part of the total system. So those are the front line reviewers. And indeed, one of their responses is to mark something as disturbing, which means it won't get seen by people under 18. That's a very important immediate protection. But behind them ...

I: Well people who say they're under 18

RA: But behind them sits a team of child safety experts. There are actually Facebook full time staff. They work with child safety organisations around the world and they work with law enforcement agencies. And material that is problematic and harmful where we think children are at risk, that team reviews – so not the front line reviewers in the CPL service, but the Facebook full time employees. They will make an assessment of whether the child is at risk. They will make a decision about what to do with the content. Including referring it to law enforcement agencies where that is appropriate.

I: But this was not escalated by CPL.

RA: Again, I would need to look into the specifics, but our system is designed that material where there is a risk certainly should be escalated to Facebook staff yes.

I: And should they have called the police if they had seen that? {unclear 6.20} like this interview?

RA: Again, just to be very clear that the Facebook staff do have relationships with law enforcement agencies and will report it to the police.

I: If it's reported to the Facebook staff?

RA: Yeah, we don't ask our front line staff in the contracting agencies to do that, but we do have a very strong team of serious child safety experts who do indeed have contacts with police forces around the world.

I: The point is, material like this which is shared tens of thousands of times and seen by millions of people makes you money. Facebook is making money from this kind of content.

RA: I disagree. I mean it is not in our interests. It's not in the interests of the people we serve to have that kind of material circulate on the surface.

I: It's not in your interest, but it is a fact that Facebook makes money from this material.

RA: I disagree. The way in which we make money is that we place advertisements in somebody's news feed. Just like if you watch commercial television, your experience is interrupted by an ad break. Well on Facebook your news feed is interrupted by an ad break. And that then isn't associated with any particular kind of content. So shocking content does not make us more money. That's just a misunderstanding of how the system works.

I: Shocking content surely keeps people on Facebook. That means it's not likely that they will view your advertising. That makes you money. That's why shocking content is good for Facebook.

RA: Again, that's not our experience of the people who use our service round the world. People come to Facebook for a safe, secure experience to share content with their family and friends. The vast majority of those two billion people would never dream of sharing content like that to shock and offend people. And the vast majority of people don't want to see it. There is a minority who are prepared to abuse our systems and other internet platforms to share the most offensive kind of material, but I just don't agree that that is the experience that most people want and that's not the experience we are trying to deliver.

I: You see, but one of your earliest investors and a former mentor of Mark Zuckerberg, Roger McNamee, described this kind of dark content as the crack cocaine of Facebook product. I mean you hook people on this stuff, you get them highly engaged with it, people share it – in outrage perhaps – but they are still viewing it and sharing it. That means you are making money from the advertising.

RA: I want to be clear. This is a small minority of people who are sharing the most offensive and shocking kind of content. And I don't think it's fair to generalise.

I: How many?

RA: Well again, we have published some data on, for example, takedowns of shockingly violent content. We're talking millions of pieces of content that we're taking down automatically in the first quarter of the year. But that's against the user population of ... My experiences of Facebook ... I use Facebook every single day, so do my family and friends. We're not seeking out content like that. In fact, we'd be deeply offended if it appears. And I think my experience is much more typical than the experience of the minority who choose to share this content. We have a responsibility to deal with that minority, but I think it's a mistake to characterise the whole platform by the actions of a small group of people who are interested in that kind of shocking content.

I: Yet the culture you created in your own moderation houses is one in which moderators are saying it's all about making money at the end of the day. If you start censoring too much, then people lose interest in the platform. That's what your moderators are saying.

RA: And that doesn't reflect the discussions that I ... I've been at Facebook 9 years. I sit in the discussion ...

I: Yeah but they're on the front line and you're not.

RA: Then they're not ... In this case, we've accepted that there were weaknesses in the people that you ... in the performance of the people that you identified in your research. Those weaknesses include that kind of comment, which simply does not reflect the culture that we've created as a company. I sit in the senior management meetings when we make the decisions about content and the issues we're considering are balancing a political expression with the requirement to keep people safe from hate speech, balancing up child safety with other issues. They're not about making money.

I: In the incidence of the video of the schoolgirl who was being beaten up and the video was being shown on Facebook, why did you have to leave that video up?

RA: People sometimes will share material that does indeed appear shocking and can be quite offensive, but they are sharing it to draw attention to a problem and highlight it.

I: Why do you need to show the video?

RA: People have, in that case, chosen to upload the video. It's not Facebook showing it; it's an individual has said look at this incidence. I want to share this with you and show you something shocking that happened and that can have a very positive effect. People can gather round and say that bullying was awful, let's all stop the bully. And they've done that by stimulating the interest through the video. Now I

want to be clear again. If the individual themselves says I want that to come down, it comes down. If the parent or guardian says I want that to come down, it comes down. If people share it to praise the incident “Look at this bullying, it’s great”, it will come down. But there are some circumstances where something that’s shocking has some valuable public function in that people are sharing that to prevent the action.

I: Not to the child, surely not for the child. If this was your child being shown being beaten up on Facebook, how would you feel?

RA: And again, as a parent, what I can do is tell Facebook to take that content down and we will. And we have taken that content down.

I: But how would you feel? As a parent. If you woke up one day and found a video of your daughter being beaten up being viewed across ...

RA: Just to be clear, we’ve had people on both sides and we’ve had people say to us “Please take that content down”.

I: Well I’m asking you, how would you feel?

RA: Again, in my personal preference would be to take the content down, but there are other parents who actually want the content to be shared in order to raise awareness of the awful incident that has happened.

I: But that harm ...

RA: To condemn the individuals.

I: That harm has been done, hasn’t it? This girl has been humiliated on Facebook because Facebook left the video up. Her family are appalled by it. The harm has been done.

RA: And we’ve taken the video down at their request now. Now I regret it if the individual feels that we were too slow or too unresponsive and again, that’s one of the things we need to look at now. The standard we set for ourselves and the standard for the people using the service is that if a parent or guardian sees a video of their child in circumstances that they object to, they do have the right to insist that we take it down and we do take it down when we’re made aware of it.

I: Why is it up to parents to put an end to the harm you are doing to their child? Why aren’t you stopping the harm before it happens?

RA: Again, the child themselves, if they tell us that they want the content taken down, we will also take it down.

I: You’re putting the onus on the victim here to complain to you. I’m saying to you, why aren’t you taking this material down before it humiliates children?

RA: And again, if the content is shared in a way that praises or encourages that violence, it’s going to come down. But where people are highlighting an issue and condemning an issue, even if the issue is

painful, there are a lot of circumstances where people will say to us “Look Facebook, you should not interfere with my ability to highlight a problem that’s occurred”. So we’re trying to make that balance. These decisions are hard and there will be people argue on either side of it. They’re very tough decisions. We’re trying to strike the balance where when people want to highlight a problem, even using shocking material, we don’t stop them from doing that, we don’t cover it up. At the same time protecting individuals who are affected.

I: And again, as people watch these videos, Facebook’s making money.

RA: Yeah ... The money we make is by people using the service and seeing ads within their news feed. There’s no connection between the advertising and a specific piece of content. I want to, again, be very clear ...

I: No but this content is keeping people on your platform and that helps you make billions.

RA: And I disagree with the idea that it is extreme content that keeps people on our platform. People come to the platform because they want this safe, secure experience where they’re sharing with family and friends. I accept there is a minority of people who will gravitate towards shocking and extreme content, but I just don’t accept that that’s the mainstream experience of people who use our service.

I: But you’re not saying that this is shocking and extreme content. You’re saying that this may be positive.

RA: I’m saying it can be depending on the context. And I want to be clear, these decisions, again, are very hard. There are criticisms on both sides. We spend a lot of time debating this internally. When we have that discussion, what should we do with the bullying video, for example, of a fight between teenagers. The discussion takes place in the context of what’s the right child safety outcome, what’s the outcome that people expect where they are both trying to highlight a problem and keep the child safe. They’re not discussions about money.

I: Isn’t the truth that you’ve been massively under-resourced? You haven’t put the money that you should have done into this?

RA: Yes, and we’ve accepted that. And I want to be very clear. You know, since last year, we’ve accepted that we were not performing at the standard that we expected?

I: Why was that?

RA: The standard we set ourselves. Ehh, I mean we’re doing something genuinely innovative here. People have not built services of the scale that we’ve built before. We have a responsibility to make sure that we do keep that service safe and secure and we announced last year about Mark Zuckerberg’s saying to investors that we are going to take a profit hit as we move from having 10,000 people working in safety and security to 20,000. That’s the kind of commitment that we think is necessary in order for us to deliver the service that we want to the standards we have set.

I: When our reporter was at CPL, there was a backlog of several days. Isn’t it possible that people reported their belief that someone was about to commit suicide and you didn’t get to it in time because you hadn’t put the money into the system?

RA: So it's correct that there was a backlog at the time. We set ourselves a standard of trying to get to the vast majority of reports within 24 hours. There are peaks in demand that sometimes mean that we don't reach that standard. And in fact, your reporter was hired as part of a recruitment exercise precisely to get us back on track.

I: I'm talking about suicide.

RA: But I want to be very clear on the suicide point. That suicide reports are rooted to a different queue. Queue is a word for the list of reports that we have coming in. If there's any reports that are related to somebody at risk of a suicide would not have gone into the queue where there was a backlog. They would have gone into a high priority queue where we were meeting the standards. We have checked since you brought this issue to us and we are very confident that even in that period where we had a backlog in the normal queue, we did not have a backlog in the suicide queue. And indeed these two can sometimes relate to each other. That as we put more people onto the high priority tasks, we sometimes slip on the lower priority tasks. The hiring we're doing is trying to make sure we can stay on top of both high priority and low priority, but I don't want anyone to think that we were careless with suicide reports – they were going into a high priority queue and they were being dealt with.

I: So the cpl moderator was wrong? To be concerned.

RA: They were wrong. Yes.

I: Right OK. That's another quite serious failure then isn't it? Erm ... Let's talk about shielding. You've heard various accounts of individuals who have been shielded. They've had shielded accounts, so that when CPL found something wrong with them and wanted to delete a post, they weren't able to. Why does Tommy Robinson get a shielded account the same as the government or the BBC or high profile organisations that are respected?

RA: So we have a system called cross check, is actually the way we refer to it now.

I: That's why you've renamed it?

RA: Yeah, and it's based on ... again, just want to explain that it's based on our experience that, you know, we had instances in the past where a very significant page on Facebook with a very significant following could be taken down by the action of somebody in one of the outsource centres pushing a button. And that was problematic.

I: What was wrong with that?

RA: That's problematic in the sense that what we need to do is make sure that decision is correct. And that's the cross check point. That we want somebody of Facebook also to look at the decision. If the content is indeed violating, it will go. And to give you an example of how that's played out – Britain First. A legal registered British political party had a page on Facebook. WE actually took it down in March of this year because they repeatedly violated our policies on hate speech. So we will take them down. But we didn't want something as significant as that – the taking down of a major, whether we agree with them or not, a major political force within the United Kingdom – to be done by a single individual at a single outsource centre. We think that those kind of decisions do deserve extra review ...

I: Because they're very valuable accounts these, aren't they? They've got hundreds of thousands of followers {unclear 18.55} Facebook content.

RA: Again, I will be clear, this is not a discussion about money. This is a discussion about political speech. People are debating very sensitive issues on Facebook including issues like immigration currently and that political debate can be entirely legitimate. It can also slip over into hate speech. And we are working very hard to try and understand that line and be very clear with people where the line is. If you slip over into hate speech, we will remove your content. But we don't want to be over censorious of legitimate political debate. That's the decision we need to make and I do think having extra reviewers on that when the debate is taking place on the site of a political party, absolutely makes sense and people would expect us to be careful and cautious before we take down their political speech.

I: That's why you allowed people to say "Muslim immigrants get out of Britain" but not "Muslim get out of Britain"?

RA: And again to be very clear, we are trying to distinguish that between hate speech, which is against a class of people ...

I: Do you not think "Muslim immigrant get out of Britain" is hate speech?

RA: Again, this is something that we have looked at in a lot of detail. It's very hard. This is right on that line.

I: Is it hate speech?

RA: Right on that line. We've not defined it as hate speech. If you are, again, expressing your view about the government's immigration policy ...

I: It's not ... well ... "Muslim immigrant, get out of Britain" – you're saying that's not hate speech? I think most people would disagree with you.

RA: I'm saying we're trying to define that line so that where people make an expression of their political views, that it is reasonable, even if I disagree with it, you might disagree with it, for somebody to express a view that they don't want more immigration, they don't want more immigration from certain parts of the world, they can express that view as a legitimate political view ...

I: OK.

RA: But they can also slip over into hate speech. And we're trying to define that line so that we permit political speech whilst banning hateful speech directed at individuals.

I: Why do you leave up graphic images of self harm?

RA: Again, you know, if it's self harm, those should come down. If people are promoting self harm. I would need to look at the context for the specific image.

I: Not promoting self harm. Just images of self harm, admitting self harm.



RA: And again, I need to look at the specifics to understand what we're talking about. But anything that serves to encourage or promote self harm is clearly against our policies.

I: But if people say "Look, I have just self harmed", that can stay up?

RA: And that, again, I want to be very clear here that there is a thoughtful approach behind how we deal with this. But where an individual posts on Facebook "I've just harmed myself" or "I'm thinking of committing suicide", our natural instinctive response may be "that's shocking, it could come down", but actually it's in the interests of that person for us to allow the content to be up and be viewed by their family and friends so that they can get help. And I worked through this and it seemed very counter-intuitive as you play it through that there's actually a very strong valid interest from that person if they're expressing distress to be able to express their distress to their family and friends through Facebook and then get help. We see that happen every day. That individuals are provided with help by their family and friends because the content stayed up. If we took it down, the family and friends would not know that that individual was at risk.

I: Do you think it's appropriate that children who are on Facebook to see that kind of imagery?

RA: And we do have – I want to be clear for younger people – an ability to mark content that is shocking as only available to over 18s.

I: But you know young people lie about their age on Facebook. There are lots of young kids on Facebook. The point is they've got access to these sorts of images because you leave them up.

RA: Where we're leaving that content up, it's for a specific reason. We're not doing that as a general sort of gratuitous look at graphic violence. We're doing that in the circumstances you've described because somebody is reaching out to their family and friends network through Facebook and we think that allowing them to reach out actually the benefits of that outweigh the harm that are caused by the content staying on the platform.

I: The point is that throughout all of these examples, I have shown you things that are harmful. That many experts believe cause danger to people who are viewing it. Facebook is not the safe place that it claims to be.

RA: We work very hard and actually harm is at the heart of the way we design our policies where content is genuinely harmful, then you know our policies are very squarely aimed at removing it. So for example promotion of terrorism. For example, promotion of violence against others. All of these harmful activities are prohibited from Facebook. Our community standards are very clear. So the harm based approach actually is the one we are following. There is some content really that is arguable both ways. And we indeed ourselves internally at Facebook have very detailed arguments over a lot of the policies you have described. This is content often that is on the edge. And that is precisely why it appears in the training index because this is hardest content to assess. Again, I hope that the experience of your reporter was there was a lot more routine work where you are simply taking content down because it's always wrong. But these edge cases do need arguing out. And there will be arguments on both sides. I don't want people to think we're thoughtless or that there's a money motivation. Actually the motivation is precisely that of preventing harm or reducing the risk of harm.

I: The point is that you are a publisher. You have responsibility for the content that is on your platform and as such, regulations coming your way.

RA: I mean, we accept that we have a responsibility to ensure that the environment is safe.

I: Are you a publisher?

RA: There's an important distinction between us and a publisher like a news outlet in that what we're doing is regulating the content of other people who use our service.

I: Are you a publisher? Do you accept that?

RA: I don't accept the word publisher. I don't think that's an accurate description ...

I: Because Facebook argued that you are a publisher in court.

RA: That's a legal distinction. There is a legal definition that was argued out in that court case.

I: It doesn't mean anything.

RA: Again, if we're talking to people, the common understanding of a publisher is a news programme or a newspaper. We're not a news programme or a newspaper, but that doesn't mean we don't have a responsibility. And we accept that responsibility. And to your point about regulation, we're very clear that we do expect there to be more regulation of services like ours and we're happy to work with governments in order to make sure that that regulation is workable and achieves its objectives.

I: One of the biggest examples of harm by Facebook has been your treatment of data and your failure to look after the data of people on Facebook. You have been given a record maximum fine of £500,000 by the Information Commissioner. Are you going to pay that or are you going to challenge it?

RA: We're in the process right now of the Information Commissioner has published an interim report and has made it very clear that's what it is. She has set out the concerns that she has and her intention to fine. We're now given a period of time to respond and we will respond. But I do want to make it clear ...

I: Are you challenging the ruling?

RA: I just want to make it clear that we have said over the Cambridge Analytica situation where this application run by this company called GSR accessed Facebook data against our terms and passed it onto Cambridge Analytica. That that was unacceptable and that there were failings in the way in which we handled that and that we damaged trust with our users. And we now need to rebuild that trust. So there are things that we think we did not perform well at and we need to do ...

I: You have been found to have broken the law in a very serious way.

RA: At the same time, there is a discussion about whether those failings constitutes a breach of UK law. The Information Commissioner ...

I: At the end of the discussion, the Information Commissioner has decided. You broke the law.

RA: Again, to be very clear, we have co-operated fully with the Information Commissioner's investigation into all of these situations. We've shared information with her, we've worked closely with her. She has published an interim finding that in her view we have broken UK law in certain aspects. She has invited us to respond to that and she herself says she will not publish her final decision until she has taken into account our response.

I: So even after everything that has happened, after the collapse of Cambridge Analytica, you're not accepting this basic finding? Is that what you're saying?

RA: We accept that there were things that we did wrong and we have apologised to our users for that. We accept that there are things that she describes in her report that we did wrong. There is a separate debate about whether or not the legal analysis of the finds are correct. Whether that is the right way to deal with it. That doesn't mean we don't accept we did things wrong and it doesn't mean that we don't respect the Information Commissioner's Office and that we've worked closely with them.

I: Is it true that you make half a million pounds in a few minutes? That's your revenue?

RA: I mean our revenue numbers are public and you can see them and everyone ...

I: Does that make sense?

RA: Again, I don't think it's about the money. I want to be very clear here ...

I: But, you know, partly it is about the money for people because they want to see Facebook punished for what it's done. And what you seem to have been given here is a parking ticket for an offence equivalent to harming a person behind drunk driving. This was harmful behaviour by Facebook. It was allowed by Facebook and it was delinquent behaviour and you got a slap on the wrist.

RA: There is a UK legal process going on. We will go through that process. The Information Commissioner has published her intention to fine within the parameters of UK law. We will respond to that. Because we also want to get to the truth of this. It's not, you know, something where we're trying to duck our responsibility. We accept the responsibility. But we also need to understand very clearly some of the detail of the very comprehensive report she has put out.

I: You got an investigation yourself haven't you? You've got an investigation going yourself, haven't you? I mean, why won't you reveal where else this has happened?

RA: Erm ... we've said that we are looking at any applications that we believe are high risk. We've said that we have suspended two hundred applications to date, not because we have evidence of wrong doing, but because we have suspicion that there may be something there or something hasn't checked out.

I: Why won't you reveal that? You know, you had these...people on the select committee want this information and you won't give it to them.

RA: And we are publishing information. We said we will publish information and, in fact, we have done.

There's a number of applications that we've had to suspend permanently because we believe that they were not in line with our terms. And again, I want to be clear. We have said where we find evidence of another application that has caused problems and that the problems were caused here, we will notify users of that application. We will go through all the processes that I think people rightly expected us to go through for Cambridge Analytica. So that is our commitment that in future we are going to be very clear and very comprehensive in our response.

I: Do you get why this is important? That this is democracy at stake here? That this is involving the election of the US president and possibly the referendum results in Britain?

RA: Absolutely. Again, I don't want to understate how seriously we take it at Facebook. Now this has been a subject of discussion at all levels of the company since the story broke out. We have had hundreds of people {unclear 30.11} our responses, both technical responses, to shut down possible avenues of data being taken out of our service inappropriately, but we also have people working, including myself, on trying to understand what this means for our relationship with politicians.

I: And yet you avoid accountability at every step. You know, it's months since the Observer and Channel 4 News broke these stories and you still haven't done an interview. Mark Zuckerberg won't appear before MPs. What has Facebook got to hide?

RA: I think actually we've been very public and just to be clear Mark Zuckerberg appeared in front of the European parliament. Our Chief Technical Officer, Mike Schroepfer, spent 5 hours in front of the UK parliamentary committee and I think gave them very comprehensive answers on what happened at a technical level and I'm here today to answer your questions.

I: I mean, as things stand, we are in a situation in which Facebook has been found guilty of breaking the law on data, so we can't trust you with our data. We have revealed how your own rules aren't being adhered to by your own systems. How can we trust your reassurances now?

RA: We are one of the most heavily scrutinised companies in the world. And that is right. We have a lot of reach to people in many different countries. It's right that we're held to high standards. We also hold ourselves to high standards. You have identified some areas where we have failed and I am here today to apologise for those failings and make it clear that we do recognise that they were weaknesses. That we should not be in this position. All I can say is that we are committed wherever failings are brought to our attention to taking them seriously, to addressing them and to try to make sure that we do better in future. And I do think, and again, that most of the more than 2 billion people who use our service around the world continue to get a very valuable service that works to their expectations. But where it does not, it is on us. And it is our responsibility to try and get it right.

I: And you say you want to be open. Facebook was in the Trump campaign wasn't it? Can you tell us what Trump ... you know, what Facebook people are doing in the Trump offices?

RA: Just to be clear about how our service works. That where politicians wish to use Facebook as a platform to communicate with people, we would rather they do that correctly in accordance with our policies and appropriately and so we do have people who work with political parties on a neutral basis. We have no interest in one campaign over the other. But if the political campaign wants to use Facebook ...

I: You were in helping him.

RA: No, we will give them guidance on how to do that correctly. Just as we would for any other large clients. So large clients who want to use Facebook, we have people who are sitting here in the office in London who work with them to make sure they do that correctly. Within our rules and technically appropriately. We will do the same if a political advertiser wants to advertise on the platform. And I think that's right. And is actually one of the ways in which we hope to improve the quality of political advertising over time. That we are able to set clear rules, put in place new tools and make sure the political parties use them.

I: Well thank you for answering these questions and you say you want to be open and you want to be straight with people because you want their trust back. We've been trying to get you on Channel 4 News for many months now. We're out of time on this but will you come back and answer questions fully on all the Channel 4 News investigations and revelations?

RA: I mean where you are raising issues of concern, it is appropriate that we respond and so please do get in touch with us if there are issues to do with ...

I: We've been in touch with you practically constantly since our programme first went out. Will you come on?

RA: I am here today, I am on today. If there are other issues, then please do invite us because we do want to make sure that people understand that we care about the serious issues you have raised and that we are prepared to respond.

I: Well done. Thank you very much.

***\* End of interview\****