

**FACEBOOK, INC**

**November 15, 2018**

**11:00 a.m. PT**

Mark Zuckerberg: Hey, everyone, and thanks for joining us today.

Before we get started, I want to take a moment to talk about yesterday's story.

We published a response last night, but I want to be very clear about one thing up front.

I've said many times before that we were too slow to spot Russian interference, too slow to understand it, and too slow to get on top of it. We've certainly stumbled along the way but to suggest that we weren't interested in knowing the truth or that we wanted to hide what we knew, or that we tried to prevent investigations, is simply untrue.

People have been working on this non-stop for more than a year and we've made a lot of progress, which you've seen in recent elections, including the midterms. And we're in a much stronger place today than we were in 2016, although of course we still have a lot more work to do as well.

We've also made progress on the issue of getting harmful content off our services more broadly -- things like hate, bullying and terrorism -- though, again, we still have a lot more work to do and that's with this call is about today.

This is been an important year overall and I spent most of it working on addressing these biggest issues that we face. As the year gets close to

wrapping up, I'm publishing a series of notes on the progress that we're making and the work still ahead.

Today in just a few minutes when I wrap up talking here, I'm going to publish a note laying out how we're approaching content governance and enforcement of our Community Standards.

This is something we've been working on for a couple months now. This is an important topic. It's about finding the right balance between two very important principles -- giving people a voice and keeping people safe.

And a lot of my philosophy here for building our services is expressed in the first words of our mission -- give people the power. Because I believe that the world is better when more people have a voice to share their experiences and when traditional gatekeepers don't control what ideas can be expressed.

But at the same time, we also have a responsibility to keep people safe and to make sure that our services help to bring people closer together in the face of growing polarization and division of the world. And we've see plenty of examples in the past couple of years of how giving people a voice unchecked can lead to both good and bad outcomes.

Now, this is the basic tension that all communities and Internet services need to manage. These are hard problems and there isn't a lot of agreement on exactly where to draw the lines on what content should stay up and what should come down. Different cultures have different norms, not only about what the content -- what content is OK, but about who should be making those decisions in the first place. There's no perfect solution here, and these really aren't problems that you ever fully fix.

In many ways, the problem of people posting harmful content online is like the problem of crime in the city. No one expects crime to be eliminated completely, but you expect that things will get better over time. And similarly, our job is to get the prevalence of harmful content to a low level and to continue reducing it over time and to manage and be ahead of new threats.

The approach that I outlined in this note focuses on a few strategies.

First, we're moving from reactive to proactive enforcement of our Community Standards. That means we're building AI systems that can identify potentially harmful content much faster -- often before anyone sees it -- and we're building a much larger team of reviewers to handle it. In more straightforward cases like spam or nudity, our AI system can remove bad content or accounts automatically. And then harder, more nuanced issues like hate speech or bullying, these systems generally flag posts for people on our team to review.

Second, we're working on reducing the spread of sensational and provocative content. Social networks face a big challenge, that people naturally engage with more sensational content. And this isn't unique; we certainly see this with cable news and tabloids too. But in our systems, what we see is that as content gets closer to the line of what is prohibited by our Community Standards, we see people tend to engage with it more. Interestingly, this seems to be true regardless of where we set our policy lines. A lot of our work is about addressing this basic incentive problem to ensure that borderline content that doesn't quite violate our policies but is close gets less distribution and not more. We're doing this across all our systems, from reducing misinformation on Newsfeed, to the recommendations that we make for groups and pages. And addressing this basic incentive problem will create a virtuous cycle by reducing sensationalism. We're going to create a healthier, less polarized discourse where more people will feel safe participating.

Third, we're focusing on giving people more control over what they see. Ultimately, we believe that people are better judges of what they want to see than we are. As we develop the AI systems to identify what content means what, we want to give people more control. And it's possible that down the road, these controls may even allow us to have more flexible standards for things like nudity, where cultural norms are different around the world. But that's down the line.

Fourth, we're building a much more robust appeals process. We have a team of about 30,000 people today who work hard to enforce our policies. But

many of these judgments require some nuance. For example, to determine if a post violates our hate speech standards, a reviewer might need to determine if a post is using a racial slur to condemn the slur -- or using it to attack someone. And as I mention in my note, our reviewers make a fair number of mistakes. And how we handle them is very important as the EFF and others pointed out earlier this week. We started building out a content appeals process this year; this has already helped us correct a significant number of errors. And our next step is to let anyone appeal a decision on content they reported and get a clear explanation of why it did or did not violate our standards.

Fifth, in working through all these different content issues, I have come to believe that we shouldn't be making so many important decisions about free expression and safety on our own. We've been talking to people about this for some time now and I've spoken to many experts myself, starting in the summer. And today we're announcing that we're creating a new independent body that people will be able to appeal to that will have the authority to determine whether content should come up or stay down. There's still a number of important questions to work through here and we're working on establishing this independent oversight body in the next year.

Finally, we're also very focused on increasing transparency so our community can measure our progress over time. We started issuing transparency and enforcement reports on how we're doing proactively enforcing our Community Standards, how much harmful content people are seeing, how much content we're taking down and so on. Over the next year, we're going to instrument our system so that we can issue these transparency reports quarterly and then we'll do conference calls to discuss the results. And I think it's important that we have the same cadence for this as we do for reporting our financial results, because this work is just as important for the mission of the company.

Those are some of the highlights from the note. Although, I encourage you to read the whole note when I publish it in a moment. Although, of course I would say that; I did spend a lot of time writing it.

Overall, these questions about what we want the internet to be are some of the most important issues facing our society right now. Giving people a voice aligns with our democratic ideals and we've seen a lot of examples where giving people -- where -- sorry, where people sharing their experiences has supported important movements and helps bring people together. And we shouldn't lose sight of that. But we've also seen that some people will always seek to use these tools to subvert these same ideals and try to divide us.

One of my biggest lessons from this year is that when you connect more than two billion people, you are going to see all the good and bad of humanity. And we've spent the last two years working to strengthen all of these systems, and we still have a lot to do, but we've made a lot of progress.

And the approaches we're discussing today are part of the next step in making our services more accountable, more transparent and in line with our mission of giving people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. We're going to publish the note in a minute.

And now, I'm going to hand it over to Monika, who will talk about our approach for creating and updating our policies.

Monika Bickert: Thanks, Mark.

Hi, everyone. My name is Monika Bickert and I lead the team that's responsible for developing Facebook's Community Standards.

Many people on my team spent their careers before coming to Facebook working on safety, and that includes working as academics, or members of civil society organizations, or in law enforcement or government. In fact, before coming to Facebook, I spent over a decade as a criminal prosecutor, investigating all sorts of crimes including child exploitation and terrorism.

Our Community Standards determine what stays up on our service and what comes down. And they're designed to ensure that people feel safe when they are sharing on Facebook. When I first started this job about five and a half years ago, we did have a set of public-facing Community Standards but those

policies were very high level. They said things like, we don't allow bullying, or, we don't allow hate speech.

But the devil is really always in the details. And at that time, we didn't give a whole lot of detail about what we actually meant. What we heard time and time again -- not just from people who used Facebook, but also from the outside experts and groups that we work with -- was that they wanted to know more about exactly where we were drawing these lines and why some things came down while other things stayed up.

Earlier this year, we published a new version of our Community Standards that includes the very specific definitions that we use to make decisions about the content on our platform. For example, we explained that we don't generally allow images of nudity but there are exceptions such as pictures of women who are protesting topless. Now, to be clear, this is content that we were already allowing on the site but we had never explained that detail publicly.

We felt that this greater transparency was really important for two reasons. First, so that people could understand where we draw these lines and how our policies apply to their own posts or photos. And second, given that these judgment calls impact millions of people every day, we felt this would increase our accountability for the decisions we make. Our community is now better equipped to give us their input and push us to improve.

And this second point is really important. There are so many people and organizations with valuable experience on hard issues -- like child exploitation, terrorism, hate speech, bullying -- and we really want to learn from them. We regularly ask them for advice, including when we think we need to change or update a policy, either because social norms are changing or because we're seeing a new issue in the world and we want to address it.

This year alone, for example, we updated our policy so that we now remove misinformation that may contribute to imminent violence or physical harm. That change was made as a result of advice we got from groups in Myanmar and Sri Lanka. It was clear that in those countries and others, seemingly

benign posts or photos could have severe consequences in the real-world. In fact, I'm actually in Sri Lanka right now, continuing our conversations with some of these groups and continuing to get input from them.

We've also updated our misrepresentation policies to explicitly ban coordinated inauthentic behavior. That is to say, networks of accounts working together to mislead others about who they are or what they're doing. We want people to be able to trust the connections they make on Facebook, which is exactly why we ban this kind of behavior. Thanks to these changes, we've removed over 2,000 accounts by foreign actors in places like Russia and Iran, who were using Facebook to try to manipulate opinion in other countries.

We debate the merits of all these changes, both the minor ones and the major ones in a global biweekly policy development meeting. As a regular part of this meeting we consider advice and feedback from third party groups around the world. Going forward we'll be publishing minutes of those meetings to increase transparency and accountability around these decisions. In the next few weeks we will also publish a searchable archive of the updates to our policies so that people can track our policy development process over time.

As Mark said, when you connect over two billion people you'll see a lot of good -- and you'll also see bad. It's important that we prevent this misuse so that people feel comfortable sharing on Facebook. We're committed to working hard to keep people safe when they're using our products.

Unfortunately, we know that people will always find new ways to try to get around our rules, which is why it's so important that we keep them up to date and continue to get input from outside experts, who may have more experience on a particular issue or trend than anyone else on our team.

And, with that, I'll turn it over to Guy, who's going to talk more about the (importance of safety).

Guy Rosen: Thanks, Monika.

I'm Guy Rosen; I'm Vice President of Product for Safety and Security. And I wanted today to talk you through our second Community Standards enforcement report.

This report shows how much bad content people actually saw, how much we removed, and how much we detected on our own before people reported it to us. We're releasing this report so that people can judge for themselves how we are doing in enforcing our Community Standards. With this second report now, we have published our enforcement numbers for a year, from October 2017 through September 2018 for six areas -- graphic violence, nudity, terrorist propaganda, hate speech, spam, and fake accounts.

This time around we're also adding two new categories of data for which the numbers are available starting from July of 2018 -- bullying and harassment, and child nudity and sexual exploitation of children.

I won't go through the whole report -- you can find a copy on our Web Site -- but instead I will share some highlights. As Mark has said, the single biggest improvement in enforcing our policies comes from technology -- artificial intelligence and machine learning.

We've continued to build systems to proactively detect potentially problematic posts. This has a number of important advantages. First, it lets us remove more content more quickly, before anyone reports it -- or sometimes, even before anyone sees it. For example, in the case of a post where someone is expressing thoughts of suicide this could even mean the difference between life and death because as soon as our technology has identified that someone might be at risk, our reviewers can review the post and can offer them help or even contact first responders to get help on the ground.

Secondly, the technology can help free up our reviewers to work on cases where human expertise is needed. For instance, it's sometimes hard to tell whether someone is talking about their own drug addiction, which is OK, or encouraging others to take drugs, which is not. It's the same with hate speech where, it could be a challenge to distinguish between someone describing an



experience where a hateful slur was used against them versus a person who's making hateful comments about another group. These nuances matter a lot.

And finally, technology can help reduce the number of mistakes we make in removing content because it will be more consistent at repetitive tasks than people. However, people will always be part of this work, whether it's the people in our community who report things to us, or people on our team who review content.

In the last year, we've made good progress on proactively detecting hate speech as well as graphic violence. Since our last report, the percent of hate speech that we detect proactively -- in other words before anyone reports it -- has more than doubled from 24 percent up to 52 percent. And the rate for graphic violence increased 25 percentage points from 72 to 97 percent.

But there's a lot more to do. For example, we're working to do a better job of proactively detecting bullying and harassment when it happens on Facebook. For that as well as for hate speech, we also have more work to do in languages, for example those that are less widely-spoken. For example, in the last year, we built systems to proactively detect hate speech in Burmese.

And we're not just working to find more bad content but also working to remove it. Let's take terrorist propaganda. The report shows a spike in removals in the second quarter of 2018, during which we removed 9.4 million pieces of terrorist content; that is more than in the rest of the year combined. The reason for this spike is systems we built to identify and remove old content that was on the platform. In the third quarter, the number of removals declined because we've completed this process.

We also took down over 1.5 billion fake accounts in the last two quarters. Most of these were commercially motivated with bad actors trying to create fake accounts in bulk. Because we're able to remove most of them within minutes of registration, the prevalence of fake accounts on Facebook has remained steady at between 3 to 4 percent of monthly active users -- as we reported in our last earnings as well.

Overall, we've made progress here, but we have more work to do to further fight abuse on Facebook. And as Mark said, to ensure that we continue to be transparent and accountable, we will do a quarterly call on these numbers by late next year, very similar to the call we do for our financial earnings.

Thank you.

Operator: And we will now open the line for questions. Please limit yourself to one question per person. To ask a question, press "star" followed by the number "one."

Your first question comes from the line of Rebecca Jarvis from ABC News.

Rebecca Jarvis: Hi. Thanks for doing this call.

Mark, I wanted to talk to you about the beginning of the call. You started out talking about The New York Times story and the fact that Facebook was too slow to stop Russian interference. Your board, since the story came out, has said that they pushed you to move faster.

Is anyone going to lose their job over this? And if not, can you explain your thinking and why you don't see that as part of taking responsibility here?

Mark Zuckerberg: Sure. Thanks for the question.

These are really important issues. And when we found out about them, we started investigating them heavily. It has taken us a while to fully wrap our arms around them. I do think that, for the election issues specifically, we've made a lot of progress, as you can see in the elections around the world -- although, there's still a lot more to do. You can imagine that everyone -- the management team and the board -- upon learning about this, recognized the importance of this and wanted to make sure that we fully understood the issues.

In terms of performance and personnel management, I just generally don't talk about that -- specific cases of that in public. It's not that we run the company and people make mistakes and there's no consequences. It's that as part of the

normal process of running the company, we're evaluating people's performance and making changes either in role or in some cases finding different people to do different roles when we need to.

That's an ongoing process, that's part of running the company and we'll certainly keep doing that.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Steve Kovach from CNBC.

Steve Kovach: Hi. My question's for Mark.

Your blog post this morning refers to Definers and their work related to the group Freedom from Facebook. And it says, quote, the intention was to demonstrate that it was not simply a spontaneous grassroots campaign as they claimed, but supported by a well known critic of our company.

Who is that well known critic you refer to and how do you know they supported Freedom from Facebook?

Mark Zuckerberg: Look, I learned about this reading in The New York Times yesterday. As soon as I read about this in The New York Times, I got on the phone with our team and we're no longer working with this firm.

The bottom line on this is the intention was not to attack an individual, but to demonstrate that a group that was saying that it was -- spontaneously came up as a grassroots effort was in fact funded by -- just was not a spontaneous grassroots effort. It was well funded. I have tremendous respect for George Soros, even though we disagree on the impact and the importance of the internet overall. And the bottom line here is though, as soon as I learned about this, talked to our team and we're no longer working with this firm.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Josh Constine from TechCrunch. Please go ahead. Josh Constine from TechCrunch, your line is open.

Josh Constine: Hi. This is Josh Constine.

During the letter that you published regarding Definers, you talk about not knowing -- or not authorizing Definers to write misinformation posts or fake news posts in support of Facebook.

But did Facebook know that the company, Definers, had a relationship with NTK, which wrote these kind of stories?

Mark Zuckerberg: Josh, I don't know. I learned about this relationship when I read The New York Times piece yesterday, and like I said, as soon as I read it, I looked into whether this was the type of firm that we want to be working with and we stopped working with them.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Issie Lapowsky from WIRED. Please go ahead.

Issie Lapowsky: Hi.

I just want to continue on that line of questioning though, because it was public knowledge that Definers was working with Facebook and it is public knowledge that Definers was an opposition research company. I think probably most of the reporters on the call including myself have been receiving pretty transparent messages from them on your behalf trying to badmouth either activist groups or other tech companies.

I guess I just wonder why Facebook in general -- maybe it wasn't your call -- but why Facebook felt that opposition research is a winning strategy?

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes, I -- look, so again, this is a case where -- I learned about yesterday. In general, I think you're right. This type of firm might be normal in Washington but it's not the kind of thing that I want Facebook associated with, which is why we're no longer going to be working with them.

My understanding from talking to our team is not that we had them attack any competitor or anything like that. I don't know where that part of your question is coming from, but yes, the general thing is, I learned about this yesterday, it's not the kind of firm that I think we -- the type of work that I want us to be doing, so we're not doing it.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Paresh Dave from Reuters.

Paresh Dave: Hey there.

There's -- in your addendum to the transparency report, it says that you're sampling for estimates of prevalence. Wondering why you have to sample to do that. Shouldn't there be a simple way to see how many people were presented a particular post? And then what you're doing to sort of provide estimates for the categories that you currently don't?

Guy Rosen: Hey. This is Guy. Thanks for the question.

The way prevalence works, is in order to have a sense of how much bad content on the site and is shown to people, we need to sample and essentially take a sample of the content that is viewed by people that is actually delivered to their experience, and then we provide that sample to our review team who can then go over those pieces of content and define which ones violate our standards and which ones do not.

The reason we do sampling like that is it enables us to know not just which pieces of content we caught, but also the ones we missed. And it's really important for us as we report on these metrics to be able to hold ourselves accountable and to understand which pieces of content were still presented to people, either because we didn't take it down or because we took it down, but we were too slow and it was shown to someone in the meantime.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Kurt Wagner from Recode.

Kurt Wagner: Hey. Thanks.

Obviously, I think, talking about content moderation, (obviously, Myanmar) misinformation and hate speech was leading to some really serious real-world violence.

I'm curious, did you ever consider completely shutting down Facebook in Myanmar until you (could better find out) this kind of stuff? And if not, has there ever been a situation where you considered taking Facebook offline as

the -- maybe the best way to solve the problem until you could improve your own policies (and sort of things)?

Thanks.

Monika Bickert: Thanks, Kurt.

Overwhelming, we see people using Facebook for really good reasons and we know that it actually can help people get help and stay safe. What's important to us is making sure that we are understanding the risks in any particular landscape and that we're working with partners on the ground and putting the right resources in place so we can address those risks.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of the Deepa Seetharaman from Wall Street Journal.

Deepa Seetharaman: Hey. Thanks for taking the call.

I have two questions. Mark, have there been personnel changes, structural changes? Have you actually fired anybody over some of the missteps that have been made over the last two years?

And secondly, on the Definers relationship, did the content of the messages -- did they go out without Facebook approval or was Facebook informed of all these different messages along the way?

Mark Zuckerberg: All right, Deepa, let me answer those two but I also want to add something on Kurt's question before.

He asked the question of would we ever consider taking the service down. And we have. And the cases in which we have involve when we're worried about a privacy or security issue. There was one case I think earlier -- this might have been around 2010 or so -- where an engineer shipped something that was a privacy or security risk and put people on the service at risk, so we just took the whole service down.

More recently, when we learned about the security issue that we had in the last couple of months, we didn't take the service down for everyone, but we

logged out all of the people who might have been affected, even though it's not clear that the vast majority of them actually were, just as an extra precaution. That's been the main way that we've approached that. But -- so yes, I wanted to make sure that I added that. All right.

Deepa, so your questions were first, did -- have we made any personnel changes.

Yes. As a normal course of doing things, we do make changes. Some of them have been quite public. For example, Nick Clegg recently joined as our new Head of Global Affairs and I think that that's going to be a very important addition to the team in helping us get a more global perspective. I think Nick just adds a great perspective to the team that we have here and the work that we need to do.

What was the other question?

Operator: One moment please while we...

Mark Zuckerberg: What was -- what was the actual question?

Caryn Marooney: It was, (Definers) were you aware of the content of messages they made...?

Mark Zuckerberg: Oh, I mean, me personally, no. I didn't know that we were working with them. Maybe we can follow up on that question.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Mike Isaac from The New York Times.

Mike Isaac: Hey, Mark. Hey, everyone. Thanks so much for taking my question.

Mark, I think this is one for you. Obviously you're getting a lot of questions on the Times report yesterday. I know that you had said you're not really talking about internals or personnel stuff, but I think one of the things a outside group of shareholders is pushing for is some board changes and governance stuff. And I guess I'm just wondering if you're open to the idea of the board chairman position changing? That's something that I believe you currently hold right now.

And I think -- I think people are just wanting to know -- we see a plan for Facebook to make changes so things like the disruption don't happen again, but I guess I'm just wondering if leadership at the top is really reflecting on how they weren't -- how you all weren't prepared and if you have to make real deep changes there to better foresee this stuff in the future.

Thanks a bunch.

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes. OK, so I think in general there are a lot of issues here that we were behind on. And I think a lot of the critique of the company is fair and a lot of the feedback has been very important for us to take in order to learn and do better because we feel like we have a responsibility to do that and that's our primary goal here.

In the last couple of years I think we've made a lot of progress on all of these issues. Elections, perhaps the most, but then the topic for today around Content Governance and Enforcement I think we were also making a lot of progress. We have more work to do there as well, but I think that that -- it just keeps on getting better every quarter that goes by. And you'll see that in the - - in the transparency reports that we publish.

For the board composition, I don't -- I don't think that that specific proposal is the right way to go, but I am quite focused on finding ways to get more independence into our systems in different ways, which is one of the big proposals that I'm talking about -- that we're -- that I discuss in the note is around -- is around this independent body for appeals, right?

I think it's really important that people know that this process is going to be fair, that the decisions that we make -- unfortunately, I'm -- we're never going to get to the point where there are no errors. Making sure that we handle the errors well and fairly is very important. We want to give people an appeal and then we want to give people another appeal to an independent body if the independent body thinks it's important and chooses to take that.

And I think that this is going to be a very important part of our overall governance over time. I'm trying to set up the company so that way we have



our board, and we report on our financial results and do a call every quarter, but that also we have this independent oversight that is just focused on the community. And every quarter we're going to post the transparency and enforcement results like we're posting today.

And we're also going to get on a -- on a call to talk about the results there because I do think that the balance of these two is just incredibly important for serving everyone better over time.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Sarah Frier from Bloomberg.

Sarah Frier: Hi, guys. Thank you for taking my question.

I just want to know, based on some of the critique we've had in the last couple days, how are things going to change in Facebook's relationship with its critics and with lawmakers and with the media when Facebook is criticized? Are you thinking more broadly about what should be different? I know you cut ties with Definers, but is there anything else that you want to fix?

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes. I think this is good question.

The story basically -- reading it, it goes through a lot of the issues from 2016 to today. And I think the reality is that we've made a lot of progress on a lot of these issues since then so we have addressed a lot of things. But I think transparency is one of the bigger areas where I think we need to continue doing more.

And you've seen in the last few months, we're doing more of these calls. When we -- when we find coordinated inauthentic activity, we get on the phone and we try to answer the hard questions up front so that way people understand how we're -- how we're dealing with this. We even, in a -- in a lot of cases around the security issues, have gotten on the call to try to answer questions before we even knew everything, just to be fully transparent about that.

And certainly, today, we were planning on doing this call already, but I think it's a good opportunity to make sure that I can answer questions from the

stories that came out yesterday as well. I think this is going to be just an important theme over time, is increased transparency in addition to the substantive fixes that we're making.

The last point that I would -- that I would make on this is that these really are not issues that you ever fix; they're issues that you manage over time. And we need to get them to a good level where the amount of harmful content is low and where we're continually improving and staying ahead of new threats as they come up.

But I just think that the expectation that we should have is that there are going to be ongoing content issues. People -- if we're giving people a voice some people are going to be posting bad stuff. And we need to be sure that we're on top of that but what I think what the world should expect from us is that we're transparent about that and doing as well as we can in putting the right systems in place. Those are probably some of the bigger things that -- that I think it makes sense to talk about here.

I'll also note that I think we should probably take a bunch more questions. It's -- we took awhile with the -- with the opening statements. I want to make sure that we get through a lot of the questions that you all have. Let's take a bunch more.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Elizabeth Dwoskin from the Washington Post.

Elizabeth Dwoskin: Hey, guys. Thank you very much for doing the call -- for taking the questions.

This is actually a question about the content report released today. I'm curious, why is -- why is bullying so low? I think you said it was 14.1 percent -- why are you catching so few of those bullying posts?

And I also have a second question about the Times story which is, there was a line in the story where it said how the teams found Facebook accounts that were linked to Russian hackers who were messaging journalists. And I'm

wondering, have you ever monitored the Facebook Messenger messages of journalists?

Mark Zuckerberg: Absolutely not on the second question.

And Guy can take the details of the first one.

Guy Rosen: All right. On the first question on bullying, so bullying has a relatively low rate of proactive detection because it's a very -- it has a very personal nature. At the high level you can think about bullying in two categories. Some categories are very subjective in nature and it'll actually require that someone report it to us in order for it to violate our policies. Some other cases, the policies will enable us to objectively determine something as bullying and then we can proactively detect it.

The example for that first category is -- let's say someone posts a photo of me with the caption, you're crazy. That could be either affectionate or it could be mean and we won't be able to proactively detect that kind of content but if I report that to Facebook then we can use that signal and then we will remove it.

While there is room for improvement and we're continuing to work on bullying, we'll likely never get to equivalently high rates because a big chunk of that is personal in nature.

Mark Zuckerberg: And just going back to the second one, I think what you might have been referring to here is that -- something I talked about in Congress earlier this year -- that leading up to the election in 2016 we found and handled several threats with ties to Russia -- including this group APT 28, which was under the banner of DC Leaks, was creating fake accounts that they were using to try to send messages to seed that misinformation with journalists.

We don't read messages, but what we do in a lot of these investigations to try to find inauthentic behavior is we're looking at the metadata of how -- of basically clusters of accounts that are fake accounts to try to identify -- and we do this generally, computationally a lot of the time -- to basically figure out which accounts are fake and where there might be clusters of bad activity.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Rory Cellan-Jones from BBC.

Rory Cellan-Jones: Hi, Mark.

On that issue of bullying, we've had speech from Prince William in the U.K. about that very thing. He says that social media (services aren't) taking it seriously. On every challenge they face -- fake news, extremism, hate speech, privacy, bullying -- our tech leaders seem to be on the back foot. The (noise) of shareholders, profits, is distracting them from the values that that made them successful in the first place.

I think he's talking about you and he's got a point, don't you think?

Mark Zuckerberg: Let me -- let me say a couple of things on this and I think Monika will probably want to jump in.

First is that we're doing a couple of things here that I think are really important. One is, we're going out of our way to try to proactively enforce the policies using this combination of AI systems and just dramatically growing the review team.

But even beyond that -- that's for the content that we take down -- there's also a big issue on social networks and in media more broadly which is that people are just more likely to engage with more sensationalist and provocative, and sometimes negative content. And we think that that's bad; if that's unchecked, then that can have negative effects. We think that that can fuel polarization and division and be generally a problem.

In the note that I posted, I included a graph that basically shows how distribution in engagement can roughly grow as the content approaches the line of what is acceptable. And that -- from some of our work, it seems like that's true no matter where you draw the lines.

What we really need to do here is architect the whole system to take into account that negative incentive, that negative natural pattern of how people engage with content. And we're basically going through and rearchitecting a lot of systems, not only Newsfeed but the recommendations that we make for

Groups and Pages to make sure that the content is not borderline content, whether that's misinformation or mean content that doesn't maybe violate our hate speech or bullying policies but may still be a little bit negative and make people feel not-good.

But it's -- we don't want to ban it because it doesn't cross the line of what we think should be prevented and -- from giving people a voice, but we want less of that stuff in the network. That's generally very important.

The second point that I would want to make here is, I do know that there's some tradeoff on some of these issues between privacy and some of the safety work. And one of the last questions someone was asking, do we read people's messages, and the answer's no. Of course in WhatsApp, the system is fully encrypted, which means that we couldn't even if we wanted to, but that it -- also there's some additional friction there, we can do a pretty good job on WhatsApp of detecting fake accounts, by looking at the patterns of activity and finding a lot of bad stuff that way, even without seeing the content, but there are also some tradeoffs.

And a lot of what we're trying to do is architect the systems to give people really good privacy too. And I think that some of the time -- these are why these are big and important questions and why broadly, across society, people don't necessarily agree on exactly where you should draw the line because there are questions on, should more things be encrypted to maximize privacy there? Or should we be more focused on solving some of these other issues as the (higher order of day)? Figuring out the right balance there is just extremely important.

All right, Monika, do you want to add anything?

Monika Bickert: Yes, thanks, Mark.

I would just add, coming from my background as a criminal prosecutor, this is what I did for a living, was worked on child safety and counterterrorism. And we have dedicated teams working on these issues at Facebook. Nothing is more important to us than getting it right here. We have partnerships with

academics, with safety experts, and we're building out resources for our community in the site itself.

For instance we have a safety hub and a -- and a site with information on bullying, and we're also working partnerships offline as well and that includes in schools and working with parents groups and community groups.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Michael Cappetta from NBC News.

Michael Cappetta: Mark, thank you for doing the call.

If you didn't know about the relationship with Definers can you share who did know and created it plus is there any change to how outside lobbyists are going to be hired going forward?

Mark Zuckerberg: I think our -- someone on our -- on our comms team must have hired them. In general we need to go through and look at all of the relationships that we have and see if there are other ones like this that might be more typical DC type of efforts to handle political issues that are not the kind of thing that we want to be involved with here.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Julia Boorstin from CNBC.

Julia Boorstin: Hi.

Just to follow up on that issue, Mark, I think what's most surprising about the fact that you didn't know is that all of us on the call did know and have received information and information (about) conference calls from Definers.

I guess the question is who's responsibility was that and was that under Sheryl's team, someone else's team and what changes will you make structurally or firing people as a result of that?

Mark Zuckerberg: Look, I feel like I've answered this question a bunch of times. I'm not going to get into on this call specific personnel changes or things like that. Certainly -- I care about this and we take this seriously. The most important thing to me

is getting the substance right. But yes, I'm not sure I have much more to say on that here.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Casey Newton from The Verge.

Casey Newton: Hi.

I had a question for Mark about the independent body that you proposed. I know it's super early, but I wondered if you could say anything about how you scale that to handle the amount of appeals you might receive, and whether you would like that body to publish its findings or create some kind of case law?

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes, that's basically -- that's the goal. The way that we are thinking about this is we'll have our systems do the first level of enforcement and review. Then if a person wants an appeal they can. And then we'll handle that kind of first level of appeals or the second level of review internally as well. We'll scale that up to be able to handle a lot of cases.

And then the way that we're thinking about this -- although there are a lot of questions that we need to sort out still before we can -- we can start to establish this. And we're going to start focusing on running some pilots earlier next year to try some of these ideas out. The basic approach is going to be that if you're not happy after getting your appeal, then you can also try to appeal to this broader board or body.

We're probably -- it's probably not going to handle every single case, it'll -- like some of the higher courts in other areas, maybe it'll be able to choose which cases it thinks are incredibly important to look at. And it certainly will need to be transparent about the way that it's deciding the issues. And there are a lot of specifics about how exactly this is going to work that we need to figure out over the next year.

Monika, do you want to add anything to this?

Monika Bickert: No, I think that's right. We're going to continue to learn over this next year and make sure that we get this right.

Operator: Your next question comes...

Caryn Marooney: ... (I think we have) time for two more questions.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Donie O'Sullivan from CNN.

Donie O'Sullivan: Hey. Excuse me.

This is a question for Mark. Facebook has spoken recently about how it has gotten a lot better at identifying inauthentic behavior and fake accounts. Is there any concern that Facebook's initial valuation, which was based on monthly active unique users, may have been overstated given that there might have been so many fake accounts?

And secondly, The New York Times story yesterday and Facebook's handling of Cambridge Analytica in 2015 would suggest that this is a company that we might not be able to trust. Why should Wall Street trust Facebook numbers of its monthly active unique users?

Mark Zuckerberg: Guy, do you want to take the first one then I'll take the second one...?

Guy Rosen: ... yes. Hey, this is Guy.

On your question on fake accounts, we as part of the financial earnings have always published a percent of accounts that we believe are fake accounts. We do this by a sample which we then review to see how many accounts there are fake. That number is at three to four percent of our monthly active users. We're including that both in the report today, and that also is always included in our earnings every quarter.

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes, and on the broader issue -- yes, I mean on fake accounts, I think we include in our financial disclosures that there's some percent of the accounts that we expect will be fakes. There's some margin of error there. But I mean overall, you build trust in the disclosures over time by being consistent and accurate. And when you have setbacks like we've had this year, that is a big issue. And it does erode trust and it takes time to build that back.



Certainly our job is not only to have this stuff at a good level and to continually improve but also be ahead of new issues. And I think that over the last couple of years, that's been one of the areas where we've been the most behind. Especially around the election issues that have come up and everything in the story yesterday. A lot of these were issues that we should have been ahead on and that frankly (that's) taken us too long to get ahead on, but we are making progress in getting there.

Operator: Your last question comes from the line of Hannah Golden from Elite Daily. Please go ahead.

Hannah Golden: Hi. Thank you for making this call and taking questions.

My question pertains to the reports and has to do with the prevalence of content that is deemed to be in violation of Community Standards. Given the 2.27 billion monthly active users, having three or four percent of them potentially involved in fake accounts would still be quite a significant number of users.

I'm wondering if Facebook can provide further specific data as to the prevalence of these fake accounts and things like hate speech and if it can answer whether these instances have increased in the months leading up to the 2018 election or has declined?

Thank you.

Mark Zuckerberg: Guy is going to take this one, but before -- I just think that there are a lot of good and important questions here and I want to make sure we get a chance to get to more of them, so let's keep going for a while and if you guys have more questions, we'll just keep taking them until we need to wrap up.

Guy Rosen: Hey, so on that question -- so as I said and as you said, three to four percent of the monthly active users is the number that we've determined are fake accounts. the majority of those are actually very short-lived on the site. We take down millions of fake accounts every day and that's the reason that despite even having an increase in the number of fake accounts that have been taken down, the actual prevalence of those accounts which are still monthly

active users has remained steady. And we always monitor them to better understand what kinds of abuse and what kinds of behavior are happening.

In terms of the election, we didn't see a specific spike around that; the prevalence has remained fairly constant. And again we have and will continue to publish that number.

Operator: Your next question comes from Shannon Bond from the Financial Times.

Shannon Bond: Hi, guys. Thanks for taking the call.

I'm wondering, Mark, about the -- this independent board, independent review you're looking at setting up, I know you said it's early days, but can you talk at all about the kind of expertise you'd be looking to include on this, what kind of people you'd be looking to reach?

Mark Zuckerberg: Sure, and Monika can speak to this too.

I think that one of the biggest questions that we need to figure out in the next year is how to do the selection process for this body in a way that makes it independent but also will ensure that it's focused on upholding the principles of giving people a voice while also keeping people safe. And that's just going to be a very challenging balance to get right, but it's really important.

If we -- if we make a -- if the group ends up being too tightly decided by Facebook, then it will feel like it's not independent enough. If it's completely isolated and there's no accountability, then it's really hard to make sure that it enforces the principles over time.

The bottom line on this is that the process what we're about to embark on is getting external input from a lot of the experts that we've already engaged with and others around the world -- academics, journalists, people who've studied these issues, experts in hate speech and free speech and all of the different issues that are at play.

And then we want to try to run a few pilots in the first half of the year, trying out different types of systems to address different types of issues. And we'll

learn from there and see what we want to codify. But the goal next year will be to establish this body formally in the next year across the board.

Monika, do you have anything that you want to add on this?

Monika Bickert: Sure. Thanks, Mark.

Yes, we already -- I want to be clear that we already get a lot of input from external groups, and we try to do that looking at our global community. We try to get experts from around the world who have expertise in things like Mark mentioned, like hate speech or like bullying, general safety experts, also those with experience or expertise in human rights or freedom of expression.

And what we've seen is that putting all of those different areas of expertise together can really help us get to the right place. And so we're now looking for more ways to give that community a direct voice. Like Mark said, we're still going to be -- we're going to be doing pilots, we're still going to be learning, and we still have a lot of questions to answer ourselves about how exactly we will make this body work.

But we have a good starting point and we already engage a lot with external groups.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Dan Patterson from CBS News.

Dan Patterson: Hi there. Thanks for doing these calls.

Quick question about machine learning, Mark, I wonder if you could help us understand the data center that will be used to train the M.L. and what they will be looking for specifically.

I think we can all remember some bad examples, like Microsoft's Tay bot where M.L. can go wrong.

And related to that, with this board of 20,000 to 30,000 people will be reviewing content, you said you'll be cyber experts -- I wonder if these will be Facebook employees or (be) independent contractors? And if you can help us

understand, maybe the salary range? Are they paid a salary or are they paid as hourly wage workers?

Mark Zuckerberg: Sure. OK, on the second it's a combination and Guy or Monika can speak more to the details of that.

The first is around the AI systems and how are they trained. In general, we have this large effort of people who work on enforcing the policies. That includes both content reviewers but also engineers and security experts and experts in all the different domains that we have to -- that we have to handle here.

When -- we have efforts where as people are reviewing the content. We also have groups that tag certain content in order to specifically be able to train the AI systems. That, we do across a lot of our systems, we do this in Newsfeed for understanding what the quality is that people -- that people value in stories.

We try to get to ground truth of what people's experience is and what people value and what humans think -- what real people think of our -- are the lines on these things. We need to train the systems off of that.

One of the topics that I covered in the note is addressing algorithmic bias, which you mentioned here. This is really important. There's an emerging field at the intersection of artificial intelligence, computer science and ethics around making sure that these machine learning systems that you build don't end up having biases that treat people unfairly. Because, certainly, if you -- if you train a system and it gets some sort of bias then it could apply that across a wide swath of the community.

These are really hard problems because the definitions of fairness are not -- different people have different views on what you should be optimizing for so this is an ethics issue in addition to a computer science issue. But it's somewhere where we're really focused on -- we've stood up a pretty big effort on this this year. We're focused on building a computationally rigorous and analytical framework for determining bias in the systems and making sure that we don't have unwanted bias in our systems. And that's certainly something that we'll continue reporting on over time.

Monika?

Operator: Your next question comes from...

Mark Zuckerberg: Hold on, before we go to the next question, let's...

Monika Bickert: ... yes -- thanks, Mark.

Yes, and just to answer -- to give a little bit more color about our content reviewers -- we do use a mix of full-time employees and some outsource or contract employees. And that helps us increase our language resources and making sure that we're responding to what we are seeing in our community.

And, of course, taking care of those people and making sure they have what they need to do their jobs is extremely important to us. We do pay competitive wages. We give competitive benefits and we tend to see that, generally, we have lower rates of attrition from our outsourcing center and among our full-time employees than other comparable areas and industries.

And I'd also say that we tend to see high rate of referrals for new outsource employees from friends and family. We're listening to our employees, we're making sure that they have the resiliency resources, we have 24 hour counseling available for these reviewers and we're doing what it takes to make sure they have what they need.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Queenie Wong from CNET.

Queenie Wong: Hi. Thanks for taking these questions.

I was going back to the handling of the election meddling by Russian trolls and Cambridge Analytica. Mark, could you talk about, if you could go back and do anything differently if there's anything you would have done differently?

And a lot of the story also focused on Sheryl Sandberg -- have you spoken to her and what's been her reaction to some of the allegations in the story?

Mark Zuckerberg: Sure. I can -- I can talk to all of this.

And yes, there are a lot of things that I would do differently in retrospect. Leading up to the 2016 election, we had a big security effort already. We were looking for different kinds of meddling; we actually found a bunch. We've talked about that on the call so far in terms of Russia trying to seed leaked content through DC Leaks. We've reported this, we told folks about it, we reported it to law enforcement.

The big miss was that we were not expecting these kinds of coordinated information operations which we're now well aware of. And we should have been more on top of that. And that was an important miss, and something that we've spent a lot of the last couple of years building our systems to understand, and all of this sophistication and nuance, how different countries will try to execute that.

I think we're in a better place now, but this isn't the type of thing that you ever fully solve. Governments are going to keep on doing this. They're going to evolve their tactics. We're going to need to keep on getting better but we're committed to doing this. And also the next time that a new threat emerges, we also are more focused on making sure that we're more ahead of emerging new types of threats as well.

The content issues that we're talking today about are an even broader case (with) a lot of the election work. In some ways, you can think about the election work as a very specific but important case of the -- of the broader content issues that we have where we need to be more proactive, not only in taking down content that violates the policies, but bending the curve on discouraging borderline behavior which is not something that we've gotten a lot of questions today, but I actually think is one of the most important things that we're going to be doing.

That's I think really the answer to things like the long term -- a big part of the solution for making sure that polarizing or sensational content isn't spreading in the system, and that we're having a positive effect on the world is making sure that stuff that is as close to the line as possible doesn't get more

engagement because of the nature of the way that people interact with content. We're very focused on that.

These are hard problems that -- the solution takes modern AI work, which it probably wouldn't have been possible five years ago, and an amount of investment that we can now afford because we're a much bigger company. But we could have done -- we could have gotten more ahead of some of these things, and I certainly wish that we were in a better position now but we're getting there.

I also want to talk for a second about your questions about Sheryl. I want to be clear that -- I've mentioned a couple of times that I was not in the loop on a bunch of these decisions. And I should have been clearer that I think the team has made a bunch of these decisions. And I think Sheryl was also not involved; she learned about this at the same time that I did. And we talked about this and came to the conclusion about what we should do here.

Overall, Sheryl is doing great work for the company. She's been a very important partner to me and continues to be, and will continue to be. She's leading a lot of the efforts to improve our systems in these areas. And as I've tried to convey, while these are big issues, I think we're making a lot of progress. And a lot of that is because of the work that she is doing.

Operator: Your next question comes from Marty Swant from Adweek.

Marty Swant: Hey. Yes, thanks for doing this.

In the past, I know that -- speaking of Sheryl, I know that she's talked a lot about how you guys are working together with other major platforms, such as Google, and Twitter and whatnot, to fix a lot of these misinformation issues. Could you talk about more about what you guys are doing specifically cross-platform and how you're collaborating?

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes, Guy, do you want to talk about this?

Guy Rosen: Sure, as we think particularly around the topic of elections, it's really important that we tackle that as an industry and actually not just an industry, but the private sector and the public sector together.

And I think we've seen this even over the past few weeks where government and technology companies have been working together, including -- and we work not just at the federal level, but also state and local level -- to identify and understand the different risks and to share intelligence where we have it so that we can proactively find bad actors.

Because when there's adversaries out there who are trying to spread bad content, they're not only going to limit to one platform. They will be using a multitude -- a number of platforms and services together. And so it's exceptionally important that we work very closely together on these things so that we can tackle those risks.

Operator: Your next question comes from Manuel Machado from Observador. Manuel Machado from Observador, your line is open.

And the next question comes from the line of Edgar Alvarez from Engadget.

Edgar Alvarez: Hi. Thank you for taking the time.

I have a couple of questions on the content moderation front. Why the launch of this independent committee now? Because it seems like it's been something that people have been asking for a while.

And then the second question on the Times story, aside from lawmakers, Wall Street media and critics, why should your users continue to trust you?

Thank you.

Mark Zuckerberg: Sure, all right, both good.

All right, so on the independent body for appeals, this is something I've thought about for a while. That's actually something I've talked about publicly for a while. It's a hard problem, we still don't have all the answers,



but we're moving to the next phase of starting to roll it out. I do think that there is a natural order in which you want to do this stuff.

For example, you want to get the internal appeals process working as the first step before it really makes sense to have a next level of independent appeals. That's been a big focus for this year. But also more broadly, one of the things that I try to convey in the note is that enforcement -- the most important thing is getting this right the first time. And recognizing that we're not always going to get it right the first time you want to have appeals.

But the vast majority of our energy needs to be going towards better proactive enforcement, better discouraging of borderline content, better accuracy, getting AI systems to handle the repetitive and simpler calls that computers are very consistent at and freeing up the people who are going to be experts at making harder and more nuanced judgment calls. That's I think -- when I think about what's going to have the biggest impact for our community -- that's the big thing that is -- that is actually going to make the biggest deal here.

Your other question was around people and the community trusting us. And here I guess I'd just say two things. One is the most basic thing that people trust us with is that people come to our services and about 100 billion times a day choose to share some text or a photo or videos with a person or a group of people or publicly and they need to know that our services are going to deliver that content to the people that they want. And that's the most fundamental thing and I think we continue focusing on delivering that and I think people have good confidence in general that when they use their services, that's what's going to happen.

At the corporate level more broadly, I think people want to be able to trust our intention and that we're going to learn and get stuff right. I don't think anyone expects every company to get everything right the first time, but I think people expect companies to learn and to not continue making the same mistake and to improve and learn quickly once you are aware of issues.

And what we're talking about here are complicated issues. Unfortunately, you can't -- it would've been hard to upgrade all of these different content system in a three or six month period. And I've said a bunch of times I think this is like a three year project. But we're really investing a lot. Billions of dollars into this, a ton of energy, a ton of my focus, a lot of our best people.

But we're committed to getting this right and continuing to make progress on this. And over time, I think that that's why people will trust us because we're going to get to the point where -- if we're not already -- we will be the best at this.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Brian Feldman from New York Magazine.

Brian Feldman: Hi. Thanks for taking my question.

I was wondering -- you've described the work of Definers as a typical DC firm. And I was wondering how their work differed from the coordinated inauthentic behavior that you are trying to eradicate?

Mark Zuckerberg: I'd need to understand it in more detail. And one of the -- one of the things that people were saying is that this group was spreading misinformation. When I asked our team about this after learning about this yesterday, from what I can tell, that isn't true. We certainly never asked them to spread anything that is not true; that's not how we want to operate. We don't have any detail now that would suggest that they have. I don't think that the analogy that you're making makes a lot of sense.

But look, in general I think that a lot of DC type firms might do this kind of work and I understand why other companies might want to work with them, but that's not the way that I want to run this company. When I learned about this, I looked into it and I'm certainly going to follow up and do a broader evaluation to make sure that I fully understand how this happened and that we have a better sense of the different firms that we're working with going forward.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Edward Ludlow from Bloomberg Television.

Edward Ludlow: Yes. Hi, guys. Thank you very much for doing the call.

Mark, my question is for you. I just want to ask about policy, really. Because ahead of the midterms, when we talked about the election war room, for example, we were made to believe that there's this vertical chain of command that allowed decisions on whether content is or is not within policy quickly and that under certain circumstances yourself or Sheryl could step in. But actually, that the system was efficient so that decisions could be made quickly.

Now, there's this appeals process and an independent body and it seems somewhat complicated. And you yourself were talking earlier about saying, well, you feel that you yourself can't make decisions on content anymore; it's too difficult to decide on that front.

My question is basically, do you worry now that these decisions will be slowed down drastically about whether content can stay up or come down? And have you basically just lost faith in those existing policy areas?

Mark Zuckerberg: No. I continue to have confidence that both it's important for us to get this right up front and that we can continue to improve and do better. I don't see any system in which we won't be making the first line calls about what content is up and what isn't. And I think often getting that right, getting it to be as accurate as possible is incredibly important, and making those calls quickly is important.

And a lot of what we tried to do with the war room was making sure that we had all the folks from different teams literally in the same room which, it sounds silly but you learn this stuff running a company, that that actually really matters for improving decision-making and speed.

At the same time, I do think that there is a place for -- in improving the system for having a more deliberative, longer-term process that considers the precedents that are being set and that's certainly what we want to do both with our internal appeals and a lot of the work that we have when -- internally,

where more complicated calls can get escalated to experts internally, and eventually having an external process for that as well.

I don't think that those things are in conflict; they're going to work on different timescales.

Monika, do you want to add anything?

Monika Bickert: Yes, thanks.

I would echo that, but also keep in mind that at our scale, we get millions of reports every week. And our content reviewers want to make sure that they can respond to those -- the vast majority of those within 24 hours. And so at that scale, that means that our content reviewers are going to be making most of these decisions. Now, there are times when there's additional context that we should be taking into consideration, or when something is really on the line and we will escalate it up the chain.

And we will, as a team, take a deeper look at whether or not something violates our policies. The -- getting external voices more involved in looking at specific pieces of content is really addressing the need that we have, the desire that we have, to get more external input into how we are applying those policies. We do that now with our policy development process but this is a way of getting external voices to weigh in on specific pieces of content so that we can learn from that as well.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Rob Price from Business Insider. Please go ahead.

Rob Price: Hi. Thanks for taking my question.

Mark, you've said multiple times that you don't plan to quit. But I'm just wondering, given all the mistakes that have been made over the last years, why do you believe that you're still the best person to lead Facebook?

Mark Zuckerberg: Well, I think we're doing the right things to fix the issues. I think, unfortunately, when you're building something of this scale, oftentimes,

putting in place the solutions can take a long time. And I don't think that me or anyone else could come in and snap our fingers and have these issues resolved in a quarter or half a year. This is not the first time that we've had to deal with big issues for the company.

I mean, certainly, when we -- the issues are different here, more around content and security type issues -- but when we had to pivot and build out the whole new technical platform on mobile, that was a similar kind of existential set of issues that we really had to deal with well. But it took a few years to really get right, and get to a good place.

This stuff is painful. I certainly don't want to be -- don't love that we're in a position where we aren't delivering the quality that we want to be delivering every day. But to some degree, you have to know that you're on the path that you're doing the right things and then allow for some time for the teams to actually execute and get the stuff working the way that we all know that it needs to be and to the standard that people expect.

I'm very committed to this, I understand that this is a big part of what will be - - this is just so important for the future of the internet and a lot of these big issues that society is facing. And I am just fully committed to getting this right.

Operator: Your next question comes from Steven Overly from Politico.

Steven Overly: Hi. Thanks for taking the question.

Just on this broad review of your outside lobbyists and firms, has that already started? And do you have a sense of the timeline for that?

And then second question which is, will Sheryl continue to oversee those lobbying efforts in light of The New York Times report?

Mark Zuckerberg: Sorry, I didn't fully hear that. I -- it was a little faint. What was that?

Caryn Marooney: ... (can you repeat the question)...?

Steven Overly: I can repeat the question if that's helpful. Just in terms of your review of the outside lobbyists, I wonder if you can elaborate on the timeline for that?

And is that something that Sheryl will oversee in light of The New York Times report?

Mark Zuckerberg: Yes, sure. I don't have an exact timeframe now. But this is clearly important. Nick Clegg has just started in his role and he'll be mostly directly overseeing this and he, of course, reports to Sheryl.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Manuel Machado from Observador. Please go ahead.

Manual Machado: Hello. My name is Manuel from Observador.

My question is for Mark. How can I guarantee -- or how can you guarantee to us that you still control the company considering that you have said during this call that you did not know everything that was published on The New York Times?

Mark Zuckerberg: It's a -- it's a -- I get the question. I just wrote this note, it's like 4,500 words about all of the details about all of the different ways that we're addressing Content Governance and Enforcement. I am -- I think if you read that you will get the sense that I'm very clearly involved in all of the details and execution of what we're doing.

I also think that when you run a company that has tens of thousands of people there are going to be people who are doing things that I don't know about inside the company. And similarly to how when you're running a community or your building a community of billions of people there are going to be people who are posting stuff that isn't good and that that gets through some of the -- the cracks in the systems.

And I just think that that is part of the reality of running a company is I'm not going to know every single -- what every single person here is doing. We -- I have a lot of confidence in our leadership who are building good teams and when issues come up we will deal with them and we will deal with them

transparently and I imagine that people continue to hold us accountable and make sure that we do and my commitment is that that what we'll do.

Operator: The last question comes from the line of Katy Steinmetz from Time Magazine. Please go ahead.

Katy Steinmetz: Hi. Thanks for taking this.

To build on that last question, you've mentioned scale a lot, that you were in a situation where you had to delegate the Definers decision, you're using sampling processes to get a handle on prevalence, billions of people, billions of posts, that you're the best at this yet they're -- yet there are still these problems.

Is Facebook just too big to effectively manage?

Mark Zuckerberg: Well, I think that a lot of these issues would exist if we were a tenth of our size as well. If you look at any internet platform that is trying to give people a voice broadly or any company that has hundreds of employees you're not going to know every single thing that is going on. A lot of these same systems apply. Which is why the approach that I -- that I wrote in the Content Governance and Enforcement note -- it's multi-pronged for dealing with this.

You have to hire a big team of experts, you have to hire a lot of people to do enforcement, people to be able to get into the nuances of the decisions, the AI systems, to be able to flag stuff and take it down proactively in some cases, reduce borderline content. And then you also have to deal with the fact that you need to address bias in those systems, and the system is going to make errors, so you need to address that, and then are going to be multiple levels of that.

And then on top of that, you want to create transparency and you do that in a number of ways. You do transparency reports and calls and engaging people and encouraging academic research. I just think that this is the reality for any platform that is even at a fraction of the size that we are at. Not -- these were not new problems we reached a billion people or two billion people

And I think you can look at any of the companies that are a tenth the size of us, and I think frankly our efforts compare quite well to most of these others in terms of what we're doing and how we're able to manage the community.

Caryn Marooney: Thank you...

Operator: This concludes...

Caryn Marooney: Thank you, all, for joining the call today. If you have additional questions, please reach out to [Press@FB.com](mailto:Press@FB.com) and for more information -- is always able to be found on Facebook's Newsroom.

Operator: This concludes the Facebook Press Call. Thank you for joining. You may now disconnect your line.

END