

FACEBOOK, INC
January 28, 2020
5:30 a.m. PT

Operator: Hello and welcome to today's press call on Facebook's oversight board. There will be prepared remarks and structured Q&A. To ask a question, please press "star," "1". Now I'd like to turn the call over to Carolyn Glanville, who will kick this off.

Carolyn Glanville: Hi everyone. Thanks for joining us today. I'm Carolyn Glanville on Facebook's Communications Team. As part of our effort to keep you posted on the roll out of the board, today you'll be hearing from Brent Harris and Heather Moore from our governance team who have joined you before on previous press calls and Fay Johnson, a product manager on this project. And while we're not yet in the position to announce board members, we will also like to introduce the board's first director of oversight board administration.

There will be three opportunities for questions throughout the call. We'll take two rounds of Q&As on the bylaws and then we'll open it up for questions or comments or anything else that we didn't get to on the call. Everything on this call is on the record but under embargo until 11:00 a.m. Pacific today. We will continue to keep you posted on the roll out of the board in the upcoming weeks and months and with that I'll turn it over to Brent.

Brent Harris: Thanks, Carolyn. I'm Brent Harris, the Director of Governance here at Facebook. I spoke with many of you back in September when we published the charter that defines the board mandate and describes its relationship to Facebook. That charter sets out a high level overview of the board's purpose and its objective and it's not intended to change substantially over time. It also provides for a set of bylaws which will spell out the day-to-day operational details that are necessary for the board to complete its work.

What we are publishing today is our recommendation for those bylaws which will be submitted to the board's members for formal approval. I want to preempt an obvious question that some of you may have which is why

Facebook has written these at all and not waited for the members to be appointed to create these bylaws themselves from scratch.

These bylaws capture a working relationship between Facebook and the board and we wanted to ensure that lessons learned from our global consultation are included in the bylaws. We also want to get this board up and running hearing cases as soon as possible.

We do not feel it was fair to expect the board's first weeks and months to be consumed by writing all of these rules. This document, unlike the charter is meant to be flexible. Once established, the board itself will review and adopt these bylaws which can be amended depending on changing needs by the board itself without input from Facebook.

I want to recognize and thank the dozens of experts in corporate governance, trust law and human rights who provided counsel on these proposed bylaws. Over the past three months alone, we have taken multiple rounds in person and remote feedback from experts across countries and continents and we would not be at this point without their help.

I know that the question of who will sit on the board is front of mind for many people. We're taking the time required to run a thoughtful process and considering the many candidates who continue to be put forward. We're making progress and very much hope to be in position to announce members within the coming months.

As I've said before, we're clear that in pursuit of building a board that reflects the true breadth of expression on our platform, there will inevitably be those who disagree, probably very strongly, with the views of individual members.

It is partly for that reason we've been so determined to discuss and explain the structures and process that will govern this institution and transcend any individual member or cohort of members.

At the end of this call, I will introduce the new Director of Oversight board Administration who will head up the board's administrative staff providing

procedural case support as well as research and logistics for the board's members and give you a chance to hear from him.

Turning to the bylaws we will cover Articles I and II before turning it over to our first round of questions. Article I covers the oversight board and its procedures in four areas. First, the board will include a small group of co-chairs. These co-chairs will head up the committees that the board will need to carry out its work. There will be at a minimum, a Case Selection Committee and a Membership Committee.

This is how we envision that the board itself will choose the cases it hears and also select other members going forward. Second, the board will have its own staff. This staff, which in the by-laws is called the board Administration, will not be employees of Facebook. Along with the members, the board staff will be employed by the oversight board company that is part of the oversight board trust.

They will carry out a number of duties upon the direction of the board itself. For example, based on the criteria set by the Case Selection Committee, the board staff will assist by helping review appeals.

Third, both users and Facebook will have the ability to refer cases to the board. Small panels, about five board members will convene to review and deliberate on cases. They will develop a draft decision that can be circulated to the board as a whole for its review.

Once approved by the board through a majority vote, this decision will be finalized. If it so chooses, the board can issue a policy advisory statement along with its decision on the piece of content itself.

And fourth, the board will have a number of transparency mechanisms at its disposal. Once a final decision has been reached, it will be published on the board's website. This is how, over time, we expect the board to grow its body of reason giving.

In addition, the board will issue an annual report. We expect that this report will include information on the type and number of cases that were forwarded to the board by users and Facebook.

Now, I'd like to hand over to my colleague, Fay Johnson, who's the product manager on this project has been the forefront of developing the customer infrastructure and technical tooling to support the board's work.

Fay Johnson: Thank you, Brent. I am Fay Johnson, the Product Manager on this project. Article II focuses on the responsibilities and commitments of Facebook.

Over the past six months we have been building the tools and systems required to allow users to appeal content decisions to the Oversight board. Our goal is to bring all types of contents outlined in the by-laws into scope as quickly as possible.

Due to the technical investment required to do this in a way that protects the independent judgment of the board and the privacy of user data, we will do this in stages.

At launch, users will only be able to appeal to the board in cases where Facebook has removed their content. This is due to the way that our existing content moderation system works, and in line with Facebook's commitment to protecting our user's free expression.

Other types of cases, for example, requests by individuals to remove other people's content or appealing actions taken to remove groups or pages, have external – extra layers of complexity and will require additional time to build out and integrate with the board's tooling.

There's a growing team of engineers working on this effort and we will continue to keep people updated on the progress to bring new types of content into scope for the board.

In the meantime, Facebook will be able to ask the board for an expedited review of any tough questions related to content, including things like ads, groups or pages from day one.

In addition, we're also committed to providing the board with information it requires to come to a sound and well-reasoned decision. At a minimum, this means we'll be providing a case history that is out lined – that outlines the basic facts surrounding a piece of content, including the enforcement history.

Separately, we'll also provide a policy rationale, which will explain why we made a certain decision and the policies that were applied. On both content decisions and policy advice, Facebook will communicate transparently on the actions it takes in response to the board.

In this regard, we will implement content decisions from the board within seven days of the decisions release. And communicate publicly about this action through our newsroom.

When the board chooses to issue a policy advisory statement, Facebook will review the guidance. Recommendations involving substantial changes will receive a thorough and considerate analysis, going through our full policy development process and other appropriate channels.

We'll provide regular updates through the Facebook Newsroom, the public minutes of our policy development forums and other statements. We commit to fully explaining any resulting policy changes or if necessary providing our rationale for declining to adopt the board's policy guidance.

And now I'll open the call up for questions for the Facebook Teams on Articles I and II of the proposed bylaws.

Operator: 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 "1." Your first question comes from Daniel Abril of Fortune. Your line is open.

Danielle Abril: Hi, guys. Thanks so much for taking the time. I had a quick question on for the accountability piece of this. Ultimately Facebook is funding the board and we talk a lot about transparency and the board, or Facebook adhering to the board's decision. I guess, who's holding Facebook accountable to adhering to those decision and how do we ultimately guarantee that we get full

transparency on the board's ruling and that all of these pieces are being disclosed?

Heather Moore: Thank you, Danielle. This is Heather Moore, I'm happy to take a first swing at this question. So there are a number of accountability mechanisms built into the Charter and then further strengthened in the bylaws, which will really be enforced upon by the board itself.

First, the board will be able to issue an annual transparency report where amongst other things it will report on how quickly Facebook implemented its decisions, the response back that it got from Facebook, et cetera. There are a number of other things that the transparency report will also stated as well.

In addition, if you turn to the later section of the bylaws specifically in Article II under Facebook section about response and implementation, we put language in there that was pretty tight that states any response that we have to a board's decision will be public. How we implement the board's decision will be public, as well. And whether or not we're able to follow the Policy Advisory opinion that the board gave.

So we put in a number of public accountability mechanisms so that the public will know how we're implementing the board's decision, what our response to it is. And we've also equipped the board with a mechanism as well to speak out.

Operator: Again, if you would like to ask a question press star and then the number one on your telephone keypad. Your next question comes from Thomas Streinz of NYU Law School. Your line is open.

Thomas Streinz: Thanks, a lot for doing this and good morning. And I apologizing in advance for the lawyerly question I'm going to ask. It's about (provisions) in Article II relating the kind of content that will be subject to review by the Oversight board.

And I understand the rationale why a decision on content that are determined by legal restrictions are not subject to review. But I was wondering who

makes that determination? Whether there are in fact legal restrictions in place that preclude the oversight board from reviewing decision by Facebook?

Heather Moore: Thank you, Thomas. This is Heather Moore, again. I'm happy to take that question. So we've really tried to constrict pretty tightly the legal blockage for the board to hear a case. In particular, if you go back to the charter, what it states is that the board will not be able to hear cases that implicate legal issues that relate to criminal or regulatory sanctions.

That is further expounded upon in the bylaws and specifically that provision is in there because we don't want the board, Facebook employees, or the administrative staff to be subject to criminal liability or regulatory sanctions because of a case that the board has taken.

In addition, the board can't have more legal authority than Facebook does itself and so where Facebook is required to follow the law so is the board and so I do understand this interest and we've heard it a lot through the global consultation from civil society for the board to be able to hear these kinds of issues but there has to be some guardrail put into place not only for the protection of the board and its members but also to make sure that Facebook is continuing to follow its legal obligations.

Operator: Your next question comes from Renata Sanchez of El Universal. Your line is open.

Renata Sanchez: Hello. Good morning. How do you expect to (inaudible) the announcement (inaudible) other conference that (inaudible) the (inaudible) how to live this (inaudible)? How do you to expect to have that board (inaudible) and then (inaudible)?

Heather Moore: Hi, this is Heather Moore. Please feel free to jump in if I haven't accurately captured your question but I believe your question is how is the board going to exist globally when there are so many different laws and different jurisdictions. So one of the ways that we've tried to equip the board to do that is that the board is not a legal body.

The board is there to really make decisions on Facebook’s community standards and whether or not the values have been accurately applied to decisions it makes. Facebook’s community standards are a global set of community standards and we expect the board to apply them globally as well. Where a board decision might implicate local law then Facebook and the board will have to follow that local law as we always attempt to do.

Operator: Again, to ask a question, press “star” then the number “1” on your telephone keypad. Your next question comes from Max Hoppenstedt of Tagesspiegel. Your line is open.

Max Hoppenstedt: Hello, everyone. Thanks for hosting this call. I have a question on the sort of cases that Facebook would directly refer to the board. Could you maybe elaborate on what sort of cases this could include, like imagine this board would have existed two years ago, would have it been the Nancy Pelosi doctored video or similar cases like that? What sort of cases can we expect Facebook to refer to the board? Thank you.

Brent Harris: Thank you for the question. It’s been very much top of mind for us as we’ve built out this institution. So the purpose of the board and a number of the cases that will be referred by Facebook are really ones that are some of the most important cases that either truly vary on some of the hardest questions of the day or that have broad implications across the many millions of users for Facebook.

And so we envision that Facebook will be referring a number of those decisions to this board for determination and for guidance on whether we’ve come to the right conclusion and made the right call. At the start though it’s really important to emphasize that we want to make sure that this board has a chance to walk and get up and running.

And so I think that our focus in the beginning is going to be on some of the things you’ve seen, so building this institution out, ensuring that the processes are set; having a set of members who are in place, building out the administration.

And so a lot of, I think, what you'll see in the next few months and over the next year is really that continued work of setting that up so that we have something that can walk first.

Operator: There are no further questions at this time. I will now turn it back to Faye Johnson from Facebook.

Fay Johnson: Thank you for your questions. Now Article III, which focuses on the people who use Facebook and Instagram. People with a Facebook or Instagram account, who have exhausted Facebook's appeals process can request a review by the board. A person who appeals a piece (of content to us) will receive a notice of our decision, including the content policy which was applied.

If that person is unsatisfied with the outcome of their appeal, they can choose to submit their case to the board. When submitting a case to the board, people will be able to explain the following; their disagreement with Facebook's decision, why the board should hear their case, their original intention with the post and how Facebook's decision could impact others.

After submitting a request to the board's review, the appealing person will be updated once the board has decided whether or not to select their case. They'll be updated once the board has issued its final decision and also when Facebook has implemented that decision.

Through the board's website people will have the appeals and case to the board will be able to track their progress. I'll now turn over to Heather Moore from our governance team, who has led the work on developing the board's governance and structure.

Heather Moore: Thank you, Fay, and hello, everyone. I'll turn to Article IV, which deals with the oversight for Trust. We received resounding feedback emphasizing the need for independence of the board. So we have established the Oversight board Trust and LLC and we've released trust formation documents at the end of last year.

This setup allows for the independent staffing and hiring relationships that will be connected to the LLC. Facebook will fund the trust so that it has the resources needed to support the board's operations for multiple years.

This is no small undertaking; once fully operational, the Trust is likely to employ between 30 to 40 full-time staff in the United Kingdom and the United States, up to 40 part-time board members and maintain a vast network of experts and academics that the board can call upon for research.

To underline our commitment to making this a reality, we are committing \$130 million to the trust. I should stress here, that our grant of money to the Trust will be irrevocable and will allow for the board to operate for two full terms. The trust will maintain operational oversight of the board and act in a fiduciary capacity to ensure that it is fulfilling its purpose.

To that end, amongst other duties when the board puts forward new members the trustees will confirm them as all board members will be part time employees of the LLC. The trustees will also help ensure that the board maintains a diversity of expertise, experience and geographic background.

Furthermore, a member may only be removed by the Trustees if that member has violated the code of conduct, which is attached to the bylaws we released today. Members will not be removed by trustees due to content decision they have made.

In addition, the Trustees will be responsible for safeguarding the assets in the trust and approving the board's budget. The trust will approve this budget so long as it complies with the board's stated purpose reflects operational needs and accurately accounts for spending in the prior year.

Now I'd like to turn to Article V. We have always envisioned that the bylaws could change in response to evolving needs. As such, amendments will be allowed so long as they don't contradict the charter. We wanted to provide the board with a good starting point through the set of recommendations. These bylaws have been the result of many months of work and consultation with outside experts.

As Brent talked about earlier, we felt it necessary to give them something to start with. So they will be able to ramp up operations promptly once the board is assembled. With that, let's open it up for questions on Articles III, IV and V.

Operator: 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 "1." Your first question comes from Casey Newton of Verge. Your line is open.

Casey Newton: Hi. So, you mentioned that the board will be fully funded through two terms. And I guess I wanted to know, how long is a term? And assuming everything is going well, what is the plan to fund it into the future?

Heather Moore: Thank you, Casey, for that question. So, the terms are three years, which means that the board (has been seated) with enough money to operate for six years.

We also put a provision in the bylaws in Article IV of the trust section which provides that every year the trust will provide an accounting to Facebook on the operational health, how much money is being spent, the needs that the board has seen, whether or not they need increased staffing just to give Facebook an annual update about how the money has been spent.

We will use about two or three years' worth of those reports to really start the conversation internally about endowment which will set up the board for financial independence for years to come.

Operator: Again if you would like to ask a question, press "star" then the number "1" on your telephone keypad. Your next question comes from Alexandre Piquard of Le Monde. Your line is open.

Alexandre Piquard: Hi, who is – sorry, I'm not sure if I'm asking a question about the right articles. But still it's about the selection of the members. Would you say you're late in doing that? Why would you be late? Is it hard to select the members? And is it still the case that Facebook is going to choose the first members and then the members will choose the next peers? Thank you very much.

Brent Harris: Perfect. Thank you for that question. On the selection process, it's one that we put the same level of diligence and attention to as we have to building out the structure of this board. And as we've gone about it, we have been really focused on (running) something that's truly global and it draws on the full breadth of the people who are a part of Facebook and Instagram or impacted by our products.

And it's been important to us to then really hear from and ensure that the board that we build will draw on that full diversity of this set of users and stakeholders around these products and around the company. As a consequence, we've found that we've actually had a fully tremendous interest in the board and we wanted to take those candidacies seriously.

And doing so when running this in the right way (with a set of vetting criteria) that is really equivalent to what you would see from judicial nominees and a set of a really thoughtful process, it's taking time to do that right, so and that's how we've been focused.

Heather Moore: To build on Brent's point, which I think is a second part of your question about whether or not Facebook will be selecting a group of co-chairs and then choosing with those co-chairs. That is absolutely still the plan, which we've also further (expounded upon) in the bylaws, and that's the process that we will follow through the selection process.

Operator: Ladies and gentlemen, if you would like to ask a question, please press "star" then the number "1" on your telephone keypad. Your next question comes from the line of Angel Diaz of Brennan Center, your line is open.

Angel Diaz: All right, I also have the question going back to the earlier section, in terms of the infrastructure between regulatory standards and the community standards, so if a user has their content removed for violating a ban against (inaudible) content in accordance with your community standards, but the organization is based on sanctions, would that still be within scope for the content board?

Heather Moore: Thank you for that question, and this is one that is particularly tricky given our obligations as a United States company. So the – what users will be able

to appeal to the board is content that has been removed for praise and support, and so that will absolutely be up for the board's review.

Operator: Your next question comes from Renata Sanchez of El Universal, your line is open.

Renata Sanchez: Hello, I – I'm wondering (kind of concerns) (inaudible) of content or (I was thinking to download supplies). What kind of (extensions are to date with content that don't follow the community guidelines)?

Fay Johnson: This is Fay Johnson, I believe your question was related to how we will – what kind of content is in scope for the board. All the content that is posted by individuals on our platform, which is sort of considered organic content posted by individual people is in scope with the specific caveats outlined in the bylaws and in the charter.

The content that will be in scope for review at the board, the board will be looking to apply and see how we've actually applied and whether or not they think we are properly applying our community standards and our values.

There are other ways that we sort of look at content on the platform, but this specifically jurisdictions of board will start with being focused on the specific content at hand.

Operator: There are no further questions at this time; I will now turn it back to Brent.

Brent Harris: Perfect, thank you for sticking with us through the bylaws, I'd now like to take the opportunity to introduce Thomas Hughes who will serve as director of oversight board administration. The director will manage the oversight board staff, providing operational, legal communications and logistical support as well as facilitating access to a network of experts at the board's request. The director and staff will work at the direction of the oversight board's members, not Facebook.

Their team will ensure board reviews are developed and documented in a timely and efficient manner, and that board members have access to the resources required to carry out their roles effectively. And set it out in the

proposed bylaws, and the usual course of business, the director will be appointed by the board's trustees in consultation with co-chairs.

In the interest of wasting no time developing the board's infrastructure, hiring staff so that the board can begin to hear cases, and having in place the necessary support for members from the moment they are in place, Thomas has been appointed by the board's interim trustees Brown Brothers Harriman and Company. His appointment will be reviewed by the board's permanent trustees in consultation with co-chairs once all are in place.

Thomas brings deep experience in protecting freedom of expression and other fundamental human rights from his previous role at Article 19 in international non-governmental organizations where he has served as executive director for the past six years.

In addition, Thomas is qualified for this role giving his experience building and shaping NGOs as he has served as founder and director of two social purpose organizations – diversity and virtual road.org. Having been part of the team working hard on developing the board over the past year, it's a pleasure for me to be welcoming Thomas today.

We're very excited to begin transitioning toward an independent oversight board led by someone of Thomas' expertise and passion for the issues at stake. I'd like to hand it over to Thomas to introduce himself.

Thomas Hughes: Thanks, Brent. Thank you very much for those kind words and hello to everyone on the call. Thank you for joining us today. I'm only a week into the job but I wanted to speak today about the critical importance of the oversight board's mission and why I felt passionate enough to take on this role.

And as Brent outlined, I worked on the defense and promotion of freedom of expression and other human rights for the past two decades ranging from protecting journalists in some of the most dangerous countries in the world through to advocating at the United Nations for progressive international standards including around (digital) rights issues.

But I see the role of director as a direct continuation of my work thus far over the last couple of decades because the oversight board has been created to ensure the rights of individuals are respected and that there is transparency and accountability in the application of the community standards.

In November 2018, whilst I was still with Article 19, I was amongst 70 signatories to a letter to Facebook asking the company to improve the way it thought about the global implications of content on its platform and I just want to quote directly from that letter. In that letter it stated: “As the world’s biggest communications platform, Facebook has the power to shape the news and content that we get to see. When content is removed in error, there are consequences for global freedom of expression.”

And I wanted to share that quote because the statement remains as true and important now if not more so than it was a year ago and I’m very excited to be here to help address exactly those issues.

Over the coming months I’ll be focusing on setting up the administration for the oversight board so that the board members can select which cases they would like to hear based on clear and transparent criteria and then be able to effectively and efficiently and confidentially review those cases. This will require us to hire staff and to set up processes and adopt tools to review cases which, as I’m sure you’ll all understand, is an enormous undertaking and will take us many months.

As has been mentioned already, the board will be global and will therefore reflect a breadth of perspectives. I’m sure that there will be board members with whose opinion both you or I might not agree. However, this diversity is at the very heart of the board’s rationale. I’m confident it will mean that we have stronger outcomes as a result.

The oversight board is a unique innovation and there are many lessons we will be learning as we move forward. However, I’m very confident we will make a success of it and I look forward to sharing further updates with you all over the coming months. And now if we can turn to questions.

Operator: We will now open the line to questions. Please limit yourself to one question per person. To ask a question, press “star” followed by the number “1.” Your first question comes from Steven Levy of WIRED. Your line is open.

Steven Levy: Hi all. Thanks for doing the call. Thomas, I wondered whether it was a tough choice for you to make considering Facebook's reputation, particularly some of the groups that you've been working with. You cited that the letter you yourself signed it (over there).

Can you talk a bit about your thought process and what led you to clearly take the job with a such controversial company?

Thomas Hughes: Steven, thank you for the question. I mean, I was motivated to take the job with the oversight board and because it's exactly aligned to what I've been doing for the last couple of decades, which is focused very much on the individual rights of users and promoting and protecting freedom of expression.

I think the oversight board is a unique innovation. It hopefully sets a pattern and a pathway for other companies to follow in future. So, for me, it's just a continuation of exactly the type of work I've been doing to date.

Operator: Your next question comes from Alexandre Piquard of Le Monde. Your line is open.

Alexandre Piquard: Would you say that you would weigh more on the protecting the freedom of expression side and you – as you said, if some piece of content is removed in error there are consequences. But what about the pieces of content not removed and the need to police and take away more content and more offensive content from those platforms?

Thomas Hughes: Well, thank you for the question. The – obviously the oversight board and its members, which will be taking these decisions on specific pieces of content, they have a challenging role ahead of them. Their role is to look at the community standards, but to be informed by freedom of expression and other human rights as well, as well as the values.

So, really it comes down to the individual decisions, and that's the – that's the importance of the oversight board, which is about – which is that it's about users, it's about individual cases and about giving individuals the opportunity to appeal and have those appeals heard by an independent body.

Heather Moore: To build on Thomas' great point, this is Heather Moore from Facebook, one of the ways that we designed the board was that users would have the ability to intentionally appeal exactly what you just stated, which is content that is left up on the platform.

That won't be immediately available to users, but it's something that will be a fast follow. And so, we're really looking to this board to start to develop a body of reason giving about what is the right balance and for Facebook not to be the ones really drawing that line.

Operator: Your next question comes from Max Hoppenstedt of Tagesspiegel. Your line is open.

Max Hoppenstedt: Hi, thank you. My question is also regarding the people who can refer cases for review to the oversight board. So, A, why do people need to have an account to refer cases to the oversight board? And why can't people, at the moment, refer cases where content has not been removed (et cetera), (just in content) to? And are there plans at what point in time that is going to change?

Fay Johnson: Thank you for your question, this is Fay Johnson, the Product Manager on the project. When it comes to the need to have an account with Facebook or Instagram, this stems from our belief that foremost this is a body that is here to serve and advise Facebook the company, so that we can continue to improve the products and services that we build for people, so that we can continue to add value to their lives and (deliver on) our commitment to them that we have made.

So, we believe that it's important that people have the ability to log in. It also helps us be able to verify the linkages between people's content. We think it's important for us to be able to ensure the privacy of an individual who posts a particular piece of content and one way for us to be able to do that is to ensure

that the individual's account matches the content in particular that they are bringing to the board.

In regards to content that has been left up on the platform, we decided to prioritize content that has been removed because we think that this has large consequences for (freedom of) expression. (That's why) we think it's an important thing (for) us to get right. We also think that (we will be) bringing into scope things that have been left up. In most cases one would not appeal to the board having your own content left up so this brings us into question how we bring the ability for people to appeal other peoples content.

And we think it's important for us to do this in a manner that is thoughtful as it will mean that people will be able to send other people's content in for review. We think an essential part of this is really having individuals who may be appealing to the board to have the ability to send in statements and also have an understanding of what the boards work is.

And so we think that as we get to this stage in the process it will be helpful for there to be a body of published decisions that have already been made available on the boards website as we'll allow users and those who actually submitted the content in the first place to understand the process and what the public nature of this deliberation will be.

Operator: Again, if you would like to ask a question, press "star" then the number "1" on your telephone keypad. Your next question comes from Casey Newton of Verge. Your line is open.

Casey Newton: Hi. I wanted to ask about something that someone mentioned earlier which is that they expected it would take the board up to seven days to implement the decision.

Thinking about content that the board decides should be removed (ostensibly) because there's some harm involved. (Seven days) feels like a long time to implement that kind of (decision). Can someone sort of speak to the sort of length of time (that you think) is going to be (needed) to actually remove content from the site once that feature has been enabled?

Fay Johnson: Thanks for your question, Casey. This is Fay. I think the reason we have that seven days in there is that there are – we need sort of a window of time to be able to implement things. Obviously we will take the action as quickly as possible, particularly in areas where it's a matter of potential real world harm.

The window there is also because there are certain elements on our process where we may be looking for similar content or matching content or looking to ensure that we have the ability to apply their request for removal fully and thoroughly.

And we also want to make sure within that window of time we have the ability to send the right notifications to users, (both) those who have potentially posted a similar piece of content in cases where, for example, a video that the board has decided is not appropriate to be left on the platform we would use that window of time to put that sort of media into our media banking and matching systems to allow us to roll out a scaled removal of that content where appropriate.

And so that is part of the process but obviously we will be able to take the action as quickly as possible with the intention of sort of respecting the board's decision and keeping people safe.

Operator: Again, to ask a question please press "star" then the number "1" on your telephone keypad. Your next question comes from Danielle Abril of Fortune. Your line is open.

Danielle Abril: Hey guys. Just to add on to the previous question. I know that there's seven days to implement that decision but if I read this correctly you guys are actually giving the board 90 days to make a decision in a case.

Number one, am I understanding that right, and number two, if that is the case, I guess how does that get implemented, because I – Facebook is very current in its feeds, so if something is removed or placed back, it kind of becomes irrelevant by the time this gets implemented, which I assume is the 90 days plus 7. Can somebody kind of walk me through that?

Heather Moore: Thank you Danielle for that question, so specifically the bylaws stay within 90 days, that's (to) give the board – that's the maximum amount of time that the board will take. Once the board really gets up and running, we expect to improve its processes. It also may not take that long, it really depends on the type of case that they are reviewing.

But there are other provisions in the bylaws that really allow for the board to request research from outside experts and really (fully) consider the matter. Depending on the issue that's before it and the type of research that they want to commission to really build out their understanding of the issue that's at play, its impact on the platform, we want it to be able to give them the amount of time necessary to really do that.

But we do take your point, we have heard this feedback and it's a maximum for the board.

Fay Johnson: I'll just add into what Heather was saying, this is Fay. Part of the window of time that we have proposed for the board to review cases takes into consideration the facts that the content that may be submitted to the board comes from a global guidance of individuals.

This means that in order to allow the board's work to be applied to be accessible to people from around the world, we need to allow time for translation, of any submitted information, we also have a window of time that allows an individual to submit a statement in cases where Facebook has sent the content to the board and we think it's important as part of this process to give enough time to notify that individual and then give them an opportunity to reflect on what they'd like to share to the board, ensuring translation times and then also making sure that there is an effective time for the board members and (self) to deliberate, review the submitted information.

So there's really a focus on ensuring there's enough time for there to be an effective deliberation as any decisions that the board make will obviously have consequences for the right dialogue and consideration for our future cases.

Operator: That was our final question; I will now return the call to Carolyn.

Carolyn Glanville: Thank you, everyone, for joining today and for your thoughtful questions, I appreciate you all taking the time and bearing with us as we talked through a pretty dense document.

If you have any follow-up questions please feel free to reach out, and if you have any additional questions on Thomas and the oversight board staff, you can reach out to press@osbadmin.com and we look forward to talking to you again. Thank you.

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

END