

FACEBOOK, INC
January 28, 2020
8:30 a.m. PT

Operator: Hello and welcome to today's press call on Facebook's Oversight board. There will be prepared remarks and a 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 rollout of the board, today you'll be hearing from Brent Harris and Heather Moore, both who you've heard from in the past, particularly on the Charter Press Call, who are both on our Governance Team and Fay Johnson, the product manager on this project.

And while we're not yet in a position to announce board members, we would 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&A during the bylaws themselves and then open up questions for Thomas and anything else that we didn't get to.

Everything on this call is on the record, but under embargo until 11:00 a.m. Pacific today. We'll continue to keep everyone posted on the rollout of the board in the coming 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 defined the board mandate and described its relationship to Facebook.

That charter sets out a high-level overview of the board's purpose and its objectives and is 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.

The bylaws capture a working relationship between Facebook and the board and we wanted to ensure that lessons learned from our global consultation process are included in the bylaws. We also want to get this board up and running hearing cases as soon as possible. We did 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 course of the past three months alone we've taken multiple rounds of 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 in considering the many candidates who continue to be put forward. We are making progress and very much hope to be in a position to announce members within the coming months.

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

And 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 to the board's members and give you a chance to hear from him.

OK. So turning to the bylaws, we'll 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 board members going forward.

Second, the board will have its own staff. This staff, which in the bylaws is called the board Administration, will not be employees of Facebook. Along with the members the board's 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 of five board members will convene to review and deliberate on cases. They will develop a draft decision, which will be circulated to the board as a whole for its review.

Once approved by the board through 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 four, 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 overtime 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 referred to the board by users and by Facebook. Now, I'd like to hand it over to my colleague, Fay Johnson who is the product manager on this project and is at the forefront of developing the custom infrastructure and technical tooling to support the boards 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 content outlined in the bylaws in the scope as quickly as possible. Due to the technical investment required to do this in a way that protects both 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 our existing content moderation systems work and in line with Facebook's commitment to protect our user's free expression.

Other types of cases – for example requests by an individual to remove other people's content or appealing actions taken to remove groups or pages -- have extra layers as complexity and will acquire additional time to build out and integrate the boards ruling.

There's a growing team of engineers working on this effort and we will continue to keep people updated on our 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 the 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 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 we 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 7 days of this decision's release and communicate publicly about this action through our newsroom.

When the board chooses to issue a policy advisory statement, Facebook will review this guidance. The recommendations involving sensational changes will receive a thorough and considered analysis going through our full policy development process and other appropriate channels.

We'll provide regular updates to the Facebook Newsroom, the public minutes of our policy development forum and other statements. We commit fully to 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 to questions for the Facebook team on Articles I and II for 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 the line of Jo Ling Kent from NBC News, please go ahead.

Jo Ling Kent: Hi guys, good morning thanks for doing this call today, really interesting stuff. I think my first question is really about the binding nature of these kinds of decisions that are being made by the Oversight Board.

How do you make sure that these decisions are actually binding and is that something – is the enforcement of that something you're going to be

discussing with the people who you'll eventually choose to serve on this board?

Heather Moore: Hi Jo, this is Heather Moore from Facebook, I'm happy to jump in and take this question. We've provided for the board's decision's to be binding in a couple of places. I know that we're talking about the bylaws today, but I'd also like to point you back to the charter, which is the seminal document that first sets forth this principal.

Every board decision will be binding on Facebook except for instances where the board's decision could implicate local law. Facebook has to continue to comply with local law and it cannot give the board more power than it already has as a company.

We've also reinforced this idea in the bylaws; specifically, in Article II, in the response and implementation component that really speaks to the fact that Facebook will respond publicly and state how it has implemented the board's decision. It will also take measures internally to look at whether or not it can implement that decision to identical pieces of content.

And so we've really codified that these decisions will be binding in both the charter and the bylaws, but we have left open the fact that Facebook has to comply with local law. And that board decisions cannot force us to do otherwise.

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

Kurt Wagner: Hi, thanks for taking my question. Actually, I have two, but they are related. The first is that I know the bylaws mention an idea of expediting this process no longer than 30 days. I'm curious how quickly you think you could do this in an emergency situation. What is an absolute shortest timeframe that you think that this process could be completed?

And then secondly on that same note, if you do take something a couple months – a full 90 days – for a decision – it really feels like just a more formal feedback process for the company to maybe change certain policies. I'm

curious if you could explain how you get feedback right now for changes in policies and how this might actually be different. Thank you.

Fay Johnson: Hi Kurt, this is Fay, thanks for your question. On the topic of expedited review, the reason we have this built into our system is particularly for cases like this, where there is an emergency or there is a really pressing topic that Facebook really believes the board can provide guidance on.

The reason we have that frame within the 30 days window, is we want to be thoughtful about what are some of the contacts that we might be able to give board members and to ensure that there is enough time for the board members to collect any additional supporting information that they need, either from Facebook or from external experts to be able to inform their decision.

But obviously, as the staff and the board members are up and running, they'll be able to move as quickly as they think is feasible for them from an operational perspective. And so we will default to them in that regard.

On the topic of 90 days and the question about this thing about feedback; we do think that it's important to balance – allowing there to be enough time for an individual user to appeal to the board. Currently in Facebook's existing content moderation system, you just have the ability to an appeal decision that was made within 30 days.

And obviously, appealing to the board will come after people have exhausted Facebook's existing appeals process and we really see that this 90-day window gives the Oversight Board enough time to collect experts opinions, make sure that they really have a fully understanding of the case that they might be looking at head because obviously those kind of decisions that they're making may sort of form a precedent for future decisions and advice that they might give the company.

The other thing I think from just a technical perspective that I will speak to is because of the nature of the (spotty) being global, we do want to ensure that all users from around the world will be able to submit in languages that they are comfortable with that and that will allow us also time to transfer everything that is submitted by the individual who is appealing to the board

and that obviously builds in additional time that we think is important to get the full context on a particular piece of content.

Brent Harris: To address the second part I think of your question, the company today has a product policy forum where we consult with an array of experts as policies are developed and then also publish the minutes of the forum itself.

The board will not be a substitute for the product policy forum, it will be a new mechanism that is independent and provides additional process beyond the walls of the company and beyond Silicon Valley and enables review of decisions than of those policies against Facebook's state of compliance.

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

Queenie Wong: Thank you so much for taking the time to answer my questions. I was wondering given the volume of appeals you get every year what do you think will be the estimated case load for the board? Like how many cases do you think they'll be reviewing every year? And when do you expect the board to hear their first case?

Brent Harris: Perfect. So I'll take both of those in turn and this is Brent Harris. So first on the volume of decisions I think that the board will make, I think we anticipate that that'll probably be in the dozens, at least to start. And on that – it's important to note that the decisions potentially could extend well beyond the immediate kind of cases that they hear.

And so because we've provided that similarly situated content will be reviewed as well as the possibility of these policy recommendations. While the decisions themselves I think will be narrower in the beginning on how many this board can start to take. The potential impact of those decisions could easily apply to the full two and a half billion people who use these products. I'm actually trying to recall actually the second part of the question.

Apologies. OK. Thank you. So when will the board start to hear cases? Our goal right now I think is to begin to have the board hopefully hear cases sometime this summer.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Laurence Dodds from Daily Telegraph. Please go ahead.

Laurence Dodds: Hi there. Thanks very much for having us on this call. You said that at present this process will only apply to content that Facebook takes down and not to decisions to leave up content, which in many cases are equally controversial for Facebook. But you sort of said you may extend later to the latter.

Is that an aspiration that you will eventually be able to appeal the decision to leave up (inaudible) content to this board or is it promised that Facebook will definitely do that? And in any case, when do you expect the the board to work in that way?

Brent Harris: So I'm going – I'm going to take the beginning of that question and I think hand it over to Fay on the technical side of it. So, it's important to note the scope of the board and how it will operate. And so, the opinion that the board could extend to content that Facebook has left up, be it policy recommendations via referrals that Facebook brings to the board or as well on hearing different matters that are funneled in.

On content that's taken down, it very precisely actually applies to what's technically possible for users to appeal once we start to get this board getting built. And I think I'm going to hand it to Fay on some of how we're trying to build in that capacity.

But I think it's important to underscore that this is really a pretty profound technical matter of building in the capacity for these types of appeals across a product that's used around geographies and across billions of users.

And so, actually building that into the core of these systems is something simply no other technology company that I'm aware of has attempted before. And a consequence of doing it right is that it will be phased in over time.

Fay Johnson: Thanks, Brent. Just to add additional color to that, as is standard with any product development process, we were sort of really starting with how do

people who are using the product experience the things that they are interfacing with.

And so, we do think it's important for us to sort of start with content that has been removed. It's sort of the majority of the things that we review on a regular basis and we think it's actually really close to people's daily lives and they may want to have content restored.

Obviously, the Oversight Board's work will happen after people will have already exhausted the existing appeals process, which is done, as you have you mentioned previously in your questions, to a very large volume of content on a regular basis.

And so – we are committed to continuing to work to be able to bring content that is still live and, in this case, we sort of think about (it) as content that would be a “reporter appeal”, if you want to appeal content that you see live, that you may not have posted (yourself).

But this type of engagement requires us to give notice to a larger array of individuals in order to collect their statements and have their input on for them being able to give us additional context on why they posted the content in the first place.

And we think that it's important to do thorough research on how to best do this in a way that keeps privacy central while also honoring the intention that people desire to bring new types of content or content that they may not have posted into scope of the board.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Salvador Rodriguez from CNBC. Please go ahead.

Salvador Rodriguez: Hi there, thank you guys for taking the time. So, one thing that I noticed in the bylaws is that it says that Facebook is committing to fund this for six years. So, I guess what I'm wondering is, what's to stop this from going in the same direction that the Facebook user voting procedures that were in place between 2009 and 2012? I mean, is it something that will actually continue to last and stick around give users some sort of power?

Heather Moore: Hi Sal, this is Heather Moore from Facebook. I'm happy to take that question. We have put up – we have put six years of funding into an irrevocable trust, which will allow the board to operate for two full terms. That by no means is the end of our investment in this board.

We have put a provision, if you turn to Article IV in the bylaws, in the trust section, that specifically states that part of the role of the trust will be to provide Facebook with annual accountings of how the board has spent the money each year.

We plan to use about three years of those to begin the conversations internally, to move towards endowment, which will really assure the ultimate independence and longevity of this institution. I also want to call out that the board is actually a corporate entity, so we have formed a non-charitable purpose (trust) in Delaware and an LLC that sits underneath it.

And so by no means can this structure go away on a whim. It is an actual corporate entity and it will have staff, the first of whom you will hear from later. So there's been a significant financial corporate structuring as well as human investment in this project.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Shirin Ghaffary from Recode. Please go ahead. Shirin Ghaffary from Recode. Please go ahead.

Shirin Ghaffary: Hi, sorry about that. Thanks, everyone, for taking the time. My question is, can Facebook choose to terminate any of the board members or anyone working on this project?

Heather Moore: Thank you for the question. So we've really thought about this long and hard and we heard from a number of experts and talked about this at length during the global consultation. If you go back to the Oversight Board charter, we specifically state in there that board members can only be removed by trustees for a code of conduct violation and not for any decision that – any decision that they make as a member of the board.

This is further underscored in the Oversight Board bylaws specifically of which we have attached the code of conduct that lays out the grounds that might qualify for termination by the trustees under the code of conduct, again underscoring the point that board members cannot be removed for any decisions that we make.

We think it's really an important feature of this to assure that board members are able to exercise their full, independent judgment and that they are able to feel free to really operate in their role exercising oversight over how Facebook is making decisions and that they can do so without fear of not being able to serve in that role anymore because of a decision they've made.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Mark Latonero from Data & Society. Please go ahead.

Mark Latonero: Hi, thanks for the opportunity to be on the call. I'm curious what kind of latitude the board has to amend the bylaws. You also said something about how the board won't make decisions that they conflict with local laws but, you know, that could cause a problem with those laws themselves violate human rights.

So I'm wondering what would happen if the board decides to do that anyway. If you can comment on that possibility and what are the other parameters of the board to change its bylaws, I'd appreciate it.

Heather Moore: Thank you, Mark. This is Heather Moore again. So specifically, Article V really lays out how the board can amend its bylaws. Without going into too many specific details, it's segmented according to the operational component that the board really has oversight over and they ask the board to consult with Facebook before it amends sections in which there are implications with the tooling that Fay is leading on building and with privacy and the confidentiality obligations that we have as a company that extend to the board.

One of the other things I'd like to note is that these are a proposed set of bylaws and so the last paragraph of the introduction really says that the trustees, the board itself and Facebook will all have to formally pass a

resolution that we accept these before they become final and so this is just really our proposed recommendation. We expect that the full board, when they do arrive, will have comments and there may be things that they want to shift in this document.

Operator: Your last question in this section comes from the line of Julia Boorstin from CNBC. Please go ahead.

Julia Boorstin: Thanks so much, I really appreciate it. I'm just curious how this board could change the perception of Facebook's responsibility, should Section 230 be changed? Should Facebook and other tech companies be held liable for the content on their platforms, how the Oversight Board would fit into that liability?

And also if I could understand what steps you're taking to swiftly enforce these decisions made by the board. Obviously, the idea is that if the board makes a call on a certain type of content, that would apply broadly, how are you thinking about using the decisions made by the board to set rules which will be enforced presumably by AI as well by human moderators.

Brent Harris: Perfect, thanks for the question. So the way we've been thinking about this board is that Facebook has responsibility for what's shared on its products and for its products.

And so this board is a means by which we think that we can exercise that responsibility better, and strengthen the exercise of that responsibility and so this board we're creating as a means to hold ourselves accountable and provide for oversight on whether or not we're making decisions that are principled according to the set of standards and values that we've set out and to provide for that independent judgment and that process to really ensure that we're upholding that.

So what we view this as is a step for this company, I think a step for this industry that we hope will become more widespread and adopted by others and become a standard and a norm for the right way to ensure that platforms are living up to their stated purpose.

Heather Moore: To really build on Brent's point and address the second part of your question, I think that's really geared towards implementation, we really lay out the various mechanisms that Facebook is going to employ to respond and then implement a board decision.

I want to underscore first that we're going to be public at every phase of that process, and so we will respond publicly to board decisions, we will then publicly state how we have implemented that decision, and in instances where the board provides a policy advisory statement as part of their decision on the individual piece of content, that will absolutely go through our policy development process.

We will then post a public response stating whether or not as a result of going through that policy development process, we were able to accept the board's recommendation on policy, or if we were not, why. I think the most important thing about how we're going to respond, and implement is that it's going to be public, which is adding a new layer of transparency into our process that wasn't there before.

Operator: I will now turn it back to Fay Johnson from Facebook.

Fay Johnson: Thank you for your questions. Now Article III, which focuses on 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 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 for the post, and how Facebook's decision could impact others. After submitting a request for 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 a final decision, and also when Facebook has implemented that decision. Through the board's website, people who have appealed a case to the board will be able to track its progress. I'll now turn it 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 Board Trust. We received resounding feedback emphasizing the need for the independence of the board. So we have established the Oversight Board Trust and LLC and we released trust formation documents at the end of last year.

This setup allows for 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 in 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 decisions they have made. In addition, the trustees will be responsible for safeguarding the assets in the trust and improving 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've wanted to provide the Board with a good starting point to this 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 would 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 the line of Shirin Ghaffary from Recode. Please go ahead.

Shirin Ghaffary: So, I understand that the Board Members will be from many different geographic regions. Can you explain how this staffing will work, if I heard correctly I think you said it would be 30 to 40 full-time staff in the U.K. and U.S. Will you have staff from other countries?

Heather Moore: Thank you for the question. This is Heather Moore. One of the things that we wrote in the bylaws is that the board's staff should be as diverse as the board itself. Given some of the early testing and consultation that we've done on this process we really want to support the fact that this is a global body the administration itself should be global as well.

Even though the first few offices will be in the United States and United Kingdom we expect our staff to be international and to have various

background and perspectives that will assist the board in making their decisions.

The staff is really almost like a startup. It will have the full infrastructure that any fully functioning institution will have but of course this will take time, so over time we expect that the staff will have their own – not only their own director, who you will hear from later on the call, but also their own in-house legal, communications, privacy, case management functions to really support the work of the board.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Issie Lapowsky, Protocol.

Issie Lapowsky: My question is on board members. How you're finding them, how you're getting them, where they're coming from, and then what's that sort of – built that hiring process?

Brent Harris: Perfect. Thank you for the question and it's one that has been top of mind from the very beginning of when we started out on the process of building this board. So the beginning of it was figuring it out what does it mean to be a board member and part of the reason that we went off and we did the global consultation and we've run a series of these workshops to pilot what it's like to take hard decisions on content to an outside group of people and how do you define that job.

And we've set out both in the charter and then we've set out as well and published some of the principles for what we're looking for and what we think will make for a great board member.

In the course of that as well the workshops have been a means for us to meet people around the world and people who didn't necessarily know at the start and come from a wide array of background and so (we anticipate) that the number of the members will be people who have participated in this consultation process and who really distinguished themselves in workshops or otherwise as being committed to building out an institution like this and hearing multiple points of view and deliberating with a set of colleagues.

In addition we didn't want that to be the only way that we met people and so we opened a public recommendations portal and have been seeing a wide array of names come in of some really incredible people from a diverse set of backgrounds and from all across the world. And so we've been considering people not only through that global consultation but also now through the recommendations portal over the last few months.

That has resulted in a deep and rich talent pool of people who have as many backgrounds and experiences and points of view as I think you might see almost on Facebook or on Instagram. And now we're in kind of a last phase of ensuring that final composition is one that really is a group of people who I think that everyone from a wide array of backgrounds can be proud of.

And part of that I'll underscore, and I think we've signaled this a little bit, a sign that we've done that right will be that almost any person, I think, on this planet may not like one or two people who are on this board and we think that that's a feature. We think that it'll be important because some of the people who I may not like or who may not hold my points of view are people who actually have been strongly recommended and see themselves as strong potential board members through this process.

And when we announce I think a few months later you're going to see that this isn't just a board that looks like Silicon Valley or looks like Facebook or looks like any part of the company or any particular demographic. It's really going to look like a set of people who are deeply global and who, I think, will distinguish themselves in the world.

Operator: As a reminder to ask a question, press "star" followed by the number "1."
Your next question comes from the line of Elizabeth Culliford from Reuters.
Elizabeth Culliford from Reuters, your line is open.

Elizabeth Culliford: Hi, sorry about that. Thanks for the time, guys. Right, I just wanted to follow up on what you were saying there about the talent pool that you're already seeing. And get a sense of where in that process you are.

Have you already made decisions but they just won't be announced yet?
Have you made decisions on the co-chairs for example? Thanks.

Brent Harris: Perfect, so thank you for that question. So, we at this point, I think, have had hundreds of different recommendations and potential candidates; it's actually probably well over 1,000, but we'd have to double check that number.

And over the course of that we've narrowed it down to a few dozen people who we really think have distinguished themselves. And again, hold a wide array of different experiences and come from countries all across this world. And at this point we have not yet made any formal offers to anyone yet.

And in part that's because, as I mentioned earlier, it's been really important to us to make sure that it's not just a really outstanding group of individuals, it's actually important that it's an outstanding group of people and that that composition comes together to be, I think more than the sum of its parts and something that is – that really builds behind this institution, builds behind those processes that have been put forth.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Kurt Wagner from Bloomberg. Please go ahead.

Kurt Wagner: Hey, thanks again. This is obviously a really complex and nuanced effort. I'm wondering as you guys have gone through this, what has been the most difficult part of all of this? I'm sure there are some things that when you first set out you didn't foresee. What stood out to you as being challenging about putting this together?

Brent Harris: So I'll jump in and then I'm actually curious to hear if others have additional reflections, but one part of it actually that I think has been not as public, in a way, has been really, the technical part to this. And I think you've heard Fay speak to that, but I have found a lot of people really anchor on who should serve or what should these prophesies be.

And in the background it's been absolutely crucial that we actually get the technical side right and that those decisions flow through right into the content, into the platform and that people truly have the ability to appeal these decisions and do so from a product that touches the lives of hundreds of millions and billions of people around the world.

And putting that in place and building that infrastructure, that's just – that's just not a given. And I think it's a lot harder than the attention it's been publicly given.

Fay Johnson: I will build on what Brent said. It has been challenging, but I think the investment has worked well. It is – a parallel would say that the investment and our appeals process that we've built for Facebook has been developed and iterated on over years, in order to improve the efficiency and to make the systems work well. And so we are looking to leverage what we have learned but with the unique requirements that are specific for the board.

Brent Harris: And I'll just – I'll add in on that as well that to me it also underscores some of the seriousness that the company has taken behind this effort. Because if we wanted to run this a different way and make it shallower, we would not have over a hundred people from just about every function in this company working on this and we would not actually build into the core of our product's visibility.

And this is not just an initiative that's run from policy and comms or legal or wherever. It's an initiative that's being run in deep partnership with the product (teams) of this company so that we can really give people a voice and process.

Operator: Your last question in this section comes from the line of Queenie Wong from CNET. Please go ahead.

Queenie Wong: I wanted to learn more about how you're trying to balance user privacy with transparency. The bylaws mentioned that users have to consent to include any identifying details in the board's final decisions. So, if they don't end up doing that, does the board not end up publishing much in the final decision that's posted, or how will that sort of work?

Fay Johnson: Queenie, this is Fay. Thank you so much for your question. I think it's actually a really important thing that we have been thinking through and considering. I was on the product team that actually worked on a lot of our efforts around GDPR, and so I'm also bringing that lens in to make sure that

we're being really thoughtful about our compliance with that law in particular and other similar laws internationally.

I think the thing that we are bringing in is to truly try and make the process both thorough and as clear and simple for individuals who are appealing to the board as possible, which is something that we aim to be doing from a product perspective, typically through our research, just really understanding what is working well for people and what isn't.

So, in this regard, we are going to require that if people try to share any personally identifiable information within a particular decision that the user has another person submitting the case have given consent for that to happen, I think that the way that the board has been structured and the way that their decisions in the scope of which their decisions can be applied to from a content perspective, there really will be a value-add to what the board speaks to, even if the specific information about a person who's posting the content is not included in the draft decision.

And our – we're making it as clear as possible in the actual flows for the individuals who are submitting, which we are continuing to work on at the moment. That the board will, if they decide to take up a particular case, they will publish a final decision and there will not be any sort of private decision published by the board, to the sense that anything that the board does deliberate on will be their sort of final recommendations and policy guidance will be made public.

We think that's an important part of what we are setting up here. And so, we are still trying to make sure it's very clear to the individuals who are submitting that this sort of topic and their content at hand will be included in a public decision.

Operator: I will now turn it back to Brent.

Brent Harris: Thanks for sticking with us through the bylaws. I'd like to now 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 document in a timely and efficient manner, and that board members have access to the resources required to carry out the roles effectively.

As set out in the proposed bylaws, in a usual court of business, the director will be appointed by the board's trustees, in consultation with co-chairs. In the interest of wasting no time in 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 human rights from his previous role at Article 19, an international non-governmental organization, where he has served as executive director for the past six years.

In addition, Thomas is well qualified for this role given his experience building and shaping NGOs. He served as founder and director of two social purpose organizations – Diversity and VirtualRoad.org. Having been part of the team working hard on developing the board over the past year, it's a pleasure for me to welcome Thomas today.

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

Thomas Hughes: Brent, thank you very much and thank you very much for that very kind and generous introduction and hello to everyone on the call today; thank you for joining us. 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.

I’ve 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 setting progressive standards including around digital rights related issues.

So for me, thus far, I see a continuation in taking up the role of director because the Oversight Board has been created to ensure the rights of people 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 wanted to quote from that letter today and part of it states, “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 because that statement remains as true and important now as it was a year ago if not more so important now and I’m very excited to be engaging with and working for the Oversight Board to 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 hear based on clear and transparent criteria and then to efficiently and effectively and confidentially review those cases.

This will require us to hire staff and as I pointed out earlier, we’re looking to ensure global recruitment so that staff is as diverse and globally-represented as possible as well as to set up the processes and tools which we’ve heard a little bit about as well to enable the board members to review cases. And this

is, as it goes without saying, an enormous undertaking and it will take us a few months before we are ready.

The board, as has been mentioned, will be global and will, therefore, reflect a breadth of perspectives. I'm sure there will be board members as Brent mentioned with – whose opinion you or I might disagree. However, I'm confident that this diversity is at the very heart of the board's rationale and more confident that it will mean that we will have stronger outcomes as a result.

The Oversight Board is a unique innovation and there will be many lessons that we will be learning as we move forward. But as mentioned, I am very confident that we will make a success of it and I look forward to sharing further updates with you all over the coming months ahead. And on that I'd like to turn questions.

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 the line of Shirin Ghaffary from Recode. Please go ahead.

Shirin Ghaffary: Hi, thanks, Thomas. One question I have is obviously there's going to be a high volume of appeals on a platform of Facebook's size. How does – can you give a little bit more insight into how the Oversight Board will choose which appeals they take on?

Thomas Hughes: Shirin, thanks very much for the question. That was partly answered earlier, I think, by the Facebook Team. But there will obviously be both cases that are coming from Facebook and Facebook has stated the criteria they will use for the selection of those.

But then also faces that the Oversight Board members will set criteria for the selection of as well. I have to say at this stage it's for the board members to decide how they will set those criteria. And obviously for the administration to apply those criteria to that selection process. So I look forward to be able to share more on that in the future once I get that guidance from the board members themselves.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line Laurence Dodds from Daily Telegraph. Please go ahead.

Laurence Dodds: Hi, thanks very much it's really great to hear you're on board. I want to ask about in the past Article 19 was a little, was not completely complimentary about Facebook's contents community standards – sorry. And released an analysis saying that they can't afford the low international standards on freedom of expression and have a list of recommendations of context but needed to change these policies.

Running this administration, you'll now be in a position of – the board members will be able to make policy advisory notes. But will be enforcing a policy that Article 19 certainly back in 2018 and wasn't super happy with. And I wonder how you square your job now with your job then and the how satisfied you are in putting into practice this speech code that neither you nor the board itself necessarily can change?

Thomas Hughes: Laurence, thanks very much. And as I mentioned earlier I see the Oversight Board as a key innovation for the protection of the rights of individuals of people using the platform. Of course the board members, themselves, will be looking at individual cases, they'll be considering those cases vis-à-vis the community standards.

But also in the context of wider international standards at the same time. And I want to stress again, it's for the board members to take decisions on those cases and for the board members to decide on any policy-related recommendations that they would pass back to Facebook.

Heather Moore: Just to – hi, Laurence, this is Heather Moore from Facebook. Just to underscore Thomas' point. If you go back to the Charter we put a couple of mechanisms in place. Specifically in the basis for review that do allow that Board to be able to exercise their independent judgment over our policies.

Specifically the first line of their review will be analyzing whether or not Facebook's decision was consistent with the community standards. The second line is whether or not those standards really fall in line with

Facebook’s stated values and balance the values appropriately. The top line value being freedom of expression, balance against authenticity, safety, privacy, et cetera.

And then the third line, as Thomas said, in light of international human rights norms and standards. And so there is great space for the board to really make decisions that differ from how Facebook would’ve applied its policies and also to recommend substantial changes.

Operator: As a reminder, to ask a question press “star” followed by the number “1.” Your next question comes from the line of Issie Lapowsky from Protocol, please go ahead.

Issie Lapowsky: Hi, can you all hear me a little bit better this time?

Female: Yes.

Issie Lapowsky: OK. So thank you for doing this, I wanted to ask – you said you know you’d been in this role for about a week, so I wondered if you could walk me through how involved you’ve been in drafting these bylaws and how well you think all of this speaks to the concerns that you expressed in that – in that email that you quoted from.

Are your concerns thoroughly addressed in the creation of this Oversight Board, or to your mind are there things that Facebook still needs to be doing to remedy those things?

Thomas Hughes: As was mentioned earlier, the bylaws are obviously going to be open for discussion and input from the board members once they’ve been announced, once they sit together for the first time, so there will be scope for amending and moving forward. Having looked at them myself, I do think they create a strong basis for what the administration needs to do in order to serve the board members, but again it’s for the board members to discuss those issues. Yes.

Operator: Your next question comes from the line of Jan Rydzak from Ranking Digital Rights, because go ahead.

Jan Rydzak: Thanks, everyone, and I'd just like to reflect that Ranking Digital Rights is planning to publish a full response with feedback to this announcement later today. And on the substantive side, are there any plans for the board's scope to eventually encompass not just taking down content, sort of leaving it up, but also changes to the visibility of content, like demotion, or down ranking which might also implicate human rights?

Heather Moore: Thank you for that question, Jan. I'll take the first part, and then I'll let our product manager, Fay, jump in on the second part. So the charter really provides for the scope of the board to grow and develop over time. We set the baseline in the charter stating that users who disagree with the decision that Facebook made and then have made their way through our internal appeals system can then go to the board.

And so that's pretty wide scope. What you see in the bylaws is that we really have to – we have to walk before we run, and so we can't bring everything into scope at one time and Fay can talk about that a little more. And so we – we've tried to stagger that appropriately.

Fay Johnson: Yes. Thanks for your question. I think that – on a question on of some of the broader ways that we do content moderation and look at the kind of content that is available on our platform and then have it as distributed. Obviously the board is in a position based on the bylaws to provide policy recommendations to us, which can include advice or statements about how they think they can be operating our business.

I do think that there will be different types of content brought into scope, as we're able to build out those tools. But there is – Facebook itself is committed to continuing to improve these processes and working on ensuring that we are both being transparent with users and developing the tools for people to have a better understanding about the things that they are seeing in their feed.

Operator: Your last question comes from the line of Elizabeth Culliford from Reuters. Please go ahead.

Elizabeth Culliford: Hi, Thomas. I was wondering coming in as an outsider sort of what you've been most skeptical about in the project and how you think you can help with whatever that issue is?

I know previously you had said it's a good step but it's not sufficient that the board itself solving some of Facebook's issues with the content removal process so I wondered if that's sort of an issue or is there something else that you've been thinking, I'm not sure how this is going to work, I think I'm a good person to try and fix it.

Thomas Hughes: Elizabeth, thank you very much. I mean I'm coming at this obviously with the director hat on looking at it from the administrations perspective so my eye is very much on some of the key challenges around scale, around how to set those criteria about making sure that the processes are efficient and effective for the board members and really creating processes and structures that empower the board members to be able to do their job as effectively as possible.

And a number of the issues have been mentioned already but certainly the challenges are numerous and I am personally very much looking forward to getting the board members in place and starting to tackle the different issues as quickly as possible.

Operator: I will now turn the call back over to the presenters.

Carolyn Glanville: Thank you, everyone, for joining the call 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 additional questions before the embargo list at 11:00 a.m. Pacific, please free to reach out. And if you have any additional questions Thomas and the Oversight Board staff, you can reach out to press@osvadmin.com. Thanks so much.

Operator: This concludes today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

END