

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday 24 June 2021 17:14  
**To:** BUSA Lucrezia (CAB-REYNDERS)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Flash of the meeting with IT companies on Code of conduct earlier today

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

\*\*

Meeting report: **Exchange between CAB Reynders and IT Companies on the results of the 6<sup>th</sup> monitoring exercise on the implementation of the Code of conduct on countering hate speech online and next steps.**

**Date: 24/06/2021**

**Participants:** Lucrezia Busa (CAB Reynders); [REDACTED] (JUST C2), [REDACTED] (YouTube), [REDACTED] (Twitter), [REDACTED] (Facebook), [REDACTED] (Jeuxvideo.com), [REDACTED] (TikTok)

**Objective of the meeting:** to discuss the results of the 6th monitoring exercise on the Code of conduct ahead of their publication. Since the date of publication is moved to September, it was also an occasion to discuss about possible revisions of the Code in the light of the Digital Services Act.

**Main points discussed:**

- **CAB Reynders** thanked the platforms for the engagement on the 6<sup>th</sup> monitoring exercise, their cooperation and the efforts done to revise their internal operations on the reports received. Results remain globally on target: time of assessment is on average still very high (more than 80%), while removal rates have been decreasing, in particular for some platforms; good performance by newcomer TikTok, while feedback to users remain quite low across the board. CAB Reynders asked the platforms to elaborate further on their results and share the challenges experienced during the monitoring.
- **YouTube** explained that they need to improve the cooperation and exchange with the NGOs as there is still a lack of knowledge on e.g. the dedicated page on which there is information about the outcomes of a flag and this led to misunderstanding and some mismatches with the data. They also stressed their improvement on machine learning for hate speech and find that the monitoring was a further proof of that. [REDACTED]
- **Twitter** stressed that while being happy for the progress made, the monitoring remains a quite labour intensive and heavy process for their smaller team and checking the monitoring records with each single NGO has proven impossible. Twitter also mentioned that NGOs used predominantly normal user channels rather than trusted flaggers and this may give a partial representation of the results. **CAB Reynders** on the last point responded that hate speech flags have to be treated the same way if they come from ordinary users and trusted flaggers.
- **Facebook and Instagram** flagged the need to increase the dialogue with NGOs as they recorded a number of duplicate notifications or wrong URLs that needed to be fixed. Also, they mentioned the number of cases where a divergent assessment occurred between the teams of reviewers and NGOs on the deemed illegality of the content. CAB Reynders responded on this second point that we will give account of these differences in the

factsheet presenting the results, but that anyhow it seems a relatively marginal portion of the total number of notifications, around 10%.

- **TikTok** shared their satisfaction for the results of their first test, identifying still some areas to be improved, including in particular feedback to users, and language skills on some countries (Baltic)
  - **Jeuxvideo.com** informed about a new feature that allows to systematically inform and give feedback to users flagging hate speech. This is mirrored in the results of the monitoring.
  - **All of them stressed the very positive cooperation with JUST services** in the phase of elaborating the final results.
  - CAB Reynders suggested then to look at possible next steps and indicated two areas of priority for the Commission: a) **re-launch the workshop with trusted flaggers** to foster the exchanges between teams of reviewers and NGOs. This has proven very useful in the past and the results of the 6<sup>th</sup> monitoring, including some steps back in certain countries or on certain grounds show there is a need to intensify it again. b) **start a dialogue with the platforms possibly leading to revision of the Code in the light of the DSA proposal**, building on the provisions in Art 35 encouraging co-regulation and voluntary initiatives
- [REDACTED]
- **On point a)** there was support by the platform to take the initiative to organise a workshop in autumn, possibly in person and in Dublin.
  - **On point b)** the platforms proposed to have a deep dive with the technical level in JUST to identify possible areas where the Code could be updated and improved before engaging formally in a dialogue. Some flagged the importance of ensuring synergies and no overlap with other initiatives. There was agreement that we will proceed with a technical meeting over the summer to then possibly kick off the process.
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]



**European Commission**  
DG Justice and Consumers  
Fundamental Rights Policy

[REDACTED]



EU Justice



Justice and Consumers