Gordon Crovitz and Steven Brill
Co-CEOs, NewsGuard
Media Masters – December 9th 2021
Listen to the podcast online, visit www.mediamasters.fm

Welcome to Media Masters, a series of one-to-one interviews with people at the top of the media game. It's a two-hander this week though and today I'm joined down the line from New York by Gordon Crovitz & Steven Brill, co-chief-executives of NewsGuard, the essential tool that delivers trust ratings for more than 7,000 news and information websites across the world. Created by a team of journalists who assess the credibility and transparency of news sites, NewsGuard is a vital weapon for news consumers but also helps advertisers avoid having their content appear on misinformation and hoax platforms. Gordon and Steven are veteran journalists and news entrepreneurs. Steven founded The American Lawyer, Court TV, and the Yale Journalism Initiative. Gordon was publisher of The Wall Street Journal and a columnist for the paper. Together, Gordon and Steven have supervised thousands of journalists around the world. Gentlemen, thank you for joining me.

Thank you, Paul. It's a pleasure to be with you.

Well, congratulations on an amazing initiative. Could you walk our listeners through the origin story, past, present, and what's the future?

[Gordon]

So Steve and I, as you mentioned, grew up in journalism and we'd done some startups together, this is not our first. And they've all had their goal to solve some big problem in journalism. And the problem that NewsGuard helps to solve is the infodemic of misinformation online. And in particular, the difficulty that people have telling the difference between a generally trustworthy source in their Facebook feed or their Twitter feed or in a search result and a website that is publishing misinformation, false content, hoaxes of all kinds. So the problem we imagined three years ago was a person thumbing through her Facebook feed, seeing what looked like authoritative news sources, making claims about this and that and realising that there are now so many websites and so many bad actors on the internet and digital platforms like social media companies that took no responsibility for what's on their platforms that we could step in and do a very simple thing, which was to give people some immediate indication as they thumb through their Facebook feed or their

search results whether that information is coming from a journal or a reliable source. We identified nine basic apolitical criteria of journalistic practice having to do with credibility and transparency. We put together a team of journalists and trained analysts, and we've rated all the news and information sources that account for 95% of engagement in the countries in which we now operate, which are the UK, US, Germany, France and Italy, and Canada, Australia, and New Zealand later this year. So every website gets a point score from zero to 100, a red or green rating and a detailed nutrition label, giving readers everything they need to know about that site.

[Steven]

One thing to add is if you get a 60 or above, you get a green and below 60, you get a red. The way we like to think about what we're doing is right now, suppose you walked into a library, you'd see books arranged neatly. According to subject matter, you could pick up the book and look at the book jacket and see who the author is. You can see who the publisher is. You get some sense of the author's background, their credentials, and best of all, there's the librarian there who can tell you that if you read this magazine or this book, you might get a conservative point of view or a liberal point of view, or this person won the Nobel prize for economics. This person is sort of an amateur, but the librarian will give you some sense of how you should regard what you're about to read. Now, imagine instead, if you walked into a library and you just had a million pieces of paper just flying around in the air and you plucked one out of the air and you started reading it, you wouldn't know who wrote it. You wouldn't know who's financing it. You wouldn't know what their standards are. You pretty much wouldn't know everything. And that's the internet today, whether it's a Facebook feed or a Twitter feed or a Google search, what you see are headlines and you have no idea who is feeding you the news. So we had a very simple proposition, which is we would use people who are trained as journalists to explain to people who's feeding them the news.

I think it's brilliantly executed as well, gentlemen. I mean, you've hired these analysts with serious journalism experience to put what you call nutrition labels on new sources. You talk about the nine apolitical criteria that you used to assess each website. Could you talk us through the process?

[Steven]

Typically there are six or seven people involved in every rating and nutrition label. It starts with a relatively junior analyst who has at least three years experience as a journalist reading the site, will spend a couple of days looking at the site, reading the site, looking at how the site adheres to each of the nine criteria, doing a draft, which is then read by a mid-level editor then a senior editor, if there are any issues relating to facts, it will go to a fact checker. The analyst will also call the proprietor of the site for comment, if we're going to say anything negative about the site, even if it's one of the relatively minor of the nine criteria, once that is done, there's a draft that goes to one of our senior editors who for example, was previously the news director for Reuters or someone with over 15 years experience at the associated press. Once they have vetted and edited, believe it or not Gordon and I do the final line edit of every single one of our 7,800 nutrition labels to make sure that it adheres to our

standards. There are often nuances and questions and we have a 10 o'clock all hands staff meeting that goes over those nuances, and questions and makes a final decision. And those decisions inform the whole staff. And that's the process. And once we publish the nutrition label, everyone involved in preparing it is listed at the bottom of the label. There's a link to their biography so that people can see who is doing it, who has done this. It's the opposite of what the tech companies do. Twitter, Google, and Facebook, all rate the reliability of new sources. The differences are their ratings are secret. They don't tell you what the ratings are. They don't tell you how they do the ratings. They don't tell you who does the ratings. And if you're the proprietor of The Times or BBC or CNN, and you want to know what your rating is. If you call them, you wouldn't know who to call, and if you found the right person, they wouldn't tell you what the rating is. And they wouldn't tell you how they prepared the rating, because they would be afraid that you're going to gain their system with their algorithm. We actually want people to game our system. You always know what your rating is, you know who did the rating and you can see from the nutrition label, how we applied the criteria. If you have a complaint, we will publish the complaint along with the nutrition label. And because we always call people for comment, more than 900 sites have changed what they do to get a higher rating, which we love. We want people to game our system. Once again, we always call for comment. Algorithms do not call for comment.

I agree with you. Gaming the system normally has negative connotations, but you obviously mean that positively. Cause the way to gain plaudits from your site is to be impartial and proper journalism isn't it. I mean, Mark Zuckerberg himself admits that Facebook didn't do enough to prevent the spread of fake news. That must ultimately be a great advert for what you guys are doing.

[Gordon]

You certainly would think so, Paul.

[Steven]

They would licence us and provide our ratings and labels to their users, which they could do right now if they wanted to. But I think unfortunately their business model is to have fake news. Their business model is to have the most sensational stuff that will attract the most engagement. That's what's been proven by all the revelations about Facebook and its process. Microsoft on the other hand, does licence NewsGuard for its edge browser. And it works.

[Gordon]

There are also new competitors to Facebook that's obviously a very tall order. There's a social media company actually based in the UK called Bright. That's integrating our ratings as well. And a new search engine called Neeva which has integrated our ratings into its search results, Neeva is founded by the fellow who previously ran the entire advertising business at Google. And Neeva describes itself as a consumer focused search engine, not an advertiser focused search engine. So we do see signs of more responsible companies seeing an opportunity to take

advantage of the shortcomings of Facebook and others. But it certainly has been a long time coming. And in the meantime, the problem remains deadly serious. The amount of healthcare hoaxes related to COVID and the vaccine, the political divisiveness often promoted by Russian and other propaganda operations taking advantage of platforms like YouTube and Facebook and others. These problems continue and are really quite urgent.

I really applaud what you're trying to do, gentlemen, and I wish you every success with it. My worry is that Trump and his supporters poisoned the well of civic society itself, the cry of fake news. My worry is that the type of people that stormed The Capitol, can they even be reasoned with, this is a great initiative, but are they just going to say, oh, you're just part of the DC establishment.

[Gordon]

You know, so far we've gotten good feedback from media companies on all sides of the aisle. We've been criticised by government propaganda operations, like RT and Sputnik, and some of the Chinese ones. They're not really in the journalism business, they're actually in the government propaganda business, which you referred to the January six, the people involved in that, and what's quite interesting is studies of the people who were arrested, they found that fewer than 10% of them were what one might think of as semi-professional agitators, members of the proud boys and other groups like that, almost everyone instead came from a middle-class backgrounds, held jobs, stable families, and as their news consumption has become public as people have studied how they came to believe what they believed. There's a pattern, several years ago they started seeing websites like Infowars in their Facebook feed. They were then recommended to join groups, Facebook groups, that promoted hoaxes and things that are clearly untrue. And they over time tumbled down different rabbit holes of misinformation. And by January six had come to believe many things that were just not true. Now, how much of that could have been avoided if Facebook and others had taken minimal responsibility for what appeared on our platform? One doesn't know, but the research certainly indicates that if somebody sees in his or her Facebook feed claim and it comes from a site that's gotten a red rating from us, people are much less likely to believe it and much less likely to share it. So I do think that empowering users with some context, and some understanding for the belief that the credibility of sources in their Facebook feed could help to, if not prevent incidents like January six, at least make them a lot less likely. So there's serious culpability by the digital platforms. And we're strongly encouraged by the work in the UK on the online safety bill, which would create for the first time basic duties of care by the larger digital platforms to show that they've taken reasonable steps to minimise, or hopefully eliminate the online harms that they're currently causing, not just in misinformation, but also in bullying and other known online harms. The UK is the leader in this area of the online safety legislation that is being prepared, which I think could make a tremendous difference and could change the way the digital platforms operate.

I admire the fact that you've not trying to become arbiters of which let's outlet exhibits a conservative bias, or which ones tend to adhere to the left, but

you're targeting frankly the blatantly fake, the deceptive types, like the so-called Denver Guardian, which led to those false stories about Hillary Clinton.

[Gordon]

The Denver Guardian is a fantastic example that was in 2016. I think Steve that's the site that had the new scoop that the Pope had endorsed Donald Trump, which of course turned out to be true. And that one was that that site was actually created by a Hillary Clinton supporter who was testing to see what misinformation he could publish and how it might spread. And what happened was he started earning a lot of money because of the way programmatic advertising operates. He put up this crazy site and people started clicking on it, because it had crazy stories, built an audience, and advertisers did not intend to advertise on a crazy site, but programmatic advertising, which now accounts for half of all digital advertising and digital advertising is half of all advertising. So programmatic advertising is a quarter of all the advertising in any form that goes often to these crazy sites where big brands would never, ever want their ads to appear. But because of the way the ad tech world is operating and the failure of the legacy brand safety companies to protect advertisers, we're determined along with a company called Comscore, the media measuring company. We did a report not long ago that found that there's 2.6 billion US dollars going every year to misinformation sites because of the way programmatic advertising operates. That problem is so large ee actually created our own product to help advertisers. It's our responsible advertising on news segments for programmatic advertising. That includes an exclusion list. So advertisers can tell their agencies and the ad tech companies 'I don't want my ads on these sites.' And it also includes an inclusion list of high quality news and information sites that are very rarely targeted with programmatic advertising and allows the advertiser, not only to be confident about the quality of the site where the ads appear, but to support high quality news and information sites.

Could you talk our listeners through your light bulb moment? Was there a moment when you thought right we have to do something about this and how did you decide to work together to do this?

[Steven]

It wasn't so much a light bulb moment, but someone came to me with an idea to rate news sites based on their political leanings. And this person's notion was there'd be sort of a metre or a clock like image. And it would shift to the left or the right based on somebody's judgement of whether the news site was to the left or the right. And I actually thought that was a terrible idea because just to take an example, the three of us right now, if we were to figure out how far to the left or the right the BBC is, or CNN is, or the New York times is we probably get into a pretty good debate about that. Plus when it comes to much of news, whether it's healthcare news or financial news or sports news, there really isn't a left or right. But that got me thinking, I talked to Gordon about it, that maybe there is a way to gauge or rate news sites, not based on whether they're to the left or the right, because that debate is really impossible, especially in the Trump years, because it's hard to figure out if he was left or right, or

just, just a lunatic! But there is a way to rate the reliability of sites and their trustworthiness based on their adherence to what Gordon and I, easily agreed, were basic criteria for journalistic practice. And just to jump ahead, one of the things that really surprised us and continues to surprise us is that while we have some critics on the left or on the right, or among Sputnik and RT and Infowars, nobody really has disputed the nine criteria that we set out. Whether it's in the UK, the US, Germany, Italy, France, there's pretty much a consensus that these are the basic standards for journalism, whether it's journalism that is highly opinionated or is not opinionated or covers healthcare or covers science or covers the economy that these criteria really stand up and they have stood up,

What are the nine criteria? Could you talk us through them?

[Steven]

Not a problem. The first one that counts for 22 points is whether the site repeatedly publishes false news. And that sounds like it would be the subject of a lot of debate. But the simple fact is that the way we apply that criteria, it's really a matter of stuff that is demonstrably provably false, and believe it or not, there are lots of sites that repeatedly publish misinformation that is demonstrably provably false. For example, if you go to a network of sites under the rubric of naturalnews.com, they will tell you that if you have cancer you should subscribe to their monthly supply of apricot pips because that will cure your cancer. And therefore you can cancel your appointment with your oncologist. Who's just trying to rip you off. Or there are sites that will tell you that 9/11 was an inside job by the Bush administration, or that Barack Obama was not born in the United States or that COVID was manufactured in a lab in the United States. So that's the first criteria, repeatedly publishing false news and that is actually easier to determine because what we assume is every site is green until proven red. So before we start meeting every site starts out with nine checkmarks until they don't. The second criteria, which Cannes for 18 points is whether the site gathers and presents information responsibly. And by that we mean, does it have standards in place, procedures in place to prevent the publication of false content that is really materially important? So for example, if a site doesn't repeatedly publish false news, but on frequent occasions publishes misinformation, that really is important such as 9/11 was an inside job or masks are dangerous and we'll give you COVID not prevent COVID, they will fail on that count, which counts for 18 points. The next one is regularly corrects or clarifies errors which counts for 12 and a half points. We think that's vitally important because that shows that the website really cares about getting it right, and really cares about serving its users. And the best way you can demonstrate that you care about serving your users with accurate information is if you're candid and quick to clarify an error, that shows that you have standards. The next one down the line is handles the difference between news and opinion responsibly. And by that we mean that if something is labelled as news, it doesn't have all kinds of opinionated language in it. Or if the site is an opinion site, say, it's the website of the national review, the conservative magazine founded by Bill Buckley in the 1950s. If it's an opinionated site, it readily discloses to readers, what is its agenda? What it's opinions are. The next one down the list for 10 points avoids deceptive headlines, doesn't have…

Clickbait?

[Steven]

Yeah, to deceive the reader into wasting the reader's time. After that there's one which we found to be quite important, and it cans for seven and a half points, which is, does the website disclose its ownership and financing. And there you have situations where you can have a Russian propaganda site that doesn't disclose that it's owned and controlled by the Russian government. And that's something that's important for readers to know. We have found a bellwether for real trouble with the site. If a website doesn't disclose who's behind it, who owns it, there's usually something wrong with it. It usually has an agenda and practises that are not really good for the world. Then there's another seven and a half points, or for clearly labelling advertising, if a website publishes content that it's been paid to publish, but doesn't tell that to the reader that is deceptive, that is not serving the reader. Then moving down to the eighth criteria, reveals who's in charge, including any possible conflicts of interest is the editor of the site. You know, someone who actually, you know, is working for a political candidate, that's something readers ought to know. Um, and also readers ought to know who's in charge so they have someone to complain to if they think something is wrong. And then the last one also for five points is the site provides information about the content creators. It has by-lines with real names on it. And there's something on the site that tells you something about who that byline is, what their background is, what they've written in the past, what their credentials are, that counts for five points. And all of that adds up to a hundred points. And if you get 60 points or more, you get a green, but there are shades of green, obviously a site that scores a hundred or scores 85 is adhering more closely to the high standards of journalism than a site that gets a 65.

Has NewsGuard attracted a critical mass of news users yet? Would you call it that? I'm a subscriber, but do you need a certain number of us to make this financially viable?

[Steven]

Well, the consumer piece of it, your subscription is not really the core of our business model. Our business model is a B2B business model and Gordon, maybe you just want to run through the various aspects of that.

[Gordon]

Sure. So we rely on distributors. So those are any company that has a network of users, where that company wants to give them a safer internet experience. So for example, Microsoft for its new edge browser makes our browser extension available at no cost to its users. It's otherwise the equivalent of three pounds per month. We work with a number of companies and other entities, educational institutions, healthcare systems, internet service providers, really any entity that has customers or students or staff or patients where they're interested in giving them a safer internet

experience. But to reach our goal and our goal of course, is to get NewsGuard ratings into the hands of news consumers wherever they're getting their news, that does require the biggest digital platforms like Facebook, like YouTube, like Google, like Twitter, to open their products to third party solutions. This is often described as middleware, where a consumer can choose to opt in for various protections. And that is how new search engines like Neeva, and social media companies like Bright are serving their users by opening their platforms and giving them access to tools like NewsGuard. So the best way for us to gain of a large audience will be for the platforms that caused this misinformation crisis in the first place, either to be required or voluntarily to open their products, not just to solutions from this information like ours, but to many different tools, to give users many different options about how they want to interact with that product, how they want to protect themselves and their family from the algorithms of the digital platforms. And this idea of middleware is the underlying concept behind the online safety bill in the UK, where digital platforms would be able to show that they are taking reasonable steps to protect their users if they opened their platforms to third party solutions to help consumers be safer when they're using those products.

And it is a public health matter now, isn't it. I was reading your press release in August that your analysts have now found 500 so-called new sites peddling COVID-19 misinformation, identifying 50 hoaxes related to COVID 19 vaccines.

[Gordon]

We were so surprised when we had done the ratings and we looked at our own data and we thought that the vast majority of red rated sites of unreliable sites would be political sites of one kind or another. That turned out not to be true. The dominant category of misinformation on the internet is healthcare misinformation. This was true even before COVID it's of course become that much truer, since COVID. Websites claiming that 5g and the broadband technology caused cancer now claim that 5g caused COVID. There's a lot of money in healthcare hoaxes, whether it's the problem of programmatic advertising or the problem of healthcare hoax sites, peddling false nutrition solutions like apricot pips to cure cancer. It's an enormous multi-billion dollar industry made possible by the digital platforms that have allowed large networks of healthcare misinformation sites to flourish. And when we look at the popularity, the engagement with these healthcare hoax sites, many times the engagement of responsible healthcare sites, the NIH, Web MD, the US, the Mayo Clinic, those kinds of sites get much less engagement than healthcare hoax sites through Facebook or other social media platforms.

Well, the study that you did with Comscore found the advertisers spent $2.6 billion on misinformation websites, if for every $2.16 cents spent on news websites, $1 spent on misinformation. I mean, these are breathtaking figures.

[Steven]

That's an amazing number. And put a different way if our brand guard product was universally adopted so that advertisers shifted that money to local newspaper sites in

the United States using us numbers for that, it would increase ad revenues for newspaper websites in the United States by 40% now, by the way advertisers don't want to be advertising on those sites. It's just that the opaque and unaccountable nature of the ad tech industry chiefly enabled by Google by the way, really enables that and allows that. So it is a solvable problem, but advertisers are forcing their ad companies to do something about it.

[Gordon]

And that we have begun now to work with several of the large ad agencies, IPG, Omnicom, Publicis, for example, have all made arrangements with us so that it's very easy for their clients, their advertisers to protect themselves against appearing on these inappropriate websites. But you know, this programmatic advertising has grown up over the last 20 years. It's become quite a crisis. It funds so much of the misinformation. And we hope that large brands that are socially responsible will take steps to keep their advertising off of these inappropriate websites. The 2.6 billion US dollar figure goes a long way to explaining why there's so much misinformation on the internet. It's almost built into the systems that have been created by the ad tech companies. Google's the largest demand side platform and Facebook of course, is an enormous source for advertising

[Steven]

And to emphasise about that, we now have done a study with IPG where they, with one of their clients, a big advertiser, deployed our inclusion lists, which are vetted sites, thousands of sites that we have rated green in fact, rated with a high green score. And they devoted, for this client, all of their advertising to those inclusion lists, and that kept them off of red sites and put them on highly rated new sites rated by human beings, our analysts. The result was not only where they now socially responsible, but it actually saved them money because what they found was our inclusion lists are so large that it lowered the cost per thousand for their advertising and our inclusion lists included sites that people took so seriously that it increased the response rate, the click-through rate for the ads. So unlike a lot of the socially responsible initiatives that corporations are taking, which costs them money and costs them a lot of time and effort, this socially responsible step saves money and is very simple. So it's a way to do well and do good. It sounds like a cliche but the study we did proves that, you save money and you're doing some good for the world.

You attracted $6 million in seed funding for the launch. What are the plans for the future to make it financially sustainable, gentlemen, are you seeking fresh investment?

[Steven]

We're not, we've pretty much now reached the state where we're breaking even. And we anticipate doing much better than breaking even next year. So we're not seeking any new investment. We are expanding, as Gordon mentioned, to Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, with some other countries on tap for the year after and the coming year. So we're in pretty good shape. We're building a momentum and on the

advertising side, that momentum is really accelerating because we are helping people realise that they can save money at the same time that they're socially responsible when they spend money on advertising.

You just agreed to a major deal with Neeva, the first ads free private subscription search engine, which now provides its users free access to NewsGuards trustworthy nutrition labels for its news sources.

[Gordon]

Neeva's is a fascinating news search engine. Its founder is Sridhar Ramaswamy who previously had run all of Google's advertising business for many years. And he's explained that he understood at Google that a lot of the advertising was ending up on untrustworthy sites. And if a service is geared to maximise ad revenue, then really the search engine is geared for the advertiser, not for the user. There's a saying, if you're not paying for the service, then you're the product being sold. And all of us as consumers with free services, free is great, but we are the product being sold. So Mr. Ramaswamy and his colleagues announced Neeva as a search engine that is focused on users and their experience, not on advertisers. And so that includes protections for users in our case against misinformation, Neeva has integrated our ratings and our labels so that when people do a search and news is part of that search result, they'll have instant access to the information. Is this a generally trustworthy site or is it not? And the result of that is people will focus more on news and information from reliable sources, not from unreliable sources. And it's a model for what others could do, Facebook, YouTube, Google, Twitter, and others to empower their users with some information about who's feeding them the news. And if more companies followed Neeva's lead, I think we'd go a long way to solving this infodemic of misinformation on the internet.

I'm aware gentlemen, that you've only got a few minutes left. I think what you're doing is amazing, but I just wanted to ask you about how you're going about doing it. I mean, you're both jointly co-chief executives. That's unusual as well. How does that work day-to-day? Do you have a division of labour? Do you deputise for one another, I'm interested if you could share with our listeners how that actually works in practice.

[Steven]

Well actually this podcast is probably indicative of that, we're sitting in separate rooms in our office, and we somehow seem to have split the labour of this podcast, though it's hardly labour, it's a lot of fun. We split stuff informally and nature takes its course and amazingly, this is the second business we've done successfully where we've been able to do that. We disagree often on politics, which is actually a very good thing because we keep each other honest in terms of making sure that we are as apolitical in our ratings as we say we are. But it works. And for me, if I stopped to think about why it works, I probably wouldn't be able to understand it.

[Gordon]

Yeah, as Steve says, this is our second startup together, and we are in a sense creating or part of creating a new industry of online safety tools. And when you're starting a new industry, it's hard work. There's a lot of proselytising, a lot of explaining that there is a problem. I have to say, it's become less hard to explain to people that misinformation is a problem than it was when we launched a few years ago. Everybody now understands it's a crisis, not just a problem. And I would say Steve and I both have similar management styles in the sense that we'd like to surround ourselves with the smartest people we can and the most experienced people we can. So we have terrific advisors, our senior editorial advisor in the UK is Richard Sambrook who previously ran news at the BBC. We have quite senior journalists working for us as analysts. And we have terrific advisors, members of our board of advisors, and members of the House of Lords as one of our advisors, Tom Glocer, the former CEO of Thomson Reuters as an advisor. So this sort of startup in a new industry is a real team effort.

Gentlemen, I know you're in New York at the moment, I'm talking to you from the glamorous location of Milton Keynes, but could you tell us about the online safety bill in the UK?

[Gordon]

We closely follow the preparation for the online safety bill in the UK. We think it's the leading reform that could have the most significant impact on the way Silicon Valley operates. In the US in the mid-1990s, when the internet was first commercialised, Congress decided essentially to immunise the digital platforms. There was a section 2.30 of the 1996 Telecommunications Act that said that the digital platforms won't be held liable for the harms they cause. And the idea back then was let's have the internet, a new technology. Let's see how it goes. It has the potential to do a lot of good. And of course it has done a lot of good, twenty-five years later we also see the harm and in the UK the online safety bill would create standard tort liability, regular liability for the digital platforms of the kind that every other industry has, a chemical company or a shipping company if they pollute or they've caused damage, they're held liable. That's how our common law has grown up for a thousand years. The digital platforms are reluctant to take steps to reduce their harms. They haven't done it voluntarily. That's why the legislation in the UK is so critical and the idea of requiring digital platforms to earn their immunity the way other companies do by taking reasonable steps to reduce or ideally eliminate the known harms that they create. That's what every other industry does. And the online safety bill has been in the works for quite some time. It would include protections in areas such as misinformation. And I think it already has led some other countries, Canada, Australia, others to consider similar legislation. And in Europe, the European commission has a code of practice on disinformation that currently is voluntary, that the digital platforms have signed onto, they've committed to take steps very much like the ones that'll be required by the online safety bill in the UK. And between what would be in the online safety bill and as it will be enforced through Ofcom and what's being considered by the European commission. We certainly see in the UK and Europe, leadership in this area that could alter the behaviour of the digital platforms around the world.

Gentlemen, it's been an honour and a privilege to speak with you today. I wish you the very best of luck with what you're doing. You've clearly had a huge amount of success thus far and certain to make even more of a difference. Thank you so much for your time today.

Thank you Paul, it's been a pleasure.