



General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 December 2022

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Fifty-second session

27 February–31 March 2023

Agenda items 2 and 3

Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

**Promotion and protection of all human rights,
civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

High-level panel discussion on countering the negative impact of disinformation on the enjoyment and realization of human rights

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 49/21 of 1 April 2022, in which the Council decided to convene a high-level panel discussion on countering the negative impact of disinformation on the enjoyment and realization of human rights, and ensuring a human rights-based response thereto. The high-level panel discussion was held on 28 June 2022 during the fiftieth session of the Human Rights Council. The report provides a summary of the high-level panel discussion, which underscored that responses to disinformation should be firmly grounded in human rights law to protect expressions against undue restrictions and to build public trust. Participants highlighted that measures that promoted robust public information regimes, wide-ranging access to information and free and pluralistic media contributed to exposing disinformation. They also emphasized that disinformation was more easily neutralized in situations in which independent fact-checking was in place. While encouraging the elaboration of policy measures that enhanced digital, media and information literacy, participants also urged technology enterprises to use the human rights framework to guide their business practices.



I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 49/21 on the role of States in countering the negative impact of disinformation on the enjoyment and realization of human rights, a high-level panel discussed, on 28 June 2022, how to counter the negative impact of disinformation on the enjoyment and realization of human rights, and ensure a human rights-based response thereto.¹
2. The high-level panel discussion was chaired by the President of the Human Rights Council. It opened with a statement by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Panellists included the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Ms. Irene Khan; the Executive Director of the Content Policy and Society Lab at Stanford University and a member of Meta's Oversight Board, Ms. Julie Owono; the Director of the Center for Studies on Freedom of Expression and Access to Information, University of Palermo, Buenos Aires, and Vice-Chair of the Global Network Initiative, Ms. Agustina Del Campo; and an Associate Fellow at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, Ms. Kate Jones.
3. The panel discussion provided States, international organizations and other relevant stakeholders with an opportunity to identify the key challenges related to disinformation and to share best practices and lessons learned in countering disinformation from a human rights perspective. The panel discussion was made accessible to persons with disabilities.

II. Opening session

4. Opening the discussion, the High Commissioner stressed that restoring and expanding trust was key to combating disinformation. Highlighting that disinformation as such was not generally the trigger of societal troubles but rather aggravated such ills, she noted that disinformation arose against a backdrop of systemic inequality, deep-seated discrimination, increasingly fragile institutions, loss of trust in governance structures and limited rule of law. Disinformation spread when people felt that their voices were not heard, and in situations in which civic space was limited or closed and the free flow of information and debate was restricted.
5. The human right to access and impart information was not limited to information that was deemed "accurate" by the State. She cautioned States against trying to officially ordain what was false and what was true, which she said could be easily abused to suppress opinions, beliefs and political views, and harm artistic and scientific work and public debates.
6. Noting that the use of false information for nefarious purposes was not new, she called for greater efforts to address the underlying causes that gave disinformation life and allowed it to gain traction. Given the unprecedented speed and volume of information circulating in the information ecosystem, the focus should be on assessing how communication was being revolutionized by technology. Organized online campaigns, often using automatic tools to amplify messages, could quickly create false impressions of broad popular support for or against certain ideas. Efforts to address disinformation should aim at unpacking the various types of responsibilities of actors active in that field.
7. Censorship was an ineffective way to address disinformation as it could severely affect human rights. No solution to disinformation could be effective if it did not make the rights of access to information and to freedom of expression core objectives.
8. She called upon States to maintain a vibrant and pluralistic civic space in which journalists, human rights defenders, academics and activists could all safely contribute to debates, help debunk myths and increase clarity on challenging topics. She encouraged the enforcement of policy measures that supported independent journalism and strengthened media pluralism and digital and media literacy, with a view to supporting individuals navigate complex information systems and foster critical thinking.

¹ The full video of the panel discussion is available at: <https://media.un.org/en/asset/k10/k102z4ortu>.

9. She also urged State officials to act with full transparency and share accurate information in a timely manner to achieve public trust. Those in power who engaged in disinformation to suppress speech that they disliked or to intimidate and harass critical voices must be held to account.

10. Furthermore, she called on technology companies to respect human rights, for example, by accepting independent auditing of their services and operations, to be transparent about the way advertising and personal data were being handled and to provide researchers with access to relevant data with a view to better understanding and addressing disinformation.

11. There was no single solution to stop disinformation. She called for more research on how the digital sphere had transformed media and information flows. She also called for discussions related to disinformation to be framed by human rights norms, especially freedom of expression and access to information and the right to privacy.

III. Summary of the panel discussion

12. The President of the Human Rights Council then invited the panellists to make their statements.

A. Contributions of panellists

13. The Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression underscored that freedom of expression was not only a human right to be safeguarded when tackling disinformation, but also the primary means to combat it. When freedom of opinion and expression was protected, policymakers, experts, civil society, independent journalists and government officials were able to challenge falsehoods and present fact-based alternative viewpoints. On the other hand, disinformation could not be addressed by shutting down the Internet, silencing journalists or censoring information.

14. Responses to disinformation must be rooted in universally recognized principles of human rights and promoted through multidimensional, multi-stakeholder approaches. States as the primary duty bearers of human rights should promote access to diverse and reliable information, including by making available official data online and offline, refraining from sponsoring or spreading disinformation, nurturing independent, free and pluralistic media and ensuring the safety of journalists, and building social resilience against disinformation by promoting digital, media and information literacy among the population.

15. The Special Rapporteur also called upon States to regulate social media smartly with full respect for the right to information and freedom of opinion and expression. Governments should not compel or induce platforms to remove or block content that was legitimate under international law, but focus on strong data protection, transparency of platforms and companies' human rights due diligence in line with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

16. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur called upon companies to exert additional efforts to address their ad-tech business model that fuelled disinformation and to introduce greater transparency and human rights due diligence and accountability across their operations. She also urged global companies to invest more resources to better understand the local contexts in which they operated and the vulnerable groups who may be targeted by disinformation.

17. The Special Rapporteur concluded by calling upon the Human Rights Council to convene regular multi-stakeholder consultations with companies, civil society, policy experts and States on technology and human rights, addressing both the opportunities and threats, such as disinformation. Such consultations could make an important contribution to the Secretary-General's proposed Global Digital Compact.

18. Ms. Owono started by emphasizing that disinformation was a complex term, which raised several multifaceted questions. For global platforms, those challenges were multiplied.

19. Reflecting on her work as a member of Meta's Oversight Board, the independent body set up by the company to advise on how to align Meta's content moderation policies with human rights standards, she stated that the Board had pressed the company to inform the public about the decisions taken to combat disinformation, especially in situations in which content removal was requested by States. Transparency was essential for the public to be aware of the type of content Governments sought to remove.

20. The Oversight Board proposed that Meta make several policy changes aimed at reducing disinformation while protecting human rights. In particular, the Oversight Board had recommended that Meta provide information to the public about the real-world harm that it tried to prevent when moderating content, especially in times of conflict. The Oversight Board had proposed that Meta prioritize fact-checking, taking into consideration the local contexts. The Oversight Board had urged the company to act diligently to ensure that State actors condemned violence, provided accurate information and prevented disinformation.

21. In order to reduce the demand for disinformation, digital and media literacy should be carried out to empower people to make informed decisions about the content that they saw online. Ms. Owono also called upon the technology industry to rely on local expertise and intelligence, which could help contextualize information and address harms generated by disinformation, without infringing on the freedom of expression.

22. She concluded by urging companies, Governments, and civil society to work together to protect freedom of expression, while reducing the harms caused by disinformation.

23. Ms. Del Campo underlined that disinformation was a broad term used to describe complex phenomena, for which there was no universally agreed definition. The attempts by Governments to respond to disinformation through laws should first seek to unpack the term, according to contexts and players, with a view to avoiding the risks of arbitrariness and censorship. Recent legislation to deal with disinformation had been vague and unable to precisely define the term, which had at times resulted in the prosecution of dissent under the guise of combating disinformation.

24. States had devoted more attention to tackling the spread of disinformation than analysing the causes and sources of disinformation – which might vary depending on the various types of disinformation that existed.

25. Highlighting that disinformation was not just another type of content moderation, Ms. Del Campo stressed that democratic societies should respect the right of individuals to think and speak freely and respect free flows of information and ideas of all kinds.

26. Despite being a complex issue demanding multi-stakeholder action, disinformation required a special attention from States and their officials. State officials had a clear duty not to spread disinformation, as it could adversely affect vulnerable populations and undermine trust in institutions. State officials should carry out their functions ethically, including in terms of competency, honesty and due diligence. Such obligations should aim at fostering trust between those represented and their representatives.

27. Given the complexity of disinformation phenomena, more research would be needed to better understand and address the causes, sources and impacts of disinformation.

28. Ms. Jones underscored that the heart of the challenge posed by disinformation was not related to the content of a particular piece of information but the manipulation that accompanied it. The intention to mislead, to deceive, to alter people's decision-making without their realizing was the main challenge of disinformation.

29. Addressing disinformation therefore required that States realized their positive obligation to disseminate trustworthy information and to respect freedom of expression, the right to privacy and freedom from discrimination. States that engaged in, or supported, disinformation campaigns violated the individual's freedom to seek information. Ms. Jones called upon States to act as guardians of a healthy information environment.

30. Noting that the objectives of those who sought to manipulate information had at times coincided with commercial incentives, she said that companies must be more transparent about the provenance of information and how it related to credible alternatives. Greater transparency would help tackle the tools of manipulation, such as fake accounts and bot-

driven amplification, and ensure that there was no financial value in disinformation. Companies should step up their efforts to counter manipulation in every country, with proper sensitivity to local contexts and languages.

31. Highlighting the lack of evidence on the relationship between the structure of the information environment and the spread of disinformation, she called for more research, especially on privacy matters.

32. She concluded by calling upon the Human Rights Council to create a standing forum for regular multi-stakeholder dialogue and research on technology and human rights.

B. Interactive discussion

33. During the plenary discussion, interventions were made by the representatives of Albania, Brazil, Canada (also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand), China, Croatia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Lithuania (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Norway and Sweden), the Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the European Union, the International Organization of la Francophonie and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

34. Representatives of the following national, international and non-governmental organizations also spoke: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the National Human Rights Council (Morocco), the International Lesbian and Gay Association and the World Jewish Congress.

35. Statements by representatives of the following States were not delivered owing to lack of time: Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Egypt, France, India, Indonesia, Luxembourg, Namibia, Ukraine and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). For the same reason, statements were not delivered by representatives of: the Association for Progressive Communications, the Conselho Federal da Ordem dos Advogados do Brasil, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Human Rights Council, Maloca Internationale and the Shaanxi Patriotic Volunteer Association.²

36. Several speakers raised concerns that disinformation could undermine social trust, public health, human rights and democracy. Other speakers observed that it could be used by various actors, including politicians and public officials, for a variety of motives, such as advancing political ambitions, creating divisions or attacking the most vulnerable in society. Some also raised concerns that disinformation could contribute to spreading negative stereotypes and xenophobia, conspiracy theories, antisemitism and Islamophobia. In order to effectively combat disinformation, speakers called for greater societal cohesion and respect for the rule of law and good governance.

37. Numerous speakers pointed out that disinformation had been used to attack and denigrate human rights defenders, media outlets and journalists. They underlined that disinformation should not serve as a pretext to restrict the enjoyment and realization of human rights or to justify censorship, including through vague and overly broad laws criminalizing disinformation. Several speakers underscored that the fight against disinformation should not be used as an excuse to obstruct legitimate activities of the media to access or disseminate information. Examples cited were State-sponsored Internet shutdowns or restrictions on access to independent media websites. Some noted that such measures not only contravened international human rights norms, but also eroded public trust and contributed to the spread of disinformation.

38. Highlighting that disinformation could be used to incite discrimination and violence, especially in times of emergency, crisis and armed conflict, a significant number of speakers

² Statements made during the high-level panel discussion can be found on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at:
<https://hrcmeetings.ohchr.org/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/50/Pages/Statements.aspx?SessionId=59&MeetingDate=28/06/2022%2000%3a00%3a00>.

referred to ongoing conflict situations and emphasized that State-sponsored disinformation could undermine peace, prosperity and individual freedoms. A large number of speakers claimed that coordinated State-sponsored disinformation campaigns could serve as an example of the weaponization of disinformation. To address that negative trend, which, some noted, could threaten the rules-based international order, some speakers called on States to refrain from conducting and sponsoring disinformation campaigns and to unequivocally condemn such acts. Some speakers further underlined that only international cooperation and multidimensional, multi-stakeholder, human rights-based approaches could effectively reduce disinformation.

39. Many speakers stressed that efforts to counter disinformation must be firmly grounded in the protection of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law and that respect for freedom of opinion and expression, including access to information, was a prerequisite for creating a healthy society based on trust and the only way to pre-empt, expose and successfully counter disinformation. Many speakers underscored that the most effective way to counter disinformation and prevent incitement to discrimination and hatred was to promote an environment that guaranteed pluralism, democracy and freedom.

40. Speakers highlighted that, while disinformation was problematic, States' responses to disinformation had often been inadequate and detrimental to human rights. Numerous speakers underscored that policies and laws aimed at countering disinformation must comply with the obligations of States under international human rights law. Some noticed that a number of States resorted to repressive measures, such as overbroad censorship, and criminalized certain pieces of content considered "false", without addressing the dynamics behind the viral spread of disinformation. Speakers noted that false information could not be simply expunged, particularly in the age of social media and messaging applications. They urged States to ensure that restrictions to freedom of expression complied with the principles of legality, necessity and proportionality.

41. Speakers further highlighted that the ability to exercise the right to freedom of opinion and expression was key to strengthening democracy, promoting pluralism and combating intolerance that might derive from disinformation. In that context, several speakers affirmed that access to information from diverse sources and room for debate were the best antidote to disinformation. They underlined that States should fulfil their duty to ensure the right to information and freedom of expression: first, by increasing their own transparency and proactively disclosing official data online and offline, including through comprehensive laws on the right to information; and, second, by manifesting their commitment to media freedom, diversity and independence, both offline and online. Only when non-governmental organizations, researchers and individuals were able to understand how information was shared and moderated, could they effectively inform themselves and increase societal resilience against disinformation.

42. Several speakers underlined that civil society and the media played a crucial role in identifying, uncovering and debunking false information. Several speakers underscored the need for States to promote a free, independent, plural and diverse media, to protect the safety of journalists and whistle-blowers, to ensure access to information and to invest in media and digital literacy.

43. Speakers emphasized the need to ensure connectivity to an accessible, free, open, reliable and secure Internet and to promote digital and media literacy education. Others added that fact-checking and transparent technological solutions could effectively empower individuals and build their resilience. Speakers said that an educated public would be better equipped to identify and confront misinformation and disinformation. Some indicated that such programmes could take the form of awareness-raising campaigns and capacity-building seminars. Some speakers underlined that, when people were provided with access to pluralistic information and allowed to voice their grievances freely, without harassment or any form of retaliation, they could form and develop their opinions and were better placed to identify disinformation.

44. One speaker commended the work carried out by the human rights mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, including its special procedures, even though, she noted, the

information that they shared might at times be uncomfortable, while another speaker requested that special procedure mandate holders verify the information that they received.

45. While many speakers emphasized that technologies could be used to spread knowledge conducive to humanity, stability, progress and development, the discussion also shed light on the need for business enterprises to contribute to efforts to counter disinformation online.

46. Several speakers pointed to the impacts of online disinformation. Some called for laws to regulate bots, while others called upon social media platforms and other companies to adopt measures focused on transparency and accountability. They underscored that companies, including technology companies, should apply a human rights-based approach to content moderation, in line with their responsibilities under the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Some referred to the recent adoption of the Digital Services Act and the Code of Practice on Disinformation in Europe, described as a model of co-regulation of the digital space, which sought to detect, prevent and demonetize disinformation online. Some speakers underlined that social media companies' business models and policies should comply with international human rights law. Others urged States to enact and enforce regulation of the digital space, with one speaker recommending a ban on tracking-based advertising and independent oversight over the algorithmic content-shaping systems used by online platforms.

47. Panellists were invited to elaborate on how the Human Rights Council could contribute to countering disinformation, while upholding all human rights. Speakers reflected on how to counter State-sponsored disinformation as part of hybrid influence operations and ensure that responses were based on human rights. Many speakers asked how States and the private sector could work collaboratively to ensure a rights-based approach to tackling disinformation. While underlining the need to support the protection and promotion of freedom of opinion and expression, another speaker inquired about how to ensure that Governments did not become the "arbiters of truth". Some speakers also asked panellists about how to ensure that women, girls and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, as well as populations at risk of exclusion, were protected from the impact of disinformation.

C. Responses and concluding remarks

48. Following the interactive discussion, the President of the Human Rights Council gave panellists the opportunity to make concluding remarks.

49. The Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression highlighted that the debate among Member States showed the complexity of the issue. She stressed that disinformation was a challenge to human rights, as it thrived in situations in which human rights were constrained. Recalling the framing of information as a public good by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, she called upon States to implement the right to information, including by ensuring robust, free, pluralistic, diverse and independent media. Companies had human rights responsibilities, in line with the Guiding Principles of Business and Human Rights. Human Rights Council resolution 49/21 provided a blueprint for combating disinformation from a human rights perspective. The enforcement of measures contained therein was contingent on the political will of Member States to work together and bring all relevant stakeholders to the table.

50. Ms. Owono noted the overall agreement of the Human Rights Council on the need to create safer and fairer spaces online and, in that context, called for a multi-stakeholder approach to tackling disinformation. Noting that content moderation decisions had long been taken by only a handful of individuals from the Silicon Valley, she invited States to use the experience and knowledge of experts in that sector to help identify the needs of local communities and ensure that solutions to disinformation did not have unintended consequences on freedom of expression.

51. Ms. Del Campo welcomed the holding of the high-level panel, which she said was an opportunity for various stakeholders to discuss and share evidence-based research to combat disinformation. She stressed that societies had a lot to gain or – if not properly addressed – to lose from the decisions taken to address disinformation. While reflecting on possible solutions to disinformation, she raised some critical questions, including: How to ensure individuals’ meaningful participation in public affairs? Who, if anyone, should mediate public discourse in tomorrow’s public debates? Should there be intermediaries between representatives and those represented? What was the role of technology in that area? She concluded by inviting the Human Rights Council to pursue its discussions on technology and human rights.

52. Ms. Jones agreed with other panellists that decisions that States or companies took to address disinformation could have long-term and wide-ranging repercussions. She raised concerns that, due to the challenges to define it, disinformation might be used to denigrate independent, well-evidenced and accurate information, as well as critical reporting by the media and independent voices, such as the special procedure mandate holders of the Human Rights Council. She welcomed the strong support for putting human rights at the centre of efforts to tackle disinformation. She called for further research and multi-stakeholder engagement and dialogue on the issue.

53. Following the concluding remarks, the President of the Human Rights Council thanked the panellists, the High Commissioner and the speakers. He noticed Member States’ strong interest in the issue and the growing consensus that human rights should inform strategies against disinformation. He underscored that the Human Rights Council could become the world platform to advance human rights norms and practices when combating disinformation, which could be achieved with the participation of all relevant human rights mechanisms.

IV. Recommendations

54. **Panellists and speakers made a number of recommendations during the discussion. They called upon States to ensure that their responses to disinformation complied with their obligations under international human rights law, in particular the rights to freedom of expression and access to information.**

55. **States should encourage and support more independent research to better understand and address the causes, sources and impacts of disinformation and address its root causes and societal tensions that allow disinformation to spread.**

56. **States should promote and protect the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive and impart information through any media, online and offline. The human right to freedom of information is not limited to information that is deemed “accurate” by the State, but rather applies to all ideas of all kinds, including those that “offend, shock or disturb”.**

57. **States should promote access to diverse and reliable information, which is the best means to build trust, which in turn can reduce the demand for disinformation. States and State officials should share information in a factual, timely, clear, accessible, multilingual and evidence-based manner. Adopting or strengthening laws on the right to information is one means to facilitate access to information online and offline, including by mandating maximum disclosure of information held by public bodies by default.**

58. **At the same time, States should put in place measures to hold to account those in power who deliberately disseminate false information as it interferes with the right of the public to information.**

59. **States should protect the free flow of information and ensure connectivity to an accessible, free, open, reliable and secure Internet, as both are means to provide alternative viewpoints and counter false narratives. It was stressed repeatedly that disinformation could not be addressed by disrupting access to the Internet, introducing undue restrictions in the dissemination of information or censoring critical voices.**

60. Given that disinformation takes different forms, countermeasures should be tailored to the type of disinformation that they seek to tackle and should aim at holding relevant actors accountable. States should refrain from engaging in, and should unequivocally condemn, “information operations” that result in violations of international humanitarian law or international human rights law in all contexts, including those related to military objectives.

61. As there is no universally agreed definition of disinformation, States should take care to protect freedom of expression when seeking to address this phenomenon through law. Disinformation must never become a pretext to restrict the enjoyment and realization of human rights, or justify censorship, including through vague and overly broad laws criminalizing disinformation.

62. Bearing in mind that disinformation is not a legitimate ground to restrict freedom of expression under international human rights law, States should ensure that any restrictions on freedom of expression serve a recognized legitimate interest, as stated in article 19 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and comply with the principles of legality, proportionality and necessity to protect that interest, as set forth under international law. Suppression of content should be considered only when less extreme measures prove insufficient to ensure the protection of human rights.

63. As required by international human rights law, States should put in place measures to prohibit advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, bearing in mind that only disinformation meeting this particularly high threshold should be prohibited. Other forms of disinformation should be tackled through other civil, administrative law-based restrictions or other non-legal measures.

64. States should enforce policy measures that support free, independent and pluralistic media and protect the safety of journalists with a view to creating and maintaining an open, vibrant and pluralistic civic space in which journalists, human rights defenders, academics and others can all contribute to debates, challenge falsehoods, and present fact-based information and ideas the contributions of which are key to enabling individuals to navigate the information ecosystem and to foster critical thinking. States should ensure that the legal measures that they take to combat disinformation do not unduly prevent individuals, in particular journalists, from accessing and disseminating information, both online and offline.

65. States and other relevant actors should conduct and support education and digital and media literacy programmes to prevent disinformation, which contribute to building societal resilience to disinformation.

66. State regulations should require that technology companies carry out regular human rights due diligence of their products, policies and operations, allow independent audits of their services and operations, ensure transparency in relation to the way advertising and personal data are being handled, and provide researchers with access to relevant data with a view to better understand and address disinformation.

67. States should not compel or induce technology companies to remove or block content that is legitimate under international law. Rather, States should encourage technology companies to act in a transparent manner with a view to informing the public about their interventions related to disinformation.

68. States should enforce strong data protection laws with a view to ensuring that there is no financial value in disinformation. In this context, technology companies should review their ad-tech business model, which may fuel disinformation.

69. Technology companies should apply a human rights-based approach to content moderation, in line with their responsibilities under the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. They should also invest more resources to better understand the local contexts in which they operate and the vulnerable groups that may be targeted by disinformation.

70. Technology companies should mitigate the impact of disinformation with due respect for their responsibility to respect freedom of expression and access to information, including by considering mitigation measures, such as labelling, temporary suspension of accounts, demonetization and de-amplification of content.

71. The Human Rights Council should pursue its work on human rights and disinformation, by convening regular multi-stakeholder consultations on technology and human rights with the participation of States, policy experts, civil society and private companies.
