

Hi all,

Wanted to reach out with some context regarding the document that's been circulating around about our internal moderation practices.

First, to the author and to all our moderators past and present: thank you. The work you've done has kept this platform running. You've dealt with genuinely disturbing content, absorbed abuse from users, and done it as volunteers with tools that weren't good enough. We are incredibly grateful for this.

The document raises a lot of legitimate concerns. Many of them we've been aware of; some of them we should have addressed sooner. I'm not going to make excuses—I want to provide transparency about why things have been the way they are and what we're doing about it.

On the tools: The moderation tools are really bad right now. We've historically faced a direct tradeoff between improving mod tools and shipping user-facing features, and we leaned too far toward the latter.

A couple of weeks ago, we kicked off a project to rebuild the moderation tools, and Shep and I have spent hundreds of hours over the past month building significantly improved moderation tooling. We were planning to announce this when it was ready for testing next week, but I want you to know it's coming.

On communication: The document describes mods learning about policy changes at the same time as users, being expected to enforce rules they weren't informed about, and receiving conflicting guidance. That's a failure on our part. We're implementing a formal communication pipeline so mod teams are briefed on policy changes before they go public, with clear documentation of what's changing and why.

Our communication with users has also been bad. We've apologized for this in the past, but despite this, you haven't seen the change we've promised. Over the last couple of weeks I've been collecting feedback to assemble an actionable plan that we can execute to make real progress here. I would love for you all to be involved in figuring out what concrete steps we should prioritize to make progress here.

On policies being vague: Some of this is unavoidable—we're operating in genuinely uncertain legal territory, and we're still figuring out where the lines should be. But "we're figuring it out" isn't an excuse for leaving you without guidance. We're working on clearer internal documentation that explains the reasoning behind policies, even when the policies themselves have to remain somewhat flexible.

On enforcement consistency: The concerns about different treatment based on follower counts are valid. Our intention was to add friction before actioning high-visibility accounts to prevent mistakes that would be hard to reverse—not to create a two-tier system where some users are above the rules. But the effect was the same. We'll be changing these policies over

the next couple of weeks.

Verification has also been too discretionary, and has gone from being something creators felt they could work towards to something that seems capricious and random. We're going to be announcing a new progress-based badge system soon.

On compensation and sustainability: Running a platform this size on volunteer moderation isn't sustainable, and expecting people to do site moderation/customer support indefinitely without compensation isn't fair. We're working on a path toward professionalizing the site moderation, though I don't have a timeline I can commit to publicly yet. I hope to be able to share more on this soon.

On the specific incidents mentioned: I'm not going to relitigate individual moderation decisions here—that wouldn't be fair to anyone involved. What I will say is that when decisions were reversed, it wasn't because we don't trust our mods or because certain users got special treatment. Sometimes we got new information, sometimes we made mistakes, and sometimes the communication about what happened and why was poor. We can do better.

Some of what's described in the document reflects real problems. Some of it reflects the genuine difficulty of moderating a platform like this. And some of it reflects perspectives I don't fully share. But dismissing the concerns because I disagree with parts of it would be wrong.

We're not where we need to be. We're working to get there.

I'm going to be active in the CS Slack and #dev-chat on Discord to answer any questions. I'd also like to offer to talk with anyone who would like to discuss concerns privately, either over DMs or a voice call whenever is convenient. Please just ping me and I am happy to find some time to talk.

Thank you for everything you do <3

Hugo