FINISHED FILE

APRIGF 2026

OCTOBER 6, 2026
DRAWING THE LINE: ONLINE HARM, QUEER EXPRESSION, AND PLATFORM GOVERNANCE IN ASIA-PACIFIC
LANGTANG HALL
10:15 A.M. NPT

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
719-941-9557
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> Hi Mr. Park, can you hear me?

>> KS PARK: Yes, I can hear you.

>> Can you try your audio as well.

>> KS PARK: Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

>> yep, we can hear you. Thank you very much. And we will make sure you have your audio set up. Thank you.

>> Just letting you know I am not hearing anything. No audio coming in.

>> Good morning, everyone. Thank you very much for joining us here whether you are in Kathmandu or watching us online. In this workshop we are talking of the importance of drawing the line between personal expression and lived abuse in the laws and governance in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I am Jeremy Malcolm, the Chair of a

small organization called the Center for Online Safety and Liberty. And with me here is Shambhawi Paudel. And remotely we have Dr. KS Park from Korea University and Open Net Korea. And we were sorry today to learn our fourth panelist, Mish Pony is unable to join us today because they are unwell. That just gives a little bit of extra time for discussion since Mish can't be with us.

As I said, the overall topic of this session is to talk about the line between personal expression and lived abuse. With personal expression we mean art, fiction, message your and sex education and testimony. With online abuse we need nonconsensual imagery and deep fakes or CSAM or child sexual abuse material. Next slide, please.

So in this opening presentation, I would like to frame what's to follow by saying a bit more about the drawing the line project. So drawing the line is an open multistakeholder initiative which has delivered two complementary outputs so far, shown here. On the left, we see six principles, which we developed, beginning with the simple central claim that expression is not abuse. Now there's a lot more to these principles and you can read the full language of them on the website, drawing the line principles.org.

On the right-hand side, you will see our major research publication, which provides an evidence base for why the promulgation of these principles is necessary. If you are here in person you will find copies of that publication on your tables. The draw line watch list covers 10 countries including four from the Asia-Pacific region. Japan, South Korea, Australia, and Iran. The watch list shows how well each of those countries respects the line that the principles draw between expression and abuse.

I do want to make the point unlike the principles, which is agnostic about which type of abuse they are talking about, the wash list is more specifically on distinguishing child sexual abuse from personal expression. Why? Mainly because it's the type of abuse where the line gets blurred the most. So it illustrates the problem the most clearly. But just in what's to follow, I'll be focusing mostly on child sexual abuse and I don't want you to think that's the extent of what the principles cover.

If we could move to next slide, please. One of the examples of how the line between expression and abuse is blurred

is in our language. In particular, the term CSAM for child sexual abuse material is commonly being used to describe cases in which there is no sexual abuse involved at all. So this February, in recommendation on AI generated content, UNICEF suggested that states should amend their laws to treat these three categories of content the same. However, two of them are not like the other.

When a sexual image of a real child is shared created there's a victim right there. And this applies whether it's a real photo or video or AI deepfake that depicts an identifiable person. In either of those cases there is real harm. But in the third case where there's no real child involved there is no victim and there is no abuse.

The principles applying the principles we would say that CSAM is the wrong term to use in that case. Next slide, please.

We also see loosening definitions of obscenity. And works often not intended to be sexually arousing but could be prosecuted under child abuse laws or censored or banned or challenged. As all of the works and many others shown here have been. Just to pick out a few examples. Gender queer shown on the right is a biographical work that was challenged the Australian courts, unsuccessfully in this case because it contains sexual themes and ill duration in form of a queer biography. Another work from the region is a girl on the shore shown second from the left it's a Japanese work by a acclaimed Manga that explores teenage sexuality not in a exploitive way but comes under scrutiny as the line between content and abuse is challenged.

So and people who share their experience as the abuse survivors. The three of the remaining works, The Teenage -- The Diary of a Teenage Girl and Daddy's Girl and Lost Girls are all speaking of sexual abuse and they could be censored on the fact that they are abusive.

Next slide, please. Let me give another concrete example from the Asia-Pacific region. In Australia, the definition of child exploitation material in the law does not draw any distinction between real CSAM, that's videos and photos of child sexual abuse or fictional or fantasy material. That means because there's no difference in the law Australians have no way of knowing how many prosecutions under this law involve real victims and how many are over victimless materials such as novels.

This slide talk about the case of a female novelist named Lauren Mastrosa who where a erotic novel called Daddy's Little Toy of which she was prosecuted over sexual abuse.

That's at novel for everyone. It has themes of a 45-year-old man and a 18-year-old woman and the woman role plays as child. And there's no real sexual abuse in the novel as fictional as it would be but the author was charged and convicted of a crime the same crime as if she created a real video of child sexual abuse. I hope most of us can agree there's a real distinction there and it's wrong to conflate it as Australian does.

And this creates a practical problems in the way we direct our enforcement resources. So the drawing the line watch list examines the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom unlike in Australia, there are separate laws that are used for real child sexual abuse material and fictional material.

They do track separate statistics. Because of that, we were able to track those statistics over a 10-year period. And we found that over the same material -- over the same period there was a significant rise in fictional material prosecutions, there was also a fall in conventional CSAM cases. Although this doesn't necessarily show one for one displacement of real prosecutions for fictional ones. It does seem to show that fictional materials prosecutions are placing pressure on enforcement priorities. And clearly children with are not the beneficiaries of that. And it's hard to identify who is.

Next slide, please.

Now, up with of the justifications that's often put forward by policy makers and advocates in this area for criminalizing fictional material as if it was real is the hypothesis that fictional works that depict child sexuality or abuse will result in more abuse being carried out in real life. That's the hypothesis. However, research doesn't actually bear that out. So the current state of research into this question as conducted by colleagues at Nottingham Trent University doesn't establish a causal pathway from traditional material to again. What it does is suggests there may be possible risks to people who consume fiction in a unhealthy way. But for others they may be protective uses of fiction and fantasy that could operate as a outlet for feelings. And actually inhibit them from acting out in real life.

So while more research is needed, we can't say there's a simple relation between fictional and real. What we can assume

from the research as it stands is clinical support to people who are struggling with unhealthy relationships to fiction is probably more effective than simply banning art and fiction for everyone. Next slide, please.

That isn't just good science it's also international law. International law requires the restrictions on expression must be necessary and proportionate. This doesn't mean that offensive words or illustrations can't be regulated at all. They can be. But not using the same methods that we use against perpetrators of actual sexual abuse crimes. Fictional characters cannot be rescued or revictimized. It's the presence of a victim that changes the both the nature of the wrong can the proper legal response. And identifiable victim provides the legal basis for treating authentic CSAM as an exception category.

Next slide, please.

To reiterate, it's very important to acknowledge just because we don't treat personal expression the same as lived abuse, it doesn't mean that we can't do anything about expression that is sensitive, broadly offensive, unsuitable for children or that creates indirect social harms. On this slide, I point out some of the more proportionate alternatives to criminalization and sensationism of content. So there's filters and labels and recommendations and age gates. There's clinical solutions such as mental health support for those who have an unhealthy relationship in the way they use fiction fantasy content. And research into how the unhealthy use of the fictional content can be managed.

There's more targeted laws that can address the misuse of expressive content for things like grooming and harassments where there are identifiable victims. And platforms can adopt due process protections to avoid over censorship of sexual content. So final slide, please. Or the next slide, rather. In conclusion, blurring the line between personal expression and lived abuse is harmful. It harms victims of abuse by redirecting resources and attention away from bringing them justice and support.

It harms creators and consumers of art and fiction by stigmatizing and criminalizing works that harm nobody. And it isn't justified by research into the connection between fictional and fantasy materials and harm in the real world. And finally, it fails to take advantage of the tools that we have to address the harmful use of expression in a more precise and

proportionate way.

Final slide, please. So next, I would like to, again, introduce the other members of our panel who will provide their own regional and community and professional perspectives on how blurring the line between expression and abuse effects communities across the region. So Shambhawi Paudel from ILGA Asia is our next speaker and will relay some of the remarks that Mish Pony would have made if they were able to make this session.

So thank you very much, Shambhawi, I'll hand over to you.

>> SHAMBHAWI PAUDEL: Thank you, Jeremy. And I know that was a really heavy thing to go through talking about where the line is drawn. But I'm going to put a bit more legal perspective into why when we let the states draw the line regulating expressions we have to see whose expressions are left at the margins and and who are actually criminalized for making these expressions. Across Asia authorities are putting lines on expression.

And this is not prohibited to a LGBTQI+ content. And criminalization of queer expression is done through a various indirect laws. Laws that are based on morality and obscenity offenses like Jeremy mentioned. And there's rules around broadcasting rules and they can restrict publication and assembly and health education and sexual and reproductive health rights information and queer demonstration for community members online you have line. There's incidents of gender disinformation and online targeted hate campaigns against queer individuals and communities that are systematically weaponized to silence and disenfranchised queer individuals and queer narrative in from the internet. Next slide, please.

This slide here shows some of the headlines from the past here of which express prohibitions as well as anti-queer readings of ambiguous legal framings that are in a way that erase queer expressions and LGBTQI+ lived experiences. I would like to start with the news about reported arrest of writers of fiction or boys love novels in China. They illustrate how obscenity rules can be used against queer themed fictional writing. The production and distribution pornographic restriction in China of film and video and audio recordings and depictions of sexual acts. Many author arrested authors are women students publishing BL novels on Taiwan and not mainland China.

The writers who are not making a profit from their work not consistently enforced and not all erotic content has been prosecuted under this law. It's been used to shout down other fan fiction and erotic fiction websites and day famously AO3 in 2025 and those runs the websites have been receiving 12 years in prison. There's a case of two Chinese men who shared a manipulated photo of two gay pandas and were detained under the same law. Again as Jeremy said the two gay pandas are not victims. They do not exist.

Going on like a heavier in Malaysia. The senior government officials have been urging the government and the general public to -- urging the public to replace the term LGBT with deviant culture. It is an attempt to stop the normalization of what they call LGBT behavior saying that saying the term LGBT will take people LGBT the commission blocked access to queer dating apps like Grindr since 2026. And the country continues to add queer fiction on its list of banned publications.

A study by our member justice for sisters Malaysia and Amnesty International Malaysia has bans on 13 publications on LGBTQI+ themes and content between 2020 and 2025. Many are autobiographical experience of queer people growing up and written published outside of Malaysia.

Another case which sets a dangerous precedent is a raid on Swatch Watch stores in 2024. The government were attempting a raid in the store because they were selling rainbow coloured watches, which were alleged to be Pride theme, is illegal. But the Court held while the raid was illegal the watch itself is prohibited material. And this scan while it's not been evoked since the scan is used to restrict production and distribution of other rainbow or Pride themed merchandise in the country.

There's a broader rule of queer work online and this can lead to policy changes that aim to silence or communities. In Malaysia and Indonesia recently there is quote unquote body hunter campaign which is a derogatory term used for queer individuals. These are run through Facebook groups by vigilantes who aim to dox queer people online, often posing as queer themselves and some have led to violence offline attacks.

This should be read in a broader context of Malaysia in where the conduct is criminalized. And it is criminalized under the federal Penal Code but some forms of gender expressions are also criminalized in Malaysia under the laws. In this case, the self-censorship for queer peoples becomes a protection mechanism.

And anonymity is very important for them online. And these kind of mechanisms and sensors themselves protects them from harms like arbitrary detention and police raids. And these harms can also exacerbate their basic human rights guarantees like privacy and equality and expression and association both online and offline.

Another news headline comes from a study from human rights watch found that the authorities across many regions men have been using queer dating apps to prosecute and criminalizing same sex conduct. And the police pose for someone looking for a relationship on online dating apps or flings dating apps and when they attempt to meet in person the person is prosecuted. The April 2024 amendment on the Iraq's law on combating prostitution of 1988 is one of the few laws that explicitly criminalizes same sex relations and surgeon gender expression in online and offline places in the term of promoting homosexuality. And this is meant to normalize and to invisiblize LGBTQI+ lives and experiences and they create a environment of personal and legal risk of people who speak out against these laws.

Newer developments are also happening in Indonesia. One of the scariest thing to come out of out of the country is the presidential order from last year, which puts LGBTQI+ as non-military threat. The designation of non-military threat is the same as drug offenses. It is the same as a -- it is on the same level as terrorism. But non-military.

This also has led to other legal provisions and actions happening as a result of this classification. Indonesia House of Representatives advanced a revised broadcasting bill and has passed a lower House in 2026. And its discussions with the government are to follow. The bill has been controversial since it was first published in 2024 for its overreach on freedom and criminalizing of decent and the attack on the Indonesia democracy as some activists would call it.

But it's also a bill that explicitly adopts a ban on all queer content. To site directly from the bill, the article 28 A of the proposed bill prohibits broadcasting institutions from broadcasting content displaying any behavior of lesbian, homosexual and bisexual and transgender individuals. And it prohibits models of LGBTQI+ behavior in advertisements and Article B regulating the broadcast broadcasting standards applied throughout the nation by prohibiting broadcast of any content displaying LGBTQI+ behavior both online and offline.

Previously the state used pornography laws for deviant behavior and so regulations with morality was this. And the ban shrinks further LGBTQI+ on Indonesians to express themselves freely and puts them as a direct risk of criminalization. There's already been cases under the previous presidential order that I mentioned of people in Java detained under investigation for running closed community groups on Facebook for gay men. Once this bill becomes law we have no idea how that is going to be implemented and what that will look like.

Based on this example, while their legal basis and out comes differ, restrictions somehow how access to space can narrow participation and visibility. This vague standards are used by authorities or platforms to label accurate information as misinformation. Accurate, like people asking for their rights and activists as anti-national threats and. They interpret the basic right to expression and assembly as harmful without demonstrating any concrete harm, next slide, please. The developments around LGBTQI+ censorship in Asia must be understood as a pattern of invisiblization and repression.

And alongside raids and discriminatory laws and restrictions on civil society and the online and offline violence. Here the online bleeds to offline and vice versa. They regulate spaces and platform governance. Some rely on ambiguity framed restrictions and the regular expression and assembly across online platforms and laws against anonymity and surveillance make this risk for acute for marginalized communities and activists. Nepal had a social media bill which was largely controversial. And it also banned an anonymous use of the internet. While the bill is repealed there's similar laws coming across Asia.

The criminalization of queer expression is a question of morality and obscenity and we are drawing to draw the line how obscene or moral are queer expression instead of seeing them living as themselves. Protection as narratives often times centering children and family values are in the center of such censorship for queer individuals. There's a large conflation of queer content as sexual content. There's a assumption that anything that has to do with LGBTQI+ people is pertaining to adult and/or sexual content. When Tumblr announced a side wide ban on adult content all queer content was affected and sexual and reproductive content was affected and people living the lives were affected and survivor lives perfect affected and fiction and fan fiction depicting same sex pairings for effected

And a lot of automated systems by the platforms flag queer content as adult or sexual content regardless of the content posted. And individuals and activists can express themselves are disappearing and civil spaces are shrinking. It's making it harder for activists to document abuse and advantage distances that govern their life and the backsliding of freedom of opinion and expression is happening globally not in silos and they are rooted to take a protective lens which disproportionately affects marginalized community, in this case, the LGBTQI+ communities.

I would also like to add a little bit of something that our co-panelists Mish Pony would have said had they been able to make it here, but next slide, please I think that's a good place to go. So this is from Mish Pony who says there is a continued narrative that representation and depiction of fictional act leads to their enactment in real life.

The Australian government is also looking to follow the UK in banning depictions of choking in pornography this is the kind of microlevel regulation as does not as Jeremy mentioned show real harm bleed into real life.

Under the online safety act of 2021 of Australia the commissioner brought powers over content. And there is a proposal that allows the minister for communications to designate and regulate new online harms without and they have the authority to interpret online harms without any judicial or legislative oversights.

This include and have previously -- have been seen through previous content removal notices. There's been a global take down order coming from the e-safety commission other Australia following a stabbing case in the church for depicting violent content when people were sharing what they saw when the incident occurred. There was a federal court judgment that said it was okay for the e-safety commissioner to order the take down within the boundaries or the legal jurisdiction of Australia.

But not globally. Which we still feel isn't -- is a disproportionate response to violent content. There is an interconnected web of actors crave driving this work that includes anti-abortion narratives and anti-queer and anti-gender narratives driven by conservative religious and Christian organizations that center the real issues of violence against women and use the case of online harassment as smoke screens to push their anti-rights agendas. And we should be very careful in how we define these harms and how we regulate and legislate them. Thank you.

(applause)

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Thank you very much. So Dr. KS Park is our next presenter and is going to present to us remotely from Korea.

>> KS PARK: Good afternoon. Or good morning. Can I have my slides? Great. So I'm going to talk about Korean case of misalignment. Misalignment became a buzzword with Artificial Intelligence. And I must say there is a misalignment of the laws, which are despite being well intended end up causing harms on children. Next slide, please.

So please focus on the image in front of you. That is artwork, as you can see, it is funny in a sense. It is the phrase up above the phrase at the top the sentence at the top says, should a man dream a life like this at least once?

So it is caricature of man's sexual pride. It is artwork by a high school art teacher. He was charged for CSAM back in 2000. And court intervened and said CSAM law, at least the law at the time, is to protect real child. And there is no child being harmed by this image. But 10 years later, 2011, the legislator changed the law explicitly to include the material featuring a character that can be perceived as a child.

Now, all the heavy punishment used to protect real children are now since then being applied equally to producers, downloaders, possessors of images like this. A year after the law changed the number of child sex offenses documented with the Korean police rose from 100 to more than 2,000, to be exact, 2200. So there was a 2 times fold increase. Not because Korean population more pedophiles. Only because all this animation cartoons were now charged as CSAM. Next slide, please.

To show the inequity of this law, on the left-hand side, you can see that a rape by violence or threat of violence carries a minimum sentence of 3 years. And rape of a child, rape of a real child carries life or min of five years. And the production of a material featuring a character that can be perceived as child engaged in sexual conduct can carry a life sentence or 5 or more years plus 20 years residence tracking by police and 10 years of employment restrictions.

Restriction from the jobs were children may be. And most jobs take place where children may be. So we are talking about other than other establishments you would be banned from getting

the job for 10 years. Yes, if this punishment is applied to images featuring real children, that is understandable. But here, all this punishment applied to situation where there's no real child. Next.

Another comparison. The distribution of obscene material carries maximum 1 year. But the distribution of a material featuring a character that can be perceived a child engaged in sexual conduct carries a maximum of 7 years plus 20 years of residence reporting and 10 years of employment restriction.
Next.

Um, I mean, I don't need to go through this but for those who are new to this debate, children are legally incapable of consent to sexual conduct. So if asked to do so, that act is nonconsensual, which is rape. And so production of system involving real child involves asking child to engage in sexual conduct it's tantamount to raping the child. Therefore, there is a heavy punishment on production of CSAM and projection and viewing is punished because it's considered to generate demand for them.

And free speech scholars have opposed obscenity law on various grounds, for instance, sexual conduct of -- conduct of adults is completely legal. And there is no reason to prohibit production or viewing if the goal is to protect sexual morality, then the solution is for viewers not to view those material. That is the -- that is usually a objection coming from free speech scholars. But even that is not -- it doesn't apply to CSAM because production of CSAM does involve rape of a child.

There was expansion of a CSAM law as Jeremy already explained. Simulated sexual act. Photo shopped sexual act. Even drawing realistic enough to identify a child. However, all this expansive of CSAM law always had a child at the center. Next slide, please. But the Korean law is attacking images that don't have a child. If you look at the -- and it -- it is a -- the law is militating against itself. If you look at Article 1, the purpose of the law is stated this way. That is a law to protect victimized child by special punishment on sexual offense.

And Article 2 is the victimized child and the victims of the crime. Blah blah blah. These phrases, of course, are based on the premise that there is a real child to be protected. Next slide, please. Now, governments response has been two. Number 1, yes, these images don't involve a real child but they want to

stop the non-real images from simulating real child sex offenses. And number 2, they want to protect people from protect people from seeing obscene material featuring children to protect general sexual morality.

Under number 2 the government wants to pitch this virtual CSAM law as a some sort of enhanced obscenity law. And let me take one response -- let me respond to these government's argument one at a time. Next slide. Switzerland back in 2009, did a study on causation between the real child images and actual sex offenses and they found none. Two years later, Denmark did a study. This time causation between non-real images and actual sex offenses. And they found none. This study stopped the Danish legislator back then from passing a law like South Koreas. And Sweden Supreme Court also struck down application of CSAM law to cartoons. Despite the governments last desperate attempt to pitch this as a hate speech against children.

Some people say, now, if -- I mean, Jeremy already explained the general principle that imagination should be different from reality. The first principle he mentioned was expression is not abuse, I'll say imagination is different, imagination is different from reality. Also, even if there is a little bit of causation, producers of fake drugs use on movies, they are not punished as real drug distributers. Producers of movies featuring murder acts, they are not punished as murders.

There is something inherently wrong about punishing non-real images as a CSAM or non-real images as CSAM, even if it does have a little bit of causation as CSAM. Causation towards CSAM. If at all, it should be punished as a CSAM aiding and abetting or some encouraging system. And some other law but not as CSAM. Next.

The government second argument of treating this as obscene, this just doesn't work because you are looking at the images from two move sees that were critically acclaimed in front of the global audience. American Beauty and also Traffic. In both films, one imaginary sexual -- imaginary contact of a high school girl. And one real -- I mean, real within the movie. So it didn't really happen but real within the movie, prostitution by a high school girl.

All of this should be also banned to protect people's sexual morality. But these movies have been promoted by the media industry and have been accepted by the critics. Next

slide, please. In the end, so this is a image from website that describes the Korean law. On the left you have real children who are not getting help from the threatening figure behind. While on the right side, the police officers are busy web surfing looking to protect non-real children. Because the non-real images are written up as CSAM and CSAM is one of the five big offenses, five big offenses that police officers get promotion points for. The police are spending more time on more time (overlapping speakers) than offline tracking real children offenses.

And also, the most consumers of the most consumers of anime and cartoon are children themselves. Or young adults who -- young adults. And they aren't brought to the police for investigation when they need protection. And also, because of all these cases, the judges faced with this cases and end up issuing lenient decisions, lenient sentencing, but due to lack of segregated data because this one provision applies to both real images and non-real images, it produces a deceiving statistics showing that CSAM is punished very leniently and new judges coming to the bar end up following the guidance.

As a result, I don't know if you remember a few years ago, there was a welcome video website. A operated by a Korean person who carried thousands of real images. And made them available to hundreds of thousands of clientele around the world. All real images. And he served only 1.5 years. We believe that is because of the deceptive statistics. And which was the result of inclusion of non-real images under CSAM. Next.

A list of better option. Of course not doing anything about non-real images. But if you look at the U.S. law, and UK law, they created some compromised statutes between CSAM and normal obscenity. And have enhanced punishment for obscene images featuring representation of children. Not real children but representation of children. Um, we -- I'm not really pushing finish that now but these are the options that we can look at to solve the current -- to get out of the current fiasco. Next slide.

Okay, well, I'll stop here. I think the freedom, the normal free speech principle mandates makes clear what we need to do to to do justice on non-real images and also divert back the resources, you additional resources into protecting real children. Thank you.

(applause).

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Thank you very much, Professor Park. We have about 10 minutes for interaction and questions. And those can be both online or from the room here. So if you have a question or a response you would like to give to any of the panelists? In front here. We have a mic, roaming mic.

>> Hello. Come from Taiwan. And I think child pornography is a major concern in Taiwan. And in fact we had a controversy over virtual child pornography in 204. In Taiwan there's a organization called I Win that handles confident online content with minors and a platform to protective natures. What happens is that a local online forum caused some content depicting underage looking character. And that's potentially illegal and asked the implement to remove it.

This trigger a big backlash from the ACG community because they argue that fictional creation shouldn't be treated as illegal. And also led creating and viewing virtual contents doesn't necessarily relate to anti-social behavior in real life. So I want to ask, do you think a criminal needs to have a real victim? Or is it proper age rating enough? Thank you.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Do you want to respond? Or Dr. Park, do you want to respond?

>> KS PARK: I didn't hear carefully. But what did -- I mean, which criminal law prohibition of Taiwan was used to charge the non-real image there? Hello?

>> There is a child exploitation prevention act in Taiwan.

>> KS PARK: But doesn't the law require a real child?

>> I think we always target at real child but they also some images maybe pictures or videos but not a target at virtual character. So this is what happened.

>> KS PARK: That's why it became controversial. Well, I think Jeremy and I have shown how it's self-defeating, how it is inefficient to expand the definition of CSAM or which I would exploitation law to include images that do not feature a real child. So please, you know, give your contact information with the organizers there, if you want. I would love to be involved in the legal defense or constitutional challenge, if necessary, within Taiwan. Actually, I'm going to Taiwan next week. If you are interested.

>> Thank you.

>> SHAMBHAWI PAUDEL: I would also like to make a quick addition about the issue of forum post when we're talking about posts like that, context matters. It is like in what context was the image shared? Was it just imagination? Was it asking for like for their action or exploring fantasies? Or was it like talking in context of a real child or what we would like in real life in that kind of context of which the conversations are happening, first. And second the context of the forum itself what kind of platform is it? Who is the main audience? Are children the main audience? Or is it logged or blogged or consumed by adults who are having adult conversations where the post is being made? That's a very important context.

The third important context is as Dr. Park said, what laws were used? And whether like how was the harm identified or seen? And most importantly, it's like if that law and that invocation of that law in that way sets a precedent which blurs the line and maybe pushes the line censorship and further away from child protection.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: We have a few more questions in the room. And we won't get to all of them because we only have 5 minutes. So we have a question from the Taipei local hub. And two questions here and then the lady at the back after that. And then the Taipei hub if they have time.

>> Thank you very much from Pakistan. A quick question to Dr. Park. You talk of the child online protection and the law. But is it any over-the-top regulations in Korea as well? Because you have the law but for enforcing the law you need to first register those platforms. Are they registered? How is this law being enforced? Do you have regulations regulating these big social media platforms and online platforms? I'm asking from the enforcement context, thank you.

>> KS PARK: Sure, let's hear all the questions first and then we will answer.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Lady in the middle. Thank you.

>> Thank you for the insightful session. I'm from South Korea. A brief comment from the floor. And I appreciate the discussion and I strongly resonate with the call to draw the line strictly whether to identify a victim actually exists. And regulation and platforms conflate victimless victim. And care

expression and survivors sharing their stories are often the first to be erased. And from governance should not be driven by moral panic and enforcement needs to stay focused on addressing real world harm against living children. And while defending genuine person and career expression

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Thank you, there's two local hubs and Taipei and Hong Kong. We may not be able to do justice to the questions but let's hear from the local hubs.

>> Taipei, would you be able to unmute yourself?

>> Yes, can you hear us?

>> Yep.

>> Hi. I am the Chair of Taiwan Internet Governance Forum. Today, we organize a local hub inviting all of our members to join remotely online. Hi Dr. Park nice to see you online.

>> KS PARK: Good to see you.

>> We want to share a experience in Taiwan as the young lady said recently the Taiwan government reinforced or children protection statute. There's additional obligation imposed on online platforms for them to perform notice and take down obligations and to extreme the government may implement certain content blocking technical mechanism. For those the institute hasn't be effective but it's going to become effective soon.

And locally, such forums like us or other civil society and organization, we advocate and urge the Taiwan government to listen to multistakeholder's voice to take into consideration different stakeholders like artists. Writers. And also parents and also platforms. We hope the government could open their ears and listen to us. And the in Taiwan we have been fighting and protecting this legal rights and the freedoms for many, many years.

We believe it was for us to continue such dialogue with the government. Only if we continue to actually use the -- I shouldn't use the word fight but only if we continue to insist to talk to government, the government will listen to us and we will reach the balance and to find a fine line for the different issues. That's our source and contribution, thank you Chair and all the panelists.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Thank you very much for that intervention. We have some questions that we are going to be answering in the Zoom chat. So if you are not online you might want to check out the Zoom chat for this conference room. And we can address some of the other questions that we had there. Unfortunately, we aren't going to be able to answer them in the room today.

I do apologize we weren't able to reserve more time for interaction. But look forward to discussing further with you in the Zoom chat. And thank you very much to everyone for being here to our panelists and Shambhawi and Dr. Park. And Mish in their absence. And thank you and goodbye for now.
(applause)

>> KS PARK: The person who asked about platform restoration law in Korea, can the organizers give I my email address to him? So he can contact me with the question? I have a perfect answer to that. And I know how platform restoration law has been used in Nepal.

>> Thank you Dr. Park and all the questions asked in the chat and also some questions asked here we will send it to you over email.

>> KS PARK: Thank you.

>> Thank you very much session moderators and speakers for this wonderful session. Next up, we have from local evidence to regional tie log in the room. And we also have in the next room. At 11:30, we have from local evidence to regional dialogue in the room. And we also have internet index in the next room and do come back at 11:25 so we can start the sessions on time. Thank you.

(applause)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.