CHILDLIGHT
Global Child Safety Institute

SEARCHLIGHT 2023
CHILDLIGHT ANNUAL FLAGSHIP REPORT

TECHNICAL NOTES

Project

ONLINE CONTENT SHARING SERVICES TRANSPARENCY METRICS & REPORTING ON CSEA

ONLINE CONTENT SHARING SERVICES TRANSPARENCY METRICS & REPORTING ON CSEA

Technical Note

This scoping review purposively sampled within the universe of identified transparency reports as reported by OECD in their transparency reporting benchmark report (OECD, 2023). We actively tried to access all transparency reports but were able to only access 19 reports.

Services with and without transparency reports and those Included in the study

Services with transparency reports that are included in this study. N of transparency reports =19	Services with transparency reports that we were unable to access for this study. n = 1	Services with no transparency reports based (OECD, 2023) n = 30
Amazon (Amazon.com, Inc.; Discord (Discord, Inc.) Dropbox (Dropbox, Inc.) Facebook (Meta Platforms, Inc.) Facebook Messenger (Meta Platforms, Inc.) Instagram (Meta Platforms, Inc.) Google Drive (Alphabet, Inc.) LINE (Line Corporation) LinkedIn (Microsoft, Inc.) Microsoft OneDrive (Microsoft, Inc.) Microsoft Teams (Microsoft, Inc.) Microsoft Bing (Microsoft, Inc; Pinterest (Pinterest, Inc.)	Ask.fm (IAC [InterActiveCorp])	Baidu Tieba (Baidu, Inc.) DeviantArt (DeviantArt, Inc.) Douban (Information Technology Company, Inc.) Flickr (SmugMug, Inc.) Huoshan (ByteDance Technology Co.) iMessage/ FaceTime (Apple, Inc) IMO (PageBites, Inc.) iQIYI (Baidu, Inc.) KaKao Talk (Daum Kakao Corporation) Kuaishou (Beijing Kuaishou Technology Co., Ltd) Likee (BIGO Technology PTE. LTD.) Medium (A Medium Corporation.) Odnoklassniki (Mail.Ru Group)

Services with transparency reports that are included in this study. N of transparency reports =19	Services with transparency reports that we were unable to access for this study. n=1	Services with no transparency reports based (OECD, 2023) n=30
Reddit (Reddit, Inc.) Skype (Microsoft, Inc.) Snapchat (Snap, Inc.) Tik Tok (ByteDance Technology Co.) Twitch (Amazon.com, Inc.) Twitter (Twitter, Inc.) YouTube (Alphabet, Inc.) Verizon (Verizon Communications, Inc.; Zoom (Zoom Video Communications, Inc.)		Picsart (Picsart, Inc.) QQ (Tencent Holdings Ltd.) Quora (Quora, Inc.) QZone (Tencent Holdings Ltd.) Smule (Smule, Inc.) Telegram (Telegram Messenger LLP) Tumblr (Automattic, Inc.) Viber (Rakuten, Inc.) Vimeo (Vimeo, Inc.) VK (Mail.Ru Group) Weibo (Sina Corp.) Weixin/WeChat (Tencent Holdings Ltd.) WhatsApp (Meta Platforms, Inc.) Wikipedia (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) WordPress.com (Automattic, Inc.) Xigua Video (ByteDance Technology Co.) Youku Tudou (Alibaba Group Holding Limited)

This scoping review was in a form of a rapid assessment which is a type of knowledge synthesis in which components of the traditional systematic review process are simplified or omitted to produce information in a short period of time (Khangura et al., 2012). The methodology strives for methodological rigour and transparency, adhering to systematic principles while recognising the need for trade-offs in terms of breadth and depth. The methodology offers various valid strategies to streamline the process, such as refining research questions, employing broader or less complex search methods, conducting review-of-reviews, reducing the inclusion of grey literature, focusing on essential variables, and conducting straightforward quality assessments. The reviewer has the discretion to determine which stages to streamline and is required to clearly document the anticipated impact of these adjustments (Grant & Booth, 2009).

Two reviewers reviewed the most recent accessible transparency reports from the universe of companies publishing these reports. These two reviewers then extracted data including metrics details related to online CSEA and any company reported limitations. One reviewer then mapped the metrics across different domains and two reviewers' fact checked against the transparency reports. All information is made available in the attached dataset and the transparency report accessed are linked in the reference list below.

Limitations of this study include not being able to access one company report and thus not reporting on the entire universe of transparency report metrics. The groupings of metrics are also subject to the researcher's interpretation, other groupings may also be possible. The researchers have made the dataset available to allow for more and continued research in this area.

Technical note references

See attached dataset for details of all included metrics as well as links to the transparency reports used.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health information & libraries journal*, 26(2), 91-108.

Khangura, S., Konnyu, K., Cushman, R., Grimshaw, J., & Moher, D. (2012). Evidence summaries: the evolution of a rapid review approach. *Systematic reviews*, 1(1), 1-9.