

Announcer: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Washington Editor-At-Large for the Atlantic, Mr. Steve Clemons.

Steve Clemons: Greetings everyone. We're here today to talk about rebooting transatlantic trust and technology, and I want to thank Bob [Caughin 00:00:20], I don't know if he's here with us, for basically setting I think, a very realistic depiction of where we are in a lot of fronts in the transatlantic relationship.

Steve Clemons: But, what is often not understood, is where the digital relationship is effects so many other areas of transatlantic relations, that it is absolutely vital to get this. You don't have to be a technologist to understand the ramifications that are there, but you need to know that there are a lot of interconnectedness between these various parts of the picture.

Steve Clemons: We have a wonderful couple of folks to come in and help us. Let me introduce the Honorable Andrus Ansip, who is the, of course the former Prime Minister of Estonia. He is now Vice President and Commissioner for the digital single market of European Commission, please welcome him.

Steve Clemons: Your highness, whichever you like. There we go.

Steve Clemons: And please welcome the honorable Susan Ness, of course former commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission in the United States, and now a senior fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations at SAIS John Hopkins University.

Steve Clemons: Please pull out your app. We're going to start this.

Steve Clemons: I was going to originally ask all of you to think of a word that comes to mind when you think of digital distrust, but I was sitting next to my friend the Russian ambassador that I met here just a little while ago, Ambassador Chizhov, and the first thing that came to mind for me was Russia, so I decided to be more politic here, and ask, what words come to mind when you think of digital trust.

Steve Clemons: So why don't you type in which word comes to mind. I'm going to as our two special guests what comes in. I'm going to type mine in here as well, in very fast form. Let's see.

Steve Clemons: Susan, are you getting ready? Do you know what word you're going to say, Susan? Don't tell me yet.

Susan Ness: Okay.

Steve Clemons: Okay, let's see if mine pops up. Oh, espionage, I love that. Cyber attack. 17 seconds. Oh, somebody did do Russia. Fake. I just love how Nixonian this audience really is. There we go.

Steve Clemons: I see, I'm going to acknowledge my word up here, on what comes to mind when you think of digital trust. Mine is naive. That's what came to mind when I thought of this, but Mr. Commissioner, what is the word you would suggest?

Andrus Ansip: This is not the first time for me to say, but trust is the must.

Steve Clemons: #trustisamust.

Andrus Ansip: Oui.

Steve Clemons: Okay, there we go, so that would be yours. Susan?

Susan Ness: Free expression.

Steve Clemons: Free expression. Well thank you. You're both much more optimistic than I am.

Steve Clemons: Let me start out just with you, Mr. Commissioner, in talking about this challenge that I think, given what we just saw from this audience, that there's a perception that there is a, at least a low level of trust on the digital front between the transatlantic partners. And, I'd love to get how you would frame the challenges we have today in rebuilding or restoring that trust.

Andrus Ansip: Too often politicians, they think that there is some kind of mistrust between the United States and Europe, and people in the United States, they think of Europeans that they cannot trust them, and then so on. I'm from Estonia, and because of my background, I can trust the United States of America, because all the people in my country, they know that the United States of America never recognized the illegal incorporation of those free Baltic states between Latvia and Estonia, into the Soviet Union, and it was really important for us to know that the most powerful country in the world is together with Estonians.

Andrus Ansip: Then when we regained independence, of course we were proud about our Singing Revolution, but we know that even in those countries where they didn't [inaudible 00:04:55], they got also independence. So according to my understanding, the most important player at that time was once again the United States of America.

Susan Ness: Before I-

Steve Clemons: Just, oh-

Andrus Ansip: And when we regained independence, then we know that some countries, when they gained independence, they were not so lucky as Estonia was, just because of the United States of America. Those Russian military troops were withdrawn from my country-

Steve Clemons: Right.

Andrus Ansip: And now we can say a miracle happened in Estonia. Without any shot, we got back our independence, and we can compare our economy with the economies that they have in our neighboring countries. In Sweden, in Finland. Of course, we are not on the same level yet, but we're on the same picture, and this is a miracle already. We didn't do it alone. It happened because of the strong support we got from the United States. I can trust Americans. And now, we are facing with the same challenges on both sides of Atlantic.

Steve Clemons: So before I go to Susan Ness to help frame how she sees the environment, I just want to ask you for a moment, as both a Vice President, and as the Commissioner, sort of the digital commissioner in the European Commission, how out of step, or how wide a gap is there between you and your colleagues?

Andrus Ansip: When talking about decision making then, this format is based unanimity, so no gap. But of course, we have all the hot debates and there are some different views, and you know when there are open debates, then it's possible to create quite good solutions.

Steve Clemons: So-

Andrus Ansip: A gap is not a solution.

Steve Clemons: If you were to take a poll of your colleagues that you're trying to draw along, and say there is dramatic levels of trust that continue between United States and ... If you were to scale your colleagues on a scale of one to 10, how do they weigh the trust with the United States?

Andrus Ansip: I can say also about other commissioners, they can trust United States of America. Of course, there are some difficulties, even today we know that there are some tensions in the air because yeah ... We used to, I mean my small Estonia, and the United States of America, we used to act together in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and now we got the message. My small country is a national security threat to the United States of America. So yeah, we are selling also steel and aluminum to the United States. I don't know exactly it is, but \$600,000 when talking about steel. \$200,000, not million, not billion, when talking about aluminum and security threats. It sounds strange, but I'm sure we will be able to find a good solution also for those.

Steve Clemons: Susan, how do you see the environment, and particularly I want you to pretend to be an executive vice president of Google, or any of the large platform companies that are over here, looking at the GDPR. For those of you who don't know, the General Data Protection Regulations that are being deployed right now. Do you feel, if you were a company, or Susan Ness Inc., do you feel trusted by the Europeans?

Susan Ness: I think there's a long ways still to go. A lot of the-

Steve Clemons: So you disagree with the Commissioner.

Susan Ness: Well a lot of the tech, well, you're asking me to look at it from a tech company perspective, as opposed to a more-

Steve Clemons: Yeah, so we have tension here.

Susan Ness: -Government to government perspective. There has been tension. There's been tension in large measure because a lot of the U.S. companies just did not perhaps do their homework. Did not understand what working with the Europeans was going to be like. They certainly, in the United ... Let me just talk about the United States.

Susan Ness: With the Presidential election of 2016, they came out pretty flat-footed. They did not realize, nor did we, the extent of engagement of foreign powers in our electoral process. How they used what had been social media techniques for advertising and for community building to build in distrust and hatred, to a point that really was quite shocking, as we're pulling back the skins of the onion to see what's underneath there.

Susan Ness: And as a consequence of that, I think a lot of the technology companies are now having to rebuild trust within the United States, not just here in Europe. Also, over the period of time, I think the Europeans have asked the companies to come together. One of the things certainly under your jurisdiction, that you did a great job on, is setting up some multi-stakeholder groups to examine the fake news issue. To examine the hate speech issue. To come up with a code of conduct, where the companies have been able to work to meet expectations.

Susan Ness: I think all of that is really, really good. It would be nice to have it be a transatlantic multi-stakeholder approach because the Internet is global, and solutions ought to be worked out on a global basis. That, in and of itself, will build a lot more trust. But, I think the companies are beginning to come back, certainly with the expectation of implementation of GDPR.

Steve Clemons: I don't mean to interrupt-

Susan Ness: That they will-

Steve Clemons: But I'm going to jump in here. Be a little bit harsher. I mean, both of you. I'd like to know where U.S. companies have failed in a sense, thus far. I mean, maybe they haven't, but my understanding from reading the European press, which is excellent, or Politico Europe, over here, is that privacy is a big deal, and a much bigger deal over here than in the United States.

Steve Clemons: And, you just shared something Susan, very important that ... And, I've been talking to Senator Mark Warner, I know he's not here at the forum, there are other senators and congressmen here from the United States, but he believes

the tech firms have been derelict in their responsibilities to American citizens, in not assuring a much more transparency on the issues of Russian intervention in the media, or in the social media platforms in other ... So I'd like to know, given the way in which we're organizing this forum, at Brussels Forums, around fixes, solutions, what needs to be done. I don't want a kumbaya statement, I want you to go to the most strident extremes that you want to go, to deliver to American firms what they need to understand if they're going to play in your territory.

Andrus Ansip: Everybody who wants to act here in Europe has to respect our rules, but this is quite challenging because Europe is fragmented. Instead, to have huge, digital single market with 500 million healthy customers, in fact 28 relatively small markets here, and now we're trying to build up this digital single market in the European Union.

Andrus Ansip: I don't think people in the United States, they don't care about data protection and things like this. In the European Union we launched this General Data Protection Regulation, and I think it's good also for global service providers. Also, for Google because now there is just one, single, set of rules, and it's easy to understand about this one set of rules. Before that, we had 28 different sets of rules.

Andrus Ansip: But when global service providers, they are able to deal with this fragmentation, then European own start-ups.

Steve Clemons: Okay-

Andrus Ansip: For them it's practically impossible to understand about those different rules in different member states and messages we will send in this way, when we will continue with this fragmentation to our start-up-

Speaker 1: In this way, when we've ... We'll continue with this presentation to our start-ups will be quite simple. Stay at home or go to the United States where there is a single market. This is not the message we would like to send.

Speaker 2: So part of the two big provisions of the GDP are on extreme content and also what kind of data can be acquired. Susan, where are you, as an American regulator, previous American regulator, but also someone who knows the US firms, where are they on the issues of really speech and extreme content as well as data collection?

Susan: Well, as far as data collection, most of the bigger companies have already put in place all of the different mechanisms that they need to do to comply with GDPR. Smaller companies both digital and otherwise in the United States may not even be aware at this point in time that they're about to be hit with a frying pan because it is complicated and they're gonna suddenly find they're not in compliance. The bigger ones, they're gonna be fine.

Susan: Similarly, in Europe, a lot of startups are gonna have to figure out how to do that. But on the speech side of things, right now, the emphasis ... Because of the timelines for European elections, timelines for regulatory processes are such that they're pushing faster and faster and faster for companies to comply with what had been voluntary rules. And these voluntary rules .. And if you think they're voluntary, I've got a bridge that goes to Brooklyn that I'd be happy to sell you, Steve. But in any of that, these are very complex rules because they go to the heart of speech. That is, on hate speech, on fake news, on what constitutes terrorism, what constitutes what is not. And so you have situations where companies, because they've got to take down, particularly on the terrorist side of things, they've got to take it down within an hour.

Susan: You have situations where they're taking down examples of atrocities in Syria that are evidence of the atrocities that people really wanna have out there and see. Or you may have a political tyrant capable of saying that something is ... You know, passing a law that makes something considered to be terrorist, but other people would look at that as being freedom fighters, so there's a lot of judgment. And what's going on is it's pushing on these companies. And this is really important. It's pushing on these private companies deputizing them to be law enforcers, judge and jury, and as a consequence, what are they doing?

Susan: Well, in Germany, where you already have a law in place right now in hate speech, a hundred percent of the items that are tagged and taken down. Whereas, in other countries, it's a lesser percentage. Why is it so different? Because the companies know that if they don't take it down, they are liable to 50 million Euros fine. And so it incentivizes them to take down pretty much everything, particularly speech that maybe controversial but not illegal, and that is a threat to democracy, in my perspective.

Speaker 2: [crosstalk 00:17:44] quick response?

Speaker 1: Yep, I fully agree what was [inaudible 00:17:48] said right now because once again, I have to talk about the fragmentation of the EU markets, but as you have correctly mentioned, in Germany, they already have this [inaudible 00:18:01], dealing with hate speech. And some other EU members, they've said they are prepared for that kind of rules and that's why it's so important to launch these recommendation, dealing with illegal content on our platforms. But I think those challenges, they are exactly the same in the United States or here or in some other continent. I fully agree. If there will be no harmonized rules, then it's difficult to understand what is happening in one country. What is legal in one country can be illegal in some other countries.

Speaker 1: And so one, there has to be a harmonized approach, but in the European Union, we have this e-commerce directive and according to this e-commerce directive, there is limited liability principle dealing with platforms. It has to stay. Some people, responsible for law enforcement, they think that platforms like Google and all that, they have to be liable for all those ... What was uploaded by somebody on those platforms. A quantitative limited liability principle. Platform

is not liable until they didn't know that something illegal was uploaded on their platforms. So, and when we will not have those harmonized rules, then reaction of platforms will be simple. If there are some doubts and you have to think about fines equal to 50 million Euros, then it means down, down, up, out. But somebody has to protect our freedom of expression and this has to be observed ...

Speaker 2: Thank you [crosstalk 00:20:00].

Speaker 1: European commission.

Speaker 2: You've both laid the foundation very well. I wanna go to the audience in a minute, but to do that, I want you to pull out your apps again because I framed perhaps badly a question but you since you got the platforms, I'm interested in this thing that I've read a lot about, that in Europe, because of privacy, because of other sort of core norms that matter, that there's this notion of society first, technology and innovation second, where the United States is being called the place where technology and innovation first, and we'll worry about the social consequences later. So I've craft this: Few European rivals to Google, Facebook, Twitter, Microsoft and YouTube have emerged. Is the reason because Europeans put society first and the U.S. puts technology first? You get to answer: one, you've got a point. Or two: this U.S.-focused moderator is not well-informed about huge European digital firms. I would gladly hear that. I went to a lot of European [inaudible 00:20:51]. I'm wrong on this and no one has challenged me yet. And three: the U.S. made a major mistake allowing enormous platform monopolies to exist.

Speaker 2: I asked this question because we've framed this almost from what seems like a U.S.-centric perspective. Google, Facebook, Twitter, hate speech. These platforms. And Estonia seems to be a place where you could be imagine in the environment that you're building that large platforms could, but for some reason, Europe hasn't been as robust there. That may be a good thing from European point of view. It may be a bad thing from an economic perspective, but I think it gets us into the ... to the nugget of the tension and difference between - if not trust of the digital world - a different attitude towards business and perhaps monopolies today.

Speaker 2: Susan, let's see how things come out here.

Speaker 2: Oh, some 8.6 percent thought that I am not well-informed. Come inform me later at coffee break. But most people think, in fact, that there is in fact a difference, but it's not... It's a very slim margin. And that many people think it's a major mistake that the United State - many more than I thought - that these platform monopolies were allowed to grow as big and powerful as they are.

Speaker 2: So, Susan, from your perspective, do you think is as an FCC Commissioner concerned with competition ... I know that you helped enforce and deploy the

1996 Telecommunications Act that we don't need to go into, but it was just a pit of snakes for all you who wanna know about that, but have we made a mistake in the United States by allowing these monopolies to grow so large?

Susan: I don't think so. Basically, you look at Facebook, for example. If you are 12 to 18 years old, you're probably not using Facebook. You remember Myspace? Rupert Murdoch's company or [inaudible 00:22:35]? So, things do change and a lot of the bigger companies have to cannibalize their own products in order to be staying current and to be able to capture an audience because things are happening so rapidly that the audiences change and they've got to respond.

Speaker 2: Mr. Commissioner.

Speaker 1: I just think that in the European Union, we would like to have also our own Google and Facebook and Amazon and Salon and we made a huge mistake some years ago already. In the United States, you decided to invest 10 billion U.S. dollars during the five years into ICT technologies then in the European Union, we used to deal with a 50,000 [inaudible 00:23:33] project. And they didn't make those fairer first investments. Why have to hope to get some profits later on? So, it was mistake but this is not the end of this competition. I'm talking about the artificial intelligence. I'm talking about embedded systems. For example, car manufacturing industry in Europe is doing really well. [inaudible 00:24:02]. You have plenty of time to continue with this competition. Some battles we lost already. Nokia- success story for a year, but now nobody remembers about those smartphones anymore.

Speaker 2: I do remember Nokia. I wanna go to Todd for a minute. Todd, I love both of your questions but because I look at you as one of the smartest public intellectuals I know in this arena, one of the questions is, is it healthy to have the kind of level of transatlantic trust ... I want to be facetious slightly here but the kind of trust that Andres thinks exists and maybe relies on ... I'm right now looking at Kaspersky Labs in the United States or Huawei. And there's an awful lot of skepticism about those companies because people look them as engaged in espionage potentially and engaged in becoming national carriers. I'm wondering is it better to be skeptical of Google on the same basis? Is it better to be skeptical of Facebook? Is a little bit of doubt, a little less trust healthy for the system or not. Just short form. This is lightning round.

Todd: I think your question's exactly right. I think there is a basis for being skeptical about all these things but at the same time, let's not deny the huge benefits that they brought with them. One thing that I wanted to ask you, Steve, though is that since now that we know that Facebook is rapidly becoming obsolete, was its real purpose to destroy the news medias we know in the United States and divert all the profits from it elsewhere?

Speaker 2: That is an interesting question and my view is The Atlantic has done quite well, so ... But with that, I think when you look at these platform questions and you sort of look whatever, I sort of disagree with you. I think probably there's been a

lot of dereliction of responsibility and I think Mark Warner and others are right to go in and have a town hall with the employees of these companies and say you have a responsibility not only to us but to all of your users in a way. And they're derelict in that responsibility.

Susan: And I think that message has been given and received. And I would agree with you. I think before the issue ... the election, it was a very different atmosphere. They could do no wrong and now they realize - and I think a lot of them are just horrified - by the stuff that they were doing ended up with an outcome that they abhor.

Speaker 2: [inaudible 00:26:22]

Speaker 5: [inaudible 00:26:23]

Speaker 6: Chatham House. We've been talking about the transatlantic relationship on technology and differences of the way we see it in society. Is there a chance that the challenge we're beginning to see from China and from some other countries is actually gonna bring us together? How are we actually going to deal with the external challenges transatlantically or are we not going to be able to ...

Speaker 2: Great question. We'll rush at China [crosstalk 00:26:51].

Speaker 1: I really think there are some areas where no single state is able to act in a really effective way alone. Let's take cybersecurity for example. We have to join our forces because of those criminal groups. They have really fruitful cooperation between them, free flow of [inaudible 00:27:13] is relative for them. They are doing pretty well, but legal institutions, they are not cooperating or even when talking about artificial intelligence. Too many people, they're afraid today about the artificial intelligence. They think that computers will be really smart ones and humans will be not needed for those computers and of course, when temperatures will be lower, computers will behave better and they will destroy atmosphere and no human beings anymore and so on. We know that practically all what was created by human beings you can use in good purposes and in bad pur...

Andrus Ansip: In good purposes and in bad purposes. The same story with the artificial intelligence. We had to cooperate, we have to join our forces, and find some other areas where tackled alone, it's practically impossible.

Speaker 2: My question relates to the rise ... The social media has a new source of information for [inaudible 00:28:26], and is it possible, both Europe and the United States are thinking about this phenomenon in terms of the wrong models. For example, why shouldn't we start thinking about it in the terms of the way we regulate broadcasters, and other forms? There are certain things you can't say on television, both in Europe and the United States. And the fact that Google, Facebook have evolved into public utilities, suggest that this is

something that there ought to be some kind of international government control over.

Speaker 3: Susan, I'm gonna bounce this to you for a second.

Susan Ness: Okay. Don't do it, would be my reaction. These are vibrant services that provide a global platform, not just here, not just in the United States, but globally for communication. And if you wanna turn them into a utility, you're gonna be killing the very vitality and the very benefit that we all have found from these. Yes, there's a problem, and the technology is working really hard to find creative ways to solve the issues that were uncovered in the election.

Speaker 3: So, if you were Vice-President and Commissioner for everything digital in the European Committee, if you had his job, how would you be wrapping their knuckles? Would you be doing the GDPR?

Susan Ness: I would be doing ex ...

Speaker 3: Exactly the same thing?

Susan Ness: GDPR, it is. It is what it is. Would I have done it in such a regulatory fashion? Probably not. Privacy is extremely important. I consider it very important myself. With respect however to regulating speech on the internet, I'd be extremely cautious, because things are changing so rapidly, as soon as you get into regulation, you've outdated yourself. And it will end up being producing more unintended consequences, that are gonna be difficult to reverse, than doing the way we do often times now, which is multi-stakeholder approach. Bring a whole bunch of folks into the room as you've been doing. And work ... Hammer through the issues in a thoughtful way.

Andrus Ansip: To regulate platforms, to kill innovations, it's so easy. But ... Yeah, I said already, I promise soon, and it means I have some experience about censorship. We had during our Soviet years, in our country. Those authorities, they were primarily effective in usage of preventive measures. Then censorship was effective. And with the very effective censorship, they created even more effective self-censorship. So, [inaudible 00:31:20] removal is a rare threat, and we have to protect the freedom of expression. We have to believe in commonsense of our people.

Andrus Ansip: You can cheat all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. Abraham Lincoln, or not. So, we don't know who said this, but it's [inaudible 00:31:49] even today. And now it seems to me that people ... Some people, they would like to regulate, to put some strict rules, and in this way, it's so easy to create [inaudible 00:32:01], Minister of Trust. I know what does it mean from my own experience.

Speaker 3: I wanna go to Christoph on [inaudible 00:32:10] for a last question, and this have been a wonderful discussion, but I want to know, just for those who may not familiar with some of the large European firms that are emerging, that are themselves frustrated with your rules and regulations. Which European firms do you know after ... Do you dialogue with, are telling you the GDPR is too much? Or that you are ... Are there any firms that we can sort of talk to add to our list of YouTube, Facebook, and others that are out there, basically saying, "You've gone too far as a regulator."

Andrus Ansip: [inaudible 00:32:42] power is not an issue in the European Union anymore. It was accepted by both of our ...

Speaker 3: So, there are no fronts challenging you?

Andrus Ansip: Industries for Google, it's important to know where this dividing line exactly is, and then you can adapt. And there are clear rules covering the whole continent. It's much easier than to deal with those who dictates small markets. It's not an issue. Now, we're discussing about teen privacy regulation already. Some other topics.

Speaker 3: Christoph?

Christoph: Christoph von Marschall. I'm at the moment the [inaudible 00:33:23] for Transatlantic Relations. It's a GMF. I would like to ask from a totally different point, and that is tech space, one. And second, how do we count service, surplus, and trade exchange and service exchange surpluses? Just, we have a common interest in the United States and Europe, and that is stabilize our tax spaces and to have an understanding where which services are counted and taxed ... And to stabilize this whole relationship. The tech's reform of-

Speaker 3: I'm gonna ask you for short questions, we're at the end. So, you have digital taxation?

Christoph: Yeah, and just one short example. See techs reforms the United States. If it would have a consequence, that Google and Facebook and all of these companies would be counted in the United States, it would change totally our statistics about trade and service surpluses or not surpluses. What is the idea-

Speaker 3: So, you're asking for clarity on digital taxation?

Christoph: Yeah, it's a common European [inaudible 00:34:19] interest to regulate that. And it's not how we discussed it at the moment, it's Europe against the United States or something like that.

Speaker 3: I think that's a wonderful way to end the discussion, but I'm not sure. Andrus, digital taxation?

Andrus Ansip: Yeah. This is a challenge for us, but once again, challenge for Americans, so challenge for Europeans. When some local service providers, they have to pay all the taxes, including corporate tax, and some global service providers, they don't have to pay this corporate tax at all, because they're placed on some kind of island, or whatever. Then, how can you compete with those? Let's take tax services, as everybody's able to understand. One local provider using the same sharing economy platform, and one global service provider. It's practically impossible to create a level playing field and competition when we will not be able to agree on this common tax space. Now, no developments when thinking about OECD. We've got all our tax rules from OECD practically.

Andrus Ansip: And now, we're waiting and, and ... No results. And some ... The United States, they have [inaudible 00:35:52] already. They launched their own rules, and to be honest, I'm not able to understand about all those proposals according with ... We have to tax turnover, because all the startups, in the very beginning, in the first stage, they would like to create discussing space, and they are facing with losses. Does it mean that we have tax losses? It's pretty strange for me. It's much more reasonable to try to work with this permanent [inaudible 00:36:34] of residency principal. It doesn't matter where the headquarter of the company really is. It's important that they have some businesses in some countries. [inaudible 00:36:51] off to tax, and we have to work with those ideas.

Speaker 3: Clearly you hit a nerve Christoph. Susan, final thoughts. Clarity on this digital taxation question or any other way you'd like to leave our audience here.

Susan Ness: Okay, well. Just quickly on the digital tax. One thing that I don't understand, normally, companies are taxed on the net income after deduction of expenses. It looks to me as though this particular idea is to tax revenues, and not [inaudible 00:37:26] expenses. So, for example, if I am a tech company that takes in advertising revenues, and then hands back to the websites, then actual host the ads-

Speaker 3: Bloggers.

Susan Ness: 85% of the actual revenues ... Am I taxed on the full amount, or am I taxed after expenditures. And it sounds to me like this is just simply a way to get at those fat US companies once again. And I hope it's given some thought.

Speaker 3: I hate ending in the digital tax rabbit hole, but I'm afraid we're gonna have to do that-

Andrus Ansip: But this is not just digital tax, some other companies. Not so much digital companies. Global service providers reeling that same model of taxation or hopes to avoids paying taxes. I don't like the idea to tax innovative technologies, digital technologies, not to tax some other tax models in not so innovative sectors, [inaudible 00:38:35] differently.

Speaker 3: In thanking both of you for a moment, cause we got to bring this to an end, but in thanking both of you for what you're doing ... I do wanna say, there was a surprising level, particularly from you, Mr Commissioner, that belief that maybe we don't need to [inaudible 00:38:49] the trust dynamic as much as I thought we did. That you seem to be conveying a larger degree of trust in the Transatlantic technology and digital relationship, than I think a to of media at least are purveying. I'm not sure where the public is. And Susan, you have kind of given some counsel and advice on how to not screw it up. Not how to find your way over regulating towards vision.

Susan Ness: But I also have, if I can ...

Speaker 3: Really fast.

Susan Ness: Just one ... Okay, one positive point. There is a tremendous area, call it green field, where we're all finally discovering what's possible with AI and some other technologies. Let's work together. Let's have workshops together so that we're all getting the same information at the same time. That may make it easier at a later point in time to oversee it.

Speaker 3: And I would say, just finally come back to [inaudible 00:39:41] interesting comment about what might [inaudible 00:39:43] drive that, you can either do it the earnest way or there is a bank shot. And sometimes the bank shot to achieving greater trust is not sitting arounds saying, "I'm sorry, we're at the end." We're in a bank shot where you can come in and basically say, "You know, Russia's meddling." Or, "These challenges on tariffs ..." Or what was said by Bob Kagan about Donald Trump and America. Maybe get you back to begin negotiating about what really matters, what you really care about. So, rather than having a kind of view of trust in this technology platform driven by Inertia, maybe shaking up is part of the process of fixing it. So, to get back to the fixing a solution.

Speaker 3: I wanna thank Andrus Ansip. I wanna thank Susan Ness. Thank you both very much for being here. Thank you for your [inaudible 00:40:24]. And I'm gonna ask [inaudible 00:40:26], the most fabulous boots in the world, worn by Ines Pole, Editor-in-Chief of [Dutch E`vella 00:40:36]. Please show off your boots. They should definitely go in the Hall of Fame of the Brussels Forum. Anyway, Ines, the floor is yours.

Ines Pole: [inaudible 00:40:41] boots isn't it?

Speaker 3: Exactly. [inaudible 00:40:43].

Ines Pole: And I ...