Towards Socially Sustainable Platforms

November 14th 2025, Tampere/Helsinki

Kuvat: Joonas Laine

DigiSus · Tampereen yliopisto Tampere University · LUT University · DECA

Towards Socially Sustainable Platforms

The seminar Towards Socially Sustainable Platforms focused on ways in which a more socially sustainable digital environment could be brought into being. We asked 'what is social sustainability in digital environment and on digital platforms?' and 'how can we achieve it?'

Our aim was to bring together researchers who are working on projects that explore, in different ways, questions around social sustainability, regulation, equality, ethics, and fairness related to the digital environment, particularly to digital platforms and the Internet. Since there is already a substantial amount of research on the problems and concerns around digital, datafied environment, the seminar sought to focus into the different alternatives and solutions – particularly *exploring the ways in which researchers could enter the debate and make an impact*: how can we make use of our expertise; what kind of collaborations could we further; what kind of creative research activities could we pursue? What insights from your research and experiences with these themes would you like to share with the audience?

The seminar consisted of two keynote talks – Professor **Eugenia Siapera**, from University College Dublin and Professor **Helen Kennedy**, from University of Sheffield – and workshops organized by the SoSu-team which focused on mapping and recording existing solutions towards digital social sustainability and then reimagining, devising and advancing towards digital social sustainability.

HowSpace can be accessed until the end of January 2026. You can access the site through your account at https://sosuseminar.in.howspace.com/welcome.

The seminar was funded by Digital and Sustainability Transitions in Society (DigiSus) https://research.tuni.fi/digisus/. DigiSus aims to bring together academics, private sectors and the public to rethink how the Tampere region could become a global leader in sustainable digitalization. DigiSus seeks to develop a cross-disciplinary community, increase research excellence, and inspire sustainable digital futures.

Keynotes

Professor Eugenia Siapera, University College Dublin: Sustainable AI? Contradictions, Costs, and the Limits of Governance

This talk asks: Can AI be sustainable? I approach this question through three dimensions of sustainability, economic, environmental, and societal, while drawing on early findings from the Horizon Europe Forsee project, including interviews with civil society organisations (CSOs), trade unions, and small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) on how they conceive "successful" AI.

Economically, AI must be situated in the post-2008 context of capitalist crisis, where it has been framed not only as technological innovation but as a techno-solution to restore productivity. Yet such gains remain contested and, where realised, are transformed into capital accumulation at the expense of labour, raising doubts about AI's long-term economic sustainability at least from the point of view of labour. Environmentally, the extractive and energy-intensive demands of AI systems generate enormous ecological costs, even as AI is folded into 'green capitalist' agendas that prioritise growth over repair. Societally, AI reshapes social reproduction in ways that intensify dependencies, reproduce systemic biases, and unevenly burden already vulnerable communities and in this manner compromising rather than enabling collective flourishing.

These contradictions raise a pressing governance question: can the EU's current model of risk-based AI regulation meaningfully address such structural issues? While this approach may mitigate discrete harms, it leaves untouched the underlying political-economic logics that drive unsustainable trajectories. The talk therefore concludes by asking how governance might be reimagined in ways that do not merely manage risks, but actively reshape the conditions under which AI is developed, deployed, and evaluated, opening space for more genuinely sustainable digital futures.

Professor Helen Kennedy, University of Sheffield: Reflections and challenges from the Digital Good Network, exploring what a good digital society looks like and how we get there

The ESRC Digital Good Network asks what a good digital society looks like and how we get there. It takes as its starting point the substantial critiques of contemporary digital deployments offered by social scientists, humanities scholars, and digital rights advocates and activists. In surveying these critiques, the contours of the digital society we don't want become clear. The Digital Good Network takes the next analytic step, inspired by a vein of scholarship that challenges us to imagine more desirable futures (e.g. Benjamin 2024). In other words, we pivot from the question 'what digital society don't we want?' to 'what kind of digital society do we want, and how do we get there?'.

Over the past three years, we have carried out and funded research, trained researchers, and connected with stakeholders, in pursuit of answering these questions. In this presentation, I present some examples of our efforts to identify what a good digital society looks like and routes to achieving it and I reflect on some of the challenges that arise when asking normative questions like ours. These include the thorny issue of who gets to define good, better, desirable, sustainable, and other highly contested matters of language. A good digital society requires us to celebrate polyvocality, but how do we translate that into action? The lack of consensus about how to evaluate whether technologies contribute to a good digital society, whether to measure, and whether it's possible to abstract general principles from specific contexts are further challenges. Imagining a better digital future requires interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaboration – I conclude with some thoughts about the pleasures and pains of such partnering.

The organizing team (SoSu-team)

Reeta Pöyhtäri (Media Studies, Tampere University)	reeta.poyhtari@tuni.fi
Kaarina Nikunen (Media Studies, Tampere University)	kaarina.nikunen@tuni.fi
Paula Haara (Media Studies, Tampere University)	paula.haara@tuni.fi
Kari Söderqvist (Media Studies, Tampere University)	kari.soderqvist@tuni.fi
Minna Vigren (LUT University)	minna.vigren@lut.fi
Aleksi Knuutila (Rajapinta, University of Helsinki)	aleksi.knuutila@gmail.com

Research Interests of the Participants

Tekoälyn luoma sanapilvi

Workshop 1: Mapping existing solutions

In the first workshop, we mapped **existing solutions** towards digital social sustainability across five areas: **technology, law and policy, activism, research, and media & media education**. There were ~25 people present in Tampere and about 5 in Helsinki – mostly academics.

The most notable talking points of **technological solutions** focused on the questions of ownership and availability. Seminar participants agreed on decentralized structures, in which federally or communally maintained digital platforms focus on providing service instead of pursuing revenue. The technological solutions discussed also require systemic change, where existing platforms are repaired, taken offline or local. Global and cloud-based systems create excessive and redundant costs and waste in addition to depletion of natural, personal or social resources.

There exists already a great deal of **regulations and policies** that strive for sustainable digital futures. EU regulations, government plans and problem preventing/solving associations or operatives such as ethics councils and inspection requisites already support social sustainability to some extent. But the work is not done; some democratic and informed decisions are still waiting to be made. Sustainable digital futures can't be attained without proper economic planning, developing systems of distributive justice and increasing understanding about the issues at hand amongst regulators. Affective bridges between citizens, NGOs, progressive policy makers and intergenerational endeavors need active maintaining so that well-being may be created and existing welfare can be carried on.

Artists, protesters and informed demonstrations do great deals of good by displaying the will of the people. Non-profit associations file privacy complaints, meet with decision makers and call out disturbing practices. Seminar participants also discussed ways in which the common folk can participate in **activism**. For example, we can all refuse to participate in discussions that only uphold negative practices, we can refuse to join or leave problematic platforms, and we can avoid sharing and thus reproducing counterproductive talking points. We can include

decolonial intersectional approaches and bring questions about e.g. irresponsible AI use (among many other things) to the discussion.

Seminar participants (most of whom work in science or academia) largely agreed on two things when discussing **research solutions**. Firstly, we need to do research, where we do not sit alone at our desks for the most part. We need to use more participatory, community-based methods, where different audiences or demographic target groups are included. We must include young people in the processes of science. We need to observe people when they use AI or log online and aim to establish dialogue with them to make feats of emancipation possible to a wide range of people. All this type of research luckily has already been undertaken, like e.g. the Digital Good Network demonstrates, but still it could be mainstreamed. Secondly, we need to put effort into making actions and observing phenomena. We can e.g. develop AI or create "disruptive forms" of social media ourselves, implement sustainability into our creations, and make observations within instead of afterwards. We should do more secondary data analysis – create and use data archives to have a wider glance at the research subjects at hand. Research must also continue addressing tensions between comfort provided by commercial platforms and the implications they have on individuals and society.

Considering **solutions about media and education**, the words critical, diversity, accessible, aware, possible and evaluation became pivotal. Thankfully, e.g. data/information/media literacy workshops and tools for various groups and audiences are already offered, and there are investigative journalism initiatives as well as university level education on media studies. We need to continue supporting all these educational opportunities to build towards social sustainability, and for example to raise awareness about how commercial algorithm driven and data-based platforms operate. A wide expertise should be present in the societal debates on these matters and we should avoid leaning on industry views only. Questions arose also about AI and deepfake. Are there tools or watermarks to identify AI content? What do we believe AI is truly capable of and what can it not do? What do we mean with AI in each case?

Are there any **other** ways we can build socially sustainable digital environments? The solutions mentioned include cooperative enterprises and inclusive business solutions – but also degrowth mentality, working with slower temporality and dismantling capitalism. Vandalism and concrete action against data centers were also mentioned. Solutions around materiality and the redistributions of materials are worth consideration, such as printing all our data and planned power cuts. We should also aim to elevate people whose work creates change towards better or grant funds/endowments to those who can create good with it.

It is worth mentioning, that it wasn't an easy task to think of existing solutions. New solution ideas seem to come up quite easily, most likely because we are not happy with how things are in the world currently. This workshop was held after Professor Eugenia Siapera's talk, which had crucial and necessary examples about how unfairness and inequity exist in Europe. The talk also mentioned problematic policy changes, data centers as questionable undertakings and issues about AI. This critical and praiseworthily analytical talk most likely steered ideas and thoughts in the first workshop to said topics, which is why they are well represented in the answers.

Workshop 2:
Advancing Digital Social Sustainability

In the second workshop, we continued working in small groups to **discuss and elaborate on solutions and new directions** that we as researchers could contribute to. They were listed under four themes: research designs or approaches needed, societal discussions and developments, supporting pluralism, and imagining socially sustainable technology and digital environments. **Participants created the following short summaries** about each theme's canvases.

1. **What new research designs or approaches are needed / missing?**
    a. Radical research, not serving big tech, academic freedom
    b. Historical sensitivity, in with the old, out with the new
    c. Cross-design in everything (cross-sectional, -generational, etc.)
    d. Improve researcher career sustainability

2. **What could researchers' active role be in the societal discussions and developments on digital social sustainability in Finland?**
    a. Let's institutionalize research communication, impact and teaching as part of "real" research process and funding plan.
    b. Engage, popularize, step outside! Do stuff with non-researchers.
    c. Be a brave public intellectual, appreciate your expertise!

3. **How could we better support pluralism as a part of contributions towards digital social sustainability? What voices and views are missing or unheard in research discussions and how could we get them on board?**
    a. Genuine, meaningful commitment to including people from diverse groups. 'Doing good as' – push for that and if not possible, promote 'doing good with' and 'by'. Building trust and affective connection with minority communities.
    b. Make sure designs are available and accessible for diverse populations, people in different life situations.
    c. Learn from history.

4. **What are socially sustainable technology or digital platforms like? What do we want and by what means could we try to advance them?**
    a. Alternative, small-scale, community-based platforms that represent users' needs and wishes. Platforms that are transparent about their funding, algorithmic models, data collection etc.
    b. Promoting digital wellbeing: no overload, no digital waste, environmentally sustainable.
    c. Alternative forms of design on platforms: Remove addictive features, give users more control about the UX, no to infinite feeds and information overload, involve diverse groups in design.

If we were to summarize the summaries made, our participants aim towards socially sustainable digital platforms by remembering and harnessing history, by building bridges between different people, by replacing digital hindrances with wellbeing, and by leaping into the breach when we detect a need for information or expertise we possess.

What should we do next? What are the next steps?

At the end of our SoSu-seminar we asked participants to name possible **next steps** to advance the work towards socially sustainable digital platforms. The most preferred answers were about intentions to draw attention to social sustainability. Participants solicited radical action and newsworthy perceivable change – awareness doesn't happen on its own, it needs to be created. We can't change what is not known.

We should also be focusing on creating public service social media platforms, doing cross-sectoral collaborations, co-designing services with end users, problematizing the role digital platforms play in our lives, speaking in podcasts about social sustainability in digital environments, mobilizing research and writing Wikipedia-articles on the matters discussed at our seminar. We need to reframe the agenda setting, foster informed decision making and create democratic discourse.

We will also look at possibilities to see how the worke started at this SoSu-seminar could be continued and new collaborations created between the participants.

Content Annex

Answers collected from Howspace (doesn't include names or likes)

Workshop 1: Mapping existing solutions

Technological solutions

• ActivityPub & Fediverse

• Translation services, language-proof reading

• Pix payment system in Brazil (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pix_(payment_system))
- like cash, but digital, no (US) banks or financial institutions or big tech

• UPI payment system https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unified_Payments_Interface
• Open source AI models
• Edge computing as an alternative to data centers

• Co-design of digital health technologies with patients and care partners (e.g., https://icare-pd.ca/)

• Research on using locally running AI models. People may use large cloud-based AI systems to run tasks that could be run on their own PC.

• Six new projects funded by the Digital Good Network 'building the digital good' - https://digitalgood.net/six-new-research-projects-building-the-digital-good/

• Commons-based solutions: https://digitalgood.net/dg-research/truly-ethical-digital-design-the-digital-commons-and-social-enterprise-in-brazil-2-7/

• Offline copies

• Federated social media like mastodon - but not very successful

• Search engines (like duck duck go), email systems (like proton.me) which promise not to monetise people's data

• Privacy-adding add-ons (container tabs etc.)

• Lots of re-use and repair projects at small/local scale

Legal and policy solutions

• EU regulation...

• Support for e.g., using AI to enhance democracy, and tying that to sustainability considerations. That way its not opposition to AI use but advocation for good AI use.

• Act on the Openness of Government Activities / Freedom Act etc.

• Affective bridges between grassroots activists, NGOs, policy makers, progressive politicians, experts, etc. and participatory approach by citizens

• Youth participation in political decision making related to digital and AI

• Proper economic planning

• Eugenia referred to 'distributive justice' (work of Linnet Taylor & others)

• Litigation to break down platforms

• Developing "an ethics of response-ability" that helps us clarify "which kinds of data are of use and value and for who" - from Klausen (2024)
https://doi.org/10.48335/9789188855961-8

• Equipping regulators, both EU and national level, with necessary knowledge to understand how platforms and AI technologies in general operate

Activism towards solutions

• noyb & tactical tech

• Organization of cultural producers, strike action

• Affective bridges between grassroots activists, NGOs, policy makers, progressive politicians, experts, etc. and participatory approach by citizens

• Refusal, non-participation, everyday acts of ('mundane'?) resistance

• Arts-based activism (storytelling... etc.)

• Decolonial intersectional feminist approaches

• Calling out disturbing practices (for example instances where AI is being used irresponsibly)

Research solutions

• Participatory, community-based methods, arts-based methods (including online methods/tools/platforms)

• Research METHOD solutions: Experimental, hands-on research projects that examine e.g. AI solutions via developing them and hence, potentially, implementing sustainability and critical views from within, not afterwards.

• Also research about the actual practices of AI users

• Projects in which we popularize scientific findings, for example museum exhibitions working together with researchers, workshops with different audiences / target groups and changes in the school curriculums

• Digital Good Network (of course!)

• Research that address tension between comfort what commercial platforms provide and the critical thinking that would help to understand their implications on individuals and society

• Yes, making the links visible!

• Young people as co-researchers about digital platforms and infrastructures

• Secondary data analysis, revisiting data that's already governed or exists in the ether. Happens on a minor scale, exists (using Big Data & opposing it's harms)

• And there's also lots of data that is archived under open access / open data initiatives - there was a big drive towards this in the EU around 10 years ago; each country has its own data archives, qual as well as quants

• Responsible innovation for public media futures @ bbc r&d : https://www.bbc.co.uk/rd/projects/responsible-innovation-centre

Media & education solutions

• Critical investigative journalism

• Diversity of experts in media - not just industry representatives

• Bridging over language gaps (e.g. in online workshops)

• Awareness-raising among students: There are lots of them, how good are they, to what extent do they include critical literacy, how good are they at keeping up, and Qs about who is funding them – e.g. of Google funding media literacy work in India

• Critical data literacy

• Community-driven information literacy promotion initiatives

• Digital detox programmes and other "quests"

• CRITICAL -project. Critical geomedia. Geographers. Helsinki University.

• Create some kind of tool or watermark for deepfake and/or synthetic media

• Raising awareness about how commercial algorithm driven and data based platforms operate and what implications their operations have, infrastructural meaning making.

• Public service (media) algorithms

• Practices of disconnected citizenship

• Education on what is and is not possible. We may believe narratives that AI can do anything, when some things are really impossible no matter how advanced the AI is. We also need to be clearer about what we mean with "AI" in each case

• News Source Diversity Meter and other diversity monitoring applications: https://moniaanisyysmittari.fi/english/

• ps. Welcome online to discuss this, webinar in English next Wed (19.11.) afternoon: https://www.tuni.fi/fi/ajankohtaista/uutisten-moniaanisyyden-mittaaminen-oppeja-ja-kokemuksia

Other solutions

• Projects, short time grants and plans from foundations, institutions or endowments, such as Sua Varten Somessa -project https://suavartensomessa.fi

• Visualising what goes behind AI, e.g., : ESTAMPA's cartography of generative AI: https://cartography-of-generative-ai.net/. Many languages available and explanations on their website!

• Vandalism against data centres

• Direct action against data centres

• Planned power cuts

• Inclusive business solutions - creating communities of co-creators

• De-growth

• Print all your data

• Living and working with slower temporality

• Cooperative enterprises

• Fighting against becoming lazy!

• Dismantle capitalism...

• When giving awards, honorary prizes or doctor honoris causa, mentioning who is worth remembering and the reasonings behind the award. Raise each other.

Workshop 2: Advancing towards Digital Social Sustainability

1. What new research designs or approaches are needed / missing?

> **Summary made by seminar participants**
>
> Radical research, not serving big tech, academic freedom.
>
> Historical sensitivity, in with the old, out with the new.
>
> Cross-design in everything (cross-sectional, -generational, etc.).
>
> Improve researcher career sustainability, incorporate the Norwegian model

All the answers to Question 1

• We need more secondary data analysis

• Designs made by minorities, people with diverse backgrounds

• Address imbalance in who can access (e.g. platform) data

• Real research cooperation with policy makers / officials with their involvement at all stages of the research project incl. data analysis, discussion of preliminary results etc.

• Research where businesses are involved, maybe an approach where the scientist's work desk is in a "regular job" location. This is how we impact in this capitalistic society in the best way.

• Norway's model: first a 6 month grant to engage with target groups / audience segments / different segments of people, and "build a bridge" with them. THEN you apply for the money to report about what you learned and what kind of research you could do with the group of people you have gotten to know. So let's learn from that: first we do applied anthropology, and only after that we do the research with / about them.

• More real cooperation with tech and big tech companies. Not like sources of data but as co-creators of research project. Now, tech companies are usually black boxes for researchers

• The above is important but tricky a) to set up & b) to ensure that change happens when you have set up such partnerships

• Mixed methods

• Addressing the irony that researchers' careers are not very sustainable? Long term contracts for interdisciplinary sustainability researchers?

• THIS ^

• Participatory / co-design approaches

• Arts-based methods --- diverse modalities, communication

• Feminist reflexivity/ participatory approaches/ research that brings different groups together

• Many of these are already done btw, which is great :)

• Involving people who are affected by the technologies

• Research teams from diff. disciplines and geographical regions. Equality in research/academia.

• A cross sectoral approach

• Sustainable jobs for researchers - universal basic income for researchers

• Smaller projects to more people

• Platform Ts&Cs are a commercial decision - we don't have to stick to them :)

• Radical research, not serving or doing what big tech wants.

• Historical approaches

• Cross generational research

• Studying the "paths not chosen" in the history of media.

• Post-colonial methodologies

• Studying failures, not hiding them.

2. What could researchers' active role be in the societal discussions and developments on digital social sustainability in Finland?

Summary made by seminar participants

Let's institutionalize research communication, impact and teaching as part of "real" research process and funding plan.

Engage, popularize, step outside! Do stuff with non-researchers.

Be a brave public intellectual, appreciate your expertise!

All the answers to Question 2

• Implementing one's research results into teaching of one's own unit. Even small elements. This task could always be included in research plans. (The link between research and teaching is not automatic.)

• Diversify the modes of presentation (science communication) beyond text.

• Lobbying

• Volunteering, hanging around, providing educational tips or other related to own knowledge, learning from community's knowledges in a neighbourhood --- serving different roles, no only needing research contribution. Presenting something at events...

• Not only children's science questions in newspapers, also adults' science questions!

• Organise public consultations and process the findings

• Publish work in a popular form like in The Conversation

• Yes (about diversifying science communication), for example doing monologues about your research, etc. And also participating in more events such as researchers' night (although they should be called differently maybe) - e.g., https://www.comciencia.urv.cat/en/vols-saber-que-investigo/

• Participatory, action-oriented research that produces proof-of-concepts or "products".

• Being proactive in public debates in which we have expertise in.

• Step (physically) out of the campus building. E.g. libraries, schools...

• Researchers start going to politics, or we change the system so that politicians have to listen and take into account the hearings/speeches (valiokunta). Instead of ignoring academic voices.

• Advocate for pragmatist model of researcher-political action interplay where we try what research points towards, then learn, and try again.

• Researchers need to also write Wikipedia-articles for easy information access

• We need technocracy :D

• University communication services could cooperate better with research projects to communicate the results

• If researchers could spend less time on acquiring funding, they'd have more time for societal and community-based activities...

• Providing research-backed alternative actions / solutions for organizations and citizens, being vocal about the alternatives

• I think first researchers in Finland should have more or less shared and clear understanding of what digital social sustainability in Finland is.

• One-to-one discussions with policy makers and officials, to inform and influence - also listen to what is going on in the institutions and organizations

• Always say yes when invited to talk about your research to non-academic audiences

• Exhibitions based on research lie un-used after initial exhibition - universities could think creatively about how to use them - this & other institutional support is needed by researchers

• Example of institutional support for researchers: https://www.comciencia.urv.cat/en/

• Public intellectuals

3. How could we better support pluralism as a part of the contributions towards digital social sustainability? What voices and views are missing or unheard in research or discussions and how could we get them on board?

> **Summary made by seminar participants**
>
> Genuine, meaningful commitment to including people from diverse groups. 'Doing good as' - push for that and if not possible promote 'doing good with' and 'by'. Building trust and affective connection with minority communities.
>
> Make sure designs are available and accessible for diverse populations, people in different life situations.
>
> Learn from history.

All the answers to Question 3

• PEACE!

• Learning from HISTORY (to fight against the pressure to investigate the FUTURE without temporal context)

• Be a guest speaker in a podcast

• Is research done ON/FOR youth, but not BY and WITH them?

• Age matters! Lack of voices from the aging populations.

• Take the tram to Hervanta

• Co-design, co-research

• Remember the global dimension / diversity that already exist in your own research environment.

• Meaningful intersectionality

• To make sure the support/funding goes to community

• Hanging out in neighbourhoods and getting to know the different voices….

• Surveys in minority languages as well.

• We need to have seminars in different locations as well. For example: in schools, in down syndrome -caretaking facilities, in elderly homes, in religious spaces.

• Diversity is intersectional but also fluid --- some call it hyper-diversity (Tasan-Kok) or translocational (Anthias). no only, age, gender, class eg. but also lifestyles and other group/individual identities.

• Policy made through grass-roots participation

• Advocate for allowing original comments, thoughts, ideas, not only for creative ideas

• Destroy unnecessary formalism

• How to live with imperfect world----compromises --- how to live with difference

• Neurodiversity

• Facilitate universal design processes

• Quadratic voting process for decision making -> this prioritises the voices of those more directly affected by a policy

• Community-crossing dialogues, to learn how to make a point that is convincing and concrete

• Building trust and affective connection with minority communities

• There needs to be genuine political commitment to inclusion - and there isn't

• Mechanisms to ensure that inclusion is done well, not superficially / lip-service

• Go where the minorities are - or spend a long time by creating networks and involve with communities

• Make sure digital systems are designed for diverse publics

• Non-Finnish speaking , immigrant communities could be better heard.

• Avoid fetishing plurality for its own sake and seek to develop commonalities

4. What are socially sustainable technology or digital platforms like? What do we want and by what means could we try to advance them?

> **Summary made by seminar participants**
>
> Alternative forms of design on platforms: Remove addictive features, give users more control about the UX, no to infinite feeds and information overload, involve diverse groups in design.
>
> Promoting digital wellbeing: no overload, no digital waste, environmentally sustainable.
>
> Alternative, small-scale, community-based platforms that represent users' needs and wishes. Platforms that are transparent about their funding, algorithmic models, data collection etc.

All the answers to Question 4

• Platforms with a non-profit model with transparent funding
• Ability for officials to say "enough instagram for today" and then they can close it for everyone in Finland for 8 hours or set
• Transparency about funding
• How to advance? always speak up / even if fighting a losing battle
• Make the use of good platforms and systems visible - be active!
• Opt-out and opt-in features that allow maximum user control
• UI & UX that we can edit according to our values and needs on any platform
• Platforms that are easily modified for different needs (the same platform could work for research or for children's play) and have no forced marketing
• They need to be environmentally sustainable.
• Platforms designed by people from diverse groups
• Services without addictive design
• No to infinite scrolls

- 'scaling up' is not the solution - the local matters
- They don't involve big tech / big tech is bypassed
- Digital platforms that are selective in using automation or AI or not using them at all
- Platform business models matter - sometimes it makes sense to ask people to pay for things, so you don't need to do ads
- More options for digital platforms one wants to use
- Information security and safety of the environment socially
- Remove informational overload
- Eliminate digital waste
- Digital platforms made by women and non-binary people adopting feminist intersectionality
- Identify and remove dark patterns in platform/app design
- Nordic public service social media platform?!

What should we do next? What are the next steps?

All answers to the question:

- Anarchy!
- Abolish capitalism
- "Be the change you want to perceive." Gandhi
- Public service social media platforms
- Collaboration cross sectors
- Co-design digital technologies and services with end users
- Problematize the role of platforms - they have been taken for granted for too long
- Open letter for university rector and Petteri [Orpo, prime minister]
- Write Wikipedia articles, speak in podcasts, participate in angry mobs
- Mobilize research
- Act more like rock stars: glue hotel furniture to the roof in order to get media visibility for research and science.