



MODEL UNITED NATIONS KARACHI II

United Nations Commission on the Status of Women

Study Guide

AGENDA

Assessing the Impact of Digital Platforms and Influencer Economies on Women's Rights and Dignity

Table of Contents

Letter from the Secretary-General.....	1
Introduction to the Committee Mandate: CSW.....	2
Introduction to the Agenda.....	3
Background of the Agenda.....	4
Overview.....	4
Pre-Digital Foundations and Early Recognition.....	4
The Rise of the Internet and Social Platforms.....	4
Commercialization, Influencer Economies and Digital Activism.....	5
The Pandemic, Generative AI and Global Governance.....	5
Existing International Frameworks and Their Gaps.....	7
CEDAW and General Recommendation No. 35.....	7
Beijing Platform for Action, Section J.....	7
CSW67 Agreed Conclusions.....	7
Global Digital Compact.....	8
UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.....	8
Relevant Work of the ITU, UNESCO and ILO.....	8
Key Terminologies.....	10
Key Challenges to Women's Rights and Dignity.....	12
Digital Exclusion and Unequal Participation.....	12
Technology-Facilitated Gender-Based Violence and Online Sexual Abuse.....	12
Algorithmic Bias, Unequal Visibility and Discriminatory Moderation.....	12
Economic Exploitation and Precarious Work in the Influencer Economy.....	13
Restrictions on Women's Political Expression, Journalism and Public Participation.....	13
Weak Accountability, Cross-Border Enforcement and Barriers to Remedy.....	14
Intersectional and Context-Specific Vulnerabilities.....	14
Case Studies.....	16
1) Australia.....	16
2) France.....	16
3) Afghanistan.....	17
4) India.....	18
QARMA (Questions a Resolution Must Answer).....	20
Bibliography.....	21

Letter from the Secretary-General

Esteemed Delegates,

On behalf of the entire MUNKR II team, it is my privilege to welcome you to this year's conference. Over the course of the next few days, you will be asked to do far more than defend a position. You will be asked to question assumptions, engage with perspectives different from your own, and work towards solutions to some of the most pressing issues of our time.

MUNKR II has been designed to place you at the centre of meaningful discussion. Across every committee, you will encounter issues that rarely have simple answers. Whether you are addressing questions of international security, economic development, human rights, environmental policy, or domestic governance, the challenge will not simply be to identify what is wrong, but to understand why it persists and determine what can realistically be done about it.

We have not created MUNKR II simply to recreate the debates that take place beyond these walls. We want you to challenge existing approaches, engage with opposing perspectives, and explore the political, economic, social, and legal realities that shape every decision. The strongest solutions will not necessarily be the most ambitious ones, but those that demonstrate a genuine understanding of the circumstances in which they must operate.

Throughout the conference, I encourage you to approach every discussion with curiosity, confidence, and an open mind. Research thoroughly, debate respectfully, and never hesitate to challenge an idea simply because it is conventional. Most importantly, remember that MUN is not only about representing a country or defending a position. It is about learning how to listen, negotiate, collaborate, and lead.

I hope MUNKR II gives you an experience that extends far beyond the committee room. I hope you leave with new perspectives, meaningful friendships, and a greater confidence in your ability to contribute to the world around you.

I look forward to seeing the ideas you challenge, the solutions you develop, and the memories you create throughout the conference.

With warm regards,

Zekiel Gulab

Secretary-General

MUNKR II

Introduction to the Committee Mandate: CSW

The Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) was established in 1946 through ECOSOC Resolution 11(II) and functions as the principal global intergovernmental body dedicated exclusively to advancing gender equality, women's rights and the empowerment of women and girls. As a functional commission of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), it consists of 45 Member States. Its mandate is to identify emerging challenges affecting women, evaluate progress and implementation gaps, formulate global policy standards, and promote women's rights across political, economic, civil, social and educational fields. The Commission also holds primary responsibility for reviewing the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

CSW performs these functions by examining reports and evidence submitted by Member States, the UN Secretary-General, UN entities and accredited civil-society organizations; convening governments, experts and other stakeholders for policy dialogue; reviewing national and international commitments; and negotiating collective responses to priority gender-equality issues. Its principal outputs include resolutions, Agreed Conclusions and policy recommendations submitted to Member States and ECOSOC. Although these outcomes are generally not legally binding, they establish international standards, influence national legislation and programmes, guide the work of UN bodies and encourage governments and private actors to adopt coordinated measures. However, CSW cannot enact binding international laws, prosecute individuals, impose sanctions, compel governments to implement its recommendations or directly regulate private companies. Implementation consequently depends upon Member States, national institutions, UN agencies, civil society, digital platforms and international cooperation.

The impact of digital platforms and influencer economies falls directly within this mandate because these systems increasingly shape women's safety, privacy, dignity, economic opportunity, and freedom of expression. While digital platforms create new opportunities for entrepreneurship, education, political engagement and representation, they may also expose women and girls to online harassment, non-consensual intimate imagery, sexual deepfakes, algorithmic discrimination, precarious digital labour and harmful gender stereotypes. The agenda therefore concerns rights protected under **CEDAW** and corresponds with the **Beijing Platform for Action's** critical areas relating to women and the media, violence against women, women and the economy, and women in power and decision-making. It is further supported by the **CSW67 Agreed Conclusions** on gender equality in the digital age, the **Global Digital Compact's** commitment to countering technology-facilitated violence against women and girls, and the **2030 Agenda**, particularly **SDGs 5, 8, 10 and 16**. Accordingly, CSW's role under this agenda is to assess both the opportunities and risks created by digital platforms and influencer economies and to formulate gender-responsive policy recommendations that strengthen women's online safety, economic rights and access to remedy while protecting their autonomy, participation, privacy and freedom of expression.

Introduction to the Agenda

The rapid expansion of digital platforms and influencer economies has transformed how people communicate, work, conduct business, and participate in public life. Social media platforms operate across national borders and shape the information, opportunities, and social standards encountered by billions of users. However, women do not participate equally in this digital transformation. According to the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), 71 per cent of women used the Internet in 2025 compared with 77 per cent of men, leaving approximately 280 million more men than women online. This divide is further influenced by income, geography, digital literacy, device ownership and social restrictions, making the effects of digital platforms particularly unequal across developed and developing countries.

Within this ecosystem, digital platforms provide the infrastructure and algorithms that determine what users see and whose voices receive attention. Influencers create and distribute content, while the influencer economy converts online visibility into income, commercial power and social influence. These developments can advance women's rights by expanding access to employment, entrepreneurship, education, advocacy and political expression. At the same time, they can threaten women's dignity through online harassment, economic exploitation, discriminatory algorithms, deceptive advertising, harmful representation and the misuse of their images or personal information. Therefore, responsibility must not be placed on individual women alone; governments, platforms, advertisers, content creators and audiences must all be considered when addressing these systemic harms.

Because digital platforms operate across borders, both their opportunities and harms can spread from one country to another within seconds. A woman may create content in one state, work through a platform based in another, reach audiences worldwide and face abuse from users whose identities or locations remain unknown. International cooperation is therefore necessary to protect women's digital access while safeguarding their freedom of expression, privacy, safety, autonomy and inherent dignity. As delegates examine this agenda, they must ask: **How can states protect women without restricting their voices? Who should be held accountable when digital harm crosses borders? And how can the influencer economy become a source of empowerment rather than exploitation?** The challenge before this committee is not whether women should participate in the digital world, but how that world can be made equally accessible, economically fair, and safe for every woman and girl.

Background of the Agenda

Overview

The impact of digital platforms on women's rights did not begin with the creation of social media. Many of the inequalities visible online originate from long-established social systems in which women possessed less access to education, employment, property, political power and public expression. Women's bodies, sexuality and behavior have historically been policed under stricter standards than those imposed on men. Violence against women was easier to get away with, and misogyny itself was largely tolerated as a social norm. Digital technology did not create these attitudes; it transferred them into a new environment where they could spread faster, reach larger audiences and become more difficult to remove.

At the same time, digital platforms disrupted traditional systems of control by allowing women to publish content, establish businesses and organize movements without relying entirely on established institutions. The result has been a historical paradox: platforms expanded female autonomy while enabling misogyny, surveillance, exploitation and discrimination at industrial scales. Understanding the agenda therefore requires examining how traditional gender inequality, mass media, the early Internet, social-media business models and artificial intelligence gradually combined to create the modern influencer economy.

Pre-Digital Foundations and Early Recognition

Before the 1990s–1995

Newsprint and broadcast media controlled who and what the public saw before social media. Editors and producers at newspapers, television networks, ad agencies and film studios largely determined what kinds of women were visible and how they were presented. Women had less control over who owned and produced the media, while much of advertising content focused on beauty, domesticity and sexuality.

International efforts slowly laid the legal groundwork to help address some of these inequalities. The UN General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) on 18 December 1979 which obligates States Parties to end discrimination against women. In 1993, the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women recognized violence against women as a human-rights violation. Following these in 1995, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action identified “women and the media” as one of twelve critical areas of concern and called for the increased participation of women in the media and the eradication of damaging stereotypes. All three predate modern forms of social media but would later be found to apply to online spaces as well.

The Rise of the Internet and Social Platforms

1990s–2009

The internet's rapid expansion in the 1990s meant women could launch their own online spaces like websites, blogs, forums, and networks, free from the constraints of traditional media. Women used these channels to discuss issues related to discrimination, reproductive rights and violence against women which may have been silenced or taboo in society. However, women's participation remained limited by unequal access to devices, education and connectivity.

Social-media and content-sharing sites proliferated throughout the early and mid-2000s. During this period, users began to evolve from passive consumers of media to publishers themselves. The World Summit on the

Information Society, held in Geneva in 2003 and Tunis in 2005, recognized the importance of women's access to information and communication technologies. Yet, the rapid growth of these platforms outpaced the development of protective legislation. Harassment, stalking, and non-consensual content sharing thrived across borders aided by anonymity, perpetual storage of data and global connectivity. Platforms also began collecting user data and controlling visibility, but women had little influence over how these systems were designed.

Commercialization, Influencer Economies and Digital Activism

2010–2019

Throughout the 2010s, the proliferation of smartphones, visual platforms, and algorithmic systems made it possible for personal identity and lifestyle choices to be monetized at the individual level. Influencers could monetise through sponsorships, affiliate marketing, advertising revenue, and selling products. Although there were new opportunities for women to start businesses and gain audiences worldwide, there was pressure to commodify beauty, relationships and private life. Creator accounts became reliant on algorithms and were generally still classified as users or contractors instead of protected employees.

In that same period, the political muscle of social media became evident. The #MeToo movement became global as survivors utilized digital platforms to call out sexual harassment and silence across institutions. The movement illustrated how social media visibility can turn individual instances into worldwide movements for change. Heightened visibility would also lead to gendered backlash, including coordinated attacks of harassment and disinformation aimed at women activists, journalists, and politicians. In 2017, CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35 recognized that gender-based violence can happen in technology-mediated environments and can transcend national boundaries. This recognition was significant because cyber abuse began to be treated as an extension of gender-based violence, not a separate issue.

The Pandemic, Generative AI and Global Governance

2020–Present

The COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 accelerated dependence on digital platforms as employment, education, commerce and public services moved online. During the pandemic, women relied on platforms to keep their businesses afloat, find new sources of income, and stay informed. Those who were not connected were further marginalized. Additionally, abusive partners leveraged technology to monitor their partners' online accounts and devices as a form of coercive control. COVID-19 highlighted that access and safety online were necessary for women to fully engage in society.

The year 2022 marked the beginning of widespread generative AI tool adoption, making the creation of realistic fake images, videos, and voices a far less difficult undertaking. Sexual deepfakes, identity impersonation, automated harassment, and unauthorized commercial use of women's likenesses became faster and cheaper to produce. These technologies did not invent objectification or reputational abuse; they automated and expanded practices that had historically targeted women.

International governance also advanced during this period. CSW67 in 2023 focused on innovation, technological change and education in the digital age, recognizing both technology's potential for empowerment and its risks of discrimination and violence. UNESCO published its Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms in November 2023, which called on States to adopt policy approaches that center transparency, human-rights due diligence and accountability for platforms. In September 2024, UN Member States adopted the Global Digital Compact, which included commitments to ensure digital

cooperation is gender-responsive and addressed technology-facilitated violence. Recognizing these normative developments in September 2025, UN Women described 2024 as a “landmark year for developing global standards to address technology-facilitated violence against women and girls.”

Existing International Frameworks and Their Gaps

Women's rights in digital spaces are addressed through several international human-rights, labour and digital-governance instruments. Collectively, these frameworks recognise women's rights to equality, free expression, safety, decent work and participation in public life online. Each framework was developed independently, and at different times for different reasons. Consequently, no single international framework comprehensively regulates digital platforms, the influencer economy and technology-facilitated gender-based violence.

CEDAW and General Recommendation No. 35

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) requires States parties to eliminate discrimination against women and protect their equal participation in political, economic and social life. General Recommendation No. 35, adopted by the CEDAW Committee in 2017, clarifies that gender-based violence can occur in technology-mediated environments, including the Internet and digital platforms. The recommendation also binds States under the principle of due diligence, which mandates States to take reasonable steps to prevent, investigate and respond to violence perpetrated by private actors.

CEDAW is a treaty that is legally binding on States that ratify it, whereas General Recommendation No. 35 interprets CEDAW rather than creating a standalone treaty. Additionally, this framework holds States responsible for meeting its obligations instead of creating binding obligations on platforms, advertisers and influencer agencies. It also does not establish specific standards for content removal, algorithmic accountability, digital-evidence preservation or cross-border investigations.

Beijing Platform for Action, Section J

Adopted in 1995, **Section J of the Beijing Platform for Action** identifies “Women and the Media” as a critical area of concern. It calls for women's greater access to expression and decision-making through media and communication technologies and promotes balanced, diverse and non-stereotypical portrayals of women. These principles remain relevant to influencer marketing, online advertising and the representation of women and girls on digital platforms.

However, the Platform for Action was adopted before the development of contemporary social media, algorithmic recommendation systems and influencer-based employment. It therefore does not directly address deepfakes, coordinated harassment, discriminatory algorithms, creator contracts or the commercial use of women's personal content. Its implementation also depends mainly upon national policies and voluntary media self-regulation.

CSW67 Agreed Conclusions

The Agreed Conclusions of the sixty-seventh session of the Commission on the Status of Women in 2023 provide the most directly relevant UN framework concerning gender equality in the digital age. They call for meaningful digital access, greater participation of women in technological design and leadership, gender-responsive innovation and stronger action against technology-facilitated gender-based violence. They also recognise the responsibilities of governments, technology companies and other stakeholders in making digital systems safer and more inclusive.

Nevertheless, agreed conclusions are politically negotiated commitments rather than legally binding rules. CSW67 does not create an international enforcement body, uniform platform-liability standards or guaranteed remedies for survivors. States also continue to use different definitions of technology-facilitated violence, making international data collection, evidence-sharing and cross-border enforcement more difficult.

Global Digital Compact

Adopted as part of the Pact for the Future in 2024, the Global Digital Compact establishes shared principles for an open, safe and inclusive digital future. It commits States to closing digital divides, supporting women's participation in the digital economy and countering sexual and gender-based violence that occurs through or is amplified by technology. It also calls for common safety standards, risk-mitigation measures and access to remedy while protecting privacy and freedom of expression.

The Compact provides an important global direction, but it remains a non-binding political framework. It does not create sanctions for non-compliant platforms, determine liability when companies operate across several jurisdictions or guarantee that its commitments will be incorporated into national law. Its effectiveness therefore depends on implementation by States, technology companies and other stakeholders.

UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights

The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights are based on three pillars: the State duty to protect human rights, the corporate responsibility to respect human rights and access to an effective remedy. Applied to this agenda, platforms, advertisers, brands and influencer agencies should assess how their algorithms, contracts, advertising systems and moderation policies affect women and take steps to prevent or address resulting harm.

However, the Guiding Principles are not independently enforceable international law. They rely heavily on national legislation, corporate human-rights due diligence and voluntary grievance mechanisms. As a result, women may receive different levels of protection depending on where a company is registered, where the harm occurred and whether domestic law creates an enforceable remedy.

Relevant Work of the ITU, UNESCO and ILO

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) supports gender-disaggregated digital data, connectivity, affordability and digital-skills programmes through initiatives such as the EQUALS Global Partnership and Her Digital Skills. This work helps address the gender digital divide but does not provide legal remedies or regulate platform conduct.

UNESCO's Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms promote transparent moderation, independent oversight, cultural and linguistic diversity and the protection of freedom of expression. Its Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence also calls for fairness, gender equality, transparency and human oversight of algorithmic systems. However, these instruments remain dependent on voluntary implementation and national regulation.

The ILO Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190) recognises that workplace violence and harassment may occur through digital communications and protects people working under different contractual arrangements. In June 2026, the ILO also adopted the Decent Work in the Platform Economy Convention (No. 193), the first international labour standard specifically addressing platform work. It covers

areas such as fundamental labour rights, remuneration, occupational safety, social protection and algorithmic management, regardless of how platform workers are classified under national law.

These ILO standards become binding only upon ratification and national implementation. Convention No. 193 is also newly adopted, meaning its practical impact remains to be established. Furthermore, influencers earning through sponsorships, advertising revenue or independent commercial arrangements may not always fit clearly within the definition of platform workers, leaving uncertainty over which labour protections apply to them.

Taken together, these frameworks provide a strong international foundation but remain fragmented. Major gaps include the absence of a universally applied definition of technology-facilitated gender-based violence, limited enforceable duties for platforms and commercial actors, uncertain labour protection for influencers and weak cross-border access to evidence and remedies. Delegates should therefore consider how existing commitments can be converted into common definitions, minimum platform responsibilities, accessible survivor remedies, labour protections and international cooperation while safeguarding privacy, due process and freedom of expression.

Key Terminologies

Key Term	Definition
Creator Economy	The economic system in which individuals earn income by producing and distributing digital content.
Deepfake	AI-generated or manipulated media that convincingly imitates a real person's face, body or voice.
Monetisation	Converting content, visibility or audience engagement into income.
Content Moderation	The process through which platforms review, restrict or remove content and accounts.
Nano-, Micro- and Macro-Influencers	Influencers categorized by audience size, ranging from small community creators to large public figures.
Affiliate Marketing	A system in which creators earn commission when users purchase through their promotional links or codes.
Native Advertising/Marketing	Paid promotion designed to resemble ordinary, independent content.
Parasocial Relationship	A one-sided emotional relationship in which an audience member feels personally connected to a public figure.
Image-Based Abuse (IBA)	Creating, sharing or threatening to share intimate or sexual imagery without consent, including altered or fabricated images.
Non-Consensual Intimate Imagery (NCII)	Intimate images created, obtained or distributed without the depicted person's consent.
Sextortion	Blackmail involving threats to release intimate material unless the victim provides money, further images or another benefit.
Doxxing	Publishing someone's private identifying or location information to intimidate, harass or endanger them.
Technology-Facilitated Gender-Based Violence (TFGBV)	Gender-based violence committed, assisted, amplified or aggravated through digital technologies.
Algorithmic Bias	Systematic unfairness resulting from an algorithm's data, assumptions or design.
Gig Work	Short-term or task-based work conducted outside traditional employment, often through digital platforms.
Shadow Banning	Reducing an account's visibility without clearly notifying the user.
Demonetisation	Removing or restricting a creator's ability to earn income from their content.

Key Term	Definition
Engagement-Based Ranking	Prioritising content according to predicted clicks, comments, shares or viewing time.
Algorithmic Amplification	The automated expansion of content's visibility beyond its original audience.
Proxy Discrimination	Discrimination produced when an apparently neutral characteristic indirectly represents gender or another protected identity.
Datafication	Converting human behaviour, relationships and identities into measurable and commercially usable data.
Human-Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)	A continuous process through which organizations identify, prevent, mitigate and remedy their human-rights impacts.
Algorithmic Audit	A formal examination of an algorithm's data, design and outcomes for bias, safety and legal compliance.
Trusted Flagging	A verified organization whose reports of unlawful online content receive priority treatment from platforms.
Gender Mainstreaming	Integrating gender considerations throughout every stage of policy development, implementation, budgeting and review.

Key Challenges to Women's Rights and Dignity

Digital Exclusion and Unequal Participation

To unlock the advantages of digital platforms, women must first have substantive internet access, fitting devices, digital proficiency, and financial services. For countless women, particularly in rural areas, low-income communities, and places experiencing conflict, the cost of internet access is prohibitively high. Their exclusion remains because of unaffordable connectivity, inadequate infrastructure, limited education, inaccessible technology, and social restrictions on women's use of mobile devices. Even when women gain internet access, they may have less control over shared household devices, fewer opportunities to develop advanced digital skills, or limited access to bank accounts and international payment systems.

This exclusion keeps women out of the influencer economy, from starting businesses, getting an education, accessing public health services, and having a say in political conversations. Policy created solely around women active online may further entrench inequality.

This divide originates from more extensive disparities in income, education, asset ownership, and avenues for decision-making. It is further intensified by rural infrastructure gaps, unaffordable devices, safety concerns, male control over household technology, and the underrepresentation of women in technology design and leadership. Delegates should therefore define digital inclusion beyond basic internet connectivity. Meaningful solutions should ensure affordable access as well as ownership of devices through which individuals can operate independently. Services should promote digital literacy and financial inclusion among women affected by barriers such as living in rural areas, low-income levels and conflict.

Technology-Facilitated Gender-Based Violence and Online Sexual Abuse

Digital platforms can facilitate gender-based violence in the forms of misogynistic abuse, sexual harassment, cyber stalking, doxxing, impersonation, organized trolling, unsolicited sexual communications, or non-consensual image disclosure. More severe forms include sextortion, non-consensual distribution of intimate images, sexual deepfakes, online grooming, and threats that extend into physical violence.

For women in visible careers, including influencers, journalists, politicians, activists, and human-rights defenders, the need to have an online presence elevates their risks. However, private users are also targeted by abusive partners, family members, strangers, or coordinated online mobs. Harm caused can range from fear and trauma to reputational damage and loss of income, quitting jobs, and self-censorship.

Online violence mirrors offline misogyny and gender inequality, but the internet accelerates harm and broadens its reach. Content that inflames gender-based violence can be spread virally by engagement-based algorithms, and poor or a lack of reporting tools, local-language moderation, and enforcement enable impunity. Social stigma and fear of victim-blaming also discourage women from reporting abuse. Therefore, the central challenge is to prevent online abuse from causing lasting psychological, economic and physical harm. Delegates must ensure that responses to such abuse are effective, accessible, and balanced with privacy, due process, and freedom of expression.

Algorithmic Bias, Unequal Visibility and Discriminatory Moderation

Platform algorithms decide whose posts are suggested for viewing, what ads people see and which creators can monetize their work. These systems may reproduce gender inequalities when they are trained on biased

data or designed without adequate gender-impact assessments. This includes amplifying sexualized content of women, recommending misogynistic media or advertising jobs and gigs to select demographics.

Women creators can similarly face inexplicable visibility drop-offs, demonetizations, suspensions, or removals of otherwise valid content. Automated moderation may incorrectly restrict educational material concerning women's health, sexuality or gender-based violence while failing to detect coded harassment and abuse. Moderation failures disproportionately affect content in regional languages and women from racial, religious, or sexual minorities.

Algorithms are often optimised for engagement, advertising rates and user retention instead of equality and safety. Discrimination can result from unrepresentative training data, biased historical trends and unequal representation of women in computing. Non-transparent recommendation systems, lack of independent auditing and poorly designed appeal processes allow discrimination to go unchecked. So, it must be determined how platforms can be held accountable when their algorithms unfairly restrict women's visibility, income or legitimate content while amplifying harmful material. Debate should address gender impact assessments, audits, transparency of content moderation guidelines and adjudication systems, with particular focus on moderation for regional languages and marginalised communities.

Economic Exploitation and Precarious Work in the Influencer Economy

Influencer work can appear autonomous and flexible, but many are reliant on opaque algorithms controlled by platforms, contracts with brands, and unpredictable audience interest. Women creators may experience irregular income, unequal payments, unpaid promotional work, delayed compensation, exploitative agency agreements, and unauthorized use of their content. One algorithm update, demonetization ruling, or account suspension can cut a creator's main source of income overnight.

Creators are often legally classified as independent contractors and not workers. As a result, they can be denied minimum wage protection, maternity benefits, health insurance, paid time off, collective bargaining rights, and safeguards against sexual harassment at work. Women may also perform continuous emotional and appearance-related labour, remain constantly available to audiences, and expose parts of their private lives to maintain engagement. Domestic labour can also decrease the rate at which women can produce content, putting them at a disadvantage in platforms where frequency is rewarded.

Platforms and brands have more leverage over creators individually. Payment platforms and sponsorship fees are often opaque. The lack of formal employment status, creator unions, or standardized contracts leaves women at a disadvantage when negotiating. Existing gender pay gaps, unequal access to investment and professional networks, and the unequal distribution of unpaid care work are consequently reproduced online. ILO research shows that digital platforms can provide income while still exposing women to lower earnings, weak social protection, and algorithmic control. Overall, the committee must consider whether creators classified as independent contractors should still receive basic economic and workplace protections. Possible measures should address transparent payments, standardised contracts, content ownership, social protection, sexual harassment, and fair appeals against demonetisation or account suspension.

Restrictions on Women's Political Expression, Journalism and Public Participation

Digital platforms have expanded women's ability to participate in political debate, contest elections, report on public affairs and organise social movements. However, women politicians, journalists, activists and human-rights defenders are frequently targeted through gendered disinformation, sexualised insults, manipulated

images, impersonation, doxxing and threats of sexual or physical violence. Unlike ordinary political criticism, these attacks often focus on a woman's gender, appearance, family or private life to undermine her credibility rather than challenge her views.

The effects extend beyond individual victims. Persistent harassment may cause women to limit what they publish, withdraw from public debate, leave journalism or avoid seeking political office altogether. Threats made online may also place their physical safety, professional reputation and families at risk. These pressures are often intensified for women from religious, ethnic, rural, low-income or other marginalised communities, who may have less access to legal assistance, institutional protection and platform representatives.

Responses to this problem can also create risks. While content moderation and online-safety laws may protect women from serious abuse, vague definitions of harmful, false or offensive content can be misused to restrict dissent, investigative journalism or criticism of public authorities. Excessive content removal may similarly suppress legitimate political discussion. Effective policy must therefore distinguish threats, targeted gendered abuse and deliberately deceptive content from lawful criticism, satire, reporting and political disagreement.

Delegates must determine how States and platforms can protect women's dignity, safety and equal political participation without restricting press freedom or legitimate criticism. Measures should address serious threats, doxxing, sexualised manipulation and gendered disinformation while providing transparent standards, independent oversight and accessible appeal mechanisms.

Weak Accountability, Cross-Border Enforcement and Barriers to Remedy

Women who report digital harm frequently encounter complicated procedures, automated responses, delayed content removal, and unclear appeal systems. Digital evidence may be lost before it can be secured by law enforcement; abusive content is often replicated on countless sites after being taken down from one. Police and judiciary lack technical understanding, or do not perceive online abuse to be as serious as in-person offenses.

Obtaining accountability is even more difficult when the survivor, perpetrator, platform, and server are dispersed across jurisdictions. Nations also have varying definitions and laws around cyberstalking, intimate-image abuse, deepfakes, and platform liability. Certain forms of abuse could be illegal in one country but permitted in another. In States where institutions are weak or corrupted, women may be unable to hold multinational companies running digital platforms accountable to preserve digital evidence, disclose the offender's information, or provide reparations.

Technology evolves more quickly than laws can keep pace, while platforms act internationally but enforcement is usually done at a national level. Agencies can be underfunded and lack technical expertise, while companies can push back on requests to disclose algorithms or user information. Survivors may lack funds or wish to avoid stigma, retaliation, and victim-blaming by deciding not to pursue legal routes. Meanwhile, broad online-safety laws can be used by authoritarian governments to silence women, journalists and political dissidents. Delegates must clarify responsibility when survivors, perpetrators, platforms and digital evidence are located in different jurisdictions. Recommendations should reinforce shared understandings on legal definitions, sharing of evidence, cooperation from platforms and access to remedy while also guarding against expansive internet-safety legislation being used to censor women's legitimate political speech.

Intersectional and Context-Specific Vulnerabilities

Intersectional vulnerability is concerned with how different parts of a woman's identity and social location (i.e., age, race, ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation as well as income, migration status, occupation and place) intersect with digital platforms. This means that women experience different types and degrees of harm online and do not have the same capacities to defend themselves from these harms. One online attack can thus have greatly varying impacts depending on the context of the woman suffering the attack.

Vulnerability isn't solely a consequence of exposure. A woman's ability to access protection and recovery services matters too. A wealthy celebrity may face harassment on a greater scale but often has lawyers, professional management, security and direct access to platform companies. In contrast, a low-income micro-influencer who depends on one account may lose her income and safety after a single suspension, impersonation or harassment campaign, with little ability to seek remedy. These disparities are heightened further when gender intersects with age, disability, ethnicity, religion, poverty, migrant or geographic location. This leaves minority journalists, adolescent girls, women with disabilities, refugees, rural women and women in conflict-affected or conservative societies at particular risk of unique harms and with the fewest resources for reporting, legal and financial resources to address them.

Digital platforms do not create social inequalities independently; they often reproduce and amplify inequalities already embedded within society. Standardized moderation systems, incomplete datasets, unequal access to legal assistance and policies designed around dominant languages and identities frequently fail to recognize overlapping forms of discrimination. As a result, those facing the greatest risks may also possess the fewest resources to report abuse, preserve evidence and secure justice. Delegates should therefore keep local languages, ability to accommodate disabilities, access to legal assistance, financial dependence and geographic location in mind so that rural women, refugee women, minority journalists and others are not left out of protection and remedy.

Case Studies

1) Australia

Australia provides a useful example of how specialised regulation can protect women from serious online abuse while supporting their equal participation in the digital economy. Its internet-advertising market reached approximately AUD 18.4 billion in 2025, demonstrating the growing economic importance of online platforms and social media. This makes women's safety, dignity and access to effective remedies essential to maintaining inclusive and trustworthy digital spaces.

The centre of Australia's approach is the **Online Safety Act 2021**, which establishes a national framework for addressing cyber abuse, child cyberbullying, non-consensual intimate imagery and certain illegal or restricted content. The Act is enforced by the **eSafety Commissioner**, an independent regulator with powers to investigate complaints, compel information from platforms, issue removal notices and impose civil penalties for non-compliance. The Act is supported by the **Basic Online Safety Expectations**, to maintain effective reporting systems and address risks arising from anonymity, recommender systems and generative artificial intelligence.

Australia has also addressed emerging and commercial harms. The **Criminal Code Amendment (Deepfake Sexual Material) Act 2024** criminalises the non-consensual transmission of sexual material, including content that uses artificial intelligence to generate or alter appearances, in violation of which offenders can face up to six years' imprisonment and seven years if aggravating circumstances are involved. Meanwhile, the **Australian Consumer Law** requires social-media promotions to be truthful and clearly identifiable when influencers receive payments, gifts or other benefits. In 2026, PhotobookShop paid AUD 39,600 following **Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC)** infringement notices concerning an allegedly misleading influencer review, demonstrating the practical application of consumer law to digital advertising.

The framework has provided measurable remedies: between August 2018 and June 2023, eSafety delivered remedies by fully or partially removing all reported content in 89.9 per cent of image-removal requests. However, the system remains largely complaint-based, requiring survivors to identify, document and report abuse. Strict legal thresholds, anonymous accounts and cross-border reposting may also prevent some harmful content from being addressed. Australia has nonetheless committed to further reforms on a Digital Duty of Care which would shift responsibility to online platforms for foreseeable harm, though this framework is yet to be finalised.

Australia shows that an independent regulator, effective removal tools and criminal and consumer protections can offer better access to remedy for women. Delegates should nonetheless consider how responsibilities can shift further towards prevention by online platforms, while ensuring due process, lawful expression and proportionate responses.

2) France (Professionalising and Regulating the Influencer Economy)

France provides a leading example of how governments can recognize influencing as a genuine economic activity rather than treating it as informal social-media use. Its model combines legislation, regulatory enforcement, industry certification, consumer education and European platform regulation. France demonstrates how influencer work can be recognised as a commercial profession with defined rights and responsibilities. Investment in French influencer marketing reached approximately €587 million in 2025,

reflecting its growing economic importance. As creators often negotiate individually with brands and agencies, this growth raises concerns about transparent advertising, fair contracts, harmful representation and economic exploitation, particularly in sectors connected to beauty and lifestyle content.

The foundation of France's approach is **Law No. 2023-451 of 9 June 2023**, which defines commercial influence and establishes responsibilities for influencers, agencies and advertisers. Commercial content must clearly disclose its advertising purpose, including partnerships involving payment, gifts or other benefits. Retouched and AI-generated representations of faces or bodies must also be labelled as “Retouched Images” or “Virtual Images.” The law additionally restricts the promotion of certain risky cosmetic procedures, nicotine products and financial services. These measures aim to protect audiences, especially women and girls, from deceptive advertising, unsafe products and digitally manipulated beauty standards.

France also provides contractual protection for creators. From 1 January 2026, promotional campaigns valued at €1,000 or more, excluding tax, require a written contract identifying the parties, responsibilities, payment or benefits, and intellectual-property rights. Influencers, agencies and advertisers may also share liability for harm caused during a commercial campaign. These requirements provide greater certainty over payment, content ownership and responsibilities, reducing the risk of informal or exploitative arrangements. At the platform level, the **EU Digital Services Act** further requires major platforms to assess systemic risks and improve transparency and accountability.

Enforcement is carried out principally by the **DGCCRF**, France's consumer-protection authority. In 2024, it inspected more than 260 influencers and found irregularities in 40 per cent of the cases, resulting in warnings, compliance orders and criminal reports. This demonstrates active enforcement, but also shows that non-compliance remains widespread. Challenges include regulating foreign accounts targeting French audiences, protecting smaller creators below the mandatory written-contract threshold and addressing unequal bargaining power or limited social protection for independent creators.

Overall, France demonstrates that recognising influencer work in law can strengthen contractual certainty, advertising transparency and accountability. Delegates should consider which minimum protections should apply to every creator, how rules can be enforced across borders and how platforms, brands and agencies should share responsibility without placing the entire burden on individual influencers.

3) Afghanistan (Digital Exclusion under the De Facto Authorities)

Afghanistan demonstrates how digital exclusion can result not only from poverty or inadequate infrastructure, but also from restrictions on education, employment, mobility and public expression. Since August 2021, directives issued by the de facto authorities have significantly narrowed women's participation in public and economic life. As of August 2026, approximately **2.4 million girls** had been excluded from secondary education. This limits the development of digital literacy and professional skills required for women to participate as creators, journalists and online entrepreneurs. The case therefore directly illustrates State-driven digital exclusion and unequal participation.

Relevant measures include the exclusion of girls beyond Grade Six from secondary education since March 2022 and the suspension of women from universities in December 2022. Further directives restricted women from working for national and international non-governmental organisations and United Nations offices, while a December 2021 measure required women travelling more than 77 kilometres to be accompanied by a male relative. In late 2024, women and girls were also prevented from attending public and private medical institutes. Together, these restrictions reduce women's access to education, employment, financial independence and professional networks, all of which are necessary for meaningful digital participation.

The **2024 Law on the Promotion of Virtue and Prevention of Vice** further regulates women's dress, mobility and public expression. It restricts women from singing, reciting or reading aloud in public and grants morality officials broad enforcement powers. Article 17 also restricts media from publishing images of living beings, affecting photography, video production, broadcasting and other forms of digital content. Regional fibre-optic restrictions and a temporary nationwide communications blackout in September 2025 additionally interrupted online education, digital payments, business activity and access to information. These conditions make it difficult for women to maintain a visible and sustainable presence online.

Women-led and internationally supported initiatives continue to provide limited alternatives. **Radio Begum**, which broadcasts educational and informational programming for women, was temporarily suspended in February 2025 over alleged broadcasting-licence violations but was later permitted to resume operations. Its suspension demonstrates the administrative vulnerability of women-focused media rather than an ongoing closure. UNESCO, UNDP and other organisations have also supported radio education, online learning, digital payments and e-commerce opportunities for women. However, these initiatives cannot fully compensate for restrictions on formal education, employment, movement and expression.

Afghanistan demonstrates that digital inclusion cannot be achieved through connectivity and devices alone when women lack the wider rights needed to use technology independently. Delegates should consider how international cooperation can support alternative education, women-led media, digital finance and safe online enterprise while promoting the restoration of women's access to education, employment and public expression.

4) India (Intersectional Risks to Women in Politics and Journalism)

India's large and diverse digital public sphere has created new opportunities for women to campaign, report on public affairs and participate in political debate. However, greater visibility can also expose women in politics and journalism to sexualised abuse, threats and attacks on their credibility. India therefore demonstrates the challenge of protecting women's dignity and safety in public life while preserving legitimate political criticism, press freedom and freedom of expression.

During India's 2019 general election, Amnesty International analysed 114,716 posts mentioning 95 women politicians and classified 13.8 per cent as abusive or problematic. Approximately one-fifth of this content contained sexism or misogyny. The abuse was also intersectional: Muslim women politicians received 55.5 per cent more abusive or problematic content and 94.1 per cent more religious or ethnic slurs, while politicians from marginalised caste groups received 59 per cent more caste-based abuse. These findings show that women's experiences online are shaped not only by gender, but also by religion, caste and political identity.

Documented cases involving women journalists illustrate how this pressure can operate through different channels. Investigative journalist **Rana Ayyub** has faced a pornographic deepfake, fabricated social-media posts, doxxing, and rape and death threats connected to her public reporting. In 2020, police opened an investigation under the **Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act** into Kashmiri photojournalist **Masrat Zahra** over photographs posted on Facebook, which authorities stated could disturb public order and promote anti-national activities. Press-freedom organisations raised concerns about applying national-security legislation to journalistic material. Together, these cases highlight the need to distinguish legitimate criticism and lawful enforcement from conduct that endangers women or creates a chilling effect on political and journalistic expression.

India has developed several protections against these harms. The Constitution guarantees equality and freedom of speech and expression, while the **Information Technology Act, 2000**, the **Bharatiya Nyaya**

Sanhita, 2023, and related rules contain provisions addressing stalking, intimidation, voyeurism, obscenity and privacy violations. The **National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal** also allows online complaints, with specific reporting options for crimes affecting women and children. Amendments to the **Information Technology Rules in 2026** introduced obligations concerning synthetically generated content, clearer labelling requirements and faster platform responses. Complaints involving specified intimate, morphed or impersonating content must now be addressed within two hours, providing stronger protection against rapidly spreading deepfakes and image-based abuse.

Despite these measures, protections remain divided across criminal, cybercrime and platform-regulation frameworks. India does not yet possess a single comprehensive, gender-sensitive system covering coordinated harassment, doxxing, gendered disinformation and intersectional digital abuse. Uneven enforcement, limited regional-language moderation, inadequate evidence preservation and barriers to legal assistance may further restrict access to remedy, particularly for rural, low-income, disabled, Muslim, Dalit, Adivasi and other marginalised women. Delegates should therefore consider how rapid platform action, survivor support and accessible legal remedies can protect women's dignity and political participation without enabling the unnecessary removal of lawful journalism or political criticism.

Key Questions a Resolution Must Answer (QARMA)

1. How should **technology-facilitated gender-based violence** be defined internationally, and should this definition include cumulative harms such as repeated misogynistic abuse, coordinated harassment, gendered disinformation and algorithmic amplification, even where individual posts may not independently be illegal?
2. How can platforms rapidly delete harmful content like nude photos shared without consent, sexual deepfakes, personal information and serious threats, preserve evidence for law enforcement, and prevent wrongful deletions?
3. What baseline preventive and responsive responsibilities should platforms have, and at what point should platforms be legally and/or financially liable for failing to manage systemic risks, moderate harmful content or offer effective redress?
4. How can women politicians, journalists, activists and human-rights defenders be protected from **coordinated harassment and gendered disinformation** without allowing governments or platforms to censor legitimate criticism, political opposition or freedom of expression?
5. How can policies protect women's **safety and dignity without becoming paternalistic restrictions** on their clothing, sexuality, visibility, employment, political opinions or independent participation in digital spaces?
6. How should influencers and content creators be legally classified, and what minimum protections should they receive concerning **written contracts, timely payment, intellectual-property and likeness rights, revenue transparency, unfair demonetisation and access to dispute resolution**?
7. How can international policies protect **nano- and micro-influencers, child creators and women from marginalized communities**, including rural, low-income, minority, migrant and disabled women, who may lack lawyers, professional representation or accessible reporting mechanisms?
8. How can Member States close the **digital gender divide** through affordable connectivity, independent device ownership, digital literacy and financial inclusion while ensuring that additional safety and compliance requirements do not exclude women or smaller creators from digital economic opportunities?
9. Should the international community establish common minimum standards for platform safety and influencer economies, or should definitions of harmful content and women's dignity remain primarily subject to national laws, cultural values and State sovereignty?
10. How should implementation be **funded, monitored and evaluated**, particularly in developing and least-developed countries, and what roles should UNCSW, UN Women, ITU, UNESCO, OHCHR, national regulators, civil society and private companies perform?

Bibliography

United Nations Women. *Commission on the Status of Women*.

United Nations General Assembly. *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*. 1979.

United Nations General Assembly. *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women*. 1993.

United Nations. *Beijing Platform for Action: Women and the Media*. 1995.

CEDAW Committee. *General Recommendation No. 35 on Gender-Based Violence against Women*. 2017.

Commission on the Status of Women. *CSW67 Agreed Conclusions*. 2023.

United Nations. *Global Digital Compact*. 2024.

International Telecommunication Union. *Partnerships for Women and Girls in ICT*.

UNESCO. *Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms*. 2023.

UNESCO. *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. 2021.

International Labour Organization. *Violence and Harassment Convention, No. 190*. 2019.

Australian eSafety Commissioner. *Basic Online Safety Expectations*.

Commonwealth of Australia. *Criminal Code Amendment (Deepfake Sexual Material) Act 2024*.

French Republic. *Law No. 2023-451 Regulating Commercial Influence*. 2023.

European Union. *Digital Services Act*. 2022.

Reuters. "Limits on Women's Education in Afghanistan." 2026.

UN Women. *Afghanistan Gender Index 2024*.

Amnesty International. "Abuse against Women Politicians in India." 2020.

Government of India. *Constitution of India*.