Campaign briefing

A trade deal with Trump:

Why we need to reject the Big Tech wishlist

April 2025

US government work / public domain

President Trump hosts Prime Minister Keir Starmer at the White House, February 2025.

"We are gradually beginning to realize the wide set of problems that these digital behemoths represent for our society, in terms of privacy, market power, manipulation, fake news... There are real efforts going on to devise a regulatory framework that addresses these issues, but [...] big [tech] corporations want to embed in international agreements a framework that would stop domestic legislation."

Professor Joseph Stiglitz

The UK is trying (again) to get a trade deal with the US

Days before Donald Trump's second inauguration, Keir Starmer told news site Politico that he wanted to start negotiations on a trade deal with the United States as soon as possible. When the two men met a month later, Trump agreed, saying he wanted a "great trade deal" and that he thought it was possible "very quickly."

The UK has twice tried to agree a trade deal with the US – first the transatlantic trade & investment partnership or TTIP, and then the post-Brexit US-UK trade deal. Talks failed both times after the public realised that the deals would pose a threat to food standards, farmer's livelihoods, public services like the NHS, and more besides.

This time, British Ambassador Peter Mandelson has called for a 'Make our Economies Great Again' agreement which would focus more on "clicks and portals than goods and mortar," suggesting the deal could be focused on digital technology. But there is no evidence that Britain will be able to limit a deal in this way – and plenty to suggest that our public services and food standards could indeed be 'on the table.' But even a digital-only trade deal carries its own serious threats for UK citizens, workers, public services, democracy and the environment.

International cooperation is good. That's not what this is

We don't need a trade deal to trade, and US tech corporations are of course already operating in Britain, with their products widely sold and utilised. What would change under a trade deal is not the availability of these products, but the rules under which they can be produced, sold and regulated.

Trade deals are, at heart, about laws and regulations. But rather than improving regulation of the digital space, trade deals aim to ban governments from introducing any regulations that could be perceived as 'interfering' with trade. In reality, this often translates into anything which challenges a multinational corporation's ability to profit.

The Big Tech industry has developed a list of demands which it wants to see realised in trade deals. President Biden's administration, recognising the problems associated with the power of Big Tech, dropped these demands in trade talks. But president Trump's administration has embraced the Big Tech giants and their agenda in full, with Elon Musk enjoying particular power to push his own interests in the government.

The Big Tech wishlist represents extreme liberalisation of the digital space, including artificial intelligence (AI) and other new technologies. If these rules are embedded in a binding US-UK trade deal, they will tie the UK government's hands, **reducing our current and future abilities to:**

1. Provide decent public services and keep our NHS data safe
2. Limit the dominance of Big Tech companies, and the inequality that results from their monopoly power
3. Tax Big Tech companies
4. Protect workers and secure rights for those in the gig economy
5. Regulate artificial intelligence (AI) and protect children and vulnerable adults online
6. Apply social, environmental and industrial policies

1. Undermining public services, safety regulations and NHS data protection

"The current digital trade rules lock in a deregulatory agenda that will make it difficult for the UK government to regulate the digital economy in public services to provide sufficient protections for public service workers and users now and into the future.

Public sector union, UNISON

At the start of 2025, Keir Starmer announced a major rollout of AI, saying that the technology would be "mainlined into the veins" of the nation. This would build on the already-significant use of digital technologies within UK public services and our wider economy, including software used by schools and social services to monitor child welfare, in computer programmes used by welfare agencies to make benefits decisions and by the police to 'predict' our likelihood of committing crime.

Digital technologies may indeed offer potential to improve our public services, but great care is needed, as these services deal with our most personal data and with life and death decisions. What is good for the users of these services is radically different from what benefits big business. Ensuring public benefit means that the government must be able to keep our data safe and ensure it is used ethically. It also means regulators must be able to understand what's going on 'under the bonnet' – the algorithms and source code that direct how the technology works.

The code that makes these technologies work can contain hidden errors, oversights, assumptions and biases, which, if unresolved can lead to safety issues, and unfair decision-making including racist or sexist outcomes. These problems can arise from failings by the products' human coders, or where products are driven by machine-learning and algorithms which incorporate errors and prejudices that the machine 'learns'. A 2019 EU White Paper on Artificial Intelligence warned that increasing use of algorithms in Europe posed risks to fundamental rights, including non-discrimination. It is therefore vital that this coding is visible to public regulators in order to hold public bodies accountable, and to spot and resolve problems. But trade rules challenge that.

Public services also gather a huge amount of data about UK citizens, covering sensitive topics including our medical histories, social services records, incomes, and which elections we voted in. This data needs to be stored securely, and used ethically, but this cannot be taken for granted, especially when data is moved beyond the reach of our regulators. The US has, to date, been judged as having an adequate regime to protect data that flows there, with transfers currently taking place under a special 'data bridge' agreement. However, Trump's administration has started dismantling the system supposed to ensure data security, and US vice president Vance has slammed Europe's "overregulation" of the online space, including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

How a US-UK digital trade deal would make it worse

Trade rules on 'government procurement' and 'market access' would give overseas companies the right to bid for contracts in the UK, including public services contracts. It would become harder to refuse US corporations contracts on any basis other than who can offer the lowest price, and governments would be open to challenge if they made decisions based on, for instance, environmental or social justice criteria.

Trade rules on data flows would make it *mandatory* that data be allowed to flow freely across borders, while requirements that data be stored or used locally would be prohibited. The US's trade deal with Canada and Mexico promotes, "Open access to government-generated public data to enhance innovative use in commercial applications and services." If a similar provision were applied to the UK, public data, including patients data gathered through the NHS, would enable Big Tech to export medical records to the US, and use them to create new products to sell back to the NHS at high prices – something British health secretary Wes Streeting has admitted. As well as risking our privacy, this would block off options to retain this data for the development of medicines, personalised care, and health systems under the control of the NHS.

Finally, digital trade rules would likely ban governments from demanding to see source code and algorithms used in digital products, including those used to make life and death decisions about our incomes or service access. Regulators would be unable to understand limitations and vulnerabilities of technologies that may be unsafe, unfair, or otherwise act against the public interest.

How secret source code allowed Volkswagen to cheat on emissions tests

In 2015 it was discovered that many VW cars being sold in the US were fitted with software that could detect when they were being tested. During tests this software would secretly change the cars' performance in order to throw out only a low level of emissions, but when they were driving normally they would emit up to 40 times more pollutants. It was only through researchers combing through bits of the source code that had been shared online that it was revealed how VW was using secret coding within cars' onboard computers to cheat emissions tests.

2. Entrenching inequality and the Big Tech oligarchy

> ***"Lack of oversight and regulation has enabled Big Tech to leverage its economic might to diminish competitors, discriminate (typically unintentionally) against vulnerable populations, and concentrate enormous political and economic power. The rise of Big Tech has inarguably contributed to a surge in wealth and income inequality within and between countries."***
>
> Public citizen

Back in the late nineteenth century, a small group of businessmen captured the American economy. They were labelled the 'robber barons' and became synonymous with obscene levels of wealth and inequality and the capture of politics by private interests. It took decades to rein in these corporate titans, by taxing, regulating, breaking them up and taking them into public ownership.

Today, a new group of corporations has risen, developing technologies which have become central to our society, and using their control of these technologies to amass unimaginable fortunes. Their power has had an extraordinary impact on our lives, work, public services, democracy and environment.

Big Tech titans like Amazon, Google and Facebook have become more powerful and wealthy than most governments, and the commodity in which they trade – data – is now considered so valuable it is described as 'the new oil'.

These technologies present the possibility of better healthcare and education, more effective farming and much more, but if that technology is simply corporate property, it will be developed to maximise profit rather than welfare. We are only just beginning to grasp the consequences of these new technologies, but it is already clear that allowing them to be concentrated in the hands of a few very powerful men carries risks of severe wealth concentration and political capture. Who controls these technologies will determine what sort of a world we will live in.

This growing monopolisation of the global economy affects global inequality too. Although digital trade is often framed as an opportunity for business in the global south, UNCTAD notes that it is much more likely that opening up to Big Tech will lead to domination of local economies by multinationals. Uber's lawsuit against Colombia for their attempt to stop Uber competing unfairly with local taxi services is one telling example of how this can play out. Uber even threatened to use a 'corporate court' embedded in a trade deal to force Colombia to back down.

Ultimately, Big Tech's power means that it won't be the creators of data who benefit, but faraway corporations. To take just one example, farmers might indeed gain from better understanding of and access to market or meteorological information, but only if that data is not monopolised by big tech companies who effectively rent it back to farmers on the terms those companies demand.

How a US-UK digital trade deal would make it worse

Trade rules on services often prevent governments from demanding that corporations set up a formal presence within a host country as a condition of operating there. That makes it much harder to hold them to account or ensure they benefit the local economy – indeed even trying to enforce local benefit is often proscribed by trade deals.

Trade rules also require regulations be applied 'fairly' to overseas corporations, but in reality we know that corporations challenge many perfectly reasonable regulations as 'unfair'. In particular, the sheer size of US tech corporations means that some regulations necessarily fall more heavily on them. This is right and proper, indeed it's necessary if we want to level the playing field. But Trump has been clear that he too regards such treatment as 'unfair' and will try to redress this in a trade deal.

Uber Eats: Supersizing costs for local restaurants

Not so long ago, if you wanted a takeaway, you might have done a quick online search for local restaurants, phoned the one you liked and ordered. The process would have cost the restaurant nothing. Now, hungry people search on a platform like Uber Eats. The service makes buying takeaways easier. But it also locks restaurants into a rent-seeking app. Even if the restaurant delivers the food themselves, Uber Eats takes from them a tasty 13% share of the bill, just for connecting you with them. Rather than value staying in the local economy, it is extracted to enrich global corporations, often based in tax havens.

Writer Cory Doctorow has explained how this form of 'platform capitalism' has proliferated across society. Platforms start out by seeming to offer a good deal to consumers, promising to make their lives easier with cheap services. The downside is felt first in the local economy, where small businesses are fleeced, as well as losing control of how they choose to offer discounts and market themselves. Then, consumers find they also have a raw deal. Sometimes they've bought something they don't really own (think of paying to stream music rather than owning a CD) or something they're unable to repair. Then they realise their data is being sold to advertisers who soon seem to know more about them than they know about themselves. Worse, by the time they want to exit, the platform has become so dominant that there's nowhere else to go. Competition has been eradicated. It's a process which Doctorow calls 'enshittification' and it's one which will be turbo-charged by the sort of rules a US-UK trade deal would contain.

This would have huge implications for consumers, for workers and for small businesses, because Big Tech corporations have become notorious at finding ways of building monopoly power – from Apple's proprietary plug sockets that lock you into buying products from a single brand, to the multiple ways companies try to prevent you repairing their products. There is a growing movement pushing back on Big Tech's monopolistic behaviour – for instance, forcing tech companies to make their products interoperable, and to give consumers 'a right to repair' their products. These moves would be threatened by a trade deal. This problem will get bigger as more and more products – from cars, to medical devices, to household appliances – become ever more digital.

3. Limiting our ability to tax Big Tech

Tax avoidance is one of the big problems of our age, and Big Tech companies are particularly adept at avoiding tax because they have traditionally not had to account for user participation in different countries. It's been estimated that seven large US-based technology groups avoided paying roughly £2 billion in UK tax in a single year. The seven paid around £750 million in tax despite having made £15 billion of profit from selling to UK customers in 2021. On a global level, ActionAid calculated that G20 countries faced a potential gap of US$32 billion from just five Big Tech firms in the same year.

To begin to rectify this problem, several countries including the UK now levy a 'digital services tax'. Even at the low rate of 2% this tax raised £567 million in 2023 and there have been calls to raise it substantially. The British government has always said this is a stop gap until an international solution can be found. However, Trump's administration has withdrawn from international tax negotiations and in February 2025 proclaimed that, "Only America should be allowed to tax American firms". Trump has also said he would apply retaliatory tariffs on countries that use digital services taxes.

How a US-UK digital trade deal would make it worse

Trade agreements ban the use of tariffs (border taxes) on digital products, and usually place limits on digital taxes, insisting that they only be introduced 'in a manner consistent with the agreement'. This vague yet binding language gives trade partners a key legal basis to challenge other countries' digital taxes. Given Trump's stated positions on the taxation of American companies, it is clear that Britain's digital service tax would fall foul of trade talks with the US.

4. Creating risks for workers: automation, surveillance and the gig economy

> ***"This revolution will create phenomenal wealth. The price of many kinds of labor (which drives the costs of goods and services) will fall toward zero once sufficiently powerful AI 'joins the workforce'."***
>
> Sam Altman, CEO of OpenAI

As digital technologies advance, including through the ongoing development of AI, these technologies create some jobs but destroy others. The jury is still out as to the aggregate effect on employment, but groups of workers will be affected differently: not everyone who sees their job automated will be in the right place or have the right skills to get a new tech job.

Meanwhile, nearly half a million UK workers work in the gig economy, in roles ranging from taxi drivers and delivery riders to translators, web developers, cleaners and dog walkers, all organised online. Securing proper workers rights such as minimum wages and paid holiday continues to require long court battles in the face of extreme resistance from tech firms such as Uber, TaskRabbit and Helpling.

People working for 'bricks and mortar' employers have also seen their working lives changed by digital technologies, with substantial surveillance of employees when at work or when working from home. Amazon was recently fined by the French government under GDPR data protection laws for excessive surveillance, including the use of an alert system triggered by workers pausing work. In the US, similar surveillance has made it difficult for workers to unionise due to fears that their discussions are being watched.

How a US-UK digital trade deal would make it worse

We've seen how trade rules on services often prevent governments from demanding that corporations set up an office or formal presence within a host country. This makes enforcement of workers' rights much more difficult. As the International Trade Union Confederation explains "without a local presence of companies, there is no entity to sue and the ability of domestic courts to enforce labour standards, as well as other rights, is fundamentally challenged." This also makes it harder to protect workers whose jobs are threatened by automation.

Trade rules also ban governments from demanding to see the coding inside digital products, which would prevent routine examination of workplace surveillance equipment and make it harder to verify what data is being used to drive decisions on pay, promotions and hiring and firing.

5. Closing down options for AI regulation and online safety

Digital trade deals are focused on extreme liberalisation – constraining governments' freedom to regulate. This is a particularly big problem when dealing with new technologies, where we're only just getting to grips with the risks these technologies might pose.

AI uses computer programmes to digest huge quantities of data and then use it to complete complex tasks, which can range from driving cars and diagnosing diseases to writing news articles and manufacturing 'photos'. In March 2023, AI experts and industry insiders wrote an open letter expressing grave concerns about the direction of AI. They began, "AI systems with human-competitive intelligence can pose profound risks to society and humanity, as shown by extensive research." They called for AI to be "managed with commensurate care" rather than the "out-of-control race" which currently characterises the sector. They called for the development of regulatory systems, independent oversight and liability for any harms caused, as well as a pause to further AI development until risks and protections were better understood. Interestingly, Elon Musk was, at the time, a signatory to the letter.

Governments clearly need to take a cautious approach: as the AI experts' letter states, decisions on how we deal with the implications of these technologies "must not be delegated to unelected tech leaders." However, this message has not yet been heeded by either the US or the UK. Trump has rescinded the Biden administration's model for keeping AI safe and responsible. The British government seems worryingly eager to follow Trump's lead, joining the US in refusing to sign a broad international agreement on AI development, while they seem to have put their own plans for regulation of AI on the backburner.

Online safety, especially for children, is a subject of vigorous debate on both sides of the Atlantic, because of the risks posed by online content and communications to children's physical and mental health. In the UK, the GDPR protects citizens' data security, while the Online Safety Act is designed to protect children and adults online.

Many problems have been raised with the way these objectives are achieved – with the Online Safety Act coming in for particular criticism from digital rights groups. But whatever the pros and cons of individual pieces of legislation, we must have the democratic space to debate options and make decisions – not curtail this debate by allowing the Big Tech barons to dictate regulation.

AI is increasingly being used in military applications, where it is making decisions with the most serious consequences imaginable. Although military matters would be excluded from trade talks, Peter Mandleson has been clear that he sees a trade deal as one part of a bigger agreement with the US which would indeed include military technology. Many companies in the tech sector are increasingly engaged in military technology – not least Palantir which currently has the contract to create our NHS data platform, but is also heavily involved with the military, the CIA and immigration deportation in the US. With an increasingly thin line between military and non-military technology, a trade deal would make it harder to reject companies and technologies complicit in human rights abuses.

How a US-UK digital trade deal would make it worse

The US and UK have very different approaches to risk, which are captured in their respective regulatory approaches. Britain generally takes a precautionary approach, which aims to prove that technology is safe before authorising it. The US tends to allow methods unless and until they are proven to be harmful. This explains differences in, for example, food standards in the US and the UK.

In trade talks, governments try to argue that their products are made to 'equal' even if not the same standards as their trading partner, and on that basis can be allowed to enter the other country's market. This process of 'harmonising' standards is often ongoing under trade deals where 'regulatory cooperation' allows for governments to regularly argue for access to new products, often pushed on by corporate lobbyists. But pretending standards are the same when they're not puts downward pressure on both countries – forcing producers to push governments to lower standards if they're to remain competitive in a race to the bottom which can undermine hard-won regulations.

All of this means it will be hard for the UK government to set a high bar on products that incorporate new technologies from the US tech sector.

What 'chlorine chicken' might tell us about the risks of a US-UK deal on AI

'Chlorinated chicken' refers to poultry washed in pathogen reduction treatments such as chlorine dioxide. The problem is what that chlorine is hiding, as it aims to remove bacteria that is accumulated in the chicken over a tortured lifetime. US battery chickens are bred in conditions not allowed in the UK, where they can barely move, cluck or eat, never see sunlight, regularly suffer heart attacks because of their unnatural size, and can be covered in sores. Workers' rights in the US meat industry are often appalling, with chemicals reported to cause "rashes, burns, destruction of the eye tissue, difficulty breathing" and more.

In previous trade talks, the US pressured the UK to accept chlorinated chicken onto supermarket shelves, alongside a host of other unsavoury products. It's true that customers wouldn't be forced to buy these products, but forcing farmers here into competition with those practising lower standards would make higher standards unsustainable.

If the same lax approach to regulation were to be applied to AI development, the risks are significant, as technologies are already being developed "that no one – not even their creators – can understand, predict, or reliably control." A trade deal could block the UK government from properly regulating AI firms and force us to accept products made with technologies which have been deemed unsafe or unacceptable here.

The US is also keen to use trade deals to prevent corporations being held liable for the harms that their technologies cause, for example in earlier US-UK trade negotiations the US was calling for rules to limit online platforms' liability for third-party content. A former British minister has warned that "a major challenge will come from the Trump administration against tech laws like the Online Safety Act… [This challenge] will most likely be made through trade negotiations."

Meanwhile, rules on free data flows would mean that the UK could be locked into allowing the use of our data by US-based AI corporations, even if we decide in the future that the employment, privacy or climate costs of this approach are too high.

6. Reducing space for social, environmental and industrial policy and for democracy

The UK government has expressed a clear desire to develop the UK's digital technology sector. Details as to how this would be achieved are yet to be published, but industrial policies typically involve government support for businesses to help them become competitive. Our government's capacity to provide such support would be severely challenged by a trade deal, as this will likely prohibit the favouring of national and local companies.

Digital technologies are powered by huge amounts of electricity, especially AI. Data centres and transmission networks already represent 2-3% of global electricity use and 1% of greenhouse gas emissions, and this is expected to grow six-fold in just the next ten years. Some studies warn that the AI industry alone could consume as much energy as the Netherlands by 2027. Technological developments might help reduce this – but they might also simply stimulate further demand. Clearly this is a threat to UK climate commitments.

These technologies also require critical minerals such as copper and lithium in their manufacture, exacerbating the need for mining and the social and environmental problems that tend to accompany this. And data centres require substantial amounts of water for cooling, leading to resistance from communities in water-scarce regions.

Finally, democracy relies on people having access to adequate information, and not being actively misled. The media has never done this perfectly, but digital technologies and AI are taking this problem to new levels. Our news feeds are personalised to what we want to hear, AI-created fake content is gaining prominence, and political campaigns micro-target their messages to tap into our darkest fears, leading the UK Electoral Commission to recommend tighter regulation of social media.

How a US-UK digital trade deal would make it worse:

Trade rules usually ban governments from applying limits on the size or types of companies that can operate in a sector, while also making it difficult for governments to support local or not-for-profit service providers. These rules block policy options that governments can use to build their industrial sector, allowing Big Tech to continue closing down competition. Trade rules make it harder for governments to prioritise local suppliers, neutralising another main tool of industrial policy. It would likely become impossible for the government to mandate use of open source software. And digital trade rules that mandate free data flows could mean losing a valuable asset – our citizens' own data – which could rather be used to boost our own digital economy.

Trade deals always prioritise *trade*, enshrining the interests of foreign corporations and investors. Social, environmental, industrial development and democratic goals are not prioritised, and can be made more difficult to achieve by the restrictions on government's ability to act. They open governments to challenge if they introduce environmental or safety regulations that harm foreign companies' profits.

Why we need open-access code to enable the green transition

Imagine the government introduces a scheme to enable petrol-to-electric car conversions. This would require car manufacturers to reveal the source code that controls their past and current car models, so that conversion staff can incorporate new electric engines into the cars. Under the prohibitions on source code disclosure requirements that digital trade deals introduce, the government would not be allowed to demand this disclosure, potentially making it impossible to systematically transition UK car stock away from fossil fuels. This is just one among many examples of occasions on which we might want to access source code for the green transition.

A major benefit of international trade is learning new processes and technologies from others. But a trade deal with the US would certainly close this down. Governments would be unable to demand disclosure of source code for industrial development purposes, while tight intellectual property rules would actively prevent dispersal of technologies, even where those technologies were developed with data extracted here.

Exemptions

Trade deals do carry exemptions which governments can use to avoid many of the rules listed in this briefing in certain circumstances, such as when 'national security' demands it. However, these exemptions are often very tightly drawn, and fail to hold up, for example, in cases of environmental necessity or workers' rights. A 'necessity' test may well be included to further curtail exemptions, under which a government might have to prove that any exemption introduced does not go further than is strictly necessary. This is often hard to prove, and can mean a government underregulates to avoid challenge, placing a chilling effect on regulation.

The US position, and why the UK won't win a good deal

The US's position on digital trade has fluctuated significantly in recent years. Initially, the US was driving forward Big Tech's trade wishlist. But recognising the dangers of that agenda, they made a significant u-turn in 2023. Withdrawing support for Big Tech's demands, a US trade official explained the need to balance trade objectives with "the right to regulate in the public interest and the need to address anticompetitive behavior in the digital economy."

However, amid a surge in lobbying from the Big Tech industry, Trump moved in the opposite direction, loosening controls on AI and weakening data protection. He is now shifting digital trade policy back to its original position. Trump's closeness to the Big Tech titans – like Elon Musk, Mark Zuckerburg and Jeff Bezos – should give particular concern that his administration has put Big Tech interests in the driving seat.

Worse still, both Starmer and Trump have pitched trade talks as a means of avoiding US tariffs, giving Trump something to hold over the UK throughout the talks, ensuring the UK gives the US more than it otherwise might.

There would be problems in negotiating a trade deal like this even without Trump's personal commitment to Big Tech power though. The relative size and power of the US and UK tech industries means the UK will always struggle to make its interests heard in such a deal – just as it risks losing the regulatory battle over food standards in trade talks.

Eight of the top ten tech firms in the world are based in the US, giving them a significant advantage over smaller UK firms which would need to be nurtured rather than opened to direct competition with these monopolies. But free trade deals are about opening markets, not protecting smaller players and regulations. Far from opening up opportunities for the UK to export services to the US, the opposite is far more likely, with the UK's high level of consumption of US-originating digital products becoming even higher, while our purchases of locally-produced digital goods and services would likely decline.

The UK government seems unaware of these risks, and is pushing ahead with the digital trade agenda under the impression that it will promote economic growth, though exactly how it is expected to do so is unclear. Baroness Kidron, an online safety expert, has expressed deep concern saying "They've just said we will do anything, take anything, run roughshod over all our principles, for a bit of growth."

Finally, as a result of Britain's outdated and deeply undemocratic way of negotiating trade deals, there is very little parliamentary or public engagement in the trade talks. Indeed, discussions between the administrations have already commenced, without parliament even holding a debate. No objectives or red lines have been set, no risk assessment carried out, no public consultation undertaken. In such circumstances, getting a deal which embeds the public interest will be impossible.

A socially and globally just approach to digital societies and trade

The proposed US-UK trade deal won't deliver the kind of digital development that would benefit our societies. What we need instead is broader cooperation, with social and environmental goals at the centre, and trade treated as a means rather than an end in itself. That kind of cooperation might include:

- Minimum corporate and wealth tax levels on the industry.
- Minimum standards for workers in the gig economy and others affected by digitalisation.
- Models for sharing digital innovations that would support social justice, development and the green transition.
- Agreements on product design to enable interoperability and repair.
- Models for public control and usage of data collected through public services.
- Minimum standards on online safety, consumer protection, data protection and digital signatures.
- Agreement on a precautionary approach towards AI and other digital technologies.

As we step forward into this new digital world, we need to proceed with caution to ensure that digital technologies benefit people rather than Big Tech. Rather than freedom for corporations to make profits, we need freedom for our governments and regulators to respond to our democratic demands, act in the public interest and more carefully manage our transition into the future.

Take action

Support the fight against corporate power and global inequality – become a member today. Go to globaljustice.org.uk/join

Global Justice Now

Global Justice Now works as part of a global movement to challenge the powerful and create a more just and equal world. Our local activist groups campaign around the country for a global economy where people come before profit.

Global Justice Now, 66 Offley Road, London SW9 0LS
+44 20 7820 4900 • offleyroad@globaljustice.org.uk • globaljustice.org.uk