



Barometer Brand Standard Categories & Definitions

At Barometer, we operationalize and expand upon consensus definitions of the GARM categories as presented in the *GARM Brand Safety Floor & Suitability Framework*. We recognize that podcasts are a unique medium with long, conversational content, which is difficult for humans to parse consistently. As such, our key contribution is to transparently define how to evaluate the risk level of each GARM component specifically in podcasts. Furthermore, our solutions extend far beyond the limited set of GARM categories to meet advertisers and publishers with the nuance required to overcome today’s over-blocking challenges.

To this end, we have developed a rich database of examples of each of these components, at each level of risk, across all of the top shows. We also have developed sophisticated tonal analysis tools that allow us to fingerprint the different tones present in the podcasts, in order to measure for the differences between glamorizing content (high risk), dramatizing content (medium risk) and educational content (low risk)..

Finally, we have intelligent topic modeling about a large set of debated sensitive social issues (listed here) based on signals from both podcasts as well as news content. This allows us to truly contextualize the podcast contents in broader culture, taking into account everything from the subject matter to the posturing between the podcast host and guest(s).

Now we will discuss each component of the Barometer Brand Standard Framework in detail. We will provide the GARM definitions for each risk level (if applicable), the contextualized definition for podcasts, and the range of output scores operationalizing each level of risk.

GARM 1: Adult/Explicit Content

We measure for Adult/Explicit content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any adult content at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no adult content detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If adult content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| GARM Definition | Suggestive sexual situation requiring adult supervision/ | Sexuality issues presented in the context of entertainment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education, |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | approval or warning Full or liberal Nudity | | Informati ve, scientific treatme nt of sexual subjects or sexual relations hips or sexuality |
| Definition Contextualiz ed for Podcasts | Discussions that glamorize adult or sexual situations | Sexuality discussions presented in the context of entertainment For example dramatic discussions of sexuality related topics such as:ou <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impotence • Lack of sexual desire • Anxiety or uncertainty about sexual orientation • Conflicting sexual desires between partners • Recovery from sexual abuse or assault • Loneliness • Body image issues • Sexual impulses or compulsions that cause distress • Promiscuous behavior | Informative discussions of topics relating to sexuality |
| Composite Score | 0-30 | 30-70 | 70+ |

Arms & Ammunition

We measure for Arms and Ammunition content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any arms & ammunition related material at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to arms and ammunition detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If arms and ammunition related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in

combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|--|--|---|--|
| GARM Definition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glamorization /Gratuitous depiction of illegal sale or possession of Arms • Depictions of sale/use/distribution of illegal arms for inappropriate uses/harmful acts | Dramatic discussions of weapons use presented in the context of entertainment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of arms and ammunition | Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of Arms use, possession or illegal sale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • News feature stories on the subject |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Content glamorizing of illegal sale or possession of arms or glamorizing depictions of the same | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about arms and ammunition related subjects including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gun violence • Gun safety • Gun rights | Educational/informative and news feature stories about arms and ammunition |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

hi

Crime & Harmful acts to individuals and Society, Human Right Violations

We measure for crime, harmful acts and human rights violations related content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any crime and harmful acts related discussion at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to arms and ammunition detected, the score “no risk” is assigned. We developed our model of crime and harmful acts related topics through detailed research of government websites and international guidance including the UN Declaration of Human Rights.
2. If crime related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the GARM definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|--|---|---|--|
| GARM Definition | Depictions of criminal /harmful acts or violation of human rights | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of criminal activity or human rights violations presented in the context of entertainment • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of criminal activity or human rights violations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of crime or criminal acts or human rights violations • News feature stories on the subject |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Content glamorizing or depicting of criminal /harmful acts or violation of human rights | Dramatic discussions of criminal activity or human rights violations presented in the context of entertainment, breaking news or op-ed | Educational/informative and news feature stories about criminal acts and human rights violations. |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Death, Injury or Military Conflict

We measure for Death, Injury or Military Conflict related content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any mention of death, injury, or military conflict at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to arms and ammunition detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If death, injury and military conflict related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| GARM Definition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depiction of death or Injury • Insensitive and irresponsible treatment of military conflict, genocide, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of death, injury, or military conflict presented in the context of entertainment • Breaking News or Op-Ed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of death or injury, or military conflict • News feature stories |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | war crimes, or harm resulting in Death or Injury • Depictions of military actions that glamorize harmful acts to others or society | coverage of death, injury or military conflict | on the subject |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Content glamorizing of death, injury and/or military conflict. | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about death, injury and/or military conflict | Educational/informative and news feature stories about death, injury and/or military conflict |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Online Piracy and Spam or Harmful Content

We combine the measurement of Online Piracy and Spam content using a single two step process. We chose to combine them because there were no significant distinctions between the topics associated with Online Piracy and Spam or Harmful Content.

1. First, we characterize whether there is any discussion of topics related to Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no such content detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| Risk Level | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| GARM Definition | Glamorization /Gratuitous depiction of Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of Online piracy, Spam or Malware presented in the context of entertainment • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of Spam or Malware | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of Spam or Malware • News feature stories on the subject |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Content glamorizing of Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic or breaking news/ op-ed discussions of Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content • Op-Ed on current events about Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content | News features about or Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of Online Piracy, Spam or harmful content |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-59 | 60 + |

Hate speech & acts of aggression

We measure for hate speech & acts of aggression related content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any mention of hate speech and/or acts of aggression at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to hate speech and/or acts of aggression detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If hate speech or acts of aggression related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| GARM Definition | • Depiction or portrayal of hateful, denigrating, or inciting content focused on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, ability, nationality, religion, caste, victims and survivors of violent acts and their kin, immigration status or serious disease sufferers, in a noneducational, informational, or scientific context | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of hate speech/acts presented in the context of entertainment • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of hate speech/act | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of Hate Speech • News features on the subject |
| Definition Contextualized for | Aggression, hateful or inciting discussion focused on immutable identify | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about hate speech and/or | Educational/informative content describing hate speech and/or |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|------------|
| Podcasts | characteristics. | aggression. | aggression |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Obscenity & Profanity

We measure for profanity and obscenity in a two-step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any profanity or obscene content at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no profane or obscene content detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If obscene and profane content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| Risk Level | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|--|---|--|--|
| GARM Definition | Glamorization/ Gratuitous depiction of profanity and obscenity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of profanity and obscenities presented in the context of entertainment by genre • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of • profanity and obscenities Genre based use of profanity, gestures, and other actions that may be strong, but might be expected as generally | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational or Informative, treatment of Obscenity or Profanity • News feature stories on the subject |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Gratuitous and glamorizing use of profanity and obscenity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describing dramatic event or dramatizing a event using profanity • Op-Ed on current events featuring profanity | Education or news on obscenity and profanity |
| Composite Score | 0-40 | 40-80 | 80 + |

Illegal Drugs/Tobacco/e-cigarettes/Vaping/Alcohol

1. First, we characterize whether there is any content relating to drugs or alcohol at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no such content detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If drug or alcohol related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| Risk Level | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|--|--|---|--|
| GARM Definition | <p>Glamorization /Gratuitous depictions of illegal drugs/abuse of prescription drugs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insensitive and irresponsible content/treatment that encourages minors to use tobacco and vaping products & Alcohol | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of illegal drug use/prescription abuse, tobacco, vaping or alcohol use presented in the context of entertainment • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of illegal drug use/prescription abuse, tobacco, vaping or alcohol use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of illegal drug use/prescription abuse, tobacco, vaping or alcohol • News feature stories on |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | <p>Content glamorizing of illegal drugs and abuse of drugs</p> <p>Content glamorizing minors’ using drugs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic or breaking news/ op-ed discussions of illegal drugs/drug abuse • Op-Ed on current events about minors using drugs or illegal drug use | <p>Feature news stories on or Educational, Informative, Scientific treatment of illegal drug use/prescription abuse, tobacco, vaping or alcohol</p> |
| Composite Score | 0-25 | 26-59 | 60 + |

Terrorism

We measure for terrorism related content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any mention of terrorism at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to terrorism detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If terrorism related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are



high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|--|---|---|--|
| GARM Definition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depiction of terrorist actions that are disturbing, agitating or promotes harmful acts to others or society • Terrorist content requiring a viewer advisory/related crimes • Insensitive and irresponsible treatment of terrorism/ related crimes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dramatic depiction of terrorism presented in the context of entertainment • Breaking News or Op-Ed coverage of acts of terrorism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational, Informative, scientific treatment of terrorism • News feature stories on the subject |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Discussion of terrorist activity are insensitive, irresponsible, and may require listener advisory | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about terrorism. | Educational/informative content describing terrorism. |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Natural Disasters

We measure for natural disaster related content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any mention of natural disasters at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to natural disasters detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If discussion of natural disasters or related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the Barometer definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| GARM Definition | N/A not addressed by GARM | N/A not addressed by GARM | N/A not addressed by GARM |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Discussion of natural disasters that are disturbing, agitating, insensitive, irresponsible, and may require listener advisory | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about natural disasters. | Educational/informative content describing natural disasters. |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Gambling

1. First, we characterize whether there is any mention of gambling at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to gambling detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If discussion of gambling or related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
| GARM Definition | N/A not addressed by GARM | N/A not addressed by GARM | N/A not addressed by GARM |
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Discussion of gambling that are disturbing, agitating, insensitive, irresponsible, and may require listener advisory | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about gambling. | Educational/informative content describing gambling. |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Occult

We measure for occult related content using a two step process:

1. First, we characterize whether there is any mention of the occult at all in a particular piece of content. If there is no content related to the occult detected, the score “no risk” is assigned.
2. If discussion of the occult or related content is present, we must determine the risk level. We then use the definition contextualized for podcasts to classify whether the issues discussed are high, medium or low risk. Finally, we look at the tone. This final step is used, in combination with the topic classification, to ultimately provide a score of high, medium, or low risk.

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| GARM Risk | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low risk |
| GARM Definition | N/A not addressed by GARM | N/A not addressed by GARM | N/A not addressed by GARM |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Definition Contextualized for Podcasts | Discussion of the occult that are disturbing, agitating, insensitive, irresponsible, and may require listener advisory | Dramatic discussions of and breaking news about the occult. | Educational/informative content describing the occult. |
| Composite Score | 0-39 | 40-60 | 60+ |

Debated Sensitive Social issues

We have a three-phased approach identifying debated sensitive social issues (DSSI) in podcast content. We acknowledge that the DSSI we are measuring are primarily relevant to the English speakers in the United States. In the first phase, available now, we are looking for the presence of the DSSI listed [here](#). Similarly to the other components, we first identified transcripts that mentioned debated sensitive social issues, and then did an analysis to understand the level of risk based on the following definitions:

| | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| GARM Definition | Depiction or discussion of debated sensitive social issues and related acts in negative or partisan context | Dramatic depiction of debated social issues presented in the context of entertainment. Breaking news or Op-Ed coverage of partisan advocacy of a position on debated sensitive social issues | Educational, informative, scientific treatment of debated sensitive social issues and related acts. News feature stories on the subject. |
| Barometer Phase III | Content that is partisan or negative in discussions of debated sensitive social issues from Phase III list | Op-ed, breaking news and entertainment discussions of debated sensitive social issues. | Educational content. |

This initial set of DSSI was selected after synthesizing the most polarizing DSSI in the USA based on research from the Pew Charitable Trust (cite). In the next phase, we will be dynamically expanding the list of issues we are listening for by incorporating a live-news-reader responsible for capturing new or trending topics and relating them to the existing topic models. In the final phase, we will implement a time variable that will allow us to identify debated sensitive social issues as they enter and leave the discourse, and focus on the most current issues at hand.



Coming soon: Elections! (US & GLOBAL!)