

# Public survey for European Democracy Action plan

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

The Commission's Political Guidelines announced a European Democracy Action Plan under the headline ambition of a new push for European Democracy. The Commission intends to present the Action Plan towards the end of 2020.

The aim of the European Democracy Action Plan is to ensure that citizens are able to participate in the democratic system through informed decision-making free from interference and manipulation affecting elections and the democratic debate.

The Commission has started the preparation of the European Democracy Action Plan and would like to consult the public on three key themes:

- Election integrity and how to ensure electoral systems are free and fair;
- Strengthening media freedom and media pluralism;
- Tackling disinformation.

In addition, the consultation also covers the crosscutting issue of supporting civil society and active citizenship.

When providing your contribution, you may opt to fill in one or more of the four sections, according to their relevance to your areas of interest. Please note that a specific public consultation on the Digital Services Act package is open until 8 September 2020 and covers also elements relevant in the context of the European Democracy Action Plan.[1]

[1] <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/consultation-digital-services-act-package>

## About you

---

### \* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish

- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

\* First name

Nathalie

\* Surname

Bargues

\* Email (this won't be published)

nathalie.bargues@euractiv.com

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

Fondation EURACTIV Europe's MediaLab

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

\* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |                                      |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan    | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya         | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands  | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania        | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria        | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau         | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |

- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- São Tomé and Príncipe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
  
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
  
- Cambodia
  
- Cameroon
  
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
  
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
  
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
  
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
  
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
  
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
  
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
  
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States

- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

### \* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

**Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

**Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## Questions on election integrity and political advertising

---

Fair democratic debates and electoral campaigns as well as free and fair elections in all Member States are at the core of our democracies. The space for public debate and electoral campaigns has evolved rapidly and fundamentally, with many activities taking place online. This brings opportunities for the democratic process, public participation and citizen outreach but also challenges, inter alia concerning the transparency of political advertising online and possible threats to the integrity of elections. Ahead of the 2024 European Parliament elections, changes to the role of European political parties might also be considered.

### (i) Transparency of political advertising

Q1 Have you ever been targeted<sup>[2]</sup> with online content that related to political or social issues, political parties (European or national), political programmes, candidates, or ideas within or outside electoral periods ('targeted political content')?

[2] Paid for ads and any form of personalised content promoted to the user

- 1. No, never
- 2. Yes, once
- 3. Yes, several times
- 4. I don't know

Q2. If you receive such targeted political content, are you checking who is behind it, who paid for it and why you are seeing it?

- 1. No, I am not interested
- 2. I don't know how to do it
- 3. Yes, occasionally
- 4. Yes, all the time
- 5. I don't receive targeted political content

Q3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements related to targeted political content you have seen online?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply
--	-------------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------------	------------------------

1. Targeted content was labelled in a clear manner	<input type="radio"/>					
2. It was easy to distinguish paid for targeted content from organic content	<input type="radio"/>					
3. It was easy to identify the party or the candidate behind the content	<input type="radio"/>					
4. The content included information on who paid for it	<input type="radio"/>					
5. The information provided with the content included targeting criteria	<input type="radio"/>					
6. The ad was linked to a database of targeted political content	<input type="radio"/>					
7. The targeted political content offered the possibility to report it to the platform	<input type="radio"/>					

Q4. Which of the following initiatives/actions would be important for you as a target of political content?

	Not at all	A little	Neither a lot nor a little	A lot	Absolutely	Don't know
1. Disclosure rules (transparency on the origin of political content)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Limitation of micro-targeting of political content, including based on sensitive criteria, and in respect of data protection rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Creation of open and transparent political advertisements archives and registries that show all the targeted political content, as well as data on who paid for it and how much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Political parties to disclose their campaign finances broken down by media outlet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Prohibit foreign online targeted political content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Prohibit online targeted political content altogether	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Rules limiting targeted political content on the election day and just before	<input type="radio"/>					
8. Other	<input type="radio"/>					

Q5. Online targeted political content may make use of micro-targeting techniques allowing advertisers to target with high precision people living in a specific location, of a certain age, ethnicity, sexual orientation or with very specific interests. Do you think that:

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply
1. Micro-targeting is acceptable for online political content and it should not be limited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Criteria for micro-targeting of political content should be publicly disclosed in a clear and transparent way for every ad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Micro-targeting criteria should be strictly limited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Micro-targeting criteria should be banned	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain

General remark: Micro targeting always comes with a cost. The more detailed someone micro targets, the more expensive such micro targeting will be. Transparency and accountability are essential.

Q6. EU countries regulate offline political advertising on traditional media (e.g. press, television) in the context of local, national or EU elections. These rules limit the amount of airtime or maximum expenditure permitted for political advertising on broadcast TV or print media. Do you think similar rules should also apply to online targeted political content?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. I don't know

Please explain your answer

(ii) Threats to electoral integrity

Q1. Do you believe the following are real and existing threats to the electoral process in the EU and its Member States?

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Intimidation of minorities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Intimidation of political opposition	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Micro-targeting of political messages, that is messages targeted to you or a narrowly defined group	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Information suppression, that is the purposeful lack of information on a topic	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Disinformation or fake accounts run by governments, including foreign governments	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Divisive content, that is content created to divide society on an issue	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. The amplification of content that makes it difficult for you to encounter differing voices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Intimidation of women candidates	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I or someone I know has been targeted based on sensitive criteria such as gender, ethnicity or sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Content where I could not easily determine whether it was an advertisement or a news post	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[IF Q1=11: Please define]

Obscure party funding; increase in Russian propaganda: Russia's actions in the field of online propaganda and fake news have long been in the crosshairs of the Commission, particularly the activities of Russia's Internet Research Agency. Indeed the scope of disinformation now extends to China. But it's easy to only "blame the foreigners". Disinformation and populism go hand-in-hand, on a domestic basis. This is a key factor for Brexit, and for worries in Italy and several Central European countries.

In all these cases - outside or domestic disinformation campaigns, the main drive is to divide, to break the consensus on shared values. European integration suffers, but that is not new, now what is at stake is democracy itself.

Q1.1 IF Q1=YES for any answer option

- 1. Have you felt personally intimidated/threatened by targeted political content?
- 2. Could you tell us more about your experience?

Please explain your answer

(iii) European Political Parties:

Q1. Is there scope to further give a stronger European component to the future campaigns for EU elections? Please list initiatives important to you in this regard

	Not at all	A little	Neither a lot nor a little	A lot	Absolutely	Don't know
1. Better highlighting the links between the national and European Political Parties, for example by displaying both names on ballot papers and in targeted political content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. More transparency on financing (e.g. information about how much national parties contribute yearly to the European Political Parties budgets)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Bigger budgets for European Political Parties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Strengthening the European campaigns by European Political Parties in Member States	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Better explaining the role of European Political Parties in the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain

(iv) European Elections

Q1. In your opinion what initiatives at national level could strengthen monitoring and enforcement of electoral rules and support the integrity of European elections (multiple selections possible)?

- 1. Strengthened sharing of information and monitoring activity across borders and between authorities
- 2. Technical interfaces to display all political advertisements as defined by online service providers
- 3. Technical interfaces to display all advertisements (political or not)
- 4. Clear rules for delivery of political ads online in electoral periods, similarly to those that exist in traditional media (TV, radio and press)
- 5. Independent oversight bodies with powers to investigate reported irregularities
- 6. Enhanced reporting obligations (e.g. to national electoral management bodies) on advertisers in a campaign period
- 7. Enhanced transparency of measures taken by online platforms in the context of elections, as well as meaningful transparency of algorithmic systems involved in the recommendation of content
- 8. Privacy-compliant access to platform data for researchers to better understand the impact of the online advertisement ecosystem on the integrity of democratic processes
- 9. Greater convergence of certain national provisions during European elections
- 10. Stronger protection against cyber attacks
- 11. Higher sanctions for breaches of the electoral rules
- 12. Other – please specify

Please explain your answer

Q2. In your opinion what initiatives at European level could strengthen monitoring and enforcement of rules relevant to the electoral context?

- 1. Strengthened sharing of information and monitoring activity across borders and between authorities
- 2. European-level obligations on political advertising service providers
- 3. European-level shared online monitoring and analysis capability being made appropriately available to national authorities
- 4. Cross border recognition of certain national provisions
- 5. Other

Please explain your answer

## Questions on strengthening media freedom and media pluralism

---

Freedom of expression and freedom and pluralism of the media are enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Article 11), and their protection is underpinned by Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. They are essential elements of a healthy democratic system. Whilst in general the EU and its Member States score well on a global scale, there are signs of deterioration (as shown by the Media Pluralism Monitor) and the sector is facing challenges from threats to the safety of journalists (including strategic lawsuits against public participation – ‘SLAPP lawsuits’) to the transformation of the sector, with digital technologies and new players transforming the established business model of advertising revenue. The COVID-19 pandemic has worsened the situation, both in the EU and outside of the EU, from restrictive national legislation to critical loss of revenues for the media sector.

Initiatives to strengthen media freedom and media pluralism will build in particular on the analysis and areas covered by the upcoming Rule of Law Report, with a focus on improving the protection of journalists, their rights and working conditions. Please note that the Commission also intends to propose, by the end of the year, an Action Plan for the Media and Audiovisual sector to further support the digital transformation and the competitiveness of the media and audiovisual sectors and to stimulate access to quality content and media pluralism.

### (i) Safety of journalists / conditions for journalistic activities

Q1. Are you aware of issues regarding safety of journalists and other media actors or conditions for journalistic activities in your country?

- 1. Yes (please justify)
- 2. No (please justify)
- 3. I do not know

Please explain your answer

Belgian journalist Florence Hainaut has been the target of an online harassment campaign following the publication on 18 July 2020 of an opinion piece about wearing of the Islamic headscarf on the website of "Le Soir" newspaper. Dozens of insulting and defamatory comments targeting the journalist were posted on the social networks Facebook and Twitter. The Facebook profile Laplume Kalam, the collective page of an organisation that brands itself "The Observatory of Fundamentalisms in Brussels", posted messages accusing the journalist of "having links with political Islam or anti-democratic fundamentalist movements" and of having fallen "into the arms of the Muslim Brotherhood". Florence Hainaut is considering legal action. She has consulted the Fem&L.A.W. collective for advice and guidance on this matter.

-Tanja Milevska, a Brussels correspondent for the North Macedonia news agency MIA, is facing online harassment, including threats of physical and sexual violence.

-EUobserver under Threat of Legal Action in Belgium after Complaint was Dismissed in Luxembourg (SLAPP)

### Q1.1 If yes, what kind of issue?

- 1. Lack of proper sanction applied to perpetrators of attacks against journalists– Yes/No
- 2. Abuse of defamation laws or other laws aiming at silencing journalists and news media – Yes/No
- 3. Lack of legal safeguards for journalistic activities – Yes/No
- 4. Lack of institutions to protect journalists – Yes/No
- 5. Online hate speech – Yes/No
- 6. Cyberbullying – Yes/No
- 7. Physical threats – Yes/No
- 8. Other – please specify

Please explain your answer

e.g Malta

### Q2. Are you familiar with the concept of 'strategic lawsuits against public participation' (SLAPPs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

### Q2.1 If yes, are you aware of such lawsuits in your own Member State?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Please explain your answer

Q3. In your opinion, on which SLAPP related aspects should the European Union-level action be taken (multiple answers possible):

- 1. Regular monitoring of SLAPP cases in the European Union
- 2. Financial support for journalists facing SLAPP lawsuits
- 3. Rules on legal aid for journalists facing SLAPP lawsuits
- 4. Cross-border cooperation to raise awareness and share strategies and good practices in fighting SLAPP lawsuits
- 5. EU rules on cross-border jurisdiction and applicable law
- 6. None of the above
- 7. Other – please specify

Please explain your answer

Anti-SLAPP directive, the reform of Brussels I and Rome II Regulation: Brussels I Regulation (recast) contains rules which grant claimants the ability to choose where to make a claim. This must be amended to end forum shopping in defamation cases, which forces defendants to hire and pay for defence in countries whose legal systems are unknown to them and where they are not based. This is beyond the means of most and falls foul of the principles of fair trial and equality of arms. Rome II Regulation does not regulate which national law will apply to a defamation case. This allows claimants to select the most favourable substantive law and therefore leads to a race to the bottom. Today, victims may be subject to the lowest standard of freedom of expression applicable to their case.

Support all victims of SLAPPs: funds are needed to morally and financially support all victims of SLAPPs, especially with legal defence. Justice Programme funds should be used to train judges and practitioners, and a system to publicly name and shame the companies that engage in SLAPPs, for example in an EU register, should be created.

Q4. Do you think that the EU should act to strengthen safety of journalists and other media actors / improve conditions for journalistic activities?

- 1. Yes (please justify)
- 2. No (please justify)
- 3. I do not know

Please explain your answer

Money to support the media sector under Creative Europe in the MFF is not enough: Creative Europe's financial envelope under the MFF will be EUR 1 642 million, only 7% more than in the original proposal. Horizon Europe is allocated €13.5 billion less than was last proposed by the European Commission, with €5 billion cut from the programme allocation in the MFF and €8.5 billion removed to pay towards the Next Generation EU recovery programme.

Q4.1 If yes, how?

- 1. By issuing guidance – Yes/No
- 2. By setting up dedicated structured dialogue with Member States – Yes/No
- 3. By providing financial support – Yes/No
- 4. Other – please specify

Please explain your answer

Money to support the media sector under Creative Europe in the MFF is not enough: Creative Europe's financial envelope under the MFF will be EUR 1 642 million, only 7% more than in the original proposal. Horizon Europe is allocated €13.5 billion less than was last proposed by the European Commission, with €5 billion cut from the programme allocation in the MFF and €8.5 billion removed to pay towards the Next Generation EU recovery programme.

Q5. Are you aware of any issues regarding the protection of journalistic sources in your country?

- 1. Yes (please provide concrete examples)
- 2. No
- 3. I do not know

Please explain your answer

There are many issues in Eastern Europe

Q6. Are you aware of any difficulties that journalists are facing when they need access information / documents held by public authorities and bodies in your country?

- 1. Yes (please provide concrete examples)
- 2. No
- 3. I do not know

Please explain your answer

(ii) Media independence and transparency

Q1. How would you characterise the situation with regards to independence of media and journalism in your country?

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a great extent	Don't know
1. The government controls or exerts pressure on media outlets	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Powerful commercial actors control or influence editorial policy of media outlets	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Journalists are afraid of losing their job or of other consequences and avoid voicing critical opinions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. News media, in particular public broadcasters, provide balanced and representative information, presenting different views, particularly in times of electoral campaigns	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2. How important is the support for independent journalism (including free lance journalists and bloggers/web journalists) and the protection of the safety of independent journalists to supporting democracy in the EU and internationally?

- 1. Very important
- 2. Important
- 3. Not important
- 4. Don't know

Q3. Do you feel sufficiently informed about the ownership of the media outlets you are consulting?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (please explain)
- 3. I do not know

Please explain

Q4. Should it be mandatory for all media outlets and companies to publish detailed information about their ownership on their website?

- 1. Yes (please explain)
- 2. No (please explain)
- 3. I do not know

Please explain

Q5. Should content by state-controlled media, where governments have direct control over editorial lines and funding, carry specific labels for citizens?

- 1. Yes (please explain)
- 2. No (please explain)
- 3. I do not know

Please explain

State controlled media is a problem in itself. For any democracy separation of powers / Checks and balances is essential. Independences from (direct) state influence should be the rule. If this is not possible, at least a specific label should be applied. Trust Indicators for all.

Q6. Do you think information from independent media and trustworthy sources should be promoted on online intermediary services (such as search engines, social media, and aggregators)?

- 1. Yes (please explain)
- 2. If yes, please give examples of how it could be achieved and how to distinguish sources to be promoted?
- 3. No (please explain)
- 4. I do not know

Please explain

via Trust indicators

Q7. Do you think further laws or institutions should be put in place in your country to strengthen media independence and transparency in any of the following areas?

- 1. Transparency of state advertising and state support to news media / journalism – Yes/No
- 2. Transparency of media ownership – Yes/No
- 3. Promotion of information from independent media and trustworthy sources– Yes/No
- 4. Ownership limitations of commercial actors – Yes/No
- 5. Ownership limitations of political actors – Yes/No
- 6. Rules to prevent foreign (extra-EU) based manipulative and hate-spreading websites from operating in the EU - Yes/No
- 7. Other – please specify

- 8. No, what is in place is sufficient
- 9. No
- 10. I do not know

Please explain your answer

We recommend media funds to support quality news and fight disinformation: To be set-up where they do not exist yet. France's aides à la presse, for example, use objective criteria and respect media independence. At the EU level, have an independent media board assess open calls on fighting disinformation, related to coronavirus or future major issues. Advertising is a fast and respectful way to feed the media, channeling money through objective channels and contracts. Unlike some subsidies, it does not interfere with editorial freedom. Massive public information campaigns (not Google ads) would sustain public trust in politics, and journalism too. In Europe, Newspaper advertising amounts to around 12 billion euros a year. Some order of magnitude: if one assumes losing one third this year, the shortfall would be 4 billion euros; the Commission and the Parliament could spend half of it, 2 billion euros, and encourage governments to spend as much. At EU level, that money could come from re-allocations, while at national level, it could be part of the economic recovery plan already decided.

Q8. Do you think that the EU should act to strengthen media independence and transparency in any of the following areas? (Multiple answers possible)

- 1. Transparency of state advertising and state support to news media / journalism – Yes/No
- 2. Transparency of media ownership – Yes/No
- 3. Promotion of information from independent media and trustworthy sources – Yes/No
- 4. Ownership limitations of commercial actors – Yes/No
- 5. Ownership limitations of political actors – Yes/No
- 6. Other – please specify
- 7. No
- 8. I don't know

Please explain your answer

Q9. If you answered yes to some of the options of the previous question, how should the EU act in these areas?

- 1. By issuing guidance – Yes/No
- 2. By setting up dedicated structured dialogue with Member States – Yes/No
- 3. By providing financial support – Yes/No

- 4. By adopting legislation – Yes/No
- 5. Other – please specify

Please explain your answer

Q10. EU countries have rules applying to media content such as news or current affairs, in general (e.g. rules on editorial independence, objectivity/impartiality), and in particular during elections (rules on scheduling and the balance of the programmes, moratoria on political campaign activity, opinion polls). Do you think similar rules should apply online?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. I don't know

Please explain your reply.

These rules have been put in place for very good reasons in the aftermath of the experiences of use of mass media during dictatorial regimes in Europe in the last century. Today, power and influence of online dissemination is at least as significant as linear. Therefore the same reasoning should apply to online.

Q11. Should the role of and cooperation between EU media regulators in overseeing respect for such standards, offline and online, be reinforced?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. I don't know

Please explain your reply.

Yes, Online is by definition crossborder, so in order to have an as homogeneous set up as possible across Europe, cooperation should be reinforced.

(iii) Cross-border cooperation, media and press councils, self-regulation

Q1. Are you aware of the existence of a press or media council or another media self/co-regulation body supervising journalistic ethical standards and conduct in your country?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Q1.1 If yes, what are the main activities of a press or media council or another media self/co-regulation body in your country?

- 1. Please specify
- 2. I do not know

Please explain your answer

Q1.2 Do you think press or media councils should be established in all EU countries?

- 1. Yes (please explain)
- 2. No (please explain)

Please explain

Q1.3 In order to address the challenges in the media sector, which activities should be prioritised by press and media councils or other media self/co-regulation bodies?

- 1. Incentivising exchanges of best practices and promoting journalistic standards, in particular online – Yes/No
- 2. Providing support for journalists in the process of digitalisation of media sector – Yes/No
- 3. Ensuring effective complaints handling mechanisms – Yes/No
- 4. Establishing links between journalists and citizens to increase trust – Yes/No
- 5. Contributing to the fight against disinformation online – Yes/No
- 6. Other - please specify

Please explain your answer

Q2. What role, if any, should the EU play to facilitate cross-border cooperation?

- 1. Provide financial support to media councils or other media self/co-regulation bodies – Yes/No
- 2. Set up an EU-level coordination network – Yes/No
- 3. Promote citizens' awareness about their activities – Yes/No

- 4. Other (please specify)
- 5. No role

Please explain your answer

## Questions on tackling disinformation

---

Designed to intentionally deceive citizens and manipulate our information space, disinformation undermines the ability of citizens to form informed opinions. Disinformation can also be a tool for manipulative interference by external actors.

(i) Scope

Q1. The April 2018 Commission Communication on Tackling online disinformation: a European Approach defines disinformation as verifiably false or misleading information that is created, presented and disseminated for economic gain or to intentionally deceive the public, and may cause public harm.[4]

Do you think this definition should be broadened and complemented to distinguish between different aspects of the problem?

[4] Public harm includes threats to democratic processes as well as to public goods such as Union citizens' health, environment or security. Disinformation does not include inadvertent errors, satire and parody, or clearly identified partisan news and commentary.

- 1. Yes (please specify)
- 2. No (please specify)
- 3. Don't know

Please explain your answer

Christophe Leclercq, founder of EURACTIV: "In the High Level Expert Group on disinformation, we spent a lot of time on definitions, even renaming our group's name which was indeed about fake news. As a very minor academic myself (Associate Professor at Université libre de Bruxelles), I will not contribute new terminology on this.

Disinformation is the right concept, and fake news will continue to be used as short-hand.

Where I think definition work is required is on future policies, for example the definitions of systemic platforms, and the policies to keep them in order, notably asymmetric regulation (level-playing field is often an excuse for doing nothing) and ex-ante competition analysis".

Q2. So far, the European Commission has addressed the spread of disinformation through a self-regulatory approach, which has resulted in a Code of Practice on Disinformation being subscribed by major online platforms and trade associations representing the advertising industry. Do you think that this approach should be:[5]

[5] This question complements the questionnaire for the public consultation on the Digital Services Act, which focuses on illegal content

- 1. Continued as it is currently pursued (status quo)
- 2. Pursued but enlarged to a wider range of signatories
- 3. Pursued but combined with a permanent monitoring and reporting programme
- 4. Pursued but on the basis of a substantially reviewed Code of Practice
- 5. Pursued but accompanied by a regulatory framework fixing basic requirements for content moderation, data access and transparency, as well as respective oversight mechanisms
- 6. Pursued but accompanied by a regulatory package fixing overarching principles applicable to all information society services and establishing more detailed rules for dealing with disinformation under such general principles
- 7. Replaced by special regulation on disinformation
- 8. abandoned altogether, as all forms of restriction or control on content posted online by internet users and which is not illegal in nature (e.g. illegal hate speech, incitement to terrorism) could endanger freedom of speech
- 9. Other (please explain)

Please explain your answer

The EU's rapid alert system, set up in March 2019, allows member states to alert one another on disinformation threats in real time.

Several organisations have come to identical conclusions concerning the Code of Practice. The code, launched in 2018, is part of the action plan against disinformation and encourages major platforms to carry out certain measures such as disrupting advertising revenues from companies that spread disinformation, making political advertising more transparent, and tackling fake accounts and online bots. Some of them are present on the Sounding Board established at the same time as the Code of Practice. The instrument, while initiating an important dialogue and assessment period, has shown to be inadequate to address the source and drivers of disinformation propagated online as foreseen in the Sounding Board's assessment of the Code of Practice. In the context of Covid-19, online disinformation has thrived, having a devastating impact on public health efforts. Fortunately, at the same time, the readership of quality media boomed: one can see where reliable information is found.

A coalition of EU member states called the self-regulatory framework currently in place "insufficient and unsuitable." The position paper, signed by Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovakia, came ahead of an announcement by the European Commission on 10 June on how they will seek to stamp out the threat of disinformation in the context of the coronavirus outbreak. "The experiences of recent months, as well as the results of the recently published independent assessments of the Code (which find partial success, at best), make it obvious that it is insufficient and unsuitable to serve as the basis for sustainably addressing disinformation on social platforms".

A study on the code of practice hit out at the self-regulatory nature of the framework, suggesting that "sanctions and redress mechanisms" should be put into place to ensure compliance. The study, published at the beginning of May by the Valdani, Vicari and Associates (VVA) consultancy firm, noted a number of shortfalls in the executive's approach to stifling the spread of fake news online. The voluntary and self-regulatory nature of the agreement makes it difficult for the platforms to be held to account for breaches in the code, the study states. "A mechanism for action in case of non-compliance of the (insufficient) implementation of the commitments that platforms signed up to, could be considered to enhance the credibility of the agreement," the report finds. "To that effect, the Commission should consider proposals for co-regulation within which appropriate enforcement mechanisms, sanctions and redress mechanisms should be established."

ERGA's opinion: "there is a need for greater transparency about how the signatories are implementing the Code. The Code relies on self-reporting but lacks a mechanism through which the information from these reports can be independently verified. The information provided by the platforms is generally aggregated for the whole EU, which makes it difficult to evaluate the impact of the Code across the EU. This difficulty is amplified at a national level where language, societal and cultural factors make it the most relevant sphere for monitoring the impact and effectiveness of the Code. Secondly, the measures of the Code are too general in terms of content and structure. To some extent, this is caused by the character of the instrument and, therefore, understandable. However, it provides space for the signatories to implement measures only partially or, in some cases, not at all. There is also a lack of uniformity in the procedures (and the definitions) adopted by the different platforms. Thirdly, the number of signatories of the Code is limited. To improve the existing model of the Code points toward a more structured form of regulation. To this effect, a shift from the current flexible self-regulatory approach to a more co-regulatory one would be required. Such a system would involve the evolution of the current self-regulatory Code to provide for more consistency in its formulation and in its implementation and the introduction of a formal backstop mechanism to deliver the required monitoring and enforcement elements. This should include a mechanism to incentivise industry players to take part in a self (or co)-regulatory structure. The ERGA experience in 2019 indicates that the effective development and implementation of the Code requires such a framework. To achieve this, operative rules should be put in place. These should consist of clear reporting obligations, more harmonised procedures and appropriate timeframes

Q3. Have you ever encountered the following measures to reduce the spread of disinformation on social media platforms?

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Alerts when attempting to share or publish content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Notifications to users who have previously engaged with content or sites that have failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Clear labels above content or sites that have failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Mechanisms allowing you to report disinformation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3.1 If yes, on which platforms have you encountered this?

- 1. Google
- 2. Facebook
- 3. Twitter
- 4. YouTube
- 5. WhatsApp
- 6. Other (Please specify)

Please explain your answer

(ii) Disrupting the economic drivers for disinformation

Q1. What type of measures should online platforms and advertising networks operators take in order to demonetise websites that create, present or disseminate disinformation?[6]

[6] Please note that this question refers to monetisation of websites that systematically publish false or misleading information, which is not illegal in nature. Monetisation via advertisement placements of web sites publishing illegal content is addressed within the context of a separate questionnaire for the public consultation on the Digital Services Act.

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply
1. Establish and regularly update lists of websites identified by fact-checkers as systematic sources of disinformation (black list approach) and publish them	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Establish and regularly update lists of websites identified by fact-checkers as systematic sources of disinformation (black list approach) and remove the ad accounts concerned	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Establish and regularly update lists of websites identified by fact-checkers as systematic sources of disinformation (black list approach) and temporarily suspend the ad accounts concerned	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Establish and regularly update lists of websites identified by fact-checkers as occasional sources of disinformation (grey list approach) and give the advertisers the possibility to selectively exclude such websites	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Block ad accounts only for those websites that engage in deceptive behaviour (e. g. spamming, misrepresentation of identity, scraping content from other sources, containing insufficient original content, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Ensure a systematic scrutiny of websites providing advertisement space and limit ad placements only on those websites that are considered trustworthy by reputable indexes (white list approach)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Ensure transparency of platforms vis-à-vis advertisers and provide for third-party verification (e.g. position of the ads, the content the ads are run next to, metrics)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2. Paid-for content on issues of public interest is promoted on social media platforms both during and outside electoral periods. Due to the special prominence given to such paid-for content in news-feeds and other systems for displaying content online, users may be misled as to its credibility or trustworthiness, irrespective of the veracity of the content. Do you think that issue-based advertising / sponsored content of political context:

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply
1. Should be systematically labelled	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Should be systematically labelled and collected in public, searchable repositories	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3. Should be subject to the same rules as on political advertising (see above section)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Should not be regulated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

(iii) Integrity of platforms' services

Q1. Do you think there should be targeted regulation at EU or national level to prohibit deceptive techniques such as the use of spam accounts and fake engagement to boost posts or products?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. Other

Q1.1 If you replied yes to the previous question, what do you think should be the most appropriate measures to tackle the above-mentioned manipulative techniques and tactics?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply
1. Label the content as artificially promoted	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Demote the content to decrease its visibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Suspend or remove the content because the use of manipulative techniques is contrary to platforms' terms of service	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Suspend or remove the accounts engaging in manipulative techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Invest in internal intelligence systems to detect manipulative techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Invest in artificial intelligence to detect manipulative techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain

(iv) Enhancing users' awareness

Q1. Do you agree that the following kinds of measures would help enhance user's awareness about how platforms operate and prioritise what users see first?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree
1. Promoting content from trustworthy sources	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Promoting factual content from public authorities (e.g. on election date)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Providing tools to users to flag false or misleading content	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Demoting content fact-checked as false or misleading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Labelling content fact-checked as false or misleading without demoting	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Platforms should inform users that have been exposed to fact-checked content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Removing content which is found false or misleading and contrary to terms of service (e.g. threatening health or public safety)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which sources do you consider as trustworthy?

Q2. In your opinion, to what extent, if at all, can the following measures reduce the spread of disinformation?

	No contribution	Minor contribution	Little contribution	Major contribution	Don't know
1. Demotion of posts or messages that have failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation in the newsfeed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Alerts if attempting to share content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Notifications to users who have previously engaged with content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Clear labels above content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Mechanisms enabling readers to flag content that is misleading	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Mechanisms to block sponsored content from accounts that regularly post disinformation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Closing of fake accounts and removal of automated social media accounts like bots	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Closing of accounts that continuously spread content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Allowing more diversity in suggestion algorithms designed to find videos, posts or sites that you might be interested in	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2.1. IF your answer=10, Please specify:

Q3. To what extent, if at all, do you support the following measures to reduce the spread of disinformation?

	Do not support at all	Do not support	Neither support nor discourage	Support	Support fully	Don't know
1. Demotion of posts or messages that have failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation in the newsfeed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Alerts if attempting to share content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Notifications to users who have previously engaged with content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Clear labels above content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Mechanisms enabling readers to flag content that is misleading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Mechanisms to block sponsored content from accounts that regularly post disinformation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Closing of fake accounts and removal of automated social media accounts like bots	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Closing of accounts that continuously spread content that has failed a fact-check by journalists or a fact-checking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Allowing more diversity in suggestion algorithms designed to find videos, posts or sites that you might be interested in	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3.1 IF your answer=10, Please specify:

What safeguards and redress mechanisms do you consider appropriate and necessary to avoid errors and protect users' rights?

Q4. Which information would you like to receive when reading the information on social platforms:

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Better information about the source of the content	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Whether the content is sponsored or not	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Information about the micro-targeting (why the information is addressed to you)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

4. Whether there are advertisements linked to the content	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Liability of the provider for supplying false or misleading information	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other: please list

Q5. As a user, when you come across information that you perceive as false or misleading, which options should be available to deal with such content (more than one reply is possible)?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply
1. Removing that content from your feed	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Removing that content from your feed and excluding similar content from being algorithmically promoted in your feed	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Flagging the content to the platform for fact-checking	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Receiving feed-back about the action taken by the platforms after flagging, including possible demotion	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Flagging the content to competent authorities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6. End-to-end encrypted messaging services (such as WhatsApp, Telegram or Signal) can be used to spread false and harmful content. In your view, should such platforms introduce measures to limit the spread of disinformation, with full respect of encryption and data protection law (more than one reply is possible)?

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree not disagree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	I don't know /No reply

1. Introduce easy-to-find reporting or flagging system for users	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Limit the possibility to forward the same content to many users	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Limit the amount of people in a discussion group	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. In exceptional cases, proactively contact users about potential disinformation wave or promote authoritative content (e.g. in cases like Covid-19 pandemic)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Other (please elaborate)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain

Q7. Do you easily find information about how content is fact-checked on online platforms, and by whom?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q8. If your post is being fact-checked or labelled, do you know how to contest this if you do not agree?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q9. Which information should online platform publish about their factchecking /content moderation policy?

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. If they pay directly the factcheckers or if they work with an external factchecking organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2. How they decide which posts are factchecked	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. How many posts are factchecked	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. How to flag posts to be factchecked	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Other, (please specify)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain

Trust indicators

Q10. Do you think it should be mandatory for online platforms to offer oversight bodies that enable users to seek recourse in case their account has been locked or content they have posted has been deleted?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q11. Do you think it should be mandatory for online platforms to provide points of contact for each Member State in their language?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q12. What kind of data and/or transparency tools do users/researchers/fact-checkers need to be better able to detect and analyse disinformation campaigns, including by foreign state and non-state actors? Please specify.

Q13. How should the EU respond to foreign state and non-state actors who interfere in our democratic systems by means of disinformation (multiple answers possible)?

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Analyse and expose state-backed disinformation campaigns	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Conduct public awareness-raising campaigns	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Support independent media and civil society in third countries	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Impose costs on state who conduct organised disinformation campaigns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

5. Develop more effective public outreach and digital communication strategies	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Other, (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain

Q14. In your opinion, should content by state-controlled media outlets be labelled on social media?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

## Questions on supporting civil society and active citizenship

---

As a crosscutting issue, civil society faces increasing pressure, but plays a key role in the democratic system, holding those in power to account and stimulating public debate and citizen engagement, as well as in combatting some of the identified threats. In addition to this, participatory and deliberative democracy gives citizens a chance to actively and directly participate in the shaping of planned or future public policies. A major element in the context will be the upcoming Conference on the Future of Europe.

Q1. Do you think civil society is sufficiently involved in shaping EU policies, notably through consultation?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

If Q1=2 What more could be done?

Q2. Do you think civil society should be more involved in concrete EU-level actions to promote democratic debate?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Please explain your answer

Q3. Do you think actions should be taken at EU level to strengthen cooperation among civil society actors across borders?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Please explain your answer

Q4. Do you think the EU should provide more financial support for civil society (for example under the 'Rights, equalities and citizenship' programme)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q5. Are you aware of measures to increase media and information literacy/develop media literacy skills? What type of action do you deem to be most efficient/most appropriate in this area:

- 1. Formal education in school/university
- 2. Education online via social media platforms
- 3. Life-long learning
- 4. Exchange of best practices in expert fora
- 5. Don't know

Q6. Do you think that more participatory or deliberative democracy at the European level, with more possibilities for public deliberation and citizen engagement, beyond public consultations, would be:

- 1. A good thing
- 2. Neither good nor bad
- 3. A bad thing
- 4. Don't know

Please explain your reply

Q6.1 If given the opportunity, would you take part in a European participatory or deliberative democracy event?

- 1. Yes, absolutely
- 2. Yes, probably
- 3. Maybe
- 4. Probably not
- 5. No, not at all
- 6. Don't know

Q7. Are you familiar with the European Citizens' Initiative?

- 1. Yes, I have taken part in one before
- 2. Yes, but I have not taken part in one before
- 3. Not sure
- 4. No, I do not know what a European Citizens' Initiative is

**Contact**

SG-DSG2-UNITE-F1@ec.europa.eu