

Public consultation on measures to further improve the effectiveness of the fight against illegal content online

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The availability and proliferation of illegal content online remains an important public policy and security concern in the EU, notably with regards to the dissemination of terrorist content, as well as of illegal hate speech, child sexual abuse material, or illegal commercial practices and infringements of intellectual property rights, selling of illicit drugs, counterfeits or other illicit goods.

The Commission adopted on 28 September 2017 a [Communication](#) with guidance on the responsibilities of online service providers in respect of illegal content online and a [Recommendation](#) on measures to effectively tackle illegal content online on 1 March 2018.

The Commission is collecting evidence on the effectiveness of measures and the scale of the problem, and will explore, by the end of 2018, further measures to improve the effectiveness of combating illegal content online.

In particular, through the present public consultation the Commission seeks to gather views from all relevant stakeholders. The questionnaire is targeted to the general public, hosting service providers such as online platforms, organisations reporting the presence of illegal content online, competent authorities and law enforcement bodies, and academia, civil societies and other organisations.

About you

* Please indicate the capacity in which you are replying to this public consultation. Please note that the option you select will personalise the subsequent questions.

at most 1 choice(s)

- a) as an individual, in my personal capacity
- b) representing an online hosting service provider
- c) representing a business associations replying on behalf of online hosting providers
- d) representing a non-for-profit organisation identifying and reporting allegedly illegal content online
- e) representing a for-profit organisation identifying and reporting allegedly illegal content online
- f) representing a competent authority, including law enforcement authorities, internet referral unit, ministries or consumer protection authorities
- g) representing an organisation or business representing victims
- h) representing civil society organisation representing civil rights interests
- i) representing other industry association
- j) representing a research or academic organisation
- k) other

Section for other organisations, civil society, academia or other businesses and associations

Replying to the questionnaire is estimated to take 20 to 30 minutes and may require documenting answers with specific data.

General information about your organisation

* Name of the organisation

50 character(s) maximum

ARTICLE 19

If your organisation is included in the Transparency Register, please indicate your ID number.

If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register [here](#), although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this consultation.

[Why a transparency register?](#)

40 character(s) maximum

684821118979-74

* Should the European Commission need further details in relation to your answers, would you agree to be contacted by the Commission?

Yes No

* Email address:

gabrielle@article19.org

* In what country does your organisation have its headquarters?

United Kingdom

* Is your organisation established in a/several EU Member State(s)?

a) Yes
 b) No

* Which one(s)?

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark

- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom

* Please briefly describe your organisation and/or provide a public URL.

500 character(s) maximum

ARTICLE 19: Global Campaign for Free Expression (ARTICLE 19) is an independent human rights organisation that works around the world to protect and promote the rights to freedom of expression and freedom of information. For more details, please see: <https://www.article19.org/about-us/>

Please indicate if you are a user of the following types of online hosting services.

- a) E-commerce market place
- b) Collaborative economy
- c) Social networking
- d) Video or audio streaming
- e) File sharing
- f) News and media
- g) App distribution
- h) Rating and reviews
- g) Other

Your experience: encountering illegal content online

While using the services mentioned here-above, did you come across the following types of content?

	Never	Once	Between 2 and 5 times	More than 5 times	I don't know
Child sexual abuse material	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Terrorist content	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pirated content (e.g. music, films, books) or other audiovisual content	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Counterfeit goods (e.g. fake perfume, fake designer brands) or other types of intellectual property infringements	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Illegal hate speech (public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined on the basis of race, colour, descent, religion or belief, or national or ethnic origin)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scams, frauds, subscription traps or other illegal commercial practices)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content I deemed illegal for other reasons than the above.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you have encountered content you deemed illegal for other reasons than the above, please specify

300 character(s) maximum

No, never. We note however that determining whether content amounts to illegal 'hate speech' is an exercise fraught with difficulty. ARTICLE 19 has developed several criteria to assess whether content amounts to 'hate speech' under international law: goo.gl/25tkXv

Your experience: removal of content online

* Have you tried to upload or post online content which was blocked or removed by a hosting service provider?

- a) No, never
- b) Yes, once
- c) Yes, several times
- d) I don't know

On what grounds was your content blocked or removed? (multiple answers possible)

- a) Incitement to terrorism
- b) Child sexual abuse
- c) Illegal hate speech
- d) Copyright infringement
- e) Infringement of other intellectual property rights (e.g. counterfeit, design infringements)

- f) Illegal commercial practice (e.g. scam, fraud, subscription trap)
- g) Infringement to other community standards or terms of service
- h) I was not informed
- i) Other

If i) Other, please specify

50 character(s) maximum

Our response g) is a guess, we were not informed.

Have you taken any action?

- a) I contacted the hosting service and argued that the content was not illegal or against community standards or terms of service
- b) I uploaded the content again on the same or a different hosting service
- c) I did not react
- d) Other action

What was the follow-up on the dispute? (multiple answers possible)

- a) The dispute was handled only at the level of the hosting service
- b) The dispute escalated to trial in court
- c) The dispute escalated to an out-of-court dispute settlement body
- d) Other

What was the final decision concerning the content? (Multiple options possible)

- a) Dispute is still ongoing
- b) The hosting service reinstated the content
- c) The content was not reinstated
- d) I do not know

Have you incurred sanctions for repeated infringements, in addition to the specific content being removed /blocked?

- a) No
- b) Yes, my account was suspended
- c) Yes, my account was terminated
- d) Yes, other sanctions
- e) I do not know

Please explain how the take-down or blocking of your content and potential follow-up actions have affected you.

1000 character(s) maximum

ARTICLE 19 had posted on Facebook a comment and link to a Human Rights Watch report on torture in Syria. It is unclear why it was removed but prevented us from sharing information about widespread human rights abuses in that country. Similarly, ARTICLE 19 had posted a comment on Facebook and Instagram about the imprisonment of a protester in Brazil for using nudity as a form of protest. The post and photograph used to illustrate it were removed. This prevented us from sharing information and engaging in matters of clear public interest: <https://www.article19.org/resources/brazil-article-19-condemns-censorship-of-protest-by-facebook/>

To what extent do you agree with the following statements in relation to the process of removing of your allegedly illegal content and follow-up actions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	I don't know
It was clear to me from the terms of service or community standards of the platform that the content I uploaded was not accepted on the hosting service.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, I find the process for removing content sufficiently transparent.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I disagree that my content should be banned by the community standards or terms of service.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I was able to contest the removal decision.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It was clear what dispute settlement mechanisms or external bodies I could use to escalate the dispute.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After repeated removals of my content, I was informed clearly about the sanctions which would be taken against me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, I find the process for disputing content removal decisions sufficiently transparent.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Illegal content online

Please describe the challenges, obstacles and risks you are facing in tackling illegal content.

1000 character(s) maximum

ARTICLE 19 does not seek to tackle illegal content per se. ARTICLE 19 strives to ensure that legitimate content under international human rights law is not arbitrarily removed by social media companies on the basis of their Terms of Service either of their own motion, upon mere 'flagging' by third parties or at the behest of governments.

Further measures for detecting, removing and preventing reappearance of illegal content

What features of notice systems and further measures do you consider to be most effective for enabling hosting service providers to make diligent decisions on the content notified? Please score the features on a scale from 1 (very effective) to 5 (not effective).

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Standardised, accessible and user-friendly online interface for reporting content	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identification of content with unique identifiers (e.g. URLs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Possibility to file multiple notices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Explanation of reasons and grounds of illegality	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allowing for anonymous notices	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Standardised, binding notice and action procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify

500 character(s) maximum

Notices should comply with the requirements set out in the Manila Principles on Intermediary Liability (Principle 3): <https://www.manilaprinciples.org/> - this should include a consideration of any exceptions, limitations or defences available to the content provider. It should also include a declaration of good faith that the information provided is accurate.

Please score the effectiveness of the following measures to support the cooperation between platforms and competent authorities/law enforcement bodies. Please use a scale from 1 (very effective) to 5 (not effective).

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Enhanced cooperation and exchanges between hosting service providers and competent authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enhanced capabilities and training for national authorities and courts	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Appointment of points of contact amongst hosting service providers within EU Member States for cooperation with competent authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Appointment of points of contact amongst law enforcement or other competent authorities for cooperating with hosting service providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Technical interfaces between platforms and law enforcement or other competent authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Obligation to report illegal content to competent authorities for analysis and investigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Setting time-limits to processing referrals and notifications from law enforcement or other competent authorities (such as internet referral units)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify

ARTICLE 19 believes that enhanced cooperation mechanisms lack in transparency and are generally used to evade basic rule of law requirements (e.g. obtaining a court order or warrant). If at all, swift communication between law enforcement or medical practitioners and hosting providers should occur in cases where there is a risk to life (e.g. abduction, suicide). However, this should not amount to a reporting obligation.

What further mechanisms would best support the cooperation between hosting services and trusted flaggers?
Please score the mechanisms below on a scale from 1 (very effective) to 5 (not effective).

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Agreement between the platform and the trusted flaggers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trusted status agreed by a group of platforms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Certification of the trusted flaggers by national authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Certification of trusted flaggers at EU level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Possibility to submit data feeding the hosting service provider's automated moderation tools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Financial support to trusted flaggers by public authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Financial support to trusted flaggers by private entities on a voluntary basis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Setting time-limits to processing referrals and notifications from trusted flaggers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other, please specify

300 character(s) maximum

ARTICLE 19 believes that the trusted flagger system is inadequate to provide an independent determination of the legality of content. Trusted flaggers are inherently biased towards the type of content they are targeting (e.g. copyright, hate speech), often at the expense of freedom of expression.

What criteria should organisations fulfil to gain a privileged status ('trusted flaggers') when reporting content for removal?

1000 character(s) maximum

Please see response above.

What are the specific privileges (e.g. fast-track/immediate removal of content notified), and responsibilities such trusted flaggers should have, in your opinion, when flagging the different types of illegal content?

1000 character(s) maximum

Trusted flaggers should not be given specific privileges. If any, it should only include fast-track examination of the content notified but definitely not immediate removal. ARTICLE 19 does not support the trusted flagger system. To the extent that it is already in place, we believe that notices issues by trusted flaggers should be shared with content providers to give them an opportunity to issue a counter-notice. The contact details of trusted flaggers should be shared with content providers. Trusted flaggers should be required to confirm that they have submitted notices in good faith. Consideration should be given to sanctioning them when they send abusive notices (i.e. sending notices in circumstances where the content is clearly lawful).

Please score the following measures to support the uptake and deployment of automated tools for removal of illegal content. Please score the measures below on a scale from 1 (very useful) to 5 (not useful).

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Sharing of best practices between industry players	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Industry-governed sharing of software solutions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Industry shared governance of databases supporting filtering technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Industry shared governance of databases of training data for detection algorithms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Publicly supported databases for filtering content, training data, and/or technical tools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public investment in research and development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Private investment in research and development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Requirements to deploy automated tools for detecting and/or blocking content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Requirements to use shared databases for blocking content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other, please specify

ARTICLE 19 does not support the uptake and deployment of automated tools for removal of illegal content. In our view, a requirement to deploy filtering tools would be in breach of Article 15 of the Electronic Commerce Directive.

What safeguards should be put in place when using automated tools for the detection and removal of illegal content online? Please score the measures below on a scale from 1 (very useful) to 5 (not useful).

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Transparency, in simple, clear language, of the general principles for the algorithmic decision-making	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparent reporting on the accuracy indicators for the automated tools used	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Audits and error-detection tests for algorithmic filtering and algorithmic detection of illegal content	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
'Human in the loop' principle: include human review in the processes leading to removal of content	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Counter-notice procedures also when content removal /blocking is decided through automated means	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other, please specify

ARTICLE 19 reiterates that we do not support the deployment of general monitoring of content with a view to detecting 'illegality'. Automated tools are inherently incapable of making assessments about the legality of content, particularly those that require an analysis of the context at issue (e.g. hate speech or terrorism) or consideration of any defences or exceptions or limitations (e.g. copyright, defamation, harassment etc.).

What are the most effective safeguards to counter erroneous removal of legal content? Please score the measures below on a scale from 1 (very effective) to 5 (not effective).

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Availability of counter-notice procedures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information to the content provider on grounds for removal	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparency on the process for removal	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparent information on time from detection/notice to removal of the different types of content	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Transparent process for restoring content when counter- notices have provided reasonable grounds to reject the allegations of illegality	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage the use of out-of-court dispute settlement	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cooperation with third-parties such as self-regulatory bodies or competent authorities, for consultation in difficult cases	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

ARTICLE 19's detailed recommendations for improving the regulation of online content are set out in our Sidestepping Rights policy (2018): <https://www.article19.org/resources/side-stepping-rights-regulating-speech-by-contract/>

We also make more detailed recommendation about the availability of self-regulatory mechanisms to deal with difficult cases in our Self Regulation of Social Media discussion paper (2018): https://www.article19.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Self-regulation-and-%E2%80%98hate-speech%E2%80%99-on-social-media-platforms_March2018.pdf

Please describe the challenges, obstacles and risks you are facing in tackling illegal content.

1000 character(s) maximum

ARTICLE 19 believes that the key challenge in tackling illegal content online is for democratic societies not to give up on fundamental rights. Our experience shows that the measures currently being considered by the European Commission run roughshod of freedom of expression and due process rights. Under human rights law, including the EU Charter of fundamental rights, Member States must protect human rights and justify any restriction as necessary and proportionate in a democratic society. The measures proposed by the Commission tend to make the protection of rights the exception rather than the rule.

Your opinion

In your opinion, who has an important role to play in tackling illegal content online?

	Main role	Important role	Marginal role	I don't know	No answer
Internet users	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hosting service providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public and other competent authorities and law enforcement bodies	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Private entities affected by the spread of illegal content (e.g. rights holders)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual victims affected by illegal content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Civil society and other organisations with expertise who flag illegal content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	I don't know	No answer
* The Internet is safe for its users.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It is important that there are arrangements in place so that no illegal content is spread on the Internet.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It is important that freedom of expression is protected online.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Hosting service providers should process all notifications they receive and assess the legality of the content notified.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* When content is flagged as illegal by private organisations with proven expertise , hosting services should speed up the process for removing the content.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* When content is flagged as illegal by competent authorities or law enforcement bodies, platforms should speed up the process for removing the content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* When online hosting services remove content, users should be able to contest this decision by contacting the service (counter-notice).	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The regulatory framework is effective against illegal content.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Hosting service providers are effective in tackling illegal content.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

In your opinion, is there a need for further measures to tackle illegal content online?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	I don't know	No answer
Through proactive measures taken by hosting service providers and other relevant actors.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Via legislative measures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Actions should be taken at EU level to put appropriate measures in place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Different types of illegal content should be dealt with in different legal frameworks, to take into account specificities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Are there additional comments you would like to make? Please detail, in particular, if your answers refer to different experiences, different types of illegal content, etc.

500 character(s) maximum

Yes, please find attached some additional comments on the European Commission's Recommendation of 2018 for tackling illegal content.

Please feel free to upload a concise document, such as a position paper of relevance to this public consultation. *Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this open public consultation.*

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Your contribution

Note that, whatever option chosen, your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under [Regulation \(EC\) N° 1049/2001](#)

- can be published with your organisation's information** (I consent the publication of all information in my contribution in whole or in part including the name of my organisation, and I declare that nothing within my response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent publication)
- can be published provided that your organisation remains anonymous** (I consent to the publication of any information in my contribution in whole or in part (which may include quotes or opinions I express) provided that it is done anonymously. I declare that nothing within my response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent the publication.

Contact

cnect-consultation-illegal-content@ec.europa.eu
