2016 Annual Colloquium on fundamental rights Public consultation* on "MEDIA PLURALISM AND DEMOCRACY"

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Media freedom and pluralism are essential safeguards of well-functioning democracies. Freedom of expression and media freedom and pluralism are enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and they are at the core of the basic democratic values on which the European Union is founded.

The second Annual Colloquium on Fundamental Rights will take place on 17-18 November 2016. It will provide the stage for an open exchange on the many different aspects of media pluralism in a digital world, and the role of modern media in European democratic societies.

The colloquium should enable policymakers at EU and national level and relevant stakeholders — including NGOs, journalists, media representatives, companies, academics and international organisations — to identify concrete avenues for action to foster freedom of speech, media freedom and media pluralism as preconditions for democratic societies.

The Commission's objective with this public consultation is to gather broad feedback on current challenges and opportunities in order to feed into the colloquium's discussions. The questions asked are thus meant to encourage an open debate on media pluralism and democracy within the European Union — without, however, either prejudging any action by the European Union or affecting the remit of its competence.

Wichtig - Offentliche Konsultation (auf deutsch) / Important - consultations publiques (en français)

DE

DE_-_Konsultationen.docx

FR

FR_-_consultation.docx

IMPORTANT NOTICE ON THE PUBLICATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS

* Contributions received from this survey will be published on the European Commission's website. Do you agree to the publication of your contribution?

- ◉ Yes, my contribution may be published under my name (or the name of my organisation);
- ○ Yes, my contribution may be published but should be kept anonymous (with no mention of the person/organisation);
- ○ No, I do not want my contribution to be published. (NB — your contribution will not be published, but the Commission may use it internally for statistical and analytical purposes).

For further information, please consult the privacy statement [click below]
Privacy_statement._2016ac_public_consultation.pdf

A. Identifying information

1. In what capacity are you completing this questionnaire?
   - ○ Individual/private person
   - ◉ Civil society organisation
   - ○ Business
   - ○ Academic/research institution
   - ○ Other (please specify)

2. If you are answering this consultation as a private citizen, please give your name.

   >

3. If you are answering this consultation on behalf of an organisation, please specify your name and the name of the organisation you represent.

   ```
   Mary Berkhout, Mediawijzer.net – the Dutch network organisation for media
   literacy
   ```

Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, please indicate your Register ID-number

If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register here. Please note that it is not compulsory to register to reply to this consultation. Responses from organisations that are not registered will be published as part of the individual contributions.

Citizens have a right to expect that European institutions' interaction with citizens associations, NGOs, businesses, trade unions, think tanks, etc. is transparent, complies with the law and respects ethical principles, while avoiding undue pressure, and any illegitimate or privileged access to information or to decision-makers. The Transparency Register exists to provide citizens with direct and single access to information about who is engaged in activities aiming at influencing the EU decision-making process, which interests are being pursued and what level of resources are invested in these activities. Please help us to improve transparency by registering.

4. If you are an individual/private person:

a) What is the country of your nationality?

- ☐ 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
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

b) What is your age group?

- ○ Under 18
- ○ 18-30
- ○ 31-40
- ○ 41-50
- ● 51-60
- ○ 61-70
- ○ Over 71

B. Media freedom and pluralism

5. In the context of media freedom and pluralism, what should be the role of the State, if any, in the regulation of media? What should be the role of self-regulation?

6. Could you provide specific examples of problems deriving from the lack of independence of media regulatory authorities in EU Member States?

7. What competences would media regulatory authorities need in order to ensure a sufficient level of media freedom and pluralism?

8. What should be the role of public service media for ensuring media pluralism?

9. How should public service media be organised so that they can best ensure the public service mandate?

10. Have you experienced or are you aware of obstacles to media freedom or pluralism deriving from the lack of independence of public service media in EU Member States?

- ○ Yes
- ● No

If yes, please give specific examples.

11. Are you aware of any problems with regard to media freedom and pluralism stemming from the lack of transparency of media ownership or the lack of rules on media ownership in EU Member States?

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, please give specific examples.

[ ]

12. Please indicate any best practice on how to ensure an appropriate level of transparency and plurality of ownership in this area.

[ ]

13. What is the impact of media concentration on media pluralism and free speech in your Member State? Please give specific examples and best practices on how to deal with potential challenges brought by media concentration.

[ ]

14. Are you aware of any problems related to government or privately financed one-sided media reporting in the EU?

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, please give specific examples.

[ ]

15. Please indicate any best practice to address challenges related to government or privately financed one-sided media reporting while respecting freedom of speech and media pluralism.

[ ]

C. Journalists and new media players

16. What is the impact of media convergence and changing financing patterns on quality journalism?

[ ]

17. Have you ever experienced, or are you aware of, any limitation imposed on journalistic activities by state measures?

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, please give specific examples and further information, including justifications given by authorities and the position taken by journalists.

18. Please indicate any best practice that reconciles security concerns, media freedom and free speech in a way acceptable in a democratic society.

19. Have you experienced, or are you aware of, limitations related to privacy and data protection imposed on journalistic activities?

- ○ Yes
- ● No

If yes, please give specific examples and further information.

20. Have you experienced, or are you aware of, problems linked to hate speech and threats directed towards individuals exercising journalistic activities?

21. Are you aware of cases where fear of hate speech or threats, as described above, has led to a reluctance to report on certain issues or has had a generally chilling effect on the exercise of freedom of speech?

- ○ Yes
- ● No

If yes, please give specific examples and further information.

22. Have you experienced, or are you aware of, problems concerning journalists' safety and security in the EU?

- ○ Yes
- ● No

If yes, please give specific examples.

23. Please indicate any best practice for protecting journalists from threats against their safety and security.

24. Have you ever experienced or are you aware of pressures put by State measures on journalistic sources (including where these sources are whistleblowers)?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

If yes, please give specific examples.

25. How would pressures on journalistic sources be best addressed?

26. Please indicate any best practice for protecting the confidentiality of journalistic sources/whistleblowers.

27. Have you experienced, or are you aware of, censorship (including self-censorship) in the EU?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

If yes, please give specific examples.

28. Have you experienced, or are you aware of, any obstacles to investigative journalism, which may include legal provisions in force or a lack of resources?

29. Do you consider that the level and intensity of investigative journalism, the number of journalists engaged in such activity, the resources available, the space in print and the time available in audiovisual media for the publication of results of investigations has changed over time?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

If yes, please give specific examples.

```
As a result of the digitisation of our society, the ways to deploy
investigative journalism and the ways to publish the results (meaning: make
the results known to the public in a broad sense) have changed dramatically
over the last years. We need to take a new perspective, unlearn and relearn
how to perform journalism and adapt to phenomena as the filterbubble,
crossmedia storytelling, the information stream, crowdsourcing, big data etc.
```

30. Please indicate any best practice facilitating investigative journalism

D. Hate speech online

31. What would be the most efficient ways to tackle the trivialisation of discrimination and violence that arises through the spreading of hatred, racism and xenophobia, in particular online?

```
Hate speech in online media is often the expression of real intolerance and
hate, it represents a means to spread ideas and feelings that can lead to
effective discrimination and criminal actions and severe bodily harm. Tackling
hate speech – or tackling the trivialisation of hate speech – has to address
the hate itself. Prevention should focus on the causes behind the hate speech,
which often lie in a lack of social integration and in perceived injustice in
someone's personal situation (family, career opportunities), general social,
political and economic aspects (e.g. discrimination on the housing of labour
markets) and someone's contact with the authorities (e.g. police controls).
On social media, bottom-up countering of violent extremist narratives and
remarks can result in a pluralistic alternative discourse that can put
extremist discourse in a different perspective. Counter narratives should not
resort to ideological battles for the right answer, but in a clear and
positive message by neutral actors or peers that can refute the extremist
narrative.
Keeping the possibility for people to let of steam on online fora is
important, therefore people who run these fora should be supported in how to
recognise and counter violent extremist propaganda.
Strong social networks are essential in providing people a safe haven, away
from extremist groups.
So, if you want to effectively tackle hate speech and/or the trivialisation of
it, you need an integrated approach of involving and targeting (young) people
themselves, but also involving and targeting key players in the contexts they
live in, more specifically their formal and non-formal educators, community
building social workers, police officers and professional media makers. Their
involvement is crucial for the project's success.
```

32. How can a better informed use of modern media, including new digital media ('media literacy')
contribute to promote tolerance? Please indicate any best practice.

```
Being media literate encompasses critical media skills, on- and offline
social/relational skills and (creative) communication skills. It contributes
to promote tolerance because it provides people with the necessary toolkit to
recognise, counteract and campaign against hate and hate speech. Media
Literacy  is activating & empowering people and their community networks to
speak up and to take action against hate speech.
Best practices: in the Netherlands we have a number of specific anti hate
related initiatives (e.g. Anne Frank Stichting, Prodemos). There is also a
3-day festival in the Week of Media Literacy named My Comment Festival aimed
at youngsters (14-17 yrs) and organised by Mediawijzer.net together with Beeld
en Geluid in Hilversum.
There is one project that implements a fully integrated approach. This is a
project by Mira Media: 'Media Digitale Generatiekloof in Allochtone Gezinnen'
(DGAG) - completed in 2013 and followed by a new project in 2014, also
organised by Mira Media (with partners such as Mediawijzer.net) aimed at
disseminating knowledge and best practices to help implement the approach in
other city districts. This project runs in Amsterdam and will be finalised in
2017.
```

E. Role of free and pluralistic media in a democratic society

33. How do developments in media freedom and pluralism impact democracy? Please explain.

34. Who do you think is the most suited to help increase media literacy? Please rank and explain why.

	The most important - 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	The least important - 8
Family	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Friends	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
School	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Public authorities	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Media, including online providers	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Dedicated learning systems using e.g. radio, TV, mobile phones and the internet (please specify)	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Civil society	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Other (please specify)	◉	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Other - please specify

```
Because we see an integral approach as essential for sustainable results, we
would rank áll partners as most important. Together with the target group
(e.g. youngsters) they need to investigate, design an develop an integrated
approach to be implemented locally (and not nationally).
```

35. Please give specific good examples or best practices for increasing media literacy.

```
- Mediawijzer.net
We consider the Mediawijzer.net network as a best practice for implementing
media literacy into society. By taking a bottom up approach and using a strong
network of partners, media literacy efforts in the Netherlands are effectively
decentralized and therefore ubiquitous, creative and innovative. The subject
of media literacy is very much alive within Dutch society after a
groundbreaking report by the Dutch Council for Culture in 2005. In reaction
the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, initiated the
```

Mediawijzer.net programme, thereby delegating the further development of media literacy to the field, led by five founding partners: Kennisnet (expert centre on ICT and Education), NTR (the independent Dutch public service broadcaster); Beeld en Geluid (national audiovisual archive); KB (Royal Dutch Public Libraries) and ECP (public-private network for information society).

Since 2005 over eleven-hundred organisations joined the Mediawijzer.net network, both for- and non-profit organisations, including publishing houses, schools, tech corporations, museums, broadcasters, film organisations, public libraries, parenting organisations, and ICT- and telecom companies. To facilitate its' partner organisations, Mediawijzer.net initiates awareness campaigns, research projects, monitors, conferences and expert meetings, hosts a community website, facilitates the exchange of expertise, issues books, publications, and toolboxes, and manages a fund to finance outstanding media literacy projects. Together the network partners have carried out numerous media literacy projects and initiatives, both within and outside formal education. As a result the public awareness of media literacy is steadily growing. To give just one example of the outreach of the network together with Mediawijzer.net: every year in the Week of Media Literacy, over 100.000 children aged 10-12 yrs play MediaMasters, an engaging interactive game on media literacy with assignments and tasks provided by the network partners.

Due to the approach in the Netherlands, there are many best practices. Below we name only three of them:

– Media Coach schools
The Netherlands has two media coach schoolscourses: the National MediaCoach Training (NOMC), founded in 2007, and the Mediacoach School course for Library Professionals, founded in 2009 on the initiative of the Dutch Libraries. Both schools have an active network of graduated media coaches, and facilitate both online and offline collaboration and knowledge exchange amongst their graduates. Also, both schools participate in international collaboration and knowledge exchange.

– Media Literacy Quality Network for vocational schools
In 2013 a school with a special program on media literacy, introduced a quality mark for Modern Media schools (comparable to quality mark systems for Gymnasia and Technasia), in order to distinguish themselves as a high quality secondary school for media education. All developed digital media teaching material is available for free on www.wikiwijs.nl, a Dutch site for sharing and arranging learning and teaching materials.

– Cinekid MediaLab
Every autumn, Cinekid organises the Cinekid Film, Television and New Media Festival for children during the school holidays. The international festival will be celebrating its 30th anniversary in October 2016. The ten days' event in Amsterdam and throughout the country (30 cities in the Netherlands) covers all aspects of the media industry for young audiences and offers workshops and masterclasses as well as high-quality media. Every year more than 50.000 children are given the opportunity to visit over 500 media productions selected by the festival: feature films, children's documentaries, short films, animations, television series and single productions, cross media

```
productions, interactive installations and set-ups as well as workshops.
```

36. What would be concrete ways for free and pluralistic media to enhance good governance and transparency and thus foster citizens' democratic engagement (e.g. self-organisation for political purposes, participation in unions, NGOs, political parties, participation in elections)?

37. What are best practices of free and pluralistic media contributing to foster an informed political debate on issues that are important for democratic societies (e.g. in terms of the nature of the content or in terms of format or platforms proposed)?

38. Which measures would you consider useful to improve access to political information across borders? Please indicate any best practice.

39. Do you consider that social media/platforms, as increasingly used by candidates, political parties and citizens in electoral campaigns play a positive role in encouraging democratic engagement?

   ◉ Yes
   ○ No

If yes, please give specific aspects and best practices that you would recommend.

```
Providing they are moderated.
```

If no, please give specific aspects and examples of negative impacts, and possible alternatives to address them.

40. Do you consider that there are specific risks or problems regarding the role of platforms and social media — in relation to pluralism of the journalistic press or more generally — as regards the quality of the democratic debate and the level of engagement?

   ◉ Yes
   ○ No

If yes, please give specific examples and best practices that you would recommend to address these risks or problems.

```
As stated in question nr 29: we need to take a new perspective and unlearn and
relearn how to perform journalism and adapt to phenomena as the filterbubble,
crossmedia storytelling, the information stream, crowdsourcing, big data etc.
```

Contact

JUST-COLLOQUIUM@ec.europa.eu