Introduction

The Commission recently announced a Digital Services Act package with two main pillars:

- first, a proposal of new and revised rules to deepen the Single Market for Digital Services, by increasing and harmonising the responsibilities of online platforms and information service providers and reinforce the oversight over platforms’ content policies in the EU;
- second, ex ante rules to ensure that markets characterised by large platforms with significant network effects acting as gatekeepers, remain fair and contestable for innovators, businesses, and new market entrants.

This consultation

The Commission is initiating the present open public consultation as part of its evidence-gathering exercise, in order to identify issues that may require intervention through the Digital Services Act, as well as additional topics related to the environment of digital services and online platforms, which will be further analysed in view of possible upcoming initiatives, should the issues identified require a regulatory intervention.

The consultation contains 6 modules (you can respond to as many as you like):

1. How to effectively keep users safer online?
2. Reviewing the liability regime of digital services acting as intermediaries?
3. What issues derive from the gatekeeper power of digital platforms?
4. Other emerging issues and opportunities, including online advertising and smart contracts
5. How to address challenges around the situation of self-employed individuals offering services through online platforms?
6. What governance for reinforcing the Single Market for digital services?
The questionnaire refers to **digital services** (or ‘information society services’, within the meaning of the E-Commerce Directive), as 'services provided through electronic means, at a distance, at the request of the user'. It also refers more narrowly to a subset of digital services here termed **online intermediary services**. By this we mean services such as internet access providers, cloud services, online platforms, messaging services, etc., i.e. services that generally transport or intermediate content, goods or services made available by third parties.

Parts of the questionnaire specifically focus on **online platforms** – such as e-commerce marketplaces, search engines, app stores, online travel and accommodation platforms or mobility platforms and other collaborative economy platforms, etc.

Other terms and other technical concepts are explained in a **glossary**.

**How to respond**

Make sure to **save your draft** regularly as you fill in the questionnaire. You can break off and return to finish it at any time. At the end, you will also be able to upload a document or add other issues not covered in detail in the questionnaire.

**Deadline for responses**

8 September 2020

**Languages**

You can submit your response in any official EU language. The questionnaire is available in 23 of the EU's official languages. You can switch languages from the menu at the top of the page.

**About you**

1 Language of my contribution
   - Bulgarian
   - Croatian
   - Czech
   - Danish
   - Dutch
   - English
   - Estonian
   - Finnish
* 2 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

* 3 First name

  Greg

* 4 Surname

  Mroczkowski
5 Email (this won't be published)

mroczkowski@iabeurope.eu

7 Organisation name

IAB Europe

8 Organisation size

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

9 What is the annual turnover of your company?

- <=€2m
- <=€10m
- <=€50m
- Over €50m

10 Are you self-employed and offering services through an online platform?

☐ Yes
☐ No

11 Would you describe your company as:

☐ a startup?
☐ a scaleup?
☐ a conglomerate offering a wide range of services online?

12 Is your organisation:

☐ an online intermediary
☐ an association representing the interests of online intermediaries
☐ a digital service provider, other than an online intermediary
☐ an association representing the interests of such digital services
☐ a different type of business than the options above
☐ an association representing the interest of such businesses
16 Does your organisation play a role in:
- Flagging illegal activities or information to online intermediaries for removal
- Fact checking and/or cooperating with online platforms for tackling harmful (but not illegal) behaviours
- Representing fundamental rights in the digital environment
- Representing consumer rights in the digital environment
- Representing rights of victims of illegal activities online
- Representing interests of providers of services intermediated by online platforms
- Other

17 Is your organisation a
- Law enforcement authority, in a Member State of the EU
- Government, administrative or other public authority, other than law enforcement, in a Member State of the EU
- Other, independent authority, in a Member State of the EU
- EU-level authority
- International level authority, other than at EU level
- Other

18 Is your business established in the EU?
- Yes
- No

19 Please select the EU Member States where your organisation is established or currently has a legal representative in:
- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Denmark
- Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden

20 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.

43167137250-27

21 Country of origin

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

- Afghanistan
- Åland Islands
- Albania
- Algeria
- American Samoa
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- Libya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Macau
- Saint Martin
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andorra</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Madagascar</th>
<th>São Tomé and Príncipe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctica</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Falkland Islands</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
<td>Martinique</td>
<td>Sint Maarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Mayotte</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>French Guiana</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>French Southern and Antarctic Lands</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba</td>
<td>Guadeloupe</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**22 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

I. How to effectively keep users safer online?

This module of the questionnaire is structured into several subsections:

**First**, it seeks evidence, experience, and data from the perspective of different stakeholders regarding illegal activities online, as defined by national and EU law. This includes the availability online of illegal goods (e.g. dangerous products, counterfeit goods, prohibited and restricted goods, protected wildlife, pet trafficking, illegal medicines, misleading offerings of food supplements), content (e.g. illegal hate speech, child sexual abuse material, content that infringes intellectual property rights), and services, or practices that infringe consumer law (such as scams, misleading advertising, exhortation to purchase made to children) online. It covers all types of illegal activities, both as regards criminal law and civil law. It then asks you about other activities online that are not necessarily illegal but could cause harm to users, such as the spread of online disinformation or harmful content to minors. It also seeks facts and informed views on the potential risks of erroneous removal of legitimate content. It also asks you about the transparency and accountability of measures taken by digital services and online platforms in particular in intermediating users’ access to their content and enabling oversight by third parties. Respondents might also be interested in related questions in the module of the consultation focusing on online advertising.

**Second**, it explores proportionate and appropriate responsibilities and obligations that could be required from online intermediaries, in particular online platforms, in addressing the set of issues discussed in the first sub-section. This module does not address the liability regime for online intermediaries, which is further explored in the next module of the consultation.

**1. Main issues and experiences**

**A. Experiences and data on illegal activities online**

**Illegal goods**

1 Have you ever come across illegal goods on online platforms (e.g. a counterfeit product, prohibited and restricted goods, protected wildlife, pet trafficking, illegal medicines, misleading offerings of food supplements)?

- No, never
- Yes, once
- Yes, several times
- I don’t know

3 Please specify.

*3000 character(s) maximum*
4 How easy was it for you to find information on where you could report the illegal good?

Please rate from 1 star (very difficult) to 5 stars (very easy) ★★★★★

5 How easy was it for you to report the illegal good?

Please rate from 1 star (very difficult) to 5 stars (very easy) ★★★★★

6 How satisfied were you with the procedure following your report?

Please rate from 1 star (very dissatisfied) to 5 stars (very satisfied) ★★★★★

7 Are you aware of the action taken following your report?

☐ Yes
☐ No

8 Please explain

3000 character(s) maximum

9 In your experience, were such goods more easily accessible online since the outbreak of COVID-19?

☐ No, I do not think so
☐ Yes, I came across illegal offerings more frequently
☐ I don’t know

10 What good practices can you point to in handling the availability of illegal goods online since the start of the COVID-19 outbreak?

5000 character(s) maximum

Illegal content

11 Did you ever come across illegal content online (for example illegal incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on any protected grounds such as race, ethnicity,
gender or sexual orientation; child sexual abuse material; terrorist propaganda; defamation; content that infringes intellectual property rights, consumer law infringements)?

☐ No, never
☐ Yes, once
☐ Yes, several times
☐ I don’t know

18 How has the dissemination of illegal content changed since the outbreak of COVID-19? Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

19 What good practices can you point to in handling the dissemination of illegal content online since the outbreak of COVID-19?

3000 character(s) maximum

IAB Europe’s members do not disseminate illegal content online, and did not do so prior to the outbreak of Covid-19. Unfortunately, advertising can, however, inadvertently finance the dissemination of illegal content online by providing revenue to properties that engage in such dissemination. This informs the fact that an important task for our members is to try significantly minimise this inadvertent funding, or tackle the so-called “ad misplacement” challenge. IAB Europe has taken the challenge of misplacement most seriously, engaging in European Commission-driven discussions about the ‘follow-the-money’ approach to minimize the misplacement on digital properties with Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) infringements. These EU-level discussions led to signing off the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Online Advertising and IPR in June 2018, to which we remain deeply committed.

The MoU provides for best practices in the field. Relevance and validity of such instruments could be demonstrated pre-Covid-19, and should prevail in the current times, too. IAB Europe’s member companies have been developing and implementing cutting-edge technologies to minimise misplacement of branded ads. What is more – beyond these commercial offerings – we have seen local markets, with National IABs’ leadership, spearheading national-level initiatives to combat the phenomenon (for instance, DTSG Brand Safety (UK); Advertise Consciously (PL); AdKodex (DK)). We believe that one of the ways in which the MoU is helpful from the market perspective is that it facilitates convergence of similar initiatives, also helping new markets or players to develop their own, maybe more nuanced approaches.

As a trade association signatory to the MoU, IAB Europe’s role focuses on educating our members on the importance of the instrument, encouraging the MoU adoption within the membership, as well as gathering members’ observations and sharing it accordingly.

As the industry representation, we continue to take advantage of any relevant opportunities to proselytise about the added value of the approach undertaken. Amongst other, we are supportive of WIPO’s efforts in terms of effectively minimizing the risk of ads inadvertently funding any illegal content, through the WIPO ALERT initiative. We also sit on the IP in the Digital World Working Group and liaise with the EUIPO’s Observatory. These efforts sit well within the context of the broader industry’s brand safety agenda.
20 What actions do online platforms take to minimise risks for consumers to be exposed to scams and other unfair practices (e.g. misleading advertising, exhortation to purchase made to children)?

Irrespective of where advertising appears and how it is delivered, it must comply with all applicable laws, rules, ordinances, codes, and regulations (including, without limitation, any industry-specific ethical, professional, or self-regulatory requirements).

In the EU, this means at least the Unfair Commercial Practices and Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directives.

Building on the legal architecture, the industry enables a robust self-regulatory system for advertising content, which covers 97% of all ads seen by the EU population. Coordinated with the support of EASA – European Advertising Standards Alliance, it plays an essential role in preventing the spread of misleading or otherwise harmful advertising on all media, including online. The self-regulatory framework plays an important role in achieving a high level of consumer protection and trust, by striving to ensure that all covered advertising practices are legal, decent, honest and truthful. In addition to company processes, the system features not only codes of conduct, independently enforced by the self-regulatory bodies, but also provides monitoring, training and compliance advice to the industry. The European bodies deal with on average 60,000 complaints per year and deliver an additional 90,000 pieces of tailored advice to the industry.

21 Do you consider these measures appropriate?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

22 Please explain.

While completely eliminating the risk of advertising funding sites that host illegal or illicit content or disinformation is probably impossible due to the boundless and pervasive nature of the internet, our experiences show that technology standards and best practice constitute a sound approach. In a recently published report, the Commission acknowledged that industry cooperation has led to progress in tackling online piracy. The MoU has not only created more awareness among brands that their ads may end up on IPR-infringing websites, but more concretely, according to evidence gathered, the share of ads for European businesses on IPR-infringing websites has dropped by 12% since the introduction of the MoU, while gambling ads collected from major brands has decreased from 62% to 50% on these websites. Similarly, the existence of well-established company practices and a broader self-regulatory framework for advertising content allows industry players to take swift and expeditious actions against misleading or otherwise harmful advertising.

B. Transparency

1 If your content or offering of goods and services was ever removed or blocked from an online platform, were you informed by the platform?
Yes, I was informed before the action was taken
Yes, I was informed afterwards
Yes, but not on every occasion / not by all the platforms
No, I was never informed
I don’t know

3 Please explain.

4 If you provided a notice to a digital service asking for the removal or disabling of access to such content or offering of goods or services, were you informed about the follow-up to the request?

Yes, I was informed
Yes, but not on every occasion / not by all platforms
No, I was never informed
I don’t know

5 When content is recommended to you - such as products to purchase on a platform, or videos to watch, articles to read, users to follow - are you able to obtain enough information on why such content has been recommended to you? Please explain.

C. Activities that could cause harm but are not, in themselves, illegal

1 In your experience, are children adequately protected online from harmful behaviour, such as grooming and bullying, or inappropriate content?

2 To what extent do you agree with the following statements related to online disinformation?
Online platforms can easily be manipulated by foreign governments or other coordinated groups to spread divisive messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree not disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>I don't know/No reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To protect freedom of expression online, diverse voices should be heard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree not disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>I don't know/No reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disinformation is spread by manipulating algorithmic processes on online platforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree not disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>I don't know/No reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online platforms can be trusted that their internal practices sufficiently guarantee democratic integrity, pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and gender equality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree not disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>I don't know/No reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Please explain.

IAB Europe is committed to reducing the incidence of online disinformation. The Association and a number of member companies are signatories to the EU Code of Practice on Disinformation, being committed to actionable commitments in their respective fields of activity. We recognise that legitimate online infrastructure can be misused by bad actors to deceive and confuse citizens, making it more difficult for them to make fact-based judgments, and ultimately undermining our democracies. Though all manifestations of online disinformation do not leverage, or relate to, advertising, digital advertising may facilitate the creation and propagation of disinformation, for example, by inadvertently enabling the placing of legitimate advertising on websites enabling disinformation. Investment in brand safety tools can significantly contribute to reducing such ad misplacement.

That said, it is in our shared interest to ensure that the digital ecosystem continues to provide accurate information and views, and on terms that are accessible and affordable for all citizens.

In this context, IAB Europe continues to engage with its members to combat stakeholder quality and transparency concerns and address the challenges that the industry is facing in order to fuel consumer trust and brand investment in the digital advertising and marketing ecosystem. This includes addressing the need for harmonised pan-European brand safety and brand suitability approaches, and collaborating with other partners, for instance, in the framework of the Global Alliance for Responsible Media (GARM) that aims to proactively and collectively address harmful and misleading media environments.
4 In your personal experience, how has the spread of harmful (but not illegal) activities online changed since the outbreak of COVID-19? Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

The Covid-19 crisis further demonstrated the need for quality news media, which at its core may be seen as a critical contributing factor to tackling disinformation. People have been looking for trusted, quality journalism, often financed primarily via ad revenues.

This spur in heightened traffic should be delivering the financial results to reward trusted journalism. However, the market has seen buyers of ads extending the use of their avoidance technologies to prevent some or all Covid-19 ad adjacencies. The inclusion of the exact match words such as ‘crisis’, ‘coronavirus’ or ‘Covid-19’ in avoidance technologies has had the unintended consequence of blocking all advertising from appearing next to Covid-19 related content, thus limiting the availability of monetizable inventory to the publisher, and surely having an impact on technology providers working on their behalf.

IAB Europe therefore recommended that during Covid-19 a blanket brand safety approach of blocking all Coronavirus or Covid-19 content is not applied. Brands should instead work closely with their media agencies, verification companies, and trusted news partners to make an informed decision by looking at the facts about the value of news environment and implementing smart solutions to ensure that their advertising continues to reach the correct audiences during COVID-19.

5 What good practices can you point to in tackling such harmful activities since the outbreak of COVID-19?

3000 character(s) maximum

When it comes to disinformation, we take the view that flexibility is required, in light of critical questions around freedom of speech and freedom of media. One should not monetise content amounting to disinformation, and in fact take active preventive measures to avoid such content and effectively avoid advertising next to it. It must not be overlooked that there is still uncertainty as to what in fact can be reasonably deemed as disinformation.

The principle of remaining vigilant had been valid pre-Covid-19, and should prevail in the current times, too. Technology companies continue to rely on proprietary and client’s brand safety mechanisms for this purpose. Ultimately, in terms of ad buying, the level of brand safety must be at the discretion of the advertiser, or a buyer for that matter. Certain products or services may fare better from an advertising perspective in specific content environments, or when viewed by a particular audience. Same environments or audience could be however deemed inappropriate by another advertiser, which underscores the fact that brand safety is context specific, and there are no one-size-fits-all approaches. Conversely, suitable solutions must be discussed on a case-by-case basis.

D. Experiences and data on erroneous removals

This section covers situation where content, goods or services offered online may be removed erroneously contrary to situations where such a removal may be justified due to for example illegal nature of such content, good or service (see sections of this questionnaire above).
1 Are you aware of evidence on the scale and impact of erroneous removals of content, goods, services, or banning of accounts online? Are there particular experiences you could share?

5000 character(s) maximum

The following questions are targeted at organisations. Individuals responding to the consultation are invited to go to section 2 here below on responsibilities for online platforms and other digital services.

3 What is your experience in flagging content, or offerings of goods or services you deemed illegal to online platforms and/or other types of online intermediary services? Please explain in what capacity and through what means you flag content.

3000 character(s) maximum

4 If applicable, what costs does your organisation incur in such activities?

3000 character(s) maximum

5 Have you encountered any issues, in particular, as regards illegal content or goods accessible from the EU but intermediated by services established in third countries? If yes, how have you dealt with these?

3000 character(s) maximum

6 If part of your activity is to send notifications or orders for removing illegal content or goods or services made available through online intermediary services, or taking other actions in relation to content, goods or services, please explain whether you report on your activities and their outcomes:

- Yes, through regular transparency reports
- Yes, through reports to a supervising authority
- Yes, upon requests to public information
- Yes, through other means. Please explain
- No, no such reporting is done
8 Does your organisation access any data or information from online platforms?

- Yes, data regularly reported by the platform, as requested by law
- Yes, specific data, requested as a competent authority
- Yes, through bilateral or special partnerships
- On the basis of a contractual agreement with the platform
- Yes, generally available transparency reports
- Yes, through generally available APIs (application programme interfaces)
- Yes, through web scraping or other independent web data extraction approaches
- Yes, because users made use of their right to port personal data
- Yes, other. Please specify in the text box below
- No

10 What sources do you use to obtain information about users of online platforms and other digital services – such as sellers of products online, service providers, website holders or providers of content online? For what purpose do you seek this information?

3000 character(s) maximum

11 Do you use WHOIS information about the registration of domain names and related information?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

13 How valuable is this information for you?

Please rate from 1 star (not particularly important) to 5 (extremely important)

14 Do you use or are you aware of alternative sources of such data? Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

---

The following questions are targeted at online intermediaries.
A. Measures taken against illegal goods, services and content online shared by users

1 What systems, if any, do you have in place for addressing illegal activities conducted by the users of your service (sale of illegal goods - e.g. a counterfeit product, an unsafe product, prohibited and restricted goods, wildlife and pet trafficking - dissemination of illegal content or illegal provision of services)?

- A notice-and-action system for users to report illegal activities
- A dedicated channel through which authorities report illegal activities
- Cooperation with trusted organisations who report illegal activities, following a fast-track assessment of the notification
- A system for the identification of professional users (‘know your customer’)
- A system for penalising users who are repeat offenders
- A system for informing consumers that they have purchased an illegal good, once you become aware of this
- Multi-lingual moderation teams
- Automated systems for detecting illegal activities. Please specify the detection system and the type of illegal content it is used for
- Other systems. Please specify in the text box below
- No system in place

2 Please explain.

5000 character(s) maximum

3 What issues have you encountered in operating these systems?

5000 character(s) maximum

4 On your marketplace (if applicable), do you have specific policies or measures for the identification of sellers established outside the European Union?

- Yes
- No

5 Please quantify, to the extent possible, the costs of the measures related to ‘notice-and-action’ or other measures for the reporting and removal of different types of illegal goods, services and content, as relevant.

5000 character(s) maximum
6. Please provide information and figures on the amount of different types of illegal content, services and goods notified, detected, removed, reinstated and on the number or complaints received from users. Please explain and/or link to publicly reported information if you publish this in regular transparency reports.

5000 character(s) maximum

7. Do you have in place measures for detecting and reporting the incidence of suspicious behaviour (i.e. behaviour that could lead to criminal acts such as acquiring materials for such acts)?

3000 character(s) maximum

B. Measures against other types of activities that might be harmful but are not, in themselves, illegal

1. Do your terms and conditions and/or terms of service ban activities such as:
   - Spread of political disinformation in election periods?
   - Other types of coordinated disinformation e.g. in health crisis?
   - Harmful content for children?
   - Online grooming, bullying?
   - Harmful content for other vulnerable persons?
   - Content which is harmful to women?
   - Hatred, violence and insults (other than illegal hate speech)?
   - Other activities which are not illegal per se but could be considered harmful?

2. Please explain your policy.

5000 character(s) maximum

3. Do you have a system in place for reporting such activities? What actions do they trigger?

3000 character(s) maximum
4 What other actions do you take? Please explain for each type of behaviour considered.

5000 character(s) maximum

5 Please quantify, to the extent possible, the costs related to such measures.

5000 character(s) maximum

6 Do you have specific policies in place to protect minors from harmful behaviours such as online grooming or bullying?

- Yes
- No

7 Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

C. Measures for protecting legal content goods and services

1 Does your organisation maintain an internal complaint and redress mechanism to your users for instances where their content might be erroneously removed, or their accounts blocked?

- Yes
- No

2 What action do you take when a user disputes the removal of their goods or content or services, or restrictions on their account? Is the content/good reinstated?

5000 character(s) maximum

3 What are the quality standards and control mechanism you have in place for the automated detection or removal tools you are using for e.g. content, goods, services, user accounts or bots?

3000 character(s) maximum
4 Do you have an independent oversight mechanism in place for the enforcement of your content policies?

☐ Yes
☐ No

5 Please explain.

5000 character(s) maximum

---

D. Transparency and cooperation

1 Do you actively provide the following information:

☐ Information to users when their good or content is removed, blocked or demoted
☐ Information to notice providers about the follow-up on their report
☐ Information to buyers of a product which has then been removed as being illegal

2 Do you publish transparency reports on your content moderation policy?

☐ Yes
☐ No

3 Do the reports include information on:

☐ Number of takedowns and account suspensions following enforcement of your terms of service?
☐ Number of takedowns following a legality assessment?
☐ Notices received from third parties?
☐ Referrals from authorities for violations of your terms of service?
☐ Removal requests from authorities for illegal activities?
☐ Number of complaints against removal decisions?
☐ Number of reinstated content?
☐ Other, please specify in the text box below

4 Please explain.

5000 character(s) maximum
5 What information is available on the automated tools you use for identification of illegal content, goods or services and their performance, if applicable? Who has access to this information? In what formats?

5000 character(s) maximum

6 How can third parties access data related to your digital service and under what conditions?

☐ Contractual conditions
☐ Special partnerships
☐ Available APIs (application programming interfaces) for data access
☐ Reported, aggregated information through reports
☐ Portability at the request of users towards a different service
☐ At the direct request of a competent authority
☐ Regular reporting to a competent authority
☐ Other means. Please specify

7 Please explain or give references for the different cases of data sharing and explain your policy on the different purposes for which data is shared.

5000 character(s) maximum

---

The following questions are open for all respondents.

2. Clarifying responsibilities for online platforms and other digital services

1 What responsibilities (i.e. legal obligations) should be imposed on online platforms and under what conditions?
Should such measures be taken, in your view, by all online platforms, or only by specific ones (e.g. depending on their size, capability, extent of risks of exposure to illegal activities conducted by their users)? If you consider that some measures should only be taken by large online platforms, please identify which would these measures be.

<p>| Yes, by all online platforms, based on the activities |
| Yes, only by platforms at particular risk of |
| Such measures should not be |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Online Platforms</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Required by Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain an effective ‘notice and action’ system for reporting illegal goods or content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a system for assessing the risk of exposure to illegal goods or content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have content moderation teams, appropriately trained and resourced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically respond to requests from law enforcement authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate with national authorities and law enforcement, in accordance with clear procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate with trusted organisations with proven expertise that can report illegal activities for fast analysis (‘trusted flaggers’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detect illegal content, goods or services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In particular where they intermediate sales of goods or services, inform their professional users about their obligations under EU law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request professional users to identify themselves clearly (‘know your customer’ policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical means allowing professional users to comply with their obligations (e.g. enable them to publish on the platform the pre-contractual information consumers need to receive in accordance with applicable consumer law)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform consumers when they become aware of product recalls or sales of illegal goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate with other online platforms for exchanging best practices, sharing information or tools to tackle illegal activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be transparent about their content policies, measures and their effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain an effective ‘counter-notice’ system for users whose goods or content is removed to dispute erroneous decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other. Please specify</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Please elaborate, if you wish to further explain your choices.  
*5000 character(s) maximum*

3 What information would be, in your view, necessary and sufficient for users and third parties to send to an online platform in order to notify an illegal activity (sales of illegal goods, offering of services or sharing illegal content) conducted by a user of the service?

- [ ] Precise location: e.g. URL
- [ ] Precise reason why the activity is considered illegal
- [ ] Description of the activity
- [ ] Identity of the person or organisation sending the notification. Please explain under what conditions such information is necessary:
- [ ] Other, please specify

4 Please explain  
*3000 character(s) maximum*

5 How should the reappearance of illegal content, goods or services be addressed, in your view? What approaches are effective and proportionate?  
*5000 character(s) maximum*

6 Where automated tools are used to detect illegal content, goods or services, what opportunities and risks does their use present as regards different types of illegal activities and the particularities of the different types of tools?  
*3000 character(s) maximum*
7 How should the spread of illegal goods, services or content across multiple platforms and services be addressed? Are there specific provisions necessary for addressing risks brought by:
   a. Digital services established outside of the Union?
   b. Sellers established outside of the Union, who reach EU consumers through online platforms?

8 What would be appropriate and proportionate measures for digital services acting as online intermediaries, other than online platforms, to take – e.g. other types of hosting services, such as web hosts, or services deeper in the internet stack, like cloud infrastructure services, content distribution services, DNS services, etc.?

9 What should be the rights and responsibilities of other entities, such as authorities, or interested third-parties such as civil society organisations or equality bodies in contributing to tackle illegal activities online?

10 What would be, in your view, appropriate and proportionate measures for online platforms to take in relation to activities or content which might cause harm but are not necessarily illegal?

11 In particular, are there specific measures you would find appropriate and proportionate for online platforms to take in relation to potentially harmful activities or content concerning minors? Please explain.
12 Please rate the necessity of the following measures for addressing the spread of disinformation online. Please rate from 1 (not at all necessary) to 5 (essential) each option below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1 (not at all necessary)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (essential)</th>
<th>I don't know / No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparently inform consumers about political advertising and sponsored content, in particular during election periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide users with tools to flag disinformation online and establishing transparent procedures for dealing with user complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackle the use of fake-accounts, fake engagements, bots and inauthentic users behaviour aimed at amplifying false or misleading narratives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency tools and secure access to platform data for trusted researchers in order to monitor inappropriate behaviour and better understand the impact of disinformation and the policies designed to counter it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency tools and secure access to platform data for authorities in order to monitor inappropriate behaviour and better understand the impact of disinformation and the policies designed to counter it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted risk assessments and mitigation strategies undertaken by online platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure effective access and visibility of a variety of authentic and professional journalistic sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing systems for platform actions and risk assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory oversight and auditing competence over platforms’ actions and risk assessments, including on sufficient resources and staff, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13 Please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

14 In special cases, where crises emerge and involve systemic threats to society, such as a health pandemic, and fast-spread of illegal and harmful activities online, what are, in your view, the appropriate cooperation mechanisms between digital services and authorities?

3000 character(s) maximum

15 What would be effective measures service providers should take, in your view, for protecting the freedom of expression of their users? Please rate from 1 (not at all necessary) to 5 (essential).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1 (not at all necessary)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (essential)</th>
<th>I don’t know / No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High standards of transparency on their terms of service and removal decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence in assessing the content notified to them for removal or blocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining an effective complaint and redress mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence in informing users whose content/goods/services was removed or blocked or whose accounts are threatened to be suspended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High accuracy and diligent control mechanisms, including human oversight, when automated tools are deployed for detecting, removing or demoting content or suspending users’ accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enabling third party insight – e.g. by academics – of main content moderation systems

Other. Please specify

16 Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

17 Are there other concerns and mechanisms to address risks to other fundamental rights such as freedom of assembly, non-discrimination, gender equality, freedom to conduct a business, or rights of the child? How could these be addressed?

5000 character(s) maximum

18 In your view, what information should online platforms make available in relation to their policy and measures taken with regard to content and goods offered by their users? Please elaborate, with regard to the identification of illegal content and goods, removal, blocking or demotion of content or goods offered, complaints mechanisms and reinstatement, the format and frequency of such information, and who can access the information.

5000 character(s) maximum

19 What type of information should be shared with users and/or competent authorities and other third parties such as trusted researchers with regard to the use of automated systems used by online platforms to detect, remove and/or block illegal content, goods, or user accounts?

5000 character(s) maximum

20 In your view, what measures are necessary with regard to algorithmic recommender systems used by online platforms?

5000 character(s) maximum
21 In your view, is there a need for enhanced data sharing between online platforms and authorities, within the boundaries set by the General Data Protection Regulation? Please select the appropriate situations, in your view:

- For supervisory purposes concerning professional users of the platform - e.g. in the context of platform intermediated services such as accommodation or ride-hailing services, for the purpose of labour inspection, for the purpose of collecting tax or social security contributions
- For supervisory purposes of the platforms’ own obligations – e.g. with regard to content moderation obligations, transparency requirements, actions taken in electoral contexts and against inauthentic behaviour and foreign interference
- Specific request of law enforcement authority or the judiciary
- On a voluntary and/or contractual basis in the public interest or for other purposes

22 Please explain. What would be the benefits? What would be concerns for companies, consumers or other third parties?

23 What types of sanctions would be effective, dissuasive and proportionate for online platforms which systematically fail to comply with their obligations (See also the last module of the consultation)?

24 Are there other points you would like to raise?

II. Reviewing the liability regime of digital services acting as intermediaries?

The liability of online intermediaries is a particularly important area of internet law in Europe and worldwide. The E-Commerce Directive harmonises the liability exemptions applicable to online intermediaries in the single market, with specific provisions for different services according to their role: from Internet access providers and messaging services to hosting service providers.

The previous section of the consultation explored obligations and responsibilities which online platforms and other services can be expected to take – i.e. processes they should put in place to address illegal
activities which might be conducted by users abusing their service. In this section, the focus is on the legal architecture for the liability regime for service providers when it comes to illegal activities conducted by their users. The Commission seeks informed views on how the current liability exemption regime is working and the areas where an update might be necessary.

2 The liability regime for online intermediaries is primarily established in the E-Commerce Directive, which distinguishes between different types of services: so-called ‘mere conduits’, ‘caching services’, and ‘hosting services’. In your understanding, are these categories sufficiently clear and complete for characterising and regulating today’s digital intermediary services? Please explain.

We support an exemption scheme as it had become a foundational principle of the internet architecture. Should a more graduated iteration of the liability regime be introduced, it ought to recognise intricacies of the digital advertising ecosystem. More specifically, the role of certain stakeholders in the supply chain, where the level of knowledge and control of advertisements or data used in the supply chain may be difficult to apply.

The digital advertising ecosystem is highly interconnected and see parties collaborating to place advertisements. Most of these parties provide for a service that may be deemed an ‘information society service’. In the supply chain, they can ultimately be considered subcontractors of one another. Most of them will not usually be involved in transmitting commercial communications, as it is the buyer’s ad server that normally transmits advertisements to the publisher. The paradigm reflects the reality of the market, whereby it is the advertiser that is fully knowledgeable about the product or service advertised for, thus being in a position to take decisions about contents of advertising and its purpose, as well as other determinations regarding the media buying, for instance, the method of trading and desired target audience.

For hosting services, the liability exemption for third parties’ content or activities is conditioned by a knowledge standard (i.e. when they get ‘actual knowledge’ of the illegal activities, they must ‘act expeditiously’ to remove it, otherwise they could be found liable).

3 Are there aspects that require further legal clarification?

4 Does the current legal framework dis-incentivize service providers to take proactive measures against illegal activities? If yes, please provide your view on how disincentives could be corrected.

One of the challenges of the current regime that can be seen as dis-incentivising service providers to act in a pro-active manner is that, if they undertake moderation or monitoring and obtain too high degree of knowledge or control of content or data, then they can lose the benefit of the safe harbours under the Directive.

As a general rule, it is worthwhile recalling that while technical capacity and functions of specific players in
the supply chain will differ, they remain entities working on behalf of other parties, notably advertisers and publishers. Generally, the various players have no knowledge or control over the content, or data stored or transmitted. That said, it should be noted that many players may undertake various monitoring activities, in order to comply with the law but also for commercial reasons further to wishes of their clients, for instance, to improve the quality and transparency of digital trading, minimize associated risk, or ensure measurement of advertising itself or services provided.

It would be unfortunate if by virtue of complying with the law or performing due diligence digital advertising players were losing the protection from liability that they enjoy due to additional knowledge or control that they may exercise over the content or data that they monitor. We therefore welcome reflection on the ‘Good Samaritan’ provision, as it could incentivize players interested in performing additional monitoring activities.

5 Do you think that the concept characterising intermediary service providers as playing a role of a 'mere technical, automatic and passive nature' in the transmission of information (recital 42 of the E-Commerce Directive) is sufficiently clear and still valid? Please explain.

As a rule of thumb, it does seem accurate to claim that the role of an ISP is limited and as stipulated in Rec. 41.

However, as explained in an answer to the preceding Question 4, many technology partners are under pressure to undertake various monitoring activities, in order to comply with the law but also for commercial reasons further to wishes of their clients, for instance, to improve the quality and transparency of digital trading, minimize associated risk, or ensure measurement of advertising itself or services provided.

These wishes of actors contracting players providing for various technological solutions must be taken into account while making an assessment of the role of an ISP.

6 The E-commerce Directive also prohibits Member States from imposing on intermediary service providers general monitoring obligations or obligations to seek facts or circumstances of illegal activities conducted on their service by their users. In your view, is this approach, balancing risks to different rights and policy objectives, still appropriate today? Is there further clarity needed as to the parameters for ‘general monitoring obligations’? Please explain.

We support the existing paradigm, whereby further to Art. 15(1) of the e-Commerce Directive an obligation exists that requires Member States not to impose a general obligation on intermediary service providers to monitor the information which they transmit or store, nor a general obligation actively to seek facts or circumstances indicating illegal activity. Digital advertising industry does primarily focus on commercial activity and as such collaborates with business partners, keeping in mind that generally, the various ecosystem players that IAB Europe associates have no knowledge or control over the content, or data stored or transmitted.
III. What issues derive from the gatekeeper power of digital platforms?

There is wide consensus concerning the benefits for consumers and innovation, and a wide-range of efficiencies, brought about by online platforms in the European Union’s Single Market. Online platforms facilitate cross-border trading within and outside the EU and open entirely new business opportunities to a variety of European businesses and traders by facilitating their expansion and access to new markets. At the same time, regulators and experts around the world consider that large online platforms are able to control increasingly important online platform ecosystems in the digital economy. Such large online platforms connect many businesses and consumers. In turn, this enables them to leverage their advantages – economies of scale, network effects and important data assets - in one area of their activity to improve or develop new services in adjacent areas. The concentration of economic power in then platform economy creates a small number of ‘winner-takes it all/most’ online platforms. The winner online platforms can also readily take over (potential) competitors and it is very difficult for an existing competitor or potential new entrant to overcome the winner’s competitive edge.

The Commission announced that it ‘will further explore, in the context of the Digital Services Act package, ex ante rules to ensure that markets characterised by large platforms with significant network effects acting as gatekeepers, remain fair and contestable for innovators, businesses, and new market entrants’.

This module of the consultation seeks informed views from all stakeholders on this framing, on the scope, the specific perceived problems, and the implications, definition and parameters for addressing possible issues deriving from the economic power of large, gatekeeper platforms.

The Communication ‘Shaping Europe’s Digital Future’ also flagged that ‘competition policy alone cannot address all the systemic problems that may arise in the platform economy’. Stakeholders are invited to provide their views on potential new competition instruments through a separate, dedicated open public consultation that will be launched soon.

In parallel, the Commission is also engaged in a process of reviewing EU competition rules and ensuring they are fit for the modern economy and the digital age. As part of that process, the Commission has launched a consultation on the proposal for a New Competition Tool aimed at addressing the gaps identified in enforcing competition rules. The initiative intends to address as specific objectives the structural competition problems that prevent markets from functioning properly and that can tilt the level playing field in favour of only a few market players. This could cover certain digital or digitally-enabled markets, as identified in the report by the Special Advisers and other recent reports on the role of competition policy, and/or other sectors. As such, the work on a proposed new competition tool and the initiative at stake complement each other. The work on the two impact assessments will be conducted in parallel in order to ensure a coherent outcome. In this context, the Commission will take into consideration the feedback received from both consultations. We would therefore invite you, in preparing your responses to the questions below, to also consider your response to the parallel consultation on a new competition tool.

1 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree not disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>I don't know/ No reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumers have sufficient choices and alternatives to the offerings from online platforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for consumers to switch between services provided by online platform companies and use same or similar services provider by other online platform companies (“multi-home”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for individuals to port their data in a useful manner to alternative service providers outside of an online platform.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient level of interoperability between services of different online platform companies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an asymmetry of information between the knowledge of online platforms about consumers, which enables them to target them with commercial offers, and the knowledge of consumers about market conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for innovative SME online platforms to expand or enter the market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional businesses are increasingly dependent on a limited number of very large online platforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are imbalances in the bargaining power between these online platforms and their business users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Businesses and consumers interacting with these online platforms are often asked to accept unfavourable conditions and clauses in the terms of use/contract with the online platforms.

Certain large online platform companies create barriers to entry and expansion in the Single Market (gatekeepers).

Large online platforms often leverage their assets from their primary activities (customer base, data, technological solutions, skills, financial capital) to expand into other activities.

When large online platform companies expand into such new activities, this often poses a risk of reducing innovation and deterring competition from smaller innovative market operators.

**Main features of gatekeeper online platform companies and the main criteria for assessing their economic power**

1 Which characteristics are relevant in determining the gatekeeper role of large online platform companies? Please rate each criterion identified below from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (very relevant):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large user base</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide geographic coverage in the EU</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They capture a large share of total revenue of the market you are active/of a sector</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on a certain sector</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They build on and exploit strong network effects</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They leverage their assets for entering new areas of activity</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They raise barriers to entry for competitors</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They accumulate valuable and diverse data and information</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are very few, if any, alternative services available on the market</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock-in of users/consumers</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>★★★★☆☆☆</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 If you replied "other", please list

3000 character(s) maximum

3 Please explain your answer. How could different criteria be combined to accurately identify large online platform companies with gatekeeper role?

3000 character(s) maximum

4 Do you believe that the integration of any or all of the following activities within a single company can strengthen the gatekeeper role of large online platform companies (‘conglomerate effect’)? Please select the activities you consider to strengthen the gatekeeper role:

- online intermediation services (i.e. consumer-facing online platforms such as e-commerce marketplaces, social media, mobile app stores, etc., as per Regulation (EU) 2019/1150 - see glossary)
Emerging issues

The following questions are targeted particularly at businesses and business users of large online platform companies.

2 As a business user of large online platforms, do you encounter issues concerning trading conditions on large online platform companies?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

3 Please specify which issues you encounter and please explain to what types of platform these are related to (e.g. e-commerce marketplaces, app stores, search engines, operating systems, social networks).
   5000 character(s) maximum

4 Have you been affected by unfair contractual terms or unfair practices of very large online platform companies? Please explain your answer in detail, pointing to the effects on your business, your consumers and possibly other stakeholders in the short, medium and long-term?
   5000 character(s) maximum
The following questions are targeted particularly at consumers who are users of large online platform companies.

6 Do you encounter issues concerning commercial terms and conditions when accessing services provided by large online platform companies? Please specify which issues you encounter and please explain to what types of platform these are related to (e.g. e-commerce marketplaces, app stores, search engines, operating systems, social networks).

5000 character(s) maximum

7 Have you considered any of the practices by large online platform companies as unfair? Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

The following questions are open to all respondents.

9 Are there specific issues and unfair practices you perceive on large online platform companies?

5000 character(s) maximum

10 In your view, what practices related to the use and sharing of data in the platforms’ environment are raising particular challenges?

5000 character(s) maximum

11 What impact would the identified unfair practices can have on innovation, competition and consumer choice in the single market?

3000 character(s) maximum

12 Do startups or scaleups depend on large online platform companies to access or expand? Do you observe any trend as regards the level of dependency in the last five years (i.e. increases; remains the same; decreases)? Which difficulties in
your view do start-ups or scale-ups face when they depend on large online platform companies to access or expand on the markets?

3000 character(s) maximum

13 Which are possible positive and negative societal (e.g. on freedom of expression, consumer protection, media plurality) and economic (e.g. on market contestability, innovation) effects, if any, of the gatekeeper role that large online platform companies exercise over whole platform ecosystem?

3000 character(s) maximum

14 Which issues specific to the media sector (if any) would, in your view, need to be addressed in light of the gatekeeper role of large online platforms? If available, please provide additional references, data and facts.

3000 character(s) maximum

Regulation of large online platform companies acting as gatekeepers

1 Do you believe that in order to address any negative societal and economic effects of the gatekeeper role that large online platform companies exercise over whole platform ecosystems, there is a need to consider dedicated regulatory rules?

☐ I fully agree
☐ I agree to a certain extent
☐ I disagree to a certain extent
☐ I disagree
☐ I don’t know

2 Please explain

3000 character(s) maximum

3 Do you believe that such dedicated rules should prohibit certain practices by large online platform companies with gatekeeper role that are considered particularly harmful for users and consumers of these large online platforms?

☐ Yes
4 Please explain your reply and, if possible, detail the types of prohibitions that should in your view be part of the regulatory toolbox.

3000 character(s) maximum

5 Do you believe that such dedicated rules should include obligations on large online platform companies with gatekeeper role?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

6 Please explain your reply and, if possible, detail the types of obligations that should in your view be part of the regulatory toolbox.

3000 character(s) maximum

7 If you consider that there is a need for such dedicated rules setting prohibitions and obligations, as those referred to in your replies to questions 3 and 5 above, do you think there is a need for a specific regulatory authority to enforce these rules?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

8 Please explain your reply.

3000 character(s) maximum

9 Do you believe that such dedicated rules should enable regulatory intervention against specific large online platform companies, when necessary, with a case by case adapted remedies?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
10 If yes, please explain your reply and, if possible, detail the types of case by case remedies.

3000 character(s) maximum

11 If you consider that there is a need for such dedicated rules, as referred to in question 9 above, do you think there is a need for a specific regulatory authority to enforce these rules?

☐ Yes
☐ No

12 Please explain your reply

3000 character(s) maximum

13 If you consider that there is a need for a specific regulatory authority to enforce dedicated rules referred to questions 3, 5 and 9 respectively, would in your view these rules need to be enforced by the same regulatory authority or could they be enforced by different regulatory authorities? Please explain your reply.

3000 character(s) maximum

14 At what level should the regulatory oversight of platforms be organised?

☐ At national level
☐ At EU level
☐ Both at EU and national level.
☐ I don't know

15 If you consider such dedicated rules necessary, what should in your view be the relationship of such rules with the existing sector specific rules and/or any future sector specific rules?

3000 character(s) maximum

16 Should such rules have an objective to tackle both negative societal and negative economic effects deriving from the gatekeeper role of these very large online platforms? Please explain your reply.
17 Specifically, what could be effective measures related to data held by very large online platform companies with a gatekeeper role beyond those laid down in the General Data Protection Regulation in order to promote competition and innovation as well as a high standard of personal data protection and consumer welfare?

18 What could be effective measures concerning large online platform companies with a gatekeeper role in order to promote media pluralism, while respecting the subsidiarity principle?

19 Which, if any, of the following characteristics are relevant when considering the requirements for a potential regulatory authority overseeing the large online platform companies with the gatekeeper role:

- Institutional cooperation with other authorities addressing related sectors – e.g. competition authorities, data protection authorities, financial services authorities, consumer protection authorities, cyber security, etc.
- Pan-EU scope
- Swift and effective cross-border cooperation and assistance across Member States
- Capacity building within Member States
- High level of technical capabilities including data processing, auditing capacities
- Cooperation with extra-EU jurisdictions
- Other

21 Please explain if these characteristics would need to be different depending on the type of ex ante rules (see questions 3, 5, 9 above) that the regulatory authority would be enforcing?
22 Which, if any, of the following requirements and tools could facilitate regulatory oversight over very large online platform companies (multiple answers possible):

- Reporting obligation on gatekeeping platforms to send a notification to a public authority announcing its intention to expand activities
- Monitoring powers for the public authority (such as regular reporting)
- Investigative powers for the public authority
- Other

24 Please explain if these requirements would need to be different depending on the type of ex ante rules (see questions 3, 5, 9 above) that the regulatory authority would be enforcing?

*3000 character(s) maximum*
25 Taking into consideration the parallel consultation on a proposal for a New Competition Tool focusing on addressing structural competition problems that prevent markets from functioning properly and tilt the level playing field in favour of only a few market players. Please rate the suitability of each option below to address market issues arising in online platforms ecosystems. Please rate the policy options below from 1 (not effective) to 5 (most effective).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Current competition rules are enough to address issues raised in digital markets</th>
<th>1 (not effective)</th>
<th>2 (somewhat effective)</th>
<th>3 (sufficiently effective)</th>
<th>4 (very effective)</th>
<th>5 (most effective)</th>
<th>Not applicable /No relevant experience or knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a need for an additional regulatory framework imposing obligations and prohibitions that are generally applicable to all large online platforms with gatekeeper power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a need for an additional regulatory framework allowing for the possibility to impose tailored remedies on individual large online platforms with gatekeeper power, on a case-by-case basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is a need for a New Competition Tool allowing to address structural risks and lack of competition in (digital) markets on a case-by-case basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is a need for combination of two or more of the options 2 to 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26 Please explain which of the options, or combination of these, would be, in your view, suitable and sufficient to address the market issues arising in the online platforms ecosystems.
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27 Are there other points you would like to raise?

3000 character(s) maximum

IV. Other emerging issues and opportunities, including online advertising and smart contracts

Online advertising has substantially evolved over the recent years and represents a major revenue source for many digital services, as well as other businesses present online, and opens unprecedented opportunities for content creators, publishers, etc. To a large extent, maximising revenue streams and optimising online advertising are major business incentives for the business users of the online platforms and for shaping the data policy of the platforms. At the same time, revenues from online advertising as well as increased visibility and audience reach are also a major incentive for potentially harmful intentions, e.g. in online disinformation campaigns.

Another emerging issue is linked to the conclusion of 'smart contracts' which represent an important innovation for digital and other services, but face some legal uncertainties.

This section of the open public consultation seeks to collect data, information on current practices, and informed views on potential issues emerging in the area of online advertising and smart contracts. Respondents are invited to reflect on other areas where further measures may be needed to facilitate innovation in the single market. This module does not address privacy and data protection concerns; all aspects related to data sharing and data collection are to be afforded the highest standard of personal data protection.

**Online advertising**

1 When you see an online ad, is it clear to you who has placed it online?

- Yes, always
- Sometimes: but I can find the information when this is not immediately clear
- Sometimes: but I cannot always find this information
- I don’t know
- No
2. As a publisher online (e.g. owner of a website where ads are displayed), what types of advertising systems do you use for covering your advertising space? What is their relative importance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising System</th>
<th>% of ad space</th>
<th>% of ad revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediated programmatic advertising through real-time bidding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private marketplace auctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic advertising with guaranteed impressions (non-auction based)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural advertising (micro-targeting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 What information is publicly available about ads displayed on an online platform that you use?
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4 As a publisher, what type of information do you have about the advertisement placed next to your content/on your website?

3000 character(s) maximum

5 To what extent do you find the quality and reliability of this information satisfactory for your purposes?

Please rate your level of satisfaction ★★★★★
6 As an advertiser or an agency acting on behalf of the advertiser (if applicable), what types of programmatic advertising do you use to place your ads? What is their relative importance in your ad inventory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Programmatic Advertising</th>
<th>% of ad inventory</th>
<th>% of ad expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediated programmatic advertising through real-time bidding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private marketplace auctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic advertising with guaranteed impressions (non-auction based)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural advertising (micro-targeting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 As an advertiser or an agency acting on behalf of the advertiser (if applicable), what type of information do you have about the ads placed online on your behalf?

3000 character(s) maximum

8 To what extent do you find the quality and reliability of this information satisfactory for your purposes?

Please rate your level of satisfaction ★★★★★

---

The following questions are targeted specifically at online platforms.

10 As an online platform, what options do your users have with regards to the advertisements they are served and the grounds on which the ads are being served to them? Can users access your service through other conditions than viewing advertisements? Please explain.
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11 Do you publish or share with researchers, authorities or other third parties detailed data on ads published, their sponsors and viewership rates? Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

12 What systems do you have in place for detecting illicit offerings in the ads you intermediate?

3000 character(s) maximum

---

The following questions are open to all respondents.

14 Based on your experience, what actions and good practices can tackle the placement of ads next to illegal content or goods, and/or on websites that disseminate such illegal content or goods, and to remove such illegal content or goods when detected?

3000 character(s) maximum
Regrettably, legitimate advertising may appear on websites which host illegal or illicit content and revenues derived from advertising can partially or wholly fund such websites. It is important to appreciate that in such cases the whole industry – advertisers and advertising agencies on the buy side, news publishers and other ad-funded sites and online services on the sell side, and technology providers serving both sides – must be considered as collateral damage of intentional misbehaviour and not as contributors to malpractice.

Minimising the risk of advertising inadvertently appearing on such sites can be facilitated with the use of brand safety tools and sound business practices. Brand safety describes an entire area of practice where advertisers, agencies and technology companies try to prevent advertising from being misplaced. The digital advertising industry is deeply invested in brand safety, as proven by our strong support for the European Commission’s “follow-the-money” approach embodied in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on misplacement of ads on websites that infringe intellectual property rights. In addition to the MoU efforts, IAB Europe has been supportive of an initiative embracing a similar approach spearheaded by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), WIPO ALERT. It is a secure, online platform to which authorized bodies in WIPO member states can upload details of websites or apps which have been determined to infringe copyright according to national rules.

The European approach builds on experiences from national markets where a number of successful industry initiatives emerged. The ‘IAB Europe Navigator: Quality Initiatives’ white paper demonstrates the vast amount of work being undertaken in Europe and beyond to build and ensure a sustainable future for digital advertising and marketing, in particular the national-level quality initiatives. There already exist several market-wide programmes, driven by European National IABs, that are designed to increase transparency & trust in how digital advertising is bought and sold, built on more specific pillars such as brand safety, fraud prevention, viewability, user experience.

Against that background, and looking at the market practice, one should also appreciate that over the past years there has been a rapid adoption by advertisers of verification services by independent third-party providers. These services are dedicated to ad placement verification and supported by high-end semantic technology.

15 From your perspective, what measures would lead to meaningful transparency in the ad placement process?

3000 character(s) maximum

As a general point, we would like to challenge the characterisation of the existing state of transparency in the ad placement process. The question appears to imply a lack of meaningful transparency, which is incorrect and may lead to skewed responses.

Digital advertising trading can happen in a variety of ways. The industry is committed to maintaining transparency and quality across the ecosystem, for all forms of trading.

As the ecosystem is ever-evolving, and new and more players join the open market, it is important to hone the approaches to generate transparency developed by the industry. Resources and technical tools, such as IAB Europe’s Supply Chain Transparency Guide, IAB Tech Lab’s ads.txt, sellers.json and OpenRTB Supply Chain object allow for analysis of the broad supply chain. Initially, prime focus of most of technical standards in the programmatic chain had been on the supply side, yet, dedicated buy-side approaches are being expeditiously reflected upon, too. Moreover, existing market-wide Programmatic Codes of Conduct (DACH, PL markets) are applicable across the board to all industry players.

These instruments help buyers and sellers of digital media to navigate through pertinent real-life operational
questions concerning data, cost and inventory source as in the case of IAB Europe’s Supply Chain Transparency Guide, or verify entities to ensure that only authorized players participate in ad transactioning. For instance, further to the adoption of ads.txt a public record of Authorized Digital Sellers is created, which makes it harder for bad actors to profit from selling counterfeit inventory across the ecosystem. By proxy, buyers are able to more easily identify the Authorized Digital Sellers for a participating publisher, allowing brands to have confidence they are buying authentic publisher inventory.

Despite the fact that the open market may on the surface come across as complex, due to the abundance of participants and offerings, it remains critically important to reach audiences at scale and to monetise inventory to support quality journalism. It is important to note that smaller players and publishers specifically rely on support from their technology partners in order to do this.

IAB Europe’s Transparency & Consent Framework – originally established as a framework for legal compliance with the EU privacy and data protection regime – does, too, provide transparency and due diligence record keeping, hence contributing to accountability of parties collaborating in the ad placement process.

Overall, the issue is not with inaccessibility of information, but rather with managing complexity and having the right analytical and data science skills. The industry is complex and continues to grow and advance, which is why IAB Europe is actively promoting educational initiatives to get more people with relevant skills into digital advertising and help companies connect with such talent.

16 What information about online ads should be made publicly available?

Virtually all digital advertising is data-driven. The GDPR’s definition of personal data is very broad, if not all-encompassing, thus all types of advertising involves processing of personal data, including contextual ads. For ad business to be valuable commercially, ad performance needs to be at the very least rigorously measured, and there may be other use cases that require personal data processing (e.g. generating audience insight, technical delivery of ads, prevention of fraud).

From the privacy and data protection perspective, the GDPR regulates the processing of personal data, whereas the ePrivacy Directive storage and accessing of information on user devices. Under the GDPR, as was the case under the old Data Protection Directive, users must be provided with certain specific pieces of information for the processing to be legal. The GDPR requires the following items to be disclosed in a clear and understandable manner, when personal data is first collected, with accurate and full information of all relevant issues provided: what kind of data is being collected and for what purpose(s); who the data controllers are (both the website owner and their technology partners can assume this role); how the user consents to or refuses the data processing; how the user can withdraw his or hers consent; the duration of the data retention (i.e. cookie expiry date). In case of lack of compliance with the information disclosure and consent requirements, the user consent will be deemed invalid. IAB Europe’s Transparency & Consent Framework (TCF) standardises how websites make the various information disclosures required by the GDPR, how they elicit and log users’ choices, and how they communicate those choices to their technology partners.

Separately, all advertising must be clearly identified as such, along with the natural or legal person on whose behalf the commercial communication is made and various other details such as the conditions for any promotional offers like discounts. The rules in fact apply to all commercial communications, further to legal provisions of the eCommerce, Information Society Services, and Unfair Commercial Practices Directives. Moreover, the existing self-regulatory rules build on the aforementioned, with the International Chamber of
Commerce (ICC) Advertising and Marketing Communications Code prescribing detailed rules on transparency and disclosure of marketing communication. The European advertising self-regulatory system, which covers 97% of all advertisements seen by the EU population, comprises European bodies that deal with complaints about advertising content being assessed against the provisions of local codes of conduct inspired by the aforementioned ICC rules.

17 Based on your expertise, which effective and proportionate auditing systems could bring meaningful accountability in the ad placement system?

As a general point, we would like to challenge the characterisation of the existing state of accountability in the ad placement system. The question appears to imply a lack of meaningful accountability, which is incorrect and may lead to skewed responses.

Meaningful accountability is informed by assurances about integrity of the rules and procedures driving the ad placement systems. Open standards and industry initiatives guarantee a level of independence and market-wide oversight. Indeed, part of IAB Europe’s mission is to promote industry collaboration to deliver frameworks, standards and industry programmes that enable business to thrive in the European market.

There exist technical standards, such as IAB Tech Lab’s ads.txt, sellers.json and OpenRTB Supply Chain object, as well as IAB Europe’s Transparency & Consent Framework, accessible to every legitimate player that in turn becomes a subject to other players’ scrutiny due to the very open nature of said standards. Some national markets introduced Programmatic Codes of Conduct binding all active ecosystem players to a set of agreed and openly available criteria.

There also exist several market-wide programmes, driven by European National IABs, that are designed to deliver accountability and increase transparency & trust in how digital advertising is bought and sold, built on more specific pillars such as brand safety, fraud prevention, viewability, user experience. These initiatives include fully-fledged schemes with existing or to-be-developed monitoring and certification mechanisms. A key part of some of these schemes, and indeed well-regarded and recommended market practice, is third-party verification whereby a company will undergo an audit to ensure their systems meet a set of agreed and openly available standards.

IAB Europe is working with members to share these best practices and help in harmonising relevant business standards across the continent.

Broad uptake of such measures, whether these are interoperable technical standards, or market-wide programmes demonstrates that there is an incentive for legitimate industry players to follow suit and become part of a circle of trusted parties with whom one can comfortably do business.

18 What is, from your perspective, a functional definition of ‘political advertising’? Are you aware of any specific obligations attached to ‘political advertising’ at national level?

Intuitively, political advertising comprises a paid-for communications that unmistakably advocates for or against the election of a clearly identified candidate during a designated election period in a given jurisdiction.
Political advertising appears to be well but diversely covered by regulated by national legislation across a number of EU Member States by electoral laws. It would seem that some of the existing rules, for instance, on disclosures or election periods, applied across the board, irrespective of the media where an advertisement appears.

In terms of digital political advertising, it should also be noted that personal data revealing political beliefs is within the GDPR's scope. Processing of such data is generally prohibited, albeit lawful processing can be allowed under certain conditions.

Taking into account the aforementioned, we would welcome the European Commission providing for a comprehensive legal overview of the digital political advertising across the EU.

Given its very specific nature, commitment to any further regulation of political advertising, or self-regulation for that matter, has to come from the actual advertisers who in the case are political actors (politicians, political parties, etc.), and not only, commercially-driven, advertising industry as such. There should be an agreement by political actors across the EU Member States, on what constitutes a political advertisement and how any rules pertaining to political advertising can be applied without prejudice to binding national-level electoral laws.

19 What information disclosure would meaningfully inform consumers in relation to political advertising? Are there other transparency standards and actions needed, in your opinion, for an accountable use of political advertising and political messaging?

The standard ad disclosure and transparency rules should by no means also be observed in case of political advertising. Therefore, consumers should be immediately able to recognise when a paid-for communication is an ad. Moreover, the identity of the advertiser should be easily ascertainable. Finally, disclosures should be prominent and understandable to consumers.

To enhance transparency, the US and Canadian markets saw introduction of a self-regulatory ‘Political Ad Icon’ initiative which serves as an immediate, simple, and intuitive tool for people to get information about the political ads covered by the Self-Regulatory Principles of Transparency & Accountability to Political Advertising. Under the Digital Advertising Alliances in the US and Canada Political Ads Programs, the Political Ad icon and/or wording should be used to provide clear, meaningful, and prominent notice that an ad is an express advocacy political advertisement for the election or defeat of a candidate for federal or certain statewide elected office.

20 What impact would have, in your view, enhanced transparency and accountability in the online advertising value chain, on the gatekeeper power of major online platforms and other potential consequences such as media pluralism?

As a general point, we would like to challenge the characterisation of the existing state of transparency and accountability in the online advertising value chain. The question appears to imply transparency and accountability are at a rudimentary level, which is incorrect and may lead to skewed responses.

Ensuring transparency and trust in how digital advertising is bought and sold has been a long-standing and
unquestioned priority of the broader digital advertising ecosystem. Constant development and iteration of technical standards, industry-wide programmes, and wide-ranging market education are a testament to industry’s righteous conduct in this regard. It is simply not a question of ‘if’ transparency and accountability should be continuously evolved; instead, it is ‘how’ to do in the most impactful manner.

IAB Europe believes that the open web - being an ecosystem of publishers, and technology companies operating collaboratively to serve the needs of marketers - can continue to support the media that are still adapting to a highly competitive digital landscape. The ad-funded - thus accessible to all users – internet indeed finances rich and quality journalism, including the local news and investigative reporting that are essential to holding power to account in a democratic society. Overall, digital advertising accounts for over 81% of European traditional newspaper and magazine digital revenues, which clearly demonstrates dependency of Europe’s content economy depends on this income stream.

The existence of the rich third-party digital advertising infrastructure at the disposal of publishers of all sizes does enable the smaller players to compete with the vertically-integrated platforms and large publishers themselves. This is owing to a sustained competitive landscape, and even more importance, the ability to profile users at scale. The sheer volume of data that users willingly provide to the platforms and the greater traffic that larger publishers attract, enable them to offer advertisers larger audiences who will likely be receptive to advertising about particular products and services. Small publishers cannot hope to achieve such scale on their own. But cross-site profiling in full view and under the control of individual users can give those small publishers asymmetrical leverage, helping them compete successfully.

The more players adhere to relevant transparency and accountability standards and practices, the better. It will only benefit the whole sector, as long as the smaller actors can rightfully compete with other players, which is yet dependent on other factors, as outlined above.

In sum, it is our conviction that the open web, supported by advertising, can help the European media in a highly competitive digital landscape, fully in line with the Commission’s priority, set out in the 2020 European strategy for data, to ensure “incentives for data-driven businesses to emerge, grow and innovate in the EU today”.

21 Are there other emerging issues in the space of online advertising you would like to flag?

3000 character(s) maximum

We believe that diverging implementations of the existing privacy and data protection framework, and associated regulatory uncertainty put the digital advertising business model in peril and create little predictability over the future.

As the leading European trade association representing the entire ecosystem, we have invested considerable resources in interpreting the EU privacy and data protection legal framework, further devising a novel approach to legal compliance which amounts to the IAB Europe’s Transparency & Consent Framework (TCF). Yet, having rolled out a framework which has become a de facto industry standard, we are deeply concerned about the fact that while on paper digital advertising is a lawful business model supporting the media ecosystem, and arguably the GDPR provides for a harmonised approached, the real-life experience shows that the opposite is happening.

There exists an issue of the so-called ‘conditionality of access to content’, discussed in the context of the proposed ePrivacy Regulation, is intimately linked with defining certain GDPR’s concepts, such as ‘consent’, and the notion of ‘freely given’ in particular. Coherence in this regard can be maintained by strong,
unambiguous legal presumptions, as laid out currently in Recital 25 of the ePrivacy Directive, and further clarification of the concept of GDPR’s ‘consent’.

Article 7(4) of the GDPR is being interpreted by the Data Protection Authorities (DPAs) as if there were an outright prohibition of online services making access to their ad-funded content conditional on consent to storing and/or accessing information on users’ devices for advertising purposes. This is in spite of the fact that it is well-evidenced that data remains critical for the European businesses to continue deriving value from their activity in the digital space, and, in particular, for the European media for which advertising is the major revenue stream that consequently provides users with unpaid access to content and services.

The European Data Protection Board (EDPB) – composed of representatives of the DPAs and set up precisely to ensure consistent application of GDPR – states in its Opinion on consent that “[…] consent cannot be considered as freely given if a controller argues that a choice exists between its service that includes consenting to the use of personal data for additional purposes on the one hand, and an equivalent service offered by a different controller on the other hand,” even though the GDPR merely lays out some practices to consider when determining whether consent is freely given without generally prohibiting them. Some DPAs, for instance the Dutch, indeed embraced that view issuing warnings to Dutch publishers stating that so-called cookie walls are prohibited under GDPR.

Smart contracts

1 Is there sufficient legal clarity in the EU for the provision and use of “smart contracts” – e.g. with regard to validity, applicable law and jurisdiction?

Please rate from 1 (lack of clarity) to 5 (sufficient clarity)

2 Please explain the difficulties you perceive.

3000 character(s) maximum

3 In which of the following areas do you find necessary further regulatory clarity?

☐ Mutual recognition of the validity of smart contracts in the EU as concluded in accordance with the national law
☐ Minimum standards for the validity of “smart contracts” in the EU
☐ Measures to ensure that legal obligations and rights flowing from a smart contract and the functioning of the smart contract are clear and unambiguous, in particular for consumers
☐ Allowing interruption of smart contracts
☐ Clarity on liability for damage caused in the operation of a smart contract
☐ Further clarity for payment and currency-related smart contracts.

4 Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum
V. How to address challenges around the situation of self-employed individuals offering services through online platforms?

Individuals providing services through platforms may have different legal status (workers or self-employed). This section aims at gathering first information and views on the situation of self-employed individuals offering services through platforms (such as ride-hailing, food delivery, domestic work, design work, micro-tasks etc.). Furthermore, it seeks to gather first views on whether any detected problems are specific to the platform economy and what would be the perceived obstacles to the improvement of the situation of individuals providing services through platforms. This consultation is not intended to address the criteria by which persons providing services on such platforms are deemed to have one or the other legal status. The issues explored here do not refer to the selling of goods (e.g. online marketplaces) or the sharing of assets (e.g. sub-renting houses) through platforms.

The following questions are targeting self-employed individuals offering services through online platforms.

Relationship with the platform and the final customer

1. What type of service do you offer through platforms?
   - Food-delivery
   - Ride-hailing
   - Online translations, design, software development or micro-tasks
   - On-demand cleaning, plumbing or DIY services
   - Other, please specify

2. Please explain.

3. Which requirements were you asked to fulfill in order to be accepted by the platform(s) you offer services through, if any?

4. Do you have a contractual relationship with the final customer?
5 Do you receive any guidelines or directions by the platform on how to offer your services?
- Yes
- No

7 Under what conditions can you stop using the platform to provide your services, or can the platform ask you to stop doing so?

8 What is your role in setting the price paid by the customer and how is your remuneration established for the services you provide through the platform(s)?

9 What are the risks and responsibilities you bear in case of non-performance of the service or unsatisfactory performance of the service?

**Situation of self-employed individuals providing services through platforms**

10 What are the main advantages for you when providing services through platforms?

11 What are the main issues or challenges you are facing when providing services through platforms? Is the platform taking any measures to improve these?

12 Do you ever have problems getting paid for your service? Does/do the platform have any measures to support you in such situations?
13 Do you consider yourself in a vulnerable or dependent situation in your work (economically or otherwise), and if yes, why?


14 Can you collectively negotiate vis-à-vis the platform(s) your remuneration or other contractual conditions?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

15 Please explain.


The following questions are targeting online platforms.

Role of platforms

17 What is the role of your platform in the provision of the service and the conclusion of the contract with the customer?


18 What are the risks and responsibilities borne by your platform for the non-performance of the service or unsatisfactory provision of the service?


19 What happens when the service is not paid for by the customer/client?


20 Does your platform own any of the assets used by the individual offering the services?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

22 Out of the total number of service providers offering services through your platform, what is the percentage of self-employed individuals?
   ○ Over 75%
Between 50% and 75%
- Between 25% and 50%
- Less than 25%

**Rights and obligations**

23 What is the contractual relationship between the platform and individuals offering services through it?

3000 character(s) maximum

24 Who sets the price paid by the customer for the service offered?

- The platform
- The individual offering services through the platform
- Others, please specify

25 Please explain.

3000 character(s) maximum

26 How is the price paid by the customer shared between the platform and the individual offering the services through the platform?

3000 character(s) maximum

27 On average, how many hours per week do individuals spend offering services through your platform?

3000 character(s) maximum

28 Do you have measures in place to enable individuals providing services through your platform to contact each other and organise themselves collectively?

- Yes
- No

29 Please describe the means through which the individuals who provide services on your platform contact each other.

3000 character(s) maximum
30 What measures do you have in place for ensuring that individuals offering services through your platform work legally - e.g. comply with applicable rules on minimum working age, hold a work permit, where applicable - if any? (If you replied to this question in your answers in the first module of the consultation, there is no need to repeat your answer here.)

3000 character(s) maximum

The following questions are open to all respondents

Situation of self-employed individuals providing services through platforms

32 Are there areas in the situation of individuals providing services through platforms which would need further improvements? Please rate the following issues from 1 (no improvements needed) to 5 (substantial issues need to be addressed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>1 (no improvements needed)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (substantial improvements needed)</th>
<th>I don't know / No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of choosing when and/or where to provide services</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency on remuneration</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to tackle non-payment of remuneration</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency in online ratings</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that individuals providing services through platforms can contact each other and organise themselves for collective purposes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling the issue of work carried out by individuals lacking legal permits</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of discrimination of individuals providing services</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33 Please explain the issues that you encounter or perceive.

3000 character(s) maximum

34 Do you think individuals providing services in the 'offline/traditional' economy face similar issues as individuals offering services through platforms?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

35 Please explain and provide examples.

3000 character(s) maximum

36 In your view, what are the obstacles for improving the situation of individuals providing services?

1. through platforms?
2. in the offline/traditional economy?

3000 character(s) maximum

37 To what extent could the possibility to negotiate collectively help improve the situation of individuals offering services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>through online platforms?</th>
<th>★ ★ ★ ★ ★</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the offline/traditional economy?</td>
<td>★ ★ ★ ★ ★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Which are the areas you would consider most important for you to enable such collective negotiations?

3000 character(s) maximum
39 In this regard, do you see any obstacles to such negotiations?

40 Are there other points you would like to raise?

VI. What governance for reinforcing the Single Market for digital services?

The EU's Single Market offers a rich potential for digital services to scale up, including for innovative European companies. Today there is a certain degree of legal fragmentation in the Single Market. One of the main objectives for the Digital Services Act will be to improve opportunities for innovation and deepen the Single Market for Digital Services.

This section of the consultation seeks to collect evidence and views on the current state of the single market and steps for further improvements for a competitive and vibrant Single market for digital services. This module also inquires about the relative impact of the COVID-19 crisis on digital services in the Union. It then focuses on the appropriate governance and oversight over digital services across the EU and means to enhance the cooperation across authorities for an effective supervision of services and for the equal protection of all citizens across the single market. It also inquires about specific cooperation arrangements such as in the case of consumer protection authorities across the Single Market, or the regulatory oversight and cooperation mechanisms among media regulators. This section is not intended to focus on the enforcement of EU data protection rules (GDPR).

Main issues

1 How important are - in your daily life or for your professional transactions - digital services such as accessing websites, social networks, downloading apps, reading news online, shopping online, selling products online?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those offered from outside of your Member State of establishment</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions are targeted at digital service providers

3 Approximately, what share of your EU turnover is generated by the provision of your service outside of your main country of establishment in the EU?
Less than 10%
- Between 10% and 50%
- Over 50%
- I cannot compute this information
4 To what extent are the following obligations a burden for your company in providing its digital services, when expanding to one or more EU Member State(s)? Please rate the following obligations from 1 (not at all burdensome) to 5 (very burdensome).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>1 (not at all burdensome)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (very burdensome)</th>
<th>I don't know / No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different processes and obligations imposed by Member States for notifying, detecting and removing illegal content/goods/services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements to have a legal representative or an establishment in more than one Member State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different procedures and points of contact for obligations to cooperate with authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of legal requirements. Please specify below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Have your services been subject to enforcement measures by an EU Member State other than your country of establishment?
- Yes
- No
- I don't know

8 Were you requested to comply with any ‘prior authorisation’ or equivalent requirement for providing your digital service in an EU Member State?
- Yes
- No
- I don't know

10 Are there other issues you would consider necessary to facilitate the provision of cross-border digital services in the European Union?

3000 character(s) maximum

11 What has been the impact of COVID-19 outbreak and crisis management measures on your business’ turnover
- Significant reduction of turnover
- Limited reduction of turnover
- No significant change
- Modest increase in turnover
- Significant increase of turnover
- Other

12 Please explain

3000 character(s) maximum

The Covid-19 outbreak has clearly impacted the industry’s turnover, significantly reducing it.

The initial macroeconomic forecast, such as by the International Monetary Fund, predicted that Covid-19 and the global lockdown would effectively spark the worst economic recession since the Great Depression of the 1930s. While the situation is fluid, the economic downturn is likely a reality.

Over the past 20 years, one could observe three advertising recessions in Europe: the so-called dot com crash and 9/11 in 2011; the financial crisis in 2008/2009; and the Eurozone crisis in 2012. Previous recessions are not a reliable model to quantify the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the market. But macroeconomic indicators, paired with industry data, are the best modelling ingredients we have. Continual review and reforecasting are critical.
The initial marketing response to the pandemic to date was rooted in the lockdown and the inability of businesses to operate, paired with risk mitigation (supply side problem). However, rising unemployment and squeezed personal expenditure can turn the ad downturn into a crisis of consumer demand, where advertisers and brands are withdrawing their ad investment. This remains a concern, in particular, as one is observing possibility of further lockdowns and depriving businesses from being fully operational for an extended period of time.

In the abstract, major brands can return to market relatively quickly with debt financing or cash reserves (though recovery of some is going to be severely affected, e.g. travel, hospitality, automotive sectors), but SMEs do not have the same resources. Whereas SMEs are crucial for ad market recovery in the digital space. For those companies a lot may depend on, for instance, government support schemes – should they work as intended, these companies will be some of the earliest to return, which is because marketing sits high on their balance sheet as a cost of sales and is imperative for doing business in the first place.

Current market forecasts for 2020 show that digital advertising could decline by -5.5%, whereas all other media are expected to experience -21.3% decline in 2020.

13 Do you consider that deepening of the Single Market for digital services could help the economic recovery of your business?
- Yes
- No
- I don't know

14 Please explain
3000 character(s) maximum

As a rule of thumb, harmonised legal approaches aid businesses across the board, in particular, if their scope is global. Indeed, major brands investing in digital advertising are multinationals interested in unified rules. Likewise, many technology companies have international operations, and synergies across jurisdictions should normally help them to thrive. At the same time, one should not underestimate cost associated with implementation and compliance efforts.

That said, we would call on the policymakers to be cognisant of the existing regulatory framework, in particular, the EU privacy and data protection framework applicable to any business activity underpinned by data. The General Data Protection Regulation unambiguously established the principles of data protection in the digital advertising context. Taking that into account, introduction of any superfluous rules will only lead to confusion and create legal uncertainty. For some sectors, such as digital advertising, it might well mean nothing else than falling into decay, eventually putting the EU ad-supported media at the risk of perishing.

The following questions are targeted at all respondents.

**Governance of digital services and aspects of enforcement**

The ‘country of origin’ principle is the cornerstone of the Single Market for digital services. It ensures that digital innovators, including start-ups and SMEs, have a single set of rules to follow (that of their home
country), rather than 27 different rules.

This is an important precondition for services to be able to scale up quickly and offer their services across borders. In the aftermath of the COVID-19 outbreak and effective recovery strategy, more than ever, a strong Single Market is needed to boost the European economy and to restart economic activity in the EU.

At the same time, enforcement of rules is key; the protection of all EU citizens regardless of their place of residence, will be in the centre of the Digital Services Act.

The current system of cooperation between Member States foresees that the Member State where a provider of a digital service is established has the duty to supervise the services provided and to ensure that all EU citizens are protected. A cooperation mechanism for cross-border cases is established in the E-Commerce Directive.

1 Based on your experience, how would you assess the cooperation in the Single Market between authorities entrusted to supervise digital services?

2 What governance arrangements would lead to an effective system for supervising and enforcing rules on online platforms in the EU in particular as regards the intermediation of third party goods, services and content (See also Chapter 1 of the consultation)?

Please rate each of the following aspects, on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearly assigned competent national authorities or bodies as established by Member States for supervising the systems put in place by online platforms</th>
<th>1 (not at all important)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (very important)</th>
<th>I don't know / No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation mechanism within Member States across different competent authorities responsible for the systematic supervision of online platforms and sectorial issues (e.g. consumer protection, market surveillance, data protection, media regulators, anti-discrimination agencies, equality bodies, law enforcement authorities etc.)</th>
<th>1 (not at all important)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (very important)</th>
<th>I don't know / No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation mechanism with swift procedures and assistance across national competent authorities across Member States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and technical assistance at EU level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An EU-level authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation schemes with third parties such as civil society organisations and academics for specific inquiries and oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: please specify in the text box below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Please explain

5000 character(s) maximum

4 What information should competent authorities make publicly available about their supervisory and enforcement activity?

3000 character(s) maximum

5 What capabilities - type of internal expertise, resources etc. - are needed within competent authorities, in order to effectively supervise online platforms?

3000 character(s) maximum

6 In your view, is there a need to ensure similar supervision of digital services established outside of the EU that provide their services to EU users?

- Yes, if they intermediate a certain volume of content, goods and services provided in the EU
- Yes, if they have a significant number of users in the EU
- No
- Other
- I don’t know

7 Please explain

3000 character(s) maximum
8 How should the supervision of services established outside of the EU be set up in an efficient and coherent manner, in your view?

3000 character(s) maximum

9 In your view, what governance structure could ensure that multiple national authorities, in their respective areas of competence, supervise digital services coherently and consistently across borders?

3000 character(s) maximum

10 As regards specific areas of competence, such as on consumer protection or product safety, please share your experience related to the cross-border cooperation of the competent authorities in the different Member States.

3000 character(s) maximum

11 In the specific field of audiovisual, the Audiovisual Media Services Directive established a regulatory oversight and cooperation mechanism in cross border cases between media regulators, coordinated at EU level within European Regulators’ Group for Audiovisual Media Services (ERGA). In your view is this sufficient to ensure that users remain protected against illegal and harmful audiovisual content (for instance if services are offered to users from a different Member State)? Please explain your answer and provide practical examples if you consider the arrangements may not suffice.

3000 character(s) maximum

12 Would the current system need to be strengthened? If yes, which additional tasks be useful to ensure a more effective enforcement of audiovisual content rules?

Please assess from 1 (least beneficial) – 5 (most beneficial). You can assign the same number to the same actions should you consider them as being equally important.

Coordinating the handling of cross-border cases, including jurisdiction ★★★
Agreeing on guidance for consistent implementation of rules under the AVMSD

Ensuring consistency in cross-border application of the rules on the promotion of European works

Facilitating coordination in the area of disinformation

Other areas of cooperation

13 Other areas of cooperation - (please, indicate which ones)

3000 character(s) maximum

14 Are there other points you would like to raise?

3000 character(s) maximum

Final remarks

If you wish to upload a position paper, article, report, or other evidence and data for the attention of the European Commission, please do so.

1 Upload file

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

42d4a92d-ea91-4266-b58d-226f9421ee73/20200908_IAB_Europe_DSA_comments.pdf

2 Other final comments

3000 character(s) maximum
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