Council of Europe Project

"Support for Media Pluralism and Freedom of Expression in the Republic of Moldova"

Aligning Regulatory Practice for a Robust Media Ecosystem

Conclusions of the Regional Peer Exchange

Republic of Moldova
4-5 September 2024

Division for Cooperation on Freedom of Expression
Council of Europe

Media pluralism in the Republic of Moldova remains a priority for the Council of Europe, a commitment reinforced by the Council of Europe Action Plan for Moldova 2021-2024.

The Project is further strengthening and building on already achieved results, as well as continuously responding to the needs identified in the implementation course of previous co-operation projects. To reach this objective, the Project is supporting the implementation of activities addressing the need for legislative reforms in the audiovisual field, capacity-building for media professionals and content diversification within the National Public Broadcaster, as well as strengthening the access to information legal framework and its implementation in the Republic of Moldova.

This document was prepared by Asja Rokša – Zubčević, Council of Europe Consultant

For further information please contact:

Support for Media Pluralism and Freedom of Expression in the Republic of Moldova
Tel: + 373 22 202 304
shahin.abbasov@coe.int
ana.chiriac@coe.int
https://www.coe.int/en/web/chisinau/audiovisual-standards

Table of Contents

1   INTRODUCTION

The Council of Europe Project "Support for Media Pluralism and Freedom of Expression in the Republic of Moldova" has been supporting the institutional strengthening of the Audiovisual Council of the Republic of Moldova (the Audiovisual Council, AC), through the endorsement of the Peer and Advisory Support for the Audiovisual Council, with the participation of the United Kingdom's Office of Communications (Ofcom). The first phase of the activity consisted of both authorities responding to a questionnaire and a visit to the Audiovisual Council by the representatives of the Ofcom in June 2023, where a baseline measurement report has been developed. The second phase of the activity enabled the organisation of a study visit of the Audiovisual Council`s representatives to Ofcom`s premises in London, UK, in December 2023, where an additional set of findings and further recommendations/policy advice on institutional building were provided to the AC, which enabled the authority to address the identified development areas.

Following the exchange of practice with the Ofcom, it was considered important to increase the cooperation with other NRAs (national regulatory authorities) more similar in terms of size and the geopolitical profile.

For that reason, and as the last exercise of the Peer Support, the regional workshop was organised in Moldova on 4–5 September 2024, involving 10 national audiovisual regulatory authorities. Several Council of Europe experts and a representative of the European Platform of Regulatory Authorities (EPRA) also joined the discussions.

The topics included:

- fighting disinformation;

- promoting media literacy initiatives;

- ensuring transparency of media ownership;

- legal approximation to the EU for candidate countries and the novelties in the EU legal framework;

- regulation of non-linear services (VOD, bloggers and influencers); and

- the use of artificial intelligence.

This report summarises the discussions and conclusions of the event.

2   ACTIVITY

2.1   Opening remarks

The conference kicked off by opening remarks of Liliana Nicolaescu-Onofrei, Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Culture, Education, Research, Youth, Sports and Media, Máté Csicsai, Deputy Head/Head of Political, Press and Information Section, EU Delegation to the Republic of Moldova, Falk Lange, Head of the Council of Europe Office in Chisinau and Alina Tatarenko, Head of Division for Cooperation on Freedom of Expression of the Council of Europe.

2.2   Topical discussions

2.2.1   *Peer support activity introduction, results and next steps*

A brief background information on the peer review was provided, as the model of structured cooperation between the two media regulatory authorities, in which there a beneficiary authority and an advanced authority, who, by engaging in this model of exchange, improve the capacity for action of the beneficiary. In this particular peer review, the Moldovan AC as a beneficiary exchanged practices with an advanced counterpart, one of the best in the field, UK's Ofcom.

This peer review starts with an internal reflection of the authorities, by means of filling out a pre-designed questionnaire. The questionnaire is intended to reflect on topics of professionalism, integrity, credibility, independence, resources, communication and continued professional training, but peers, of course, can and in this case also did add other topics of interest. This part of the peer review serves to identify complementarities and differences between peers on certain aspects of their practice, but also as a generator of a complete and faithful vision of the functioning of the institution. After having completed the questionnaire and exchanging them, the visits are then prepared, in this case first by Ofcom visiting the AC, henceforth being provided with an overview of the specific circumstances vis-à-vis the AC.

The specificities related to the peer review include the facts that:

•   This is a strictly voluntary process

•   The activity is based on the principle of mutual trust and equality of status

•   Relevant areas of the peer review are chosen for the purpose of enabling the AC, as the beneficiary authority, to profit most from the expertise of their peers, Ofcom.

The review is carried out both by Ofcom and the AC allowing them to clearly distinguish the differences in the cultural, political and economic environment which determine the working conditions of the beneficiary institution in relation to their own professional experiences.

Some of the main benefits of peer review relate to:

-       The beneficiary institution has a professional view of its current situation: the review provides concrete suggestions identified by the Council of Europe expert, based on the exchanges that took place during this activity. Also, the self-assessment allows the regulatory authority to question itself on topics that could have remained in the shadows previously: the

everyday activities and numerous tasks in performing its duties, at times, consume the authorities and do not provide room for introspection.

- The participation in the peer review allows for structural self-analyses and contemplations in this regard.

- The review has a strategic value: it highlights the good practices of the beneficiary institution as well as the added value of presentation of excellence in media regulation of its peer for the benefit of further development of the beneficiary.

After this, the peer review moved on to the second stage – the visit of two experienced executives of the Ofcom, which enabled an exchange of practices on the identified topics, as well as formulation of adequate follow-ups. One of those was an agreed and executed visit of the AC representatives to Ofcom, further exchanging on identified themes and topics.

Further, there were two reports prepared, which can be amalgamated in a one track-record of the peer review, aimed at supporting the AC in the key areas identified by the peer review. The reports include the main findings from the missions and provides recommendations/policy advice on institutional building and mechanisms which would enable the AC to start addressing identified areas for development.

2.2.2   *Tackling disinformation: approaches of National Regulatory Authorities*

The fight against disinformation needs to be structural and include public awareness campaigns, obligations for online media platforms, and measures such as establishment of disinformation units within NRAs. Any attempt to address disinformation cannot be done without sufficient resources, while not forgetting that the freedom of expression is the paramount value, as the lines can often be blurry and what appear to be legitimate aims from one perspective can have serious implications on the right to freedom of expression.

The development of the disinformation actions and campaigns stems from the Digital Services Act, among others, also from the perspective of election integrity. Media and information literacy (MIL) is recognized as another tool in relation to disinformation, user empowerment, education, going beyond the scope of recognizing content and going into civil literacy.

It was reported that two thirds of EU citizens admit coming across fake news at least once a week, over 80% of EU citizens say they see fake news as an issue for themselves and for democracy, half of EU citizens aged 15-30 say they need critical thinking and information skills to help them combat fake news and extremism in society, while only 40% of people trust news (globally). Disinformation globally rose unprecedentedly after COVID-19 and especially after the war in Ukraine.

The Council of Europe's related instruments were reiterated, including the Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)4 on promoting a favourable environment for quality journalism in the digital age, which states that disinformation undermines trust in the media and threatens the reliability of information that feeds public debate and enables democracy. Another instrument is the Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)12 on electoral communication and media coverage of election campaigns, which highlights the need for online platforms to put in place safeguards to guarantee the integrity of services and act against misrepresentation and the intentional spread of political disinformation, while implementing transparency systems for clearly

labelling automated accounts and actions, so that those activities cannot be confused with human interactions. Scrutiny of advertisement placement should also be ensured.

Addressing disinformation requires cross-sector collaborations with the involvement of governments, media organisations, tech companies and civil society actors, reinforcing cooperation and trust.

2.2.3   Media literacy initiatives

The upcoming launch of the Moldovan MIL Strategy has been positively noted.

On the issue of MIL, an exchange of practices of media regulators is inspiring, complementary and extremely valuable. Regarding the general principles of MIL, the role of the media regulators in media and information literacy is important, from the point of view of research, support and funding and coordination of MIL networks, citizen empowerment, policy development and monitoring. These were confirmed by participants, providing examples of their activities in this field. As mentioned earlier, media literacy strategy was seen as increasingly important, with, as mentioned, currently being developed, while some more advanced ones, undergoing the process of review.

The confirmed importance of media and information literacy can be connected to the Overton window theory concept which is about how ideas work. The theory talks about the six degrees of acceptance of public ideas. When applied, the theory can explain how people end up being accustomed to harmful and destructive norms, including a war, as a political and publicly accepted and even desired policy. However, as the theory works on both positive and negative ideas, we can also understand this theory in terms of MIL efforts and impact, in an evolutionary development of related projects, and in particular the ever-growing role of the media regulatory authorities in this.

2.2.4   Transparency of media ownership

The transparency of media ownership is important, and a growing recognition of it is visible.

The issue that has been identified in Moldova and Estonia relates to challenges in online media, in terms of notions related to identifying money expenditures on online networks. Transparency of media ownership helps ensure media pluralism where, among others, a licensing procedure in the UK was explained in more detail, providing a clear link with the topic discussed. Again, new EU legislation in terms of European Media Freedom Act (EMFA) was mentioned, with a stronger set of recommendations and guidelines in that respect. Funding mechanisms for the support of creation of media content is recognized as an important element contributing to media pluralism, but also media sustainability.

2.2.5   EU legal approximation for candidate countries and the novelties in the EU legal framework

The desire of candidate countries to approximate their legislative norms with those of the European Union have been confirmed, where cooperation and collaboration is again important, as a valuable tool especially for aligning the implementing practices. However, while most social processes are influenced by online platforms, the question has been raised as to the available mechanisms of candidate countries to tackle these notions. Broadly speaking, the rapidly changing media ecosystem with fundamental concerns over its

sustainability, pluralism and trustworthiness, puts the media regulatory authorities again at the centre of regulation, co-regulation, or self-regulation with some sort of backstop powers.

While the legislative novelties such as the AVMSD, DSA, EMFA, etc., are considered ambitious transformative media policies, some critics will say that online media related legislation puts emphasis on user empowerment, rather than tackling business models of online platforms. Nevertheless, after what seemed to be a rather long period of reluctance, we have this set of legislative documents, to be assessed as any other piece of legislation, which can be just as good as its enforcement.

The dual nature of EU media policy, being the safeguard of public interest objectives of media freedom and media pluralism, but also an instrument of strengthening internal media market, is primarily relevant for candidate countries from the perspective of safeguarding democracy, as regulators continue to make sure that all these policy changes feed and strengthen democracy instead of weakening it, or that they contribute to reclaiming democracy when it's damaged. It is severely damaged now, with extreme polarisation of societies, and emotional nature of populistic politics aiming to conceal pure interest-based politics.

As media has an indispensable role in the democratic functioning of societies, it is also an economic service, in which high financial values are at stake. For example, in EMFA, it is shown in almost all recitals, taking about the importance of media in the internal market. This means that the instruments' purpose we talk about is also about the preservation or a development of an internal/integrated market of audiovisual media services. From that perspective, this economic aspect of EU media policy is not immediately relevant aspect for candidate countries, as it cannot be expected, any time soon, that the media from these countries are going to be part of the EU internal market soon or that major video-sharing platforms would be under their jurisdiction.

What matters from the perspective of candidate countries is how EU media policy's effects, even if residually, can be translated into national circumstances. Therefore, what matters for candidate countries is transposing the EU policies which are meant to enhance or reclaim democracy but not those meant to foster an internal market.

2.2.6   *Regulation of non-linear services (VoD, (v)bloggers and influencers)*

Media regulatory authorities are extending their remit over the services such as Video on Demand, and exchange of practices related to this notion is important.

Regulation of (v)bloggers and influencers revolves around the examination from the perspective of their consideration of an audiovisual media service provider, normally including the examination of several factors. These usually include the number of followers, the frequency of offered content, and economic benefits of the individuals performing these roles.

The exchange of practice in this regard helps especially media regulatory authorities who have not yet embarked into regulating such services.

2.2.7   *Artificial intelligence*

The topic of artificial intelligence reminded the participants of the Council of Europe's work in the adoption of the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, the first of legally binding documents at the level of the

Council of Europe open for global ratification, which commended at the same day the discussion took place on this issue at the workshop.

The expanding tasks of NRAs (EPRA members) in this regard relate to the increasing scope of supervision, need for new approach to regulate and to cooperate with others, which is also connected to the issue of trust.

Also, a human oversight in the use of AI in regulatory merit is important, as there are numerous examples where the AI cannot fully comprehend or connect the nuances of human's language use and its impact. The discussion also highlighted the notions related to the impact of AI on the industry, but also some initial practices related to the use of AI, in addition to potential risks it can carry related to the work of regulators.

In that regard, it was noted that the academic community emphasizes the distinctions between decisions and knowledge, and between choices and answers, additionally reinforcing the need of human involvement in AI-driven activities, especially from the perspective of media regulatory authorities work. As David Runciman exemplifies with the computer's decision over an insurance claim, it may sound like the machine has done the deciding, but that is not quite the same as human judgment[1].

3   CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The peer review and its final activity – the regional peer exchange workshop "Aligning Regulatory Practice for a Robust Media Ecosystem" on 4-5 September in the Republic of Moldova, could be considered successful, especially coming at the time when Moldova received a candidate status for accession to the European Union. It is also important that the EU continues its support to NRAs in implementing related legislation, including the 2018 revised Audiovisual Media Service Directive (AVMSD), the Digital Services Act (DSA) and European Media Freedom Act (EMFA).

Existing disinformation and online platforms' challenges show and call for a greater role of NRAs and for striking a balance to ensure full respect of the Council of Europe's standards on freedom of expression. While Russian war of aggression against Ukraine brought extensive challenges to Moldova and its path to EU, to its internal stability and economic development, it was noted that the country's authorities are taking steps to counter polarisation and disinformation campaigns.

There were three issues that can be attributed to summarize all the discussions on the topics, which are cooperation, trust and media and information literacy. From within the national borders, to regional, international and cross-sectoral, the new and changed media policy changes inevitably lead the regulatory authorities towards the more, increased and structural cooperative arrangements, which are the tools in itself on many topics discussed.

---

[1] David Runciman, author of „The Handover: We Gave Control of Our Lives to Corporations, States and Ais", Liveright, 2023.

◎ Cross-sectoral corporation should be promoted, having in mind various regulatory challenges for the NRAs in terms of new obligations related to online media, but also in terms of fighting disinformation, as also confirmed by the Council of Europe's recommendations[2] and other related documents.

◎ Trust, not only within the area of mentioned cooperative mechanisms, but also trust of audiences, who are also voters, in good information, trust in news organisations that should be providing accurate and unbiased information, with full editorial and journalistic integrity is very important. It was noted that relevant and reliable information should be readily available online, while there is a need for the political will to support the media, especially the public service media.

◎ Media and information literacy is not standing on its own but is an integral part of other two points raised.

The challenges regulators, especially smaller in size and resources face, can be visible in numerous issues pertaining from new and changed legislative obligations and regulatory requirements. After what seemed to have been a period of reluctancy to engage in addressing the challenges posed by online platforms, we have seen the novelty legislative actions at the level of the EU, which are yet to be assessed in terms of their effectiveness. The tendencies to address the mounting negative impact present online for years could and do at times come with a danger of neglecting the very difficult balance of protection of freedom of expression. The experience of media regulatory authorities in this is paramount, where they stay strong on their remit to protect the freedom of expression of both the audiences/citizens and media in the wide and expanding understanding of the term.

While all media regulators have to acknowledge the interesting and dynamic times ahead, the challenges seem to be very present for the candidate countries, with many questions over the manner in which many of the EU level developments might be effectively used to reinforce democratic principles and addressing the national circumstances.

Certainly, the Council of Europe standards and recommendations as well as EU media policy instruments have plenty benefits to offer, especially for candidate countries, such as:

◎　　the measures meant to ensure appropriate funding of public service media (Amsterdam Protocol and the decisions taken in its application) as well as relevant Council of Europe standards[3];

◎　　the measures meant to safeguard that media regulators are independent from the government and the regulated players, exercise their powers impartially and transparently, have appropriate enforcement powers, and adequate financial and human and technical resources in line with the Council of Europe standards[4] and EU's AVMSD and EMFA;

---

[2] Guidance Note on countering the spread of online mis- and disinformation through fact-checking and platform design solutions in a human rights compliant manner (2024)

[3] DIGEST: Council of Europe Standards on Public Service Media - Freedom of Expression (coe.int)

[4] Media Regulatory Authorities - Freedom of Expression (coe.int)

◎   the measures meant to ensure transparency of media ownership[5] (AVMSD and EMFA);

◎   the encouragement to develop efficient co-regulatory and self-regulatory schemes (AVMSD);

◎   the provisions meant to make sure that the state respects the effective editorial freedom and independence of the media in the exercise of their professional activities in line with the Council of Europe standards[6] and EU's EMFA;

◎   the provisions ensuring that journalistic sources and confidential communications are effectively protected (EMFA);

◎   the provisions ensuring that public service media are editorially and functionally independent and provide in an impartial manner a plurality of information and opinions to their audience[7];

◎   the provisions ensuring that measures taken by the State that are liable to affect media pluralism or the editorial independence of media are duly justified, proportionate, reasoned, transparent, objective and non-discriminatory in line with the EU's EMFA and the Article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights);

◎   the provisions to lay down in law substantive and procedural rules which allow for an assessment of media market concentrations that could have a significant impact on media pluralism and editorial independence (EMFA);

◎   the provisions ensuring that audience measurement systems comply with the principles of transparency, impartiality, inclusiveness, proportionality, non-discrimination, comparability and verifiability (EMFA);

◎   the provisions to state advertising or other public funds are awarded in accordance with transparent, objective, proportionate and non-discriminatory criteria (EMFA);

◎   the Strengthened Code of Practice on Disinformation, soon to become a Code of Conduct under the DSA;

◎   the recent Political Advertising Regulation and its measures meant to ensure transparency of political advertising, to fix conditions to targeted advertising and to prevent foreign interference;

◎   at large, the European Democracy Action Plan and its various measures meant to promote free and fair elections, strengthen media freedom and media pluralism and counter disinformation;

◎   the Council of Europe standards together with EU laws and regulations offer a solid foundation for media policies. In the meantime, there is no one-size-fits-all policy, and surely even more no one-size-fits-all implementation of this policy. In the current shift from regulating content of the market players to regulating their due processes and to empowering

---

[5] Recommendation CM/Rec(2018)1[1] of the Committee of Ministers to member States on media pluralism and transparency of media ownership

[6] Legal framework to ensure independence of the media and safeguard media pluralism - Freedom of Expression (coe.int)

[7] DIGEST: Council of Europe Standards on Public Service Media - Freedom of Expression (coe.int)

users, there is of course an uneasy balance to strike in this regard, which depends on each country;

◎ the national media regulatory authorities are the ones who know where are the levels of rationality of the public at large, of vulnerability of society, of media literacy, of resilience of disinformation, etc. Therefore, cross-sector cooperation remains important and should continue. Not much can be done acting individually over online platforms since their activities, user base and resources are not within national borders. Cooperation among national regulatory authorities in search for a more coherent and coordinated approach is inevitable and indispensable.

◎ media regulatory authorities need to recognize the momentum, step outside of the regulatory comfort zone, and embark upon changes which require learning, trainings, research, cooperation, and collaboration with different stakeholders.

4   PRESENTATIONS/DISSEMINATED MATERIALS/DOCUMENTS

04.09.Kristi
Talving_Session II Med

Kristi TALVING, Director General, Consumer Protection and Technical Regulatory Authority, Estonia

04.09.Asja
ROKSA-ZUBCEVIC_Ses

Asja Rokša – Zubčević, Council of Europe Expert

20240905 Session 6
AI Ofcom.pptx

Ali-Abbas ALI, Broadcast Director, Ofcom, United Kingdom

20240904 Session 1
Misinfo Ofcom.pptx

Ali-Abbas ALI, Broadcast Director, Ofcom, United Kingdom

05.09.Helen
Rohtla_Session V Regu

Helen ROHTLA, Head of Information Society Division, Estonia

05.09.Emmanuelle_M
ACHET_Session VI Arti

Emmanuelle MACHET, EPRA Secretariat

04.09.Salla
Nazarenko_Session I 1

Salla NAZARENKO, Council of Europe consultant

04.09.Helen
Rohtla_Session III Trar

Helen ROHTLA, Head of Information Society Division, Estonia

5 ANNEX (1) – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

National Regulatory Authorities:

1. Moldova – host
2. Bosnia and Herzegovina
3. Estonia
4. Ireland
5. Latvia
6. Lithuania
7. North Macedonia
8. Romania
9. Ukraine
10. UK

Council of Europe experts and partners:

Asja Roksa – Zubcevic, author of the first two peer-support activity reports

Emmanuelle Machet, EPRA Secretariat

Martina Chapman, media literacy expert

Salla Nazarenko, disinformation expert

Irina Buzu, AI Advisor, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Alina Radu, Media Guard NGO

Ion Bunduchi, APEL, expert on audiovisual regulation

Vasile State, APEL, expert on audiovisual regulation

Alexandru Dorogan, APEL, expert on audiovisual regulation

6   ANNEX (2) – WORKSHOP'S PROGRAMME

4 September 2024, Wednesday	
08:30 – 10:30	**Traveling to Mimi Castle & Welcome Coffee**
10:30 - 11:00	**Opening remarks** ⇒ **Liliana NICOLAESCU-ONOFREI**, Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Culture, Education, Research, Youth, Sports and Media ⇒ **Falk LANGE**, Head of the Council of Europe Office in Chisinau ⇒ **Máté CSICSAI,** Deputy Head/Head of Political, Press and Information Section, European Union Delegation to the Republic of Moldova ⇒ **Alina TATARENKO**, Head of Division for Cooperation on Freedom of Expression, Council of Europe **Moderator: Shahin ABBASOV**, Programme Manager, Division for Cooperation on Freedom of Expression, Council of Europe
11:00 – 11:30	**Peer Support Activity introduction, results and next steps** ⇒ *Introduction of the Peer Support Activity between the Audiovisual Council and Ofcom by **Liliana VITU**, Chair of the Audiovisual Council of Moldova* ⇒ **Julie MAMOU**, Head of International Cooperation and Engagement, Ofcom, UK ⇒ **Asja ROKSA-ZUBCEVIC,** Council of Europe consultant
11:30 – 12:30	**Session I: Tackling Disinformation: approaches of National Regulatory Authorities** ⇒ **Salla NAZARENKO**, Council of Europe consultant ⇒ **Maria DONDE**, International Director, Irish Media Commission ⇒ **Ali-Abbas ALI,** Broadcast Director, Ofcom, United Kingdom ⇒ **Olha HERASYMIUK,** Chair of the National Council on Television and Radio Broadcasting of Ukraine **Moderator: Aneta GONTA**, Deputy Chair of the Audiovisual Council of Moldova **Q&A session and discussions**

12:30 – 14:00	**Lunch break**
14:00 – 15:00	**Session II: Media Literacy initiatives** ⇒ **Martina CHAPMAN**, Council of Europe consultant ⇒ **Lea ČENGIĆ**, Head of Program Contents and Media Literacy Department, Bosnia and Herzegovina ⇒ **Kristi TALVING,** Director General, Consumer Protection and Technical Regulatory Authority, Estonia ⇒ **Maria DONDE**, International Director, Irish Media Commission ⇒ **Mara MADARA LUSE,** Head of International Cooperation and Information Analytics Division, National Electronic Mass Media Council of Latvia ⇒ **Ali-Abbas ALI,** Broadcast Director, Ofcom, United Kingdom *Moderator:* **Aneta GONTA,** Deputy Chair, Audiovisual Council of Moldova **Q&A session and discussions**
15:00 – 16:00	**Session III: Transparency of media ownership** ⇒ Developing the media ownership monitor in Moldova – **Alina RADU**, Media Guard NGO ⇒ **Helen ROHTLA,** Head of Information Society Division, Estonia ⇒ **Maria DONDE**, International Director, Irish Media Commission ⇒ **Vladimir GJORGJIESKI,** Head of Authors' Rights Protection Unit, Agency for Audio and Audiovisual Media Services of Republic of North Macedonia ⇒ **Rowena BURKE**, Head of International Content Policy, Ofcom, UK *Moderator:* **Ruslan MIHALEVSCHI,** Member of the Audiovisual Council of Moldova **Q&A session and discussions**
16:00 – 16:15	**Coffee break**
16:15 – 17:15	**Session IV: EU legal approximation for candidate countries; novelties in the EU legal framework (AVMSD, DSA, EMFA)** ⇒ **Sophie VALAIS,** European Audiovisual Observatory (video presentation) ⇒ **Asja ROKSA-ZUBCEVIC,** Council of Europe consultant ⇒ **Jasna DŽEMIĆ**, Head of Sector for coordination, cooperation and audiovisual media services, Bosnia and Herzegovina ⇒ **Ion BUNDUCHI,** member of APEL, Moldova

	Moderator: **Ana CHIRIAC,** Senior Project Officer, Council of Europe **Q&A session and discussions**
17:15 – 19:30	**Tour of the premises, dinner and networking**
5 September 2024, Thursday	
08:30 – 10.00	**Traveling to Mimi Castle & Welcome Coffee**
10:00 – 11:00	**Session V: Regulation of non-linear services (VOD, bloggers and influencers)** ⇒ **Helen ROHTLA,** Head of Information Society Division, Estonia ⇒ **Ieva KALDERAUSKA,** Member of National Electronic Mass Media Council, Latvia ⇒ **Vadim GASPERSKIJ**, Head of Legal Division, Radio and Television Commission of Lithuania ⇒ **Emilija JANEVSKA**, Head of Programme Affairs Department, Agency for Audio and Audiovisual Media Services of Republic of North Macedonia ⇒ **Rowena BURKE**, Head of International Content Policy, Ofcom, UK *Moderator:* **Ruslan MIHALEVSCHI,** Member of the Audiovisual Council of Moldova **Q&A session and discussions**
11:00 – 12:00	**Session VI: Artificial Intelligence** ⇒ **Irina BUZU**, Advisor on Artificial Intelligence, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova ⇒ **Emmanuelle MACHET**, EPRA Secretariat ⇒ **Andrius KATINAS,** Head of the Supervision Division**,** Radio and Television Commission of Lithuania ⇒ **Ali-Abbas ALI,** Broadcast Director, Ofcom, United Kingdom *Moderator:* **Ana CHIRIAC,** Senior Project Officer, Council of Europe Office in Chisinau **Q&A session and discussions**
12:00 – 12.30	**Takeaways & Closing remarks**

	Discussing and summarising key recommendations and experiences shared among the National Regulatory Authorities involved. ⇒ **Liliana VITU**, Chair of the Audiovisual Council of Moldova ⇒ **Asja ROKSA-ZUBCEVIC**, Council of Europe consultant *Closing remarks* ⇒ **Alina TATARENKO -** Head of Division for Cooperation on Freedom of Expression, Council of Europe
12.30 – 14.30	**Lunch & departure to Chisinau**