

*Committee of experts on  
freedom of expression and digital technologies  
(MSI-DIG)*



10 June 2022

MSI-DIG(2021)05

**Draft Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member  
States on the impacts of digital technologies on freedom of expression**

## **Preamble**

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.b of the Statute of the Council of Europe (ETS No. 1),

Committed to the shared values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law;

Mindful of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (the Convention), which confers on everyone the right to freedom of expression, including freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authorities and regardless of frontiers, and of Article 10.2, as interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights, which specifies that these rights can only be limited when such interference is prescribed by law, pursues a legitimate aim, and is necessary in a democratic society;

Recalling the negative obligation of member States not to encroach on freedom of expression and other human rights in the digital environment, as well as their positive obligation to actively protect human rights and to create a safe and enabling environment for everyone to participate in public debate and freely express opinions and ideas;

Noting that private companies must not cause or contribute to adverse human rights impacts through their activities and that they must prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts linked to their operations, products or services;

Reiterating that freedom of expression is essential for democratic societies, and that digital technologies have become indispensable for said freedom;

Emphasising that digital technologies have expanded individuals' and groups' ability to receive and impart information and that they have increased the range and diversity of information individuals can access;

Conscious that digital technologies can create and strengthen social bonds, help citizens express grievances and promote alliances across borders and cultures, enable marginalised communities to build networks of solidarity, and foster more open, inclusive and diverse public spheres;

Recognising the pivotal role played by privately owned providers of digital infrastructures that enable freedom of expression online and shape the conditions under which this right can be exercised, but are not directly subject to the obligations to provide the guarantees and observe the limitations outlined in Article 10;

Recalling that media pluralism is a prerequisite for secure, widespread, and unlimited access to information on issues of public interest;

Acknowledging that professional news organisations play a crucial role in the production and distribution of high-quality information, but that digital technologies have jeopardized their business models, thus weakening their independence;

Recognising that well-funded and independent Public Service Media can enhance democratic debate;

Noting that effective policymaking on the implications of digital technologies for freedom of expression requires accurate, nuanced, and comprehensive knowledge derived from independent research, but most such knowledge, and the data required to generate it, is held but not shared by internet intermediaries;

Conscious of the need to protect children and other vulnerable groups in society, who may be disproportionately harmed by certain types of content that are widely available online, and mindful that any measures to protect them also need to secure their freedom of expression and other human rights;

Determined to safeguard the rights enshrined in the Convention and committed to follow up on the Helsinki Ministerial Declaration of May 2019, which demanded strong action to reverse the persistent deterioration of freedom of expression in Europe in recent decades,

**Recommends that member States:**

1. fully implement the Guidelines attached to this recommendation in effective cooperation with all relevant stakeholders;
2. in implementing the Guidelines, take account of the relevant case law of the European Court of Human Rights and previous Committee of Ministers' recommendations to member States and declarations;
3. review their legislative, regulatory and supervisory frameworks and policies as well as their own practices with respect to the impact of digital technologies on freedom of expression to ensure that they are in line with the Guidelines, with a view to avoiding hasty and fragmented measures that may carry further adverse effects on the larger information environment;
4. ensure that this recommendation, including the Guidelines, be translated and disseminated as widely as possible and through all accessible means among competent authorities and stakeholders, including parliaments, independent authorities, specialised public agencies, civil society organisations, users, and the private sector;
5. endow their competent regulatory authorities and institutions with the necessary resources and authority to investigate, oversee and coordinate compliance with their relevant legislative and regulatory framework, in line with this recommendation;
6. engage in regular, inclusive, meaningful and transparent consultation, cooperation and dialogue with all stakeholders (including media, internet intermediaries, civil society, human rights defence organisations, the research and professional community, and education institutions), paying particular attention to vulnerable groups, with a view to ensuring that the impacts of digital technologies on freedom of expression are comprehensively monitored, debated, and addressed;
7. encourage and promote the implementation of effective and tailored literacy programmes, in co-operation with all relevant stakeholders, to enable all individuals and groups to benefit from digital technologies for their enhanced exercise and enjoyment of freedom of expression;
8. fund and promote independent research on the individual and societal implications of digital technologies for freedom of expression, and take meaningful steps to ensure that independent researchers free from commercial and political interests can access the necessary data held by internet intermediaries in an appropriate, human rights compliant legal framework;
9. review regularly, in consultation with all relevant actors, and report domestically and within the Committee of Ministers on the measures taken to implement this recommendation and its Guidelines with a view to enhancing their effectiveness and adapting them to evolving challenges.

## Appendix to Recommendation CM/Rec(20XX)XX

### Guidelines on the impacts of digital technologies on freedom of expression

#### Scope and definitions

Freedom of expression, as protected by Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (the Convention), is not only a fundamental individual right. It is also a means to protect and enhance democracy through open and public debate. Digital technologies must and indeed can support this right and serve this purpose.

These guidelines are designed to assist States and public and private actors, in particular internet intermediaries, as well as media, civil society organisations, researchers, educational institutions, and other relevant actors in their independent and collaborative efforts to protect and promote freedom of expression in the digital age. The guidelines formulate principles aimed at ensuring that digital technologies serve rather than curtail such freedom. They also provide recommendations on how to address the adverse impacts and enhance the positive impacts of the widespread use of digital technologies on freedom of expression in human rights compliant ways.

“Internet intermediaries” are understood here as defined in the Recommendation CM/Rec(2018)2 by the Committee of Ministers to member States on the roles and responsibilities of internet intermediaries. Bearing in mind that internet intermediaries offer and perform a variety of functions and services, and may carry out several functions in parallel, where appropriate, reference is made to specific functions they perform. When referring to internet intermediaries that connect users to the internet, enable the processing of information and data, or host web-based services, including for user-generated content, the term “internet service providers” is used.

The guidelines are organised into six sections: Foundations for Human Rights-Enhancing Policymaking; Digital Infrastructure Design; Transparency; Accountability and Redress; Education and Empowerment; and Independent Research for Evidence-Based Policymaking. Each section offers guidance to States and other stakeholders on how to fulfil their human rights obligations and responsibilities with regard to freedom of expression, combining legal, regulatory, administrative, and practical measures.

#### 1. Foundations for Human Rights-Enhancing Policymaking

- 1.1. **Clear and unambiguous objectives:** Any self-regulation, co-regulation, or regulation of digital technologies that potentially impinges on freedom of expression should clearly distinguish between responses to illegal forms of expression and remedies to forms of expression that are legal and protected by Article 10 of the Convention, but may be undesirable or problematic. State regulation should only restrict the dissemination of content that is illegal and any such restrictions must comply with Article 10.2 of the Convention. For content that is legal but undesirable in a democratic society, alternative responses should be sought that are founded on the principle of flexibility as outlined in item 1.5 of these guidelines and prioritise safeguards rather than restrictions to freedom of expression. In line with their obligation to protect human rights, States should ensure that all regulatory frameworks, including self- or co-regulatory approaches, comply with the Convention.
- 1.2. **Legality, necessity and predictability:** Any State policies or actions interfering with the rights of internet users to receive and impart information and ideas should be prescribed by law, pursue one of the legitimate aims listed in Article 10.2 of the Convention, employ proportionate means, and fulfil the requirements of legal certainty and predictability.

- 1.3. **Precision:** States should only regulate forms of speech and types of content that they have clearly defined. Definitions that are vague and lend themselves to subjective interpretations should be avoided in regulatory practice, as they cannot provide sufficient clarity and predictability to all parties involved and can result in disproportionate and unjustified hindrances to freedom of expression.
- 1.4. **Proportionality:** Any regulation, compliance requirement, and administrative process put in place to achieve the goals highlighted in these guidelines should be proportionate to the risk levels, size, and capacity of different internet intermediaries. States should only impose substantial obligations on very large companies, defined based on their reach and capacity, and on companies that enable or perform activities that pose a credibly high risk to freedom of expression. The criteria based on which the size, capacity, and risk levels of different internet intermediaries are assessed should be specified clearly, reviewed periodically, measured precisely, and communicated transparently. Very small internet intermediaries whose activities pose low risks for freedom of expression should be exempt from most regulations and compliance obligations.
- 1.5. **Flexibility:** In their regulatory and co-regulatory initiatives, States should acknowledge that internet intermediaries can employ various content moderation techniques beyond removal while ensuring due transparency, predictability and oversight. These techniques include prioritisation and de-prioritisation, promotion and demotion, monetisation and demonetisation (where applicable), and the provision of supplementary information to users, including trigger warnings, alerts, and additional content from authoritative official sources.
- 1.6. **Focus on processes:** Regulation and co-regulation should be primarily focused on the processes through which internet intermediaries rank, moderate, and remove content, rather than on the content itself.
- 1.7. **User empowerment:** Regulatory, co-regulatory, and self-regulatory initiatives should aim to expand users' understanding, choice, and control of the impact of digital technologies on their freedom of expression without overburdening them with excessive requirements to safeguard their rights.
- 1.8. **Protection:** Individuals targeted by potentially damaging types of online expression – for example harassment, bullying, and stalking – suffer disproportionately because of the mass scale and high speed of messaging enabled by digital technologies. The victims of these activities should have ample and effective opportunities to report perpetrators and obtain remedies.
- 1.9. **Human rights impact assessments:** When public and private actors consider regulation, co-regulation, or self-regulation of digital technologies and their use that may affect freedom of expression, they should preliminarily conduct and publish human rights impact assessments. If those impact assessments conclude that proposed regulation carries human rights risks, they should also include clear measures to prevent or mitigate them. As digital technologies and their uses change constantly, their impacts on freedom of expression should be reviewed regularly.
- 1.10. **Privacy:** Any activities by public and private actors must conform with the existing legal frameworks for privacy and data protection, including the Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data (ETS No. 108), as updated by the Amending Protocol (CETS No. 223).
- 1.11. **Multistakeholder collaboration:** The definition of policies, guidelines and regulations around digital technologies that can impact freedom of expression requires the full participation of governments, parliaments, international organisations, internet intermediaries, media, civil society, the research community, the expert community, and users, taking into account their specific roles and responsibilities. These collaborative processes should be based on clearly defined and mutually

agreed scopes and competences, adequate funding, provision of the necessary data by all stakeholders involved, streamlined procedures to close feedback loops, and clear recognition of who is responsible for implementing the outcomes. The development of international public policies and governance arrangements should enable full and equal participation of all stakeholders from all countries, as provided for by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers Declaration on Internet governance principles.

## **2. Digital Infrastructure Design**

- 2.1. The digital infrastructure of communication in democratic societies should be designed to promote openness, interoperability, transparency, pluralism, and fair competition.
- 2.2. States, internet service providers and internet intermediaries should enable access to the digital infrastructure at fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory conditions to promote effective competition.
- 2.3. Internet intermediaries should enable third-party use and access to the audience at non-discriminatory and fair conditions, including support for data portability and interoperability. The conditions for access and use should not intensify user lock-in by preventing the switching between different ways of accessing content.
- 2.4. State regulation should strengthen competition in media and communication markets. In addition to enforcing and amending, where necessary, competition law to limit concentration in media and communication markets, States should also modernise media concentration policies to take into account the conditions under which the attention of mass publics is channeled and commercialized in the digital age, with a view to enhancing pluralism as a counterbalance to the increasingly concentrated power to shape opinions.
- 2.5. States should not use their anti-trust powers and policies to interfere with the activities of internet intermediaries in ways that restrict freedom of expression and other human rights.
- 2.6. States should invest in Public Service Media and maintain regulatory and governance frameworks that ensure that they are independent from political interference, have a clear role and remit, avoid crowding out private competitors, and serve all audiences, including younger generations, across all available digital technologies and without any discrimination. States should also support private media that demonstrably achieve the same goals without interfering with their editorial independence.
- 2.7. States should stimulate the digital transformation of news organisations and promote investment in and development of digital technologies that serve them, for example through public support for free and open source software and infrastructure development.

## **3. Transparency**

- 3.1. States and regulators should ensure that all necessary data are generated and published to enable any analyses necessary to guarantee meaningful transparency on how internet intermediaries' policies and their implementation affect freedom of expression among the general public and vulnerable groups.

- 3.2. States should assist private actors and civil society organizations in the development of independent institutional mechanisms that ensure impartial and comprehensive verification of the completeness and accuracy of any data made available by internet intermediaries in their transparency efforts.
- 3.3. Internet intermediaries should publish the necessary information in machine-readable format to ensure transparency on their policies at different levels and in pursuit of different goals: empowering users; enabling third-party auditing and oversight; and informing independent efforts to counter problematic content online. These transparency requirements should be proportional to the size, capacity, and risk levels of different internet intermediaries.
- 3.4. Internet intermediaries should provide adequate transparency on the design and implementation of their terms of service and their key policies for content moderation, such as information regarding removal, recommendation, amplification, promotion, downranking, monetisation, and distribution, particularly with respect to their outcomes for freedom of expression.
- 3.5. When internet intermediaries create or significantly update their key policies and terms of service, they should engage in open, transparent, and meaningful consultations with relevant public and private stakeholders. These processes should explore the ways in which policies and terms of service affect freedom of expression and other human rights. Internet intermediaries should provide full information on the process, content and outcome of these consultations, declaring all the feedback they received and explaining whether and how they implemented it.
- 3.6. When there are legitimate concerns that their policies may lead to discrimination of disadvantaged groups, internet intermediaries should provide information that allows independent third parties to evaluate whether their policies are implemented in a way that treats all groups equally, including by disclosing the datasets based on which automated systems are trained in order to identify and correct sources of algorithmic bias.

#### **4. Accountability and Redress**

- 4.1. States should ensure that any person whose freedom of expression is limited as a result of regulation is able to employ effective redress mechanisms against these restrictions in a simple, accessible and affordable way before courts.
- 4.2. States should ensure that any news provider whose editorial freedom, content integrity, or brand attribution is threatened as a result of internet intermediaries' inconsistent enforcement of their terms of service is able to access timely and effective redress mechanisms.
- 4.3. States should strengthen all relevant regulatory authorities and equip them with adequate resources and competencies so they can adequately monitor the impact of digital technologies on freedom of expression. States should also ensure that internet intermediaries provide the necessary information for these monitoring activities.
- 4.4. States may, where necessary and particularly in case of emergency, introduce appropriate and proportionate obligations for internet intermediaries to protect public interest content. Internet intermediaries should offer a higher level of protection for public interest content which should be clear, non-discriminatory, viewpoint neutral, and transparently defined.
- 4.5. When internet intermediaries enforce any restrictions on freedom of expression, they must provide effective redress mechanisms that allow the affected individuals to submit an appeal without undue costs, delays, or difficulties.

- 4.6. Internet intermediaries should provide users affected by restrictions on their freedom of expression with clear information on the policies based on which their rights have been limited, clear guidelines on how they can appeal, and information on how and when such appeal would be adjudicated.
- 4.7. Internet intermediaries should set up processes and procedures to ensure that information collected from their users' appeals is used to identify and implement necessary improvements of key policies, thus preventing future grievances and damages.
- 4.8. In situations when the public may experience substantial damage from content circulating online, as with the mass spread of patently dangerous health misinformation, internet intermediaries should remove this content if they have made clear it is not allowed on their platform. They should also distribute corrections or alerts issued by authoritative institutions as soon as possible and in a manner that ensures that the remedy is commensurate to the likely damage caused, for instance by targeting a similar audience as the one originally reached by the damaging content.
- 4.9. While ensuring that digital technologies enhance and respect human rights, private actors should take into account relevant local and regional contexts, including religious, historical, social, and cultural sensitivities. This should be particularly the case for technologies that function partly or fully without human input.

## **5. Education and Empowerment**

- 5.1. States should enhance privacy and informational self-determination by enabling users to exercise greater control over the data they generate and the inferences derived from such data. States should ensure that internet intermediaries meaningfully inform individuals in advance about the data their algorithmic systems will process, including the purposes and possible outcomes of these operations. States should empower users to control their data by guaranteeing interoperability. States should also ensure that internet intermediaries enable users to modify the parameters based on which they are profiled and provide alternative versions of their services not based on profiling of the user.
- 5.2. States should enable all individuals to access evidence-based digital literacy education that helps understand the conditions under which digital technologies affect freedom of expression and the ways in which individuals can protect their rights. States should also support joint educational initiatives by public institutions, international organisations, media, universities, user groups, civil society actors, internet intermediaries, and other stakeholders. Particular emphasis should be placed on the empowerment of vulnerable groups and those with limited access to quality information.
- 5.3. Digital literacy programs should enhance awareness of the kinds of personal data that are processed and/or generated by digital devices, software and applications, the processes and user behaviours that generate them, the ways in which algorithms draw inferences from them, and the purposes for which different public and private organisations employ these inferences to influence the attitudes and behaviours of individuals and groups. They should also highlight any opportunities users have to exercise control over the ways in which their data are used. Digital literacy programs should be viewpoint neutral and should not be used to discredit any particular media or platform.
- 5.4. Digital literacy programs should be inclusive and impartial, and empower individuals with awareness of the available redress mechanisms against damages they may suffer from other users' expression as well as any infringements of their freedom of expression.
- 5.5. Considering the novelty and complexity of many forms of communication enabled by digital technologies, States should promote public debate and empower expert and scientific communities



to provide evidence-based guidance on how to distinguish between uses of digital technologies that enable permissible persuasion and uses that entail unacceptable manipulation that encroaches on freedom of expression, particularly as regards self-determination and the ability to hold opinions.

## **6. Independent Research for Evidence-Based Policymaking**

- 6.1. States should increase funding for independent research that illuminates the individual and societal impacts of digital technologies for freedom of expression across different social, political, and cultural contexts, with a view to enabling evidence-based analysis, debate, and policymaking on these issues.
- 6.2. While protecting the rights enshrined in Article 8 of the Convention, States should ensure that researchers can access data held by internet intermediaries in ways that are secure, legal, and privacy compliant. Such research must always respect users' rights to privacy and relevant data protection legislation, have an appropriate legal basis for processing personal data, and be conducted in an ethical and responsible way. When legislation does not clearly establish what data held by internet intermediaries can be shared with independent researchers, States and regulatory authorities should provide actionable guidance that safeguards both users' right to privacy and independent research.
- 6.3. States and internet intermediaries should collaboratively create secure spaces where researchers can directly and responsibly access and analyse sensitive personal data in a way that safeguards privacy and respects data protection legislation.
- 6.4. Internet intermediaries should make accurate and representative individual-level data available for independent research on the effects of digital technologies on freedom of expression. Data should be shared in compliance with personal data protection laws and independent of commercial and political influence. Any dataset made available for these purposes should be anonymised using state of the art techniques and based on the principles stipulated by the Council of Europe's Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data.
- 6.5. Researchers should only be allowed to access individual-level data held by internet intermediaries if they have been vetted by an independent scientific institution based on their qualifications and the merits of their projects, are affiliated with a university, have received approval by their university's ethical review board, hold the necessary expertise to analyse and safeguard the data, and do not have commercial or political interests. Researchers and their institutions should be jointly and substantially liable if they use these data in violations of users' privacy or other provisions of the law.
- 6.6. Internet intermediaries that provide researchers with access to the data they hold should be able to monitor how data are used and to object to any uses that may compromise users' privacy or data protection rights, or otherwise violate the law. When they provide adequate safeguards to users' privacy in sharing data with researchers, internet intermediaries should be immune from liability resulting directly from the sharing of such data.
- 6.7. To protect researchers' independence, data sharing agreements should clarify that internet intermediaries cannot interfere with the design, analysis, and publication of research based on the data they make available. Independent scientific institutions should monitor the implementation of these agreements and adjudicate any disputes.
- 6.8. States should ensure that internet intermediaries' terms of service do not discriminate against research into their societal and individual implications for freedom of expression, and that university researchers who have received approval by an ethical review board cannot be held liable under the pretext of breaking the internet intermediaries' terms of service while conducting their research.