

Fall 2003

Appendix: Selected European Documents

New York Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/media_center

Recommended Citation

New York Law School, "Appendix: Selected European Documents" (2003). *Media Center*. 86.
https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/media_center/86

This Media Law and Policy, volume 12, number 1, Fall 2003 is brought to you for free and open access by the History & Archives at DigitalCommons@NYLS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Media Center by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@NYLS. For more information, please contact camille.broussard@nyls.edu, farrah.nagrampa@nyls.edu.

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

Appendix: Selected European Documents

DIRECTIVE 2000/31/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL OF 8 JUNE 2000 ON CERTAIN LEGAL ASPECTS OF INFORMATION SOCIETY SERVICES, IN PARTICULAR ELECTRONIC COMMERCE, IN THE INTERNAL MARKET (DIRECTIVE ON ELECTRONIC COMMERCE)

...

Chapter III Implementation

Article 16 Codes of conduct

1. Member States and the Commission shall encourage:

(a) the drawing up of codes of conduct at Community level, by trade, professional and consumer associations or organisations, designed to contribute to the proper implementation of Articles 5 to 15;

(b) the voluntary transmission of draft codes of conduct at national or Community level to the Commission;

(c) the accessibility of these codes of conduct in the Community languages by electronic means;

(d) the communication to the Member States and the Commission, by trade, professional and consumer associations or organisations, of their assessment of the application of their codes of conduct and their impact upon practices, habits or customs relating to electronic commerce;

(e) the drawing up of codes of conduct regarding the protection of minors and human dignity.

2. Member States and the Commission shall encourage the involvement of associations or organisations representing consumers in the drafting and implementation of codes of conduct affecting their interests and drawn up in accordance with paragraph 1 (a). Where appropriate, to take account of their specific needs, associations representing the visually impaired and disabled should be consulted.

Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the Protection of Individuals with regard to the Processing of Personal Data and on Free Movement of Such Data

...

Article 27

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

1. The Member States and the Commission shall encourage the drawing up of codes of conduct intended to contribute to the proper implementation of the national provisions adopted by the Member States pursuant to this Directive, taking account of the specific features of the various sectors.
2. Member States shall make provision for trade associations and other bodies representing other categories of controllers which have drawn up draft national codes or which have the intention of amending or extending existing national codes to be able to submit them to the opinion of the national authority.
3. Draft Community codes, and amendments or extensions to existing Community codes, may be submitted to the Working Party referred to in Article 29. This Working Party shall determine, among other things, whether the drafts submitted to it are in accordance with the national provisions adopted pursuant to this Directive. If it sees fit, the authority shall seek the views of data subjects or their representatives. The commission may ensure appropriate publicity for the codes which have been approved by the Working Party.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION OF 24 SEPTEMBER 1998 ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPETITIVENESS OF THE EUROPEAN AUDIOVISUAL AND INFORMATION SERVICES INDUSTRY BY PROMOTING NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS AIMED AT ACHIEVING A COMPARABLE AND EFFECTIVE LEVEL OF PROTECTION OF MINORS AND HUMAN DIGNITY (98/560/EC)

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 130 thereof,

Having regard to the Commission's proposal,

Having regard to the opinion of the European Parliament,

Having regard to the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee,

(1) Whereas the Commission adopted the Green Paper on the protection of minors and human dignity in audiovisual and information services on 16 October 1996 and the Council received it favourably at its meeting on 16 December 1996;

(2) Whereas the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions have all adopted opinions on the Green Paper;

(3) Whereas the conclusions of the consultation process were submitted by the Commission to the Council at its meeting of 30 June 1997 and unanimously welcomed;

(4) Whereas on 16 October 1996, the Commission adopted the communication on illegal and harmful content on the Internet; whereas on 17 February 1997 the Council and the representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, adopted the resolution on illegal and harmful content on the Internet; whereas on 24 April 1997 the European Parliament adopted an opinion on the Commission communication on illegal and harmful content on the

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

Internet; whereas this work is continuing in a manner complementary to the present recommendation since it deals with all forms of illegal and harmful content specifically on the Internet;

(5) Whereas the present recommendation addresses, in particular, issues of protection of minors and of human dignity in relation to audiovisual and information services made available to the public, whatever the means of conveyance (such as broadcasting, proprietary on-line services or services on the Internet);

(6) Whereas, in order to promote the competitiveness of the audiovisual and information services industry and its adaptation to technological development and structural changes, the provision of information, the raising of awareness and the education of users are essential; whereas this is also a condition of the European citizen's full participation in the information society; whereas, therefore, in addition to measures to protect minors and to combat illegal content offensive to human dignity, legal and responsible use of information and communication services should be encouraged, through the exercise, inter alia, of parental control measures;

(7) Whereas Directive 97/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 June 1997 amending Council Directive 89/552/EEC on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the pursuit of television broadcasting activities, and in particular Articles 22, 22a and 22b of Directive 89/552/EEC, lays down a full range of measures aimed at the protection of minors with regard to television broadcasting for the purposes of ensuring the free movement of television broadcasts;

(8) Whereas the development of audiovisual and information services is of vital importance for Europe in view of their significant potential in the fields of education, access to information and culture, economic development and job creation;

(9) Whereas full achievement of this potential requires the existence of a successful and innovative industry in the Community; whereas it is in the first instance incumbent on businesses to ensure and improve their competitiveness with the support of public authorities where appropriate;

(10) Whereas the establishment of the climate of confidence needed to achieve the potential of the audiovisual and information services industry by removing obstacles to the development and full competitiveness of the said industry is promoted by the protection of certain important general interests, in particular the protection of minors and of human dignity;

(11) Whereas the general competitiveness of the European audiovisual and information services industry will improve through the development of an environment that favours cooperation between the enterprises in the sector on matters concerning the protection of minors and human dignity;

(12) Whereas the existence of certain technological conditions enables a high level of protection of the abovementioned important general interests, in particular the protection of minors and human dignity, and, consequently, the acceptance by all users of these services;

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

(13) Whereas it is important therefore to encourage enterprises to develop a national self-regulatory framework through cooperation between them and the other parties concerned; whereas self-regulation could provide enterprises with the means to adapt themselves rapidly to the quickening technical progress and to market globalisation;

(14) Whereas the protection of general interests sought in this manner must be seen in the context of the fundamental principles of respect for privacy and freedom of expression, as enshrined in Articles 8 and 10 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and as recognised by Article F(2) of the Treaty on European Union and by the case-law of the Court of Justice as general principles of Community law;

(15) Whereas any restriction of these rights and freedoms must be non-discriminatory, necessary to achieving the desired objective and strictly proportional with regard to the limitations it imposes;

(16) Whereas the global nature of communications networks necessitates an international approach to the question of the protection of minors and human dignity in audiovisual and information services; whereas, in this context, the development of a common indicative framework at European level makes it possible both to promote European values and make a decisive contribution to the international debate;

(17) Whereas it is vital to distinguish between questions relating to illegal content which is offensive to human dignity and those relating to content that is legal, but liable to harm minors by impairing their physical, mental or moral development; whereas these two types of problem may require a different approach and different solutions;

(18) Whereas the national laws in which Member States have laid down rules and principles on the protection of minors and human dignity reflect cultural diversity and national and local sensitivities; whereas, in this regard, particular attention must be paid to the application of the principle of subsidiarity;

(19) Whereas, in view of the transnational nature of communications networks, the effectiveness of national measures would be strengthened, at Community level, by coordination of national initiatives, and of the bodies responsible for their implementation, in accordance with the respective responsibilities and functions of the parties concerned and by the development of cooperation and the sharing of good practices in relevant areas;

(20) Whereas, as a supplementary measure, and with full respect for the relevant regulatory frameworks at national and Community level, greater self-regulation by operators should contribute to the rapid implementation of concrete solutions to the problems of the protection of minors and human dignity, while maintaining the flexibility needed to take account of the rapid development of audiovisual and information services;

(21) Whereas the contribution of the Community, the aim of which will be to supplement Member States' measures to protect minors and human dignity in audiovisual and information services, should be based on the maximum use of existing instruments;

(22) Whereas there should be close coordination of the various relevant

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

initiatives conducted in parallel with the follow-up to the Green Paper, particularly the work on the follow-up to the communication on 'Illegal and Harmful Content on the Internet', including the resolution adopted by the Council and the representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council on 17 February 1997, the 1997 European Parliament resolution and the two working party reports submitted to the Council on 28 November 1996 and 27 June 1997, work carried out according to the provisions of Article 22b of Council Directive 89/552/EEC of 3 October 1989 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the pursuit of television broadcasting activities and the work on cooperation on justice and home affairs;

(23) Whereas the implementation of this recommendation will be closely coordinated with that of any possible new measure resulting from the work on the follow-up to the Commission communication on illegal and harmful content on the Internet,

I. HEREBY RECOMMENDS that the Member States foster a climate of confidence which will promote the development of the audiovisual and information services industry by:

(1) promoting, as a supplement to the regulatory framework, the establishment on a voluntary basis of national frameworks for the protection of minors and human dignity in audiovisual and information services through:

- the encouragement, in accordance with national traditions and practices, of the participation of relevant parties (such as users, consumers, businesses and public authorities) in the definition, implementation and evaluation of national measures in the fields covered by this recommendation,
- the establishment of a national framework for self-regulation by operators of on-line services, taking into account the indicative principles and methodology described in the Annex,
- cooperation at Community level in developing comparable assessment methodologies;

(2) encouraging broadcasters in their jurisdiction to carry out research and to experiment, on a voluntary basis, with new means of protecting minors and informing viewers, as a supplement to the national and Community regulatory frameworks governing broadcasting;

(3) taking effective measures, where appropriate and feasible, to reduce potential obstacles to the development of the on-line services industry while sustaining the fight against illegal content offensive to human dignity, through:

- the handling of complaints and the transmission of the necessary information about alleged illegal content to the relevant authorities at national level,
- transnational cooperation between the complaints-handling structures, in order to strengthen the effectiveness of national measures;

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

(4) promoting, in order to encourage the take-up of technological developments and in addition to and consistent with existing legal and other measures regarding broadcasting services, and in close cooperation with the parties concerned:

- action to enable minors to make responsible use of on-line audiovisual and information services, notably by improving the level of awareness among parents, educators and teachers of the potential of the new services and of the means whereby they may be made safe for minors,
- action to facilitate, where appropriate and necessary, identification of, and access to, quality content and services for minors, including through the provision of means of access in educational establishments and public places.

II. RECOMMENDS that the industries and parties concerned:

(1) cooperate, in accordance with national traditions and practices, with the relevant authorities in setting up structures representing all the parties concerned at national level, in order inter alia to facilitate participation in coordination at European and international level in the fields covered by this recommendation;

(2) cooperate in the drawing up of codes of conduct for the protection of minors and human dignity applying to the provision of on-line services, inter alia to create an environment favourable to the development of new services, taking into account the principles and the methodology described in the Annex;

(3) develop and experiment, as regards broadcasting services, on a voluntary basis, with new means of protecting minors and informing viewers in order to encourage innovation while improving such protection;

(4) develop positive measures for the benefit of minors, including initiatives to facilitate their wider access to audiovisual and information services, while avoiding potentially harmful content;

(5) collaborate in the regular follow-up and evaluation of initiatives carried out at national level in application of this recommendation.

III. INVITES the Commission to:

(1) facilitate, where appropriate through existing Community financial instruments, the networking of the bodies responsible for the definition and implementation of national self-regulation frameworks and the sharing of experience and good practices, in particular in relation to innovative approaches, at Community level, between the Member States and parties concerned in the various fields covered by this recommendation;

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

(2) encourage cooperation and the sharing of experience and good practices between the self-regulation structures and complaints-handling structures, with a view to fostering a climate of confidence by combating the circulation of illegal content offensive to human dignity in on-line audiovisual and information services;

(3) promote, with the Member States, international cooperation in the various fields covered by this recommendation, particularly through the sharing of experience and good practices between operators and other concerned parties in the Community and their partners in other regions of the world;

(4) develop, in cooperation with the competent national authorities, a methodology for evaluating the measures taken in pursuance of this recommendation, with particular attention to the evaluation of the added value of the cooperation process at Community level, and present, two years after the adoption of this recommendation, an evaluation report on its effect to the European Parliament and the Council.

ANNEX

INDICATIVE GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION, AT NATIONAL LEVEL, OF A SELF-REGULATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROTECTION OF MINORS AND HUMAN DIGNITY IN ON-LINE AUDIOVISUAL AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Objective

The purpose of these guidelines is to foster a climate of confidence in the on-line audiovisual and information services industry by ensuring broad consistency, at Community level, in the development, by the businesses and other parties concerned, of national self-regulation frameworks for the protection of minors and human dignity. The services covered by these guidelines are those provided at a distance, by electronic means. They do not include broadcasting services covered by Council Directive 89/552/EEC or radio broadcasting. The contents concerned are those which are made available to the public, rather than private correspondence. This consistency will enhance the effectiveness of the self-regulation process and provide a basis for the necessary transnational cooperation between the parties concerned. While taking into account the voluntary nature of the self-regulation process (the primary purpose of which is to supplement existing legislation) and respecting the differences in approach and varying sensitivities in the Member States of the Community, these guidelines relate to four key components of a national self-regulation framework:

- consultation and representativeness of the parties concerned,
- code(s) of conduct,
- national bodies facilitating cooperation at Community level,
- national evaluation of self-regulation frameworks.

1. CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE PARTIES

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

CONCERNED

The objective is to ensure that the definition, implementation and evaluation of a national selfregulation framework benefits from the full participation of the parties concerned, such as the public authorities, the users, consumers and the businesses which are directly or indirectly involved in the audiovisual and on-line information services industries. The respective responsibilities and functions of the parties concerned, both public and private, should be set out clearly. The voluntary nature of self-regulation means that the acceptance and effectiveness of a national self-regulation framework depends on the extent to which the parties concerned actively cooperate in its definition, application and evaluation. All the parties concerned should also help with longer-term tasks such as the development of common tools or concepts (for example, on labelling of content) or the planning of ancillary measures (for example, on information, awareness and education).

2. CODE(S) OF CONDUCT

2.1. General

The objective is the production, within the national self-regulation framework, of basic rules which are strictly proportionate to the aims pursued; these rules should be incorporated into a code (or codes) of conduct covering at least the categories set out at 2.2, to be adopted and implemented voluntarily by the operators (i.e. primarily the businesses) concerned. In drawing up these rules, the following should be taken into account:

- the diversity of services and functions performed by the various categories of operator (providers of network, access, service, content, etc.) and their respective responsibilities,
- the diversity of environments and applications in on-line services (open and closed networks, applications of varying levels of interactivity).

In view of the above, operators may need one or more codes of conduct.

Given such diversity, the proportionality of the rules drawn up should be assessed in the light of:

- the principles of freedom of expression, protection of privacy and free movement of services,
- the principle of technical and economic feasibility, given that the overall objective is to develop the information society in Europe.

2.2. The content of the code(s) of conduct

The code (or codes) of conduct should cover the following:

2.2.1. Protection of minors

Objective: to enable minors to make responsible use of on-line services and to avoid them gaining access, without the consent of their parents or teachers, to legal content which may impair their physical, mental or moral development. Besides coordinated measures to educate minors and to improve their awareness, this should cover the establishment of certain standards in the

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

following fields:

(a) Information to users

Objective: within the framework of encouraging responsible use of networks, on-line service providers should inform users, where possible, of any risks from the content of certain on-line services and of such appropriate means of protection as are available.

The codes of conduct should address, for example, the issue of basic rules on the nature of the information to be made available to users, its timing and the form in which it is communicated. The most appropriate occasions should be chosen to communicate the information (sale of technical equipment, conclusion of contracts with user, web sites, etc.).

(b) Presentation of legal contents which may harm minors

Objective: where possible, legal content which may harm minors or affect their physical, mental or moral development should be presented in such a way as to provide users with basic information on its potentially harmful effect on minors. The codes of conduct should therefore address, for example, the issue of basic rules for the businesses providing on-line services concerned and for users and suppliers of content; the rules should set out the conditions under which the supply and distribution of content likely to harm minors should be subject, where possible, to protection measures such as:

- a warning page, visual signal or sound signal,
- descriptive labelling and/or classification of contents,
- systems to check the age of users.

Priority should be given, in this regard, to protection systems applied at the presentation stage to legal content which is clearly likely to be harmful to minors, such as pornography or violence.

(c) Support for parental control

Objective: where possible, parents, teachers and others exercising control in this area should be assisted by easy-to-use and flexible tools in order to enable, without the former's educational choices being compromised, minors under their charge to have access to services, even when unsupervised.

The codes of conduct should address, for example, the issue of basic rules on the conditions under which, wherever possible, additional tools or services are supplied to users to facilitate parental control, including:

- filter software installed and activated by the user,
- filter options activated, at the end-user's request, by service operators at a higher level (for example, limiting access to predefined sites or offering general access to services).

(d) Handling of complaints ('hotlines')

Objective: to promote the effective management of complaints about content which does not comply with the rules on the protection of minors and/or violates the code of conduct.

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

The codes of conduct should address, for example, the issue of basic rules on the management of complaints and encourage operators to provide the management tools and structures needed so that complaints can be sent and received without difficulties (telephone, e-mail, fax) and to introduce procedures for dealing with complaints (informing content providers, exchanging information between operators, responding to complaints, etc.).

2.2.2. Protection of human dignity

Objective: to support effective measures in the fight against illegal content offensive to human dignity.

(a) Information for users

Objective: where possible, users should be clearly informed of the risks inherent in the use of on-line services as content providers so as to encourage legal and responsible use of networks. Codes of conduct should address, for example, the issue of basic rules on the nature of information to be made available, its timing and the form in which it is to be communicated.

(b) Handling of complaints ('hotlines')

Objective: to promote the effective handling of complaints about illegal content offensive to human dignity circulating in audiovisual and on-line services, in accordance with the respective responsibilities and functions of the parties concerned, so as to reduce illegal content and misuse of the networks.

The codes of conduct should address, for example, the issue of basic rules on the management of complaints and encourage operators to provide the management tools and structures needed so that complaints can be sent and received without difficulties (telephone, e-mail, fax) and to introduce procedures for dealing with complaints (informing content providers, exchanging information between operators, responding to complaints, etc.).

(c) Cooperation of operators with judicial and police authorities

Objective: to ensure, in accordance with the responsibilities and functions of the parties concerned effective cooperation between operators and the judicial and police authorities within Member States in combating the production and circulation of illegal content offensive to human dignity in audiovisual and on-line information services.

The codes of conduct should address, for example, the issue of basic rules on cooperation procedures between operators and the competent public authorities, while respecting the principles of proportionality and freedom of expression as well as relevant national legal provisions.

2.2.3. Violations of the codes of conduct

Objective: to strengthen the credibility of the code (or codes) of conduct, taking account of its voluntary nature, by providing for dissuasive measures which are proportionate to the nature of the violations. In this connection, provision should be made, where appropriate, for appeal and mediation procedures. Appropriate

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

rules to govern this area should be included in the code of conduct.

3. NATIONAL BODIES FACILITATING COOPERATION AT COMMUNITY LEVEL

Objective: to facilitate cooperation at Community level (sharing of experience and good practices; working together) through the networking of the appropriate structures within Member States, consistent with their national functions and responsibilities. Such structures could also allow international cooperation to be extended.

Cooperation at European level means:

– cooperation between the parties concerned:

all the parties involved in the drawing up of the national self-regulation framework are asked to set up a representative body at national level to facilitate the sharing of experience and good practices and to work together at Community and international level,

– cooperation between national complaints-handling structures:

to facilitate and develop cooperation at European and international level, the parties involved in an effective complaint management system are asked to set up a national contact point to strengthen cooperation in the fight against illegal content, facilitate the sharing of experience and good practices, and improve legal and responsible use of the networks.

4. EVALUATION OF SELF-REGULATION FRAMEWORKS

The objective is to provide for regular evaluations of the self-regulation framework at national level, to assess its effectiveness in protecting the general interests in question, to measure its success in achieving its objectives and to adapt it gradually to changes in the market, technology and types of use. The parties concerned are asked to set up an evaluation system at national level so that they can monitor the progress made in implementing the self-regulation framework. This should take into account appropriate European-level cooperation, inter alia on the development of comparable assessment methodologies.

Commission of the European Communities:

European Governance – a White Paper

25 July 2001, COM(2001) 428 Final

III. PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE

3.2 Better policies, regulation and delivery

Better and faster regulation – combining policy instruments for better results ...

- Fourth, under certain conditions, implementing measures may be prepared within the framework of co-regulation. Co-regulation combines binding legislative and regulatory action with actions taken by the actors most concerned, drawing on their practical expertise. The result is wider ownership

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

of the policies in question by involving those most affected by implementing rules in their preparation and enforcement. This often achieves better compliance, even where the detailed rules are non-binding.

– It has already been used, for example, in areas such as the internal market (agreeing product standards under the so-called “New Approach” directives) and the environment sector (reducing car emissions).

– The exact shape of co-regulation, the way in which legal and non-legal instruments are combined and who launches the initiative – stakeholders or the Commission - will vary from sector to sector.

Under the following conditions the Commission will consider the use of coregulation where it will be an effective way of achieving EU objectives.

Conditions for the use of co-regulation

Co-regulation implies that a framework of overall objectives, basic rights, enforcement and appeal mechanisms, and conditions for monitoring compliance is set in the legislation.

It should only be used where it clearly adds value and serves the general interest. It is only suited to cases where fundamental rights or major political choices are not called into question. It should not be used in situations where rules need to apply in a uniform way in every Member State. Equally, the organisations participating must be representative, accountable and capable of following open procedures in formulating and applying agreed rules. This will be a key factor in deciding the added value of a co-regulatory approach in a given case.

Additionally, the resulting co-operation must be compatible with European competition rules and the rules agreed must be sufficiently visible so that people are aware of the rules that apply and the rights they enjoy. Where co-regulation fails to deliver the desired results or where certain private actors do not commit to the agreed rules, it will always remain possible for public authorities to intervene by establishing the specific rules needed.

MANDELKERN GROUP ON BETTER REGULATION FINAL REPORT 13 NOVEMBER 2001

2.2.3 Regulation and user responsibility

Finding the most appropriate ways of implementing public policies efficiently should lead us to seek solutions that better combine public authority objectives and the responsibility of users or groups of users. It is in this sense that particular attention can be focussed on “co-regulation”.

2.2.3.1 Co-regulation

There is no one single definition of co-regulation. On the contrary, the effective implementation of public policies may, in order to achieve the same objective, lead to combining legislative or regulatory rules and alternatives to regulation. Several approaches can contribute to this.

a) Setting of objectives by the regulatory authority and the delegation of the

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

details of implementation. An initial approach involves establishing, by regulation, global objectives, the main implementation mechanisms and methods for monitoring the application of a public policy. At the same time, the intervention of private players is requested in order to define the detailed rules. This method means that regulations can be avoided which are too general or which are too unwieldy to be applied precisely in fields which require adaptability and flexibility.

b) Regulatory validation of rules stemming from self-regulation. A bottom to top approach may also prove effective. If necessary, co-regulation may lead to a noncompulsory application method established by private partners being changed into a mandatory rule by the public authority. Similarly the public authority may penalise companies' failure to honour their commitments without giving any regulatory force to those commitments.

2.2.3.2 Conditions for co-regulation

a) Maintaining the primacy of the public authority. Co-regulation does not mean that the responsibility for the rules being implemented is shared. The primacy of the public authority remains intact.

b) Necessary guarantees. Co-regulation cannot be used in all areas. This is particularly the case where safety, fundamental rights or citizen equality are at stake. In general, one should first ask whether the proposed option is appropriate and proportionate to the intended objectives. Co-regulation implies that public authorities may act in partnership with credible and representative players. Criteria establishing their representativeness should be used to identify professional or social organisations capable of contributing to the implementation of public policies within the framework of co-regulation. Co-regulation does not mean that the regulatory (or legislative) authority is no longer concerned with the effective application of the rule.

On the contrary, supervisory mechanisms must be set up.

RECOMMENDATION NO. R (2001) 8 ON SELF-REGULATION CONCERNING CYBER CONTENT (SELF-REGULATION AND USER PROTECTION AGAINST ILLEGAL OR HARMFUL CONTENT ON NEW COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES)

(*) Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 5 September 2001 at the 762nd meeting of the Ministers' Deputies

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.b of the Statute of the Council of Europe,

Considering that the aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage;

Having regard to its Declaration on a European policy for new information

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

technologies, adopted on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe in 1999;

Recalling the commitment of the member states to the fundamental right to freedom of expression and information as guaranteed by Article 10 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and to entrusting the supervision of its application to the European Court of Human Rights;

Reaffirming that freedom of expression and information is necessary for the social, economic, cultural and political development of every human being, and constitutes a condition for the harmonious progress of social and cultural groups, nations and the international community, as expressed in its Declaration on the Freedom of Expression and Information of 1982;

Stressing that the continued development of new communications and information services should serve to further the right of everyone, regardless of frontiers, to express, seek, receive and impart information and ideas for the benefit of every individual and the democratic culture of any society;

Stressing that the freedom to use new communications and information services should not prejudice the human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of others, especially of minors;

Recalling its Recommendation No. R (89) 7 concerning principles on the distribution of videograms having a violent, brutal or pornographic content, its Recommendation No. R (92) 19 on video games with a racist content, its Recommendation No. R (97) 19 on the portrayal of violence in the electronic media, its Recommendation No. R (97) 20 on "hate speech" and Article 4, paragraph a of the International Convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination of the United Nations of 1965;

Bearing in mind the differences in national criminal law concerning illegal content as well as the differences in what content may be perceived as potentially harmful, especially to minors and their physical, mental and moral development, hereinafter referred to as "harmful content";

Bearing in mind that self-regulatory organisations could, in accordance with national circumstances and traditions, be involved in monitoring compliance with certain norms, possibly within a co-regulatory framework, as defined in a particular country;

Aware of self-regulatory initiatives for the removal of illegal content and the protection of users against harmful content taken by the new communications and information industries, sometimes in co-operation with the state, as well as of the existence of technical standards and devices enabling users to select and

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

filter content;

Desirous to promote and strengthen self-regulation and user protection against illegal or harmful content,

Recommends that the governments of member states:

1. implement in their domestic law and/or practice the principles appended to this Recommendation;
2. disseminate widely this Recommendation and its appended principles, where appropriate accompanied by a translation; and
3. bring them in particular to the attention of the media, the new communications and information industries, users and their organisations, as well as of the regulatory authorities for the media and new communications and information services and relevant public authorities.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION NO. R (2001) 8 - PRINCIPLES AND MECHANISMS CONCERNING SELF-REGULATION AND USER PROTECTION AGAINST ILLEGAL OR HARMFUL CONTENT ON NEW COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Chapter I - Self-regulatory organisations

1. Member states should encourage the establishment of organisations which are representative of Internet actors, for example Internet service providers, content providers and users.
2. Member states should encourage such organisations to establish regulatory mechanisms within their remit, in particular with regard to the establishment of codes of conduct and the monitoring of compliance with these codes.
3. Member states should encourage those organisations in the media field with self-regulatory standards to apply them, as far as possible, to the new communications and information services.
4. Member states should encourage such organisations to participate in relevant legislative processes, for instance through consultations, hearings and expert opinions, and in the implementation of relevant norms, in particular by monitoring compliance with these norms.
5. Member states should encourage Europe-wide and international co-operation between such organisations.

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

Chapter II - Content descriptors

6. Member states should encourage the definition of a set of content descriptors, on the widest possible geographical scale and in co-operation with the organisations referred to in Chapter I, which should provide for neutral labelling of content, thus enabling users to make their own judgement concerning such content.

7. Such content descriptors should indicate, for example, violent and pornographic content as well as content promoting the use of tobacco or alcohol, gambling services, and content which allows unsupervised and anonymous contacts between minors and adults.

8. Content providers should be encouraged to apply these content descriptors, in order to enable users to recognise and filter such content regardless of its origin.

Chapter III - Content selection tools

9. Member states should encourage the development of a wide range of search tools and filtering profiles, which provide users with the ability to select content on the basis of content descriptors.

10. Filtering should be applied by users on a voluntary basis.

11. Member states should encourage the use of conditional access tools by content and service providers in relation to content harmful to minors, such as age-verification systems, personal identification codes, passwords, encryption and decoding systems or access through cards with an electronic code.

Chapter IV - Content complaints systems

12. Member states should encourage the establishment of content complaints systems, such as hotlines, which are provided by Internet service providers, content providers, user associations or other institutions. Such content complaints systems should, where necessary for ensuring an adequate response against presumed illegal content, be complemented by hotlines provided by public authorities.

13. Member states should encourage the development of common minimum requirements and practices concerning these content complaints systems. Such requirements should include for instance:

a. the provision of a specific permanent Web address;

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

- b. the availability of the content complaints system on a twenty-four-hour basis;
- c. the provision of information to the public about the legally responsible persons and entities within the bodies offering content complaints systems;
- d. the provision of information to the public about the rules and practices relating to the processing of content complaints, including co-operation with law enforcement authorities with regard to presumed illegal content;
- e. the provision of replies to users concerning the processing of their content complaints;
- f. the provision of links to other content complaints systems abroad.

14. Member states should set up, at the domestic level, an adequate framework for co-operation between content complaints bodies and public authorities with regard to presumed illegal content. For this purpose, member states should define the legal responsibilities and privileges of bodies offering content complaints systems when accessing, copying, collecting and forwarding presumed illegal content to law enforcement authorities.

15. Member states should foster Europe-wide and international co-operation between content complaints bodies.

16. Member states should undertake all necessary legal and administrative measures for transfrontier co-operation between their relevant law enforcement authorities with regard to complaints and investigations concerning presumed illegal content from abroad.

Chapter V - Mediation and arbitration

17. Member states should encourage the creation, at the domestic level, of voluntary, fair, independent, accessible and effective bodies or procedures for out-of-court mediation as well as mechanisms for arbitration of disputes concerning content-related matters.

18. Member states should encourage Europe-wide and international co-operation between such mediation and arbitration bodies, open access of everyone to such mediation and arbitration procedures irrespective of frontiers, and the mutual recognition and enforcement of out-of-court settlements reached hereby, with due regard to the national order public and fundamental procedural safeguards.

Chapter VI - User information and awareness

19. Member states should encourage the development of quality labels for

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

Internet content, for example for governmental content, educational content and content suitable for children, in order to enable users to recognise or search for such content.

20. Member states should encourage public awareness and information about self-regulatory mechanisms, content descriptors, filtering tools, access restriction tools, content complaints systems, and out-of-court mediation and arbitration.

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Nancy Valery
Editor-in-Chief

Carrie Krieg
Technical Editor

Alyssa Clark
Tina Dolman
Articles Editors

Lynnore Thames
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL STAFF

Peter Choi
Lisa Dudzinski
Rebecca Frank
Jed Garfunkel
Amy Gould
Vanessa Hickey
Jenny Kwon

Boris Liberman
Justin Lubatkin
Oscar Lumen
Dan Margolis
Deborah Newman
Catherine O'Connell
Richard Park
Robert Thelander

ADVISORS

Michael Botein
Fredrik Cederqvist
Peter Johnson
Ad van Loon

Media Law & Policy and New York Law School assume no responsibility for, and do not necessarily agree with the views expressed in the articles published in this issue.

Copyright © 2004 New York Law School

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

CORPORATE SPONSORS

ABC, Inc. • AC Nielsen • BRAINS, Int'l • Complan Associates • Bloomberg News • Bresnan Communications Company • Cablevision Systems Corporation • Citicorp Foundation • Empire One Telecommunications • Greystone Foundation • Hubbard Broadcasting, Inc. • Issue Dynamics • Miller & Van Eaton PLLC • Minet Global Services • MITEL Telecommunications Systems, Inc. • The New York Times Company • Nippon Television Network • NTT America, Inc. • NTV International Corporation • Renaissance Communications, Inc. • Teleport Communications Group, Inc. • Tribune Foundation • Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson & Hand • Ward & Olivo • Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP

INDIVIDUAL SPONSORS

Geoffrey Allen • John Howard Braun, Esq. • David Bronston, Esq. • John Cary • John Haven Chapman • Bill Cibbarelli • Mark Conard, Esq. • Eileen Connell • Donna Demac • John A. Dimling • Kristina L. Fischer • Mark Foster • John Friedman • Nancy Lee Giller, Esq. • Peter Johnson, Esq. • Erwin Krasnow, Esq. • Hon. Theodore R. Kupferman • Grant Lally, Esq. • Benjamin Lipschitz, Esq. • Sheila Mahoney, Esq. • Dilip Massand, Esq. • Nicholas Miller, Esq. • Abraham Mund • A. Michael Noll • Kenneth Norwick, Esq. • Margaret O'Brien • Jeffrey Olson, Esq. • Gregory Olinyk • John W. Olivo, Jr., Esq. • Lance R. Primis • Sol Schildhause, Esq. • Gary Schober • Melvin Simensky, Esq. • Samuel Simon, Esq. • Dale Strange • Peter Tannenwald, Esq. • Professor Howard White • Dovie F. Wingard, Esq. • J. Roger Wollenberg, Esq.

MEDIA LAW & POLICY

ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

Media Law & Policy accepts articles from professionals and academics. Articles from law school students are also welcome. Submissions should be approximately 5-20 double spaced pages in length and should be submitted in printed form on an IBM compatible Microsoft Word disk. Submissions will not be returned and are subject to editing. Articles should be sent to *Media Law & Policy*.

Contact Information

Media Law & Policy
New York Law School
57 Worth Street
New York, NY 10013-2960
Tel: 212.431.2899 x4305
Fax: 212.966.2053
Website: <http://www.nyls.edu/pages/1572.asp>
E-mail: mlp@nyls.edu