Reflections on Video-Sharing Platforms' promotion of Media Literacy under the Audiovisual Media Services Directive from

EPRA's Media and Information Literacy Taskforce

18 January 2021

1. Introduction

General context

In the European Commission's June 2020 Communication on Disinformation and Covid-19, it committed as part of the Media and Audiovisual Action Plan "*to propose actions to raise awareness and critical thinking amongst different groups, in particular young people, building on the potential of social media and influencers. This will build upon the amended **Audiovisual Media Service Directive which requires video-sharing platforms to provide for effective media literacy measures and tools***".

This reference is to a specific new obligation in the revised AVMS Directive, Article 28b(3)(j), that VSPs provide:

"for effective media literacy measures and tools and raising users' awareness of those measures and tools."

On 3 December 2020, the European Commission published its Media and Audiovisual Action Plan, in which it signalled its intention to develop a **Media literacy toolbox,** in cooperation with the European Regulators Group for Audiovisual Media Services ("ERGA") and *"in dialogue with VSPs"*, in 2021 to ensure the application of the new rules contained in the AVMS Directive, including the requirement for VSPs to put in place effective media literacy measures and tools.

On the same day, the European Commission also published its European Democracy Action Plan, which also includes details of how media literacy could help to tackle online disinformation and the role that the newly established European Digital Media Observatory (EDMO) could play in coordinating activity to provide support to national ML campaigns.

As Europe's oldest network of audiovisual regulators, EPRA has long placed a focus on the developing role played by media literacy in European regulatory frameworks. A number of papers, and the setup of a Media and Information Literacy Taskforce within the EPRA membership ("EPRA MIL Taskforce") have reflected the growing importance of this field for regulators. For this reason, the EPRA MIL Taskforce has decided to share the various expertise and experiences of its members in this document. Even though the AVMS Directive is not applicable in all EPRA members' countries, it nevertheless provides an important framework of reference for both the development of online regulation and how media literacy is now a key role for regulators for all EPRA members.

The document draws on existing information about online platforms' activities, national approaches to transposition of the Directive, and regulators' developing practices and expertise in coordination

and oversight of media literacy activity, to offer some reflections on how the new provision of Article 28b(3)(j) AVMSD could best be understood and applied in the widest possible interests of European citizens.

We therefore hope it will be helpful to ERGA, the Commission and VSPs in their work on a toolkit, and more broadly to VSPs and regulators in approaching compliance with and oversight of this new obligation in the best interests of European citizens of all ages.

The AVMS Directive

While it does not prescribe exactly what Member States should do to promote media literacy at the national level, the AVMS Directive can be seen as laying the ground for coordination of national policies in its previous reporting requirement. The EPRA MIL Taskforce therefore considers it important to be aware of this context and background when reflecting on the application of Article 28b(3)(j).

The Directive had already defined and given a role to media literacy in its previous version, but the emergence in the last few years of the problem of online disinformation has sharply focused attention on the role that media literacy has to play in helping to support any interventions that might address this problem – particularly given the need to empower citizens to protect themselves via critical skills, without the need for, or even to complement regulation that might restrict freedom of expression. For this reason, the revised Directive further strengthens the role of media literacy as a tool to achieve its goals, including through a new obligation on Member States to "*promote and take measures for the development of media literacy skills*" (in addition to the new obligation for VSPs in this space), as well as through new definitions:

> *'Media literacy' refers to skills, knowledge and understanding that allow citizens to use media effectively and safely. In order to enable citizens to access information and to use, critically assess and create media content responsibly and safely, citizens need to possess advanced media literacy skills. Media literacy should not be limited to learning about tools and technologies, but should aim to* **equip citizens with the critical thinking skills required to exercise judgment, analyse complex realities and recognise the difference between opinion and fact***.*

Moreover, the revised Directive now explicitly underlines the importance of multi-stakeholder cooperation in approaching media literacy:

> *It is therefore necessary that* **both media service providers and video-sharing platforms providers, in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders,** *promote the development of media literacy in all sections of society, for citizens of all ages, and for all media and that progress in that regard is followed closely.*

The European Council in May 2020 set out its [Conclusions on media literacy in an ever-changing world](#), a [common policy](#) on media literacy. The Conclusions supported the establishment of media literacy networks at a regional, national and thematic level in Member States which will support lifelong learning. The Council also suggested that EDMO be used to develop mechanisms to facilitate collaboration, and asked Member States to work together to develop criteria and evaluation processes to determine the impact of media literacy campaigns and measures.

2. Current Activities by Platforms

We already know something about online platforms[1] activity in the field of media literacy. Platforms undertake a very wide range of activities that can be classified as relating to media literacy and having the aim of improving levels of media literacy. These include:

1) **Content labelling and prominence:** This can relate to labelling content as inappropriate for younger people, or measures that the VSPs are using to try and combat dis- and misinformation. For example, a platform might add a label to content that has been proven to be incorrect, and it can also provide a link that gives context to the issue. Content prominence can push content that has been fact checked or is from sources that are considered reliable (though the assessment of reliability varies from platform to platform).

2) **Behavioural nudges and service design**: Platforms also use behavioural nudges, for example where a user is notified when they try to share content that has been confirmed as false or misleading.

3) **Resources:** Platforms also provide resources for users on increasing their knowledge of how to remain safe online or to have the most positive online experience. These resources focus primarily on operating safely on the platform and are usually aimed at children, parents and educators. Most of the resources are only available in English.

4) **Advertising transparency:** Platforms can provide explicit information to indicate that a company has paid for content or prominence, and also give explanations as to why different adverts are shown to different people.

5) **Funding, partnerships and events:** They also provide funding for projects run by third parties, and for events run by partners that promote media literacy.

6) **Campaigns:** Platforms can also run media literacy-focused campaigns, either individually or with partners, or by supporting others' campaigns.

Researchers looking into existing steps already taken by VSPs in the areas set out by the reviewed AVMS Directive found that media literacy tools and initiatives were not yet a common feature among all platforms:

> *Media literacy tools or initiatives were evident on YouTube, Facebook, Instagram/IGTV, TikTok, Snap and Dailymotion. However, on Instagram/IGTV, Snap and Dailymotion, these were limited to information and tools for parents and educators on how to protect minors and help them become more literate. There was very limited use of this measure in relation to adult users or other potential harm.[2]*

---

[1] Details and sources of existing measures taken by platforms can be found in the Annex. We have sought and relied on information about platforms' activities in the public domain, which extends to platforms broadly rather than VSPs (which are in any case not yet identified formally by regulators). "Online platforms" and "VSPs" are therefore used interchangeably in this document and do not imply any pre-judgement on the scope of the AVMS Directive.

[2] Broughton Micova, Sally and Kostovska, Ivana (2020) "*Video-sharing platforms: Study on the implementation of the new provisions in the revised audiovisual media services directive (AVMSD)*" in *Study on the implementation of the new provisions in the revised Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) Final Report* (Publication pending).

> *Focus on: Measures and Tools*
>
> One observation from the categories of activity listed above, on the one hand and the analysis conducted by researchers on the other, that there is still some debate over the breadth of activities that might be captured in the concept of "measures and tools" mentioned in Art. 28b(3)(j) of the AVMSD.
>
> Within the field of media and information literacy, tools and measures are generally understood broadly, and include offline education programmes or activities as well as what is carried out within the service itself.
>
> It would therefore seem counter-productive to limit VSPs' activities to just service-level tools, although it is also fair to say that this is where their expertise is likely to lie. But as different initiatives require different tools and measures, platforms could reasonably be expected to liaise with other bodies or organisations involved with or responsible for MIL in each country to identify appropriate on-the-ground partners. This could allow platforms to tailor tools and information within their services that complemented and reinforced educational measures that might be delivered offline or in other online environments.

3. Independent Assessment

Limited information is available from platforms about the impact of their activities in general, and even less can be said to cover the impact of media literacy tools, measures or activities on users. All the major platforms' enforcement reports[3] focus on quantitative reporting of content take-down, and there does not appear to be any available information or any metrics produced on the reduction in dissemination of mis- or disinformation due to labelling efforts or ML education, for example.

Assessment of some aspects of platforms media literacy activities can be found in additional independent sources, in particular those providing an evaluation of the European Commission's 2018 Code of Practice on Disinformation. The two main resources in this area are the ERGA Report on disinformation: Assessment of the implementation of the Code of Practice and a report by an independent consultancy, Valdani Vicari & Associati (VVA), also tasked with monitoring implementation and evaluating the efficacy of the Code.

ERGA's analysis of Pillar 4 of the Code, which deals with user empowerment, found that:

- Platforms had brought in tools to help users critically assess content they saw online as well as to promote trustworthy sources of information.
- However, platforms had frequently developed features in the US and had not rolled them out in Member States.
- There was a delay in media literacy initiatives reaching all Member States in their local languages.

---

[3] See Annex 1

The VVA study meanwhile found that:

- National regulatory authorities (NRAs) found the Code to work well in this area, but academics and experts on disinformation did not.
- There is little financial incentive to increase media literacy, which makes a public sector approach important.
- One of the main ways in which regulatory authorities can facilitate media literacy is through providing definitions and guidance, and that platforms were not content with the definitions they were currently being given to find and promote 'trustworthy' news sources. NRAs could therefore set criteria for 'trustworthy' news sources or that a body is created specifically to clarify these conditions.

These two reports varied on the assessment of the effectiveness of implementation of this Pillar of the Code by signatory platforms. However, they agreed there should be a move away from the number and extent of the measures introduced and greater focus on the success and impact on the users. Based on the report, the European Commission[4] concluded that platforms lacked easy-to-use reporting mechanisms for false/misleading information which give users updates on the outcome of their report, and the introduction of independent indicators to assess how well platform mechanisms help users to identify misleading content.

Most recently, ERGA conducted an analysis of media literacy campaigns on disinformation and efforts made by platforms as signatories to the Code on Disinformation[5]. This analysis has a relatively narrow focus, but it supports the findings of the previous independent reports. In particular, it found evidence of "efficient and good" individual media literacy campaigns and described the role played by platforms in developing and disseminating these, but also found an uneven geographic reach and gaps in reaching older people, as well as insufficient evidence of partnerships with broad groups of stakeholders.

4. Policies and Evaluation

Currently there appears to be no systematic or transparent approach to reporting on MIL actions by platforms (as evinced by the ERGA report on media literacy campaigns, and the two earlier reports on the application of the Code on Disinformation) and it is therefore difficult to have a holistic picture of the spread and reach of activity, whether it forms part of a structured media and information literacy policy on the part of online platforms, or whether activities are routinely evaluated. There seems to be no evidence of dedicated media literacy policies among platforms, and if they are evaluating impact they are not sharing a great deal of that externally (beyond simple reach data). It remains unclear why some countries see extensive investment in initiatives through large-scale programmes (primarily targeted at young people) which are not replicated in other countries.

Without a guiding policy and an attempt to evaluate impact, media literacy activity will inevitably be carried out on an ad-hoc basis, with varying (unknown) degrees of impact – potentially wasting time,

---

[4] Commission Staff Working Document (SWD (2020)180 Final - Assessment of the Code of Practice on Disinformation), Pillar D page 10 "Fourth, there is no dedicated, user-friendly and uniform procedure available on all platforms for users to flag possible disinformation cases and be adequately informed about the outcome of their actions." Available at this link: https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=69212
[5] ERGA Report, Improving Media Literacy campaigns on disinformation: https://erga-online.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/ERGA-SG2-Report-2020-Improving-Media-Literacy-campaigns-on-disinformation.pdf

energy and funding. While it is easy to talk in general terms about a "more systematic approach", the EPRA MIL Taskforce members asked themselves what that might mean concretely when applied to future activity by platforms. The following came up as non-exhaustive examples:

1. Linking tools and measures to the kinds of skills they are aiming to promote and the demographic group they are aimed at. AVMSD does not specify and we as regulators cannot dictate – so the scope is wide for however platforms want to approach it.
2. Developing and publishing an internal policy that identifies priority areas where skills are known to be lacking
3. Distinguishing different kinds of activities (funding, tools, education etc)
4. Consistency of approach and funding across countries
5. An approach to reporting on activity that allows independent assessments of efficacy to be made and helps to support more effective future approaches.

It would be fair to observe, however, that online platforms do not often appear to have been given any guidance on these matters from government departments (in the form of a media literacy strategy) or from independent bodies such as regulatory authorities. Such guidance might have offered strong principles that platforms could follow and resulted in greater consistency in the understanding and evaluation of initiatives.

As further discussed below, in the context of regulatory oversight, a national, or even European level policy could also help to indicate to platforms where their activity fits into a wider set of MIL activity so that it's clear for everyone the relevant role that VSPs can play.

Focus on: Evaluation

Evaluation is one critical way that MIL activity can be made more systematic and lead to clear and measurable outcomes – making it easier and more effective to plan future strategy. In the autumn of 2020, the EPRA MIL Taskforce met several times to examine evaluation frameworks in the context of MIL networks and MIL activity more generally. The following summary offers some options for building evaluation into the development of MIL measures.

- Evaluation should be done **early in the life** of a media literacy initiative, and funding for evaluation also needs to be considered alongside the development of such initiatives.
- There can be ambiguity in evaluation, so **assessment should be based on a combination of factors**, and carried out from different perspectives (e.g. are journalists seeing a difference in the quality of information that is getting disseminated?) not just quantitative results from platform analytics
- There is a need to focus on **measuring value rather than success**: it is less about the number of people it has affected and more that the measure has encouraged better media literate behaviour. A **"what works model"** is helpful in this context, built on:
  - o Developing initiatives from existing measures
  - o Assessing the initiative
  - o Improving the design of the measure from these findings (cyclical method of evaluation)
- Evaluation can also include a **content quality assessment**, based on the quality of content produced by those targeted by the measures, e.g. school competitions.
- Evaluation of media literacy initiatives can learn from other disciplines that need to track the efficacy of interventions to change behaviour (e.g. marketing).
- An **evaluation toolkit** can be an effective way to help platforms – and indeed any other actors - improve their evaluation approach and methods. Cross-platform collaboration can be highly useful here.

5. Transposition and Regulatory Oversight

A consideration of the approaches taken by Member States transposing the AVMS Directive into national law can also provide a useful basis on which to consider best practices and look for clues as to what is likely to be expected from VSPs in this area[6].

Most countries have chosen to transpose the provisions of the Directive in this area through a simple copy process. However, a few have taken the opportunity to either link the provision to a broader or more detailed set of requirements on media literacy.

Among the most detailed approaches transposition is in **Ireland**, which uses a new [Online Safety and Media Regulation Bill](#) proposal to enshrine a definition of media literacy in legislation and set out expectations of platforms in delivering against media literacy requirements – including clear transparency standards and the provision of education and information to users.

Other approaches of note include:

- **Italy,** where VSPs are "*invited to promote campaigns and initiatives on issues of social inclusion and cohesion, as well as the promotion of diversity and fundamental human rights, with a view to preventing and countering online discrimination*".
- **Slovakia,** which focuses on child protection to set out clear instructions on the coordination and involvement of a very wide range of stakeholders including media in the task of improving media literacy.
- **UK,** where the provision has been transposed to give a concrete outcome to VSPs efforts, by requiring them to "*provide information and tools for individuals using the service **with the aim of improving their media literacy** and raise awareness of the availability of such information and tools.*"
- **Denmark**, where as well as "*ensuring effective measures and tools to promote media awareness*" VSPs should "*launch **information campaigns** aimed at users about these measures and tools.*"

In the wider context of the revised AVMS Directive's media literacy obligations for Member States themselves, some countries have taken the opportunity to launch the development of a national media literacy policy, which as noted above can only be helpful to platforms planning activity in this area.

VSPs and regulatory authorities (where they have discretion in this area) could look closely at some of the more detailed transposition approaches, particularly if there is an appetite to take a common approach across Europe. Striving to adhere to the most detailed transposition in the interests of consistency, for example, could save time and money and mean that citizens across Europe can benefit from increased media literacy measures.

Finally, it is notable that the provision of media literacy tools and measures is one of the "Appropriate Measures" that the AVMS Directive envisages VSPs taking for the wider purpose of protecting their users. That means – like all of the appropriate measures' framework – media literacy activity will be subject to oversight by independent national regulatory authorities. A shared set of principles regarding how VSPs' activity is likely to be assessed in this context (potentially to be developed by

---

[6] Source – European Audiovisual Observatory – tracker of AVMSD Transposition.

European regulators with media literacy expert bodies) could provide much needed consistency across the landscape and send a message to platforms that they are working under a common understanding. As noted above, very few countries can yet be said to have an overarching strategy for how media literacy can play a role in dealing with online regulatory problems; this provides an opportunity for regulators to agree a set of shared media literacy principles that VSPs could follow. This is the approach applied in Ireland, an exception to this rule, where the BAI's Media Literacy Policy comprises key competencies and associated indicators. This can be used as a tool by any media literacy actor (including VSPs) to deliver and evaluate their MIL initiative. Such principles could be useful to platforms, particularly if supported by a set of shared resources, and could motivate a more consistent approach across countries.

6. Multi-stakeholder Partnerships and the Role of Networks

The available evidence shows that platforms can and do form successful partnerships, but there is definitely scope for more initiatives to be developed and carried out in consultation and partnership with other key stakeholders.

MIL networks, which are emerging across Europe and which have been the focus of extensive analysis by the EPRA MIL Taskforce, are particularly well-suited to supporting the development of such partnerships. MIL networks allow all relevant stakeholders – irrespective of size, funding or status, and including NGOs and regulators – to promote best practice and foster strong working relationships. They are also a valuable route for the development of common approaches, for example through codes of conduct or guidance. The form these networks can take are varied and should be developed according to what the network is trying to achieve. Networks can be open and accessible to all relevant stakeholders and those with an interest in media literacy. For example, the Finnish Game Educators network which allows anyone to become a member. However, networks can also have closed membership where only specific stakeholders are involved (for example the Swedish Media Council).

In fact, the role of MIL networks and alliances is critical in the development of common approaches, as it is much easier to build support for and involvement in initiatives when network partners have already been involved in, or had some say in, the policy behind their development. Some EPRA MIL Taskforce members have argued that a multi-stakeholder network is the only viable way to deliver MIL initiatives, because of the breadth of subject matter (no single organisation can have the answers or the funding) but also because it ensures key buy-in from all stakeholders. This kind of approach is open to both national and supra-national development.

7. Conclusions and Reflections

In this final section, the EPRA MIL Taskforce offers some reflections for platforms and regulators to consider, when looking to ensure effective compliance with the new MIL obligation in the AVMS Directive.

(1) Media and Information Literacy activity by VSPs can benefit from a systematic approach

Greater consistency is possible in VSPs' approach to MIL, both in terms of targeted demographic and geographic reach. There is no sense at the moment that media literacy tools and measures are made equally available in all European languages, and there is a noticeable difference in the amount of resources available in English and those in other languages.

More clarity about the goals and intended outcomes of MIL measures is desirable, particularly if it is based on a common understanding of what constitutes media and information literacy (as opposed to, for example, general service safety features). Clarity and a shared understanding could help in focusing and designing activity on the basis of what age group is being targeted, what skills are being developed (for example, around resilience to harmful material and critical understanding), how the planned measures will achieve this, and what outcomes should be expected; and making this information publicly available has positive consequences. More transparency on their media literacy activities based on more structured and consistent reporting – in general, greater information sharing, including on the uptake of any measures introduced and observable impact – would support better interventions in the future. It could also be a first step in the fulfilment of the second requirement of art. 28b3j raising users' awareness of those measures and tools.

Such an approach can also helpfully form the basis of **policies and coordinated thinking** by VSPs about media literacy. Policies do not have to be developed in isolation, and VSPs will doubtless have many potential partners eager to help them develop a more systematic approach.

(2) Multi-stakeholder networks can play a key role in delivering the media literacy goals of the AVMS Directive

It is important to consider what responsibilities lie most appropriately with VSPs and where support and partnerships are available and desirable. There will be particular approaches that online platforms will be best placed to develop and assess, such as technical tools and service-level interventions – all of which can help users to develop or strengthen media literacy skills and competencies. But that does not mean that platforms cannot also be involved in supporting other types of educational initiatives or grass-roots projects, including offline, as part of a multi-stakeholder approach.

This is likely to entail coordination with other organisations, partly to explore partnerships but also to understand where the platforms' efforts would best be directed. The role of MIL networks is highly relevant here. And a multi-stakeholder approach is not limited to the national level: to follow such an approach across Europe – and to make it a key plank in supporting citizen empowerment and engagement across the continent – could make a significant impact in this field.

(3) Oversight by regulatory authorities has the potential to encourage best practice, coordination and increasingly positive outcomes for citizens on and offline

The new requirements for VSPs are likely to have the most positive impact if they do not operate in isolation. Working together, both VSPs and regulators can build a better mutual understanding of where VSPs' activities fit into the wider context of MIL promotion. Most importantly, if VSPs' activity is positioned within the wider MIL policy context, they will be able to decide where best to direct their efforts to fill gaps, as well as consult and pursue partnerships.

An agreement at European level as to the definition of media literacy (or media and information literacy) could be extremely helpful here, but we must acknowledge that debates around this definition have been extensive and largely without agreement. The lack of agreed definition allows flexibility with what can be targeted by media literacy activities, but also guards against media literacy becoming outdated. On that basis, an agreement on core competencies and skills indicators in conjunction to a wider European media literacy strategy, could be the way forward. These core competencies and skills should be wide and varied. The list itself should also not be considered exhaustive. It is important to acknowledge that the skills and competencies needed for an individual to be media literate vary dependant on a variety of factors. However, having a base on which each State can build according to their own needs would be helpful. A shared repository of tools and resources would certainly further support coordinated activity, efficiency and partnerships.

And finally, there is also an opportunity for regulators to agree amongst themselves how best to assess and evaluate approaches to media literacy by online platforms. Common principles in this area could, for example, provide guidance on the desired outcomes of successful media literacy measures; metrics for evaluation; what constitutes media literacy promotion (and that this should go beyond basic service use and online safety, with a particular focus on critical thinking); how different platforms activities can complement each other; where offline education can support online measures etc.

Annex 1

1) The measures that VSPs are already undertaking can be grouped under ten different categories

Content Labelling:

This is when platforms add labels to content that informs the user that the content may be inaccurate or harmful. Included with this is labelling and increasing visibility of fact checked or official news content.

- Facebook: The platform adds labels to content that has been proven to be misinformation. These labels include; altered, false and missing context. Altered and false information will have their distribution reduced significantly and a warning label will be added. For missing context content, Facebook's partnered fact checkers will add context with a label. ([source](#))
- Google: Fact check tags on news sources ([source](#))
- YouTube: Provide information panels with the wider context on news or political content ([source](#) p. 21)
- Twitter: Twitter include labels which can either label content as, missing context, altered or synthetic. The response from Twitter varies dependent on the risk associated with the false information. If the risk is categorised as 'severe' (which is a danger to health or someone's safety) the content will be removed if it is confirmed to be misleading and a warning will be added is the claim is just disputed. ([source](#))

Content prominence:

- YouTube: YouTube has a Breaking News and Top News. The top shelf news panel only display content from verified news sources. For Breaking News, YouTube has created an algorithm from breaking news examples in the past to create a list of more trusted sources that respond to breaking news. They also display trusted text news from trusted sources when video content is not available. They are also trying to reduce the recommendation of low quality content ([source](#) p.21-22)
- Facebook: Reduce distribution of content confirmed as misinformation or missing context. The platform also removes incentives for people who are consistently sharing content that has been debunked. They reduce their distribution and lose the ability to monetise or advertise for a period of time (unspecified length) ([source](#))
- A tweet's reach will be limited if it violates Twitter's rules ([source](#))

Behavioural nudge:

- Twitter alerting people before allowing them to retweet news articles they have not clicked on to or read.
- Facebook gives a user trying to share content that is confirmed to be false or misleading a notification letting them know the information is incorrect or misleading. If content is confirmed to be false or misleading after it has been shared, the user will get a notification that will link to fact checker articles ([source](#))

Resources:

- Facebook

- o [Facebook Youth Portal](): A resource for young people to understand how Facebook works better and how to stay safe on Facebook. Does not include anything on how to identify or deal with misinformation.
  - o [Facebook safety resources](): Links to guides covering bullying, LGBT rights, Women online and suicide etc. (for the UK fewer in other EU countries including Germany), videos and links to partners resources. Does not include anything on how to identify or deal with misinformation.
  - o [Digital Literacy Library](): Offers lessons on digital literacy and how to behave online as well as online safety. Maybe within the lesson on spam but no actual lessons devoted to mis- and disinformation.
- Google/YouTube
  - o [Be Internet Legends](): Aimed at children to help them make smarter decisions. A resource for teachers, parents and children. Noting on ML
  - o [Be Internet Citizens](): Resources for young people (teenagers) focussing more on YouTube, covers general internet wellbeing and safety. There is a section that talks about false or misleading information, it specifically focusses on news content, "Three sides to every story" section.
  - o No resources for adults
- Facebook, Google and Twitter all have publicly accessible APIs

Advertising:

- Facebook, Twitter and Google/YouTube all provide information on how and why advertising is promoted to users as well as clear labelling of what content is advertising.

Funding:

- Facebook: Sponsor and fund several ML events and initiatives. Some run by NGO's and some funded with governments
- Twitter: Involves in helping fund MIL events in Europe and internationally
- Google: Provide funding for MIL education initiatives in member states.

Events:

- Facebook:
  - o Specific events/discussion around digital media literacy organised. For instance, in Italy, the program 'Memedia: media literacy nel mondo dei meme' for 40 students who worked together to produce content and communication strategies.
  - o Specific events and workshops organised to deliver Digital Skills Training Programme
  - o Support to the awareness campaign Stoppa, hugsa, athuga (Stop, think, check) of the Fjölmiðlanefnd (the Icelandic Media Commission) in order to help people detect fake news and disinformation.
- Google/YouTube
  - o Specific events/discussion around digital media literacy organised.
  - o Some events organised to inform consumers and journalists

Campaigns:

- Facebook: Launch of a campaign to inform and raise awareness of political advertising to users during European and local elections ([source]())

- Google: Launch of 'Be Internet Awesome' campaign ([source](#))

Work with external organisations:

- Facebook, Google, Twitter: All support the Be Media Smart campaign ([source](#))
- Twitter:
  - Support to their global network of safety partners for the Safer Internet Day 2019
  - Partnerships with civil society, institutions, governments
- Snapchat: Partnership with WHO

2) **Main platforms' reporting activity:**
- Facebook: [Community standards enforcement report](#). Quarterly, covers both Facebook and Instagram. Misinformation is covered under the 'scam' section.
- YouTube/Google: [Transparency report](#) giving metrics on the amount of content/channels/comments removed from the platform. Quarterly
- Twitter: [Biannual transparency](#) report. The most relevant aspect is the platform [manipulation section.](#)
  - [Twitter also tweeted the results of the prompt](#)
- Snapchat: [Citizensnap report- contains nothing about ML but would be the place ML evaluation might go.](#)