

# Regulatory environment for platforms, online intermediaries, data and cloud computing and the collaborative economy

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Objectives and General Information

---

**The views expressed in this public consultation document may not be interpreted as stating an official position of the European Commission. All definitions provided in this document are strictly for the purposes of this public consultation and are without prejudice to differing definitions the Commission may use under current or future EU law, including any revision of the definitions by the Commission concerning the same subject matters.**

You are invited to read the privacy statement attached to this consultation for information on how your personal data and contribution will be dealt with.

This public consultation will close on 6 January 2016 (13 weeks from the day when all language versions have been made available).

The Commission invites all interested parties to express their views on the questions targeting relations between platform providers and holders of rights in digital content (Question starting with "[A1]"), taking account of the Commission Communication "Towards a modern, more European copyright framework" of 9 December 2015. Technical features of the questionnaire have been adapted accordingly.

**Please complete this section of the public consultation before moving to other sections.**

- Respondents living with disabilities can request the questionnaire in .docx format and send their replies in email to the following address:  
CNECT-PLATFORMS-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu.
- If you are an association representing several other organisations and intend to gather the views of your members by circulating the questionnaire to them, please send us a request in email and we will send you the questionnaire in .docx format. However, we ask you to introduce the aggregated answers into EU Survey. In such cases we will not consider answers submitted in other channels than EU Survey.
- If you want to submit position papers or other information in addition to the information you share with the Commission in EU Survey, please send them to  
CNECT-PLATFORMS-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu and make reference to the "Case Id" displayed after you have concluded the online questionnaire. This helps the Commission to properly identify your contribution.
- Given the volume of this consultation, you may wish to download a PDF version before responding to the survey online. The PDF version includes all possible questions. When you fill the survey in online, you will not see all of the questions; only those applicable to your chosen respondent category and to other choices made when you answer previous questions.

\* Please indicate your role for the purpose of this consultation

- An individual citizen
- An association or trade organization representing consumers
- An association or trade organization representing businesses
- An association or trade organization representing civil society
- An online platform
- A business, including suppliers using an online platform to provide services
- A public authority
- A research institution or Think tank
- Other

\* Please indicate your country of residence

Germany 

\* Please provide your contact information (name, address and e-mail address)

CEPIC office, Fritschstrasse 22, Berlin, Germany

\* Is your organisation registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission and the European Parliament?

*Note: If you are not answering this questionnaire as an individual, please register in the Transparency Register. If your organisation/institution responds without being registered, the Commission will consider its input as that of an individual and will publish it as such.*

- Yes
- No
- Non-applicable

\* Please indicate your organisation's registration number in the Transparency Register

197834213050-71

If you are an economic operator, please enter the NACE code, which best describes the economic activity you conduct. [You can find here the NACE classification.](#)

*Text of 3 to 5 characters will be accepted*

The Statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community, abbreviated as NACE, is the classification of economic activities in the European Union (EU).

\* I object the publication of my personal data

Yes

No

## Online platforms

---

### SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ROLE OF ONLINE PLATFORMS

Do you agree with the definition of "**Online platform**" as provided below?

"Online platform" refers to an undertaking operating in two (or multi)-sided markets, which uses the Internet to enable interactions between two or more distinct but interdependent groups of users so as to generate value for at least one of the groups. Certain platforms also qualify as Intermediary service providers.

Typical examples include general internet search engines (e.g. Google, Bing), specialised search tools (e.g. Google Shopping, Kelkoo, Twenga, Google Local, TripAdvisor, Yelp.), location-based business directories or some maps (e.g. Google or Bing Maps), news aggregators (e.g. Google News), online market places (e.g. Amazon, eBay, Allegro, Booking.com), audio-visual and music platforms (e.g. Deezer, Spotify, Netflix, Canal play, Apple TV), video sharing platforms (e.g. YouTube, Dailymotion), payment systems (e.g. PayPal, Apple Pay), social networks (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, Tuenti), app stores (e.g. Apple App Store, Google Play) or collaborative economy platforms (e.g. AirBnB, Uber, Taskrabbit, Bla-bla car). Internet access providers fall outside the scope of this definition.

No



\* Please explain how you would change the definition

*1000 character(s) maximum*

1) On the one hand, the definition is too large as it does not distinguish between the various activities carried out by online platforms are active online. A differentiation should be made between "activities" rather than identity of the platforms as platforms carry out a range of activities

There is a difference between a mere passive technical "conduit" activity as per Art. 14 of E-commerce directive and (i) the active organisation and display of content, (ii) display the content as own content and/or (iii) any activity leading to the monetization of the content (directly or indirectly e.g. through advertising and using data).

2) On the other hand, the definition is too narrow because it excludes "Internet Access Providers" although some may be carrying the activities mentioned above. We believe that an activity based definition of "Internet Access Providers" could be helpful in enforcing copyright online.

What do you consider to be the key advantages of using online platforms?

Online platforms...

- make information more accessible
- make communication and interaction easier
- increase choice of products and services
- create more transparent prices and the possibility to compare offers
- increase trust between peers by providing trust mechanisms (i.e. ratings, reviews, etc.)
- lower prices for products and services
- lower the cost of reaching customers for suppliers
- help with matching supply and demand
- create new markets or business opportunities
- help in complying with obligations in cross-border sales
- help to share resources and improve resource-allocation
- others:

\* Please specify:

*100 character(s) maximum*

Answer above is based on majority answers to CEPIC survey to its membership.

**Have you encountered, or are you aware of problems faced by consumers or suppliers when dealing with online platforms?**

"Consumer" is any natural person using an online platform for purposes outside the person's trade, business, craft or profession.

"Supplier" is any trader or non-professional individual that uses online platforms to provide services to third parties both under their own brand (name) and under the platform's brand.

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please list the problems you encountered, or you are aware of, in the order of importance and provide additional explanation where possible.**

*3000 character(s) maximum*

- 1) Good experience. CEPIC members report positive experience as general users of platforms such as, for example, on Facebook where it is possible to quickly share information with friends but also. "I can quickly reach a world of knowledge such as when I have a problem in Photoshop or my camera" writes typically a survey respondent.
- 2) Bad experiences.
  1. For CEPIC members, the biggest challenged provided by online platforms is conscious and/orunconscious piracy. According to surveys by our members, 80%-90% of their images used online are unlicensed. When contacted, infringerusually respond that the image were right-click copied from Google Images. CEPIC estimates that about 8 out of 10 infringers source images this way.
  2. Next to piracy, but close to it, comes the re-use of images and investment of our members in professional images for own business model. Example Wikipedia. "Biggest problem is with Wikipedia (which we would consider being an on-line platform) and their use of photography created by our company in articles, their use of them to produce prints from these images to help them fund their business and refusing to take images off they see those images being made freely available under US Public Domain legislation and not the legislation of the country they were created in, i.e. UK. This issue has been developed by CEPIC calling for a better protection of images online:  
<http://cepic.org/issues/image-providers-call-for-a-better-protection-of-images-online>
  3. Use of images without payment or credit or/and scraping of metadata by social media platforms, aggregators.
  4. No redirection to the rightsholder website such as with Google Images (except on French and German domains)
  5. Last problem mentioned is the impossibility to "communicate" with the platform. Typical quotes from CEPIC survey: "Bad experience - Amazon bouncing me into a free trial I didn't want and hard to find a way out of it.", "Ever tried to contact a human for help or discussion? Analyze that Mr Google."

How could these problems be best addressed?

- market dynamics
- regulatory measures
- self-regulatory measures
- a combination of the above

## TRANSPARENCY OF ONLINE PLATFORMS

Do you think that online platforms should ensure, as regards their own activities and those of the **traders** that use them, more transparency in relation to:

a) information required by consumer law (e.g. the contact details of the supplier, the main characteristics of products, the total price including delivery charges, and consumers' rights, such as the right of withdrawal)?

"Trader" is any natural or legal person using an online platform for business or professional purposes. Traders are in particular subject to EU consumer law in their relations with consumers.

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

b) information in response to a search query by the user, in particular if the displayed results are sponsored or not?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

c) information on who the actual supplier is, offering products or services on the platform

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

d) information to discourage misleading marketing by professional suppliers (traders), including fake reviews?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

e) is there any additional information that, in your opinion, online platforms should be obliged to display?

*500 character(s) maximum*

Online platforms displaying images:

1. should be obliged to inform the user on copyright and usage permissions ;
2. should clearly identify the source of the images and link to that source, avoiding the confusion that all content on their site is free to re-use ;
3. should avoid metadata scraping (<http://bit.ly/>)
4. if not possible, they should include a clear warning against the re-use of the content

Have you experienced that information displayed by the platform (e.g. advertising) has been adapted to the interest or recognisable characteristics of the user?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Do you find the information provided by online platforms on their terms of use sufficient and easy-to-understand?

- Yes
- No

\* What type of additional information and in what format would you find useful? Please briefly explain your response and share any best practice you are aware of.

*1500 character(s) maximum*

The biggest challenge faced by visual content owners is the "free" re-use of their content by platforms: Online platforms re-use and promote the re-use by consumers of up-loaded content but without incurring any of the cost of creating or making this content available in the first place.

Following rules related to the way information is shown could be helpful, although not sufficient, in having platforms participate in the monetization of their content by rightsowners.

1. Clear indication of re-use of content and on which terms. Where online platforms invite users to upload images, it should prominently notify, at the time of registration and/or at the time of upload of the image, whether the online platform grant themselves the right to re-use content in any way. This information is provided but usually carefully hidden in the terms and conditions.

2. Usage data. Valuable data is generated by knowing which images users are interested in viewing. Platforms should be able to disclose any data collected in relation to requests from non-contracted copyright owners.

3. At minimum, when the user clicks on the content, online platforms should be obliged to redirect to the source website so that content owners see which image has been used. The present practice is presently the opposite: an online platform like Google displays images both in general search results and in Google Images in such a way that users stay in Google's ecosystem and never visit the source website.

Do you find reputation systems (e.g. ratings, reviews, certifications, trustmarks) and other trust mechanisms operated by online platforms are generally reliable?

- Yes  
 No  
 I don't know

What are the main benefits and drawbacks of reputation systems and other trust mechanisms operated by online platforms? Please describe their main benefits and drawbacks.

*1500 character(s) maximum*

N/A

## USE OF INFORMATION BY ONLINE PLATFORMS



In your view, do online platforms provide sufficient and accessible information with regard to:

a) the personal and non-personal data they collect?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

b) what use is made of the personal and non-personal data collected, including trading of the data to other platforms and actors in the Internet economy?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

c) adapting prices, for instance dynamic pricing and conditions in function of data gathered on the buyer (both consumer and trader)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding the use of information by online platforms

*3000 character(s) maximum*

N/A for our purpose

**RELATIONS BETWEEN PLATFORMS AND SUPPLIERS/TRADERS/APPLICATION DEVELOPERS OR HOLDERS OF RIGHTS IN DIGITAL CONTENT**

Please provide the list of online platforms with which you are in regular business relations and indicate to what extent your business depends on them (on a scale of 0 to 3). Please describe the position of your business or the business you represent and provide recent examples from your business experience.

	Name of online platform	Dependency (0: not dependent, 1: dependent, 2: highly dependent)	Examples from your business experience
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

How often do you experience the following business practices in your business relations with platforms?

The online platform ...

\* A parity clause is a provision in the terms of use of an online platform or in an individual contract between the online platform and a supplier under which the price, availability and other conditions of a product or service offered by the supplier on the online platform have to maintain parity with the best offer of the supplier on other sales channels.

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
requests me to use exclusively its services	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies "parity clauses" *	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies non-transparent fees	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies fees without corresponding counter-performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies terms and conditions, which I find unbalanced and do not have the possibility to negotiate	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
unilaterally modifies the contractual terms without giving you proper notification or allowing you to terminate the contract	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
limits access to data or provides it in a non-usable format	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
puts significant constraints to presenting your offer	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
presents suppliers/services in a biased way	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
refuses access to its services unless specific restrictions are accepted	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
promotes its own services to the disadvantage of services provided by suppliers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you do experience them, what is their impact on your business activity (on a scale from 0 to 3).

Impact on my business:

The online platform ...

\* A parity clause is a provision in the terms of use of an online platform or in an individual contract between the online platform and a supplier under which the price, availability and other conditions of a product or service offered by the supplier on the online platform have to maintain parity with the best offer of the supplier on other sales channels.

	0 – no impact	1 – minor impact	2 – considerable impact	3 – heavy impact
requests me to use exclusively its services	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies "parity clauses" *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies non-transparent fees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies fees without corresponding counter-performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
applies terms and conditions, which I find unbalanced and do not have the possibility to negotiate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
unilaterally modifies the contractual terms without giving you proper notification or allowing you to terminate the contract	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
limits access to data or provides it in a non-usable format	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
puts significant constraints to presenting your offer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
presents suppliers/services in a biased way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
refuses access to its services unless specific restrictions are accepted	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
promotes its own services to the disadvantage of services provided by suppliers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you are aware of other contractual clauses or experience other potentially problematic practices, please mention them here

*1000 character(s) maximum*

\* Please briefly describe the situation

*3000 character(s) maximum*

The CEPIC membership was surveyed with the questions above.  
For each proposition, at least one agency responded having experienced the situation although a majority > 50% did not report any abuse.  
The question on "business impact" was either not quantified or with

[A1] Are you a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright, which is used on an online platform?

- Yes  
 No

As a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright have you faced any of the following circumstances:

An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator uses my protected works online without having asked for my authorisation.

- Yes  
 No

An online platform such as a video sharing website or a content aggregator refuses to enter into or negotiate licensing agreements with me.

- Yes  
 No

An online platform such as a video sharing website or a content aggregator is willing to enter into a licensing agreement on terms that I consider unfair.

- Yes  
 No

An online platform uses my protected works but claims it is a hosting provider under Article 14 of the E-Commerce Directive in order to refuse to negotiate a licence or to do so under their own terms.

- Yes  
 No

As you answered YES to some of the above questions, please explain your situation in more detail.

*3000 character(s) maximum*

Infringed material is found on a variety of platforms from competitors' sites or legal platforms supported by tax money, pirate sites, Wikipedia, search engines such as Google images, social media sites. They benefit, at no cost, from the value created by the illegal use of

the images on their platform. Some examples:

FACEBOOK  
PINTEREST  
TWITTER  
INSTAGRAM  
FLICKR  
TUMBLR  
DEVIANART  
SNAPCHAT  
IMGUR  
IPERNITY  
PHOTOBUCKET  
YOUTUBE  
STUMBLEUPON  
Google+  
REDDIT

General sites using are mentioned using "safe harbour" excuses.

POLYVORE  
EBAY  
Lastfm.com  
Demotix

Because platforms will lose their hosting privilege if they refuse to take down on request alleged infringing material, our members report that platforms usually take down the material.

However, if asked to keep the content on their site against a license, platforms chose not to license but to take down instead. This is why "it is frustratingly difficult to enter into licensing arrangements with online platforms in respect of images ... The law currently has the perverse effect of rewarding those that turn a blind eye to infringement while disadvantaging those that make an effort to do the right thing by licensing content."

Additionally, members report that the Notice and Take Down Procedures proposed are inefficient: lengthy and costly in time. Procedures are not harmonized and vary from one platform to the other and among Member States. A picture taken down may be up-loaded the next day or a couple of days later and the all process must start all over again.

Regardless of the above, our members report that they often chose not to pursue this kind of infringements.

In any case, there is a practical impossibility to chase all usages and sharing online due to:

- the sheer daily number of images up-loaded from a picture agency on the internet ;
- the exponential multiplication of usage through sharing from one site to the other. Sometimes sharing from one site to the other happens automatically (for example from a Facebook account to a Twitter account)

;

- the price of photo being too low that it is worth economically to chase this content ;
- the difficulty of assessing ownership of content: non-exclusivity of rights, sources cultural material not unique

"We realized some time ago that we could not pursue the tsunami of global misuse." sums up a member picture agency.

Loss for picture agencies:

There is a direct and indirect loss in revenue. A major picture agency in terms of market share assesses the loss of revenue this way: "In terms of volume affected by social media copying, it probably affects 10 - 15% of our content but higher for more prominent sets or pictures we push and promote via Twitter for example, in which case it's probably 20 - 25% of those sets."

Next to the direct value loss; there is an indirect value loss made up of:

- Loss of client's relationship
- Loss of photographers' relations

Is there a room for improvement in the relation between platforms and suppliers using the services of platforms?

- No, the present situation is satisfactory.
- Yes, through market dynamics.
- Yes, through self-regulatory measures (codes of conducts / promotion of best practices).
- Yes, through regulatory measures.
- Yes, through the combination of the above.

Are you aware of any dispute resolution mechanisms operated by online platforms, or independent third parties on the business-to-business level mediating between platforms and their suppliers?

- Yes
- No

CONSTRAINTS ON THE ABILITY OF CONSUMERS AND TRADERS TO MOVE FROM ONE PLATFORM TO ANOTHER

Do you see a need to strengthen the technical capacity of online platforms and address possible other constraints on switching freely and easily from one platform to another and move user data (e.g. emails, messages, search and order history, or customer reviews)?

- Yes
- No

Should there be a mandatory requirement allowing non-personal data to be easily extracted and moved between comparable online services?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding the ability of consumers and traders to move from one platform to another

*3000 character(s) maximum*

N/A

## ACCESS TO DATA

As a trader or a consumer using the services of online platforms did you experience any of the following problems related to the access of data?

a) unexpectedly changing conditions of accessing the services of the platforms

- Yes
- No

b) unexpectedly changing conditions of accessing the Application Programming Interface of the platform

- Yes
- No

c) unexpectedly changing conditions of accessing the data you shared with or stored on the platform

- Yes
- No

d) discriminatory treatment in accessing data on the platform

- Yes
- No

Would a rating scheme, issued by an independent agency on certain aspects of the platforms' activities, improve the situation?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding access to data on online platforms

*3000 character(s) maximum*

N/A

## Tackling illegal content online and the liability of online intermediaries

---

Please indicate your role in the context of this set of questions

Terms used for the purposes of this consultation:

"Illegal content"

Corresponds to the term "illegal activity or information" used in Article 14 of the E-commerce Directive. The directive does not further specify this term. It may be understood in a wide sense so as to include any infringement of applicable EU or national laws and regulations. This could for instance include defamation, terrorism related content, IPR infringements, child abuse content, consumer rights infringements, or incitement to hatred or violence on the basis of race, origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, malware, illegal online gambling, selling illegal medicines, selling unsafe products.

"Hosting"

According to Article 14 of the E-commerce Directive, hosting is the "storage of (content) that has been provided by the user of an online service". It may for instance be storage of websites on servers. It may also include the services offered by online market places, referencing services and social networks.

"Notice"

Any communication to a hosting service provider that gives the latter knowledge of a particular item of illegal content that it transmits or stores and therefore creates an obligation for it to act expeditiously by removing the illegal content or disabling/blocking access to it.. Such an obligation only arises if the notice provides the internet hosting service provider with actual awareness or knowledge of illegal content.

"Notice provider"

Anyone (a natural or legal person) that informs a hosting service provider about illegal content on the internet. It may for instance be an individual citizen, a hotline or a holder of intellectual property rights. In certain cases it may also include public authorities.

"Provider of content"

In the context of a hosting service the content is initially provided by the user of that service. A provider of content is for instance someone who posts a comment on a social network site or uploads a video on a video sharing site.

- individual user
- content provider
- notice provider
- intermediary
- none of the above



Have you encountered situations suggesting that the liability regime introduced in Section IV of the E-commerce Directive (art. 12-15) has proven not fit for purpose or has negatively affected market level playing field?

- Yes
- No

\*Please describe the situation.

*3000 character(s) maximum*

CEPIC members may be defined as Notice Providers as above. In the previous section, we have outlined how unuseful the Notice and Take Down procedure is. In addition, the CEPIC White Paper (<http://bit.ly/1e5tuaU>) explains why Art. 14 E-Commerce Directive is not fit for purpose. Many online platforms and aggregators benefit hugely from the illegal uploading of images by their users. It is estimated that 80 % of the illegal images available online are sourced from image search services. Also social media platforms invite their users to upload and share pictures and often encourage, facilitate or tolerate illegal sharing. Such platforms commonly place responsibility on their users via terms and conditions in small print, reliant on the fact that their users are unlikely to be subject to enforcement action. In the meantime, these platforms are generating revenues from advertising, subscriptions or user data.

Yet, currently, many of those platforms that facilitate piracy are themselves immune from liability for copyright infringements committed by their users due to the “safe harbour” provision for host providers under Art. 14 E-Commerce Directive.

Originally established to foster the development of digital services in the EU by releasing them from the duty to conduct intensive investigations regarding illegal content, the host provider privilege turned into a carte blanche for piracy sites and has in effect hampered the development of lawful digital content in the EU. Considering the vast evolution of information society services since 2000, the host provider privilege now applies to types of online services that were not envisaged by the European legislator. Today there are a number of businesses that are mainly built upon this gap of copyright protection and which commercially benefit from copyright infringements carried out by their users. The liability exception is misused and provides companies which are not neutral with an excuse for not taking action to prevent pirated content being stored on their services and for facilitating infringements by not informing users.

We call upon the European legislator to narrow the scope of the privilege granted by Art. 14 E-Commerce Directive: the privilege should be limited to internet service providers when acting as true, neutral intermediaries and not benefiting from any third party proprietary content they are hosting. The privilege should not shield services that actively participate or intervene in the organisation or presentation of third party content or make it appear as their own. This is the case where (i) the provider adapts, selects, organises or promotes the content being stored; and/or (ii) presents the content being stored in such a way that it appears to be those of the service; and/or (iii) in any way commercialises the content e.g. by placing advertising around it or capturing data relating to the interests/activities of those viewing or uploading it.

Do you think that the concept of a "mere technical, automatic and passive nature" of information transmission by information society service providers provided under recital 42 of the ECD is sufficiently clear to be interpreted and applied in a homogeneous way, having in mind the growing involvement in content distribution by some online intermediaries, e.g.: video sharing websites?

- Yes  
 No  
 I don't know

Please explain your answer.

*1500 character(s) maximum*

Quote from the CEPIC White Paper: <http://bit.ly/1e5tuaU>  
"We welcome that in "L'Oréal/eBay" the CJEU joined our call for a limitation of the host provider privilege by clarifying that the privilege does not apply if the provider has assisted with the organisation and presentation of the illegal content. However, in our view, further limitations are required if the EU wishes to draw an adequate balance between the promotion of digital services and digital content. In particular, the law does not provide for a distinction with regard to the manner in which the stored data are used."  
In its White Paper Calling For A Better Protection of Images Online, CEPIC provides a possible reformulation of Article 14.

Mere conduit/caching/hosting describe the activities that are undertaken by a service provider. However, new business models and services have appeared since the adopting of the E-commerce Directive. For instance, some cloud service providers might also be covered under hosting services e.g. pure data storage. Other cloud-based services, as processing, might fall under a different category or not fit correctly into any of the existing ones. The same can apply to linking services and search engines, where there has been some diverging case-law at national level. Do you think that further categories of intermediary services should be established, besides mere conduit/caching/hosting and/or should the existing categories be clarified?

- Yes  
 No

Please provide examples

*1500 character(s) maximum*

The existing categories should be clarified as explained above, mainly by excluding "active" hosts from the scope of the hosting liability exemption.

**On the "notice"**

Do you consider that different categories of illegal content require different policy approaches as regards notice-and-action procedures, and in particular different requirements as regards the content of the notice?

- Yes
- No

Do you think that any of the following categories of illegal content requires a specific approach:

- Illegal offer of goods and services (e.g. illegal arms, fake medicines, dangerous products, unauthorised gambling services etc.)
- Illegal promotion of goods and services
- Content facilitating phishing, pharming or hacking
- Infringements of intellectual property rights (e.g. copyright and related rights, trademarks)
- Infringement of consumer protection rules, such as fraudulent or misleading offers
- Infringement of safety and security requirements
- Racist and xenophobic speech
- Homophobic and other kinds of hate speech
- Child abuse content
- Terrorism-related content (e.g. content inciting the commitment of terrorist offences and training material)
- Defamation
- Other:

Please explain what approach you would see fit for the relevant category.

*1000 character(s) maximum*

- Allowing for the monetisation of downloaded content as described in previous section.  
While all the categories above can be considered illegal, only infringement of intellectual property can be converted into a legal activity benefiting to economic growth via better revenue for rights holders and taxable licensing revenues.

### **On the "action"**

Should the content providers be given the opportunity to give their views to the hosting service provider on the alleged illegality of the content?

- Yes
- No

**\* Please explain your answer**

*1500 character(s) maximum*

- The onus should be on the online platform that is benefiting from the display of the illegal content to obtain the views of the content provider, ideally at the point of each upload by the content provider (e.g. via a tick box, not hidden in website T&C) as well as in the event of any illegality being alleged.

Additionally:

- Civil remedies available to rights-holders investing resources in the sending of notices should be strengthened.

- "Proof" mechanisms should be strengthened as well as costly mechanisms (for example the use of a notary authenticating a web screen shot in France) avoided in legislation: this requires EU action and harmonisation.

**If you consider that this should only apply for some kinds of illegal content, please indicate which one(s)**

*1500 character(s) maximum*

All intermediaries involved in the activity of allowing users to upload content (mostly social media), those involved in scraping, storing, displaying (search engines) should be subject to a duty of care.

**Should action taken by hosting service providers remain effective over time ("take down and stay down" principle)?**

- Yes  
 No

**Please explain**

Our members experience that picture downloaded on site X will 1) be up-loaded the next day on the same site so that the take down notice procedure needs to be started all over again generating new costs 2) will have been copied a x number of times on other sites which need to be addressed as well.

Therefore, we support the principle of "take down and stay down". Once issued, notice and take down should trigger actual knowledge regarding the work and not only its upload to a specific url. This is in line with Article 14 of the E-Commerce Directive.

**On duties of care for online intermediaries:**

Recital 48 of the Ecommerce Directive establishes that "[t]his Directive does not affect the possibility for Member States of requiring service providers, who host information provided by recipients of their service, to apply duties of care, which can reasonably be expected from them and which are specified by national law, in order to detect and prevent certain types of illegal activities". Moreover, Article 16 of the same Directive calls on Member States and the Commission to encourage 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". At the same time, however, Article 15 sets out a prohibition to impose "a general obligation to monitor".

(For online intermediaries): Have you put in place voluntary or proactive measures to remove certain categories of illegal content from your system?

- Yes
- No

Do you see a need to impose specific duties of care for certain categories of illegal content?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Please specify for which categories of content you would establish such an obligation.

*1500 character(s) maximum*

Intellectual Property

Please specify for which categories of intermediary you would establish such an obligation

*1500 character(s) maximum*

All intermediaries involved in the activity of allowing users to upload content (mostly social media), those involved in scraping, storing, displaying (search engines) should be subject to a duty of care.

Please specify what types of actions could be covered by such an obligation

*1500 character(s) maximum*

- Use of content identification software or similar mechanisms
- Rigorous self-certification requirements of content providers at the point of up-load
- Information on copyright and usage permissions (also via metadata)
- When unavailable, informing on the source of content and linking back to the source

Do you see a need for more transparency on the intermediaries' content restriction policies and practices (including the number of notices received as well as their main content and the results of the actions taken following the notices)?

- Yes  
 No

Should this obligation be limited to those hosting service providers, which receive a sizeable amount of notices per year (e.g. more than 1000)?

- Yes  
 No

Do you think that online intermediaries should have a specific service to facilitate contact with national authorities for the fastest possible notice and removal of illegal contents that constitute a threat for e.g. public security or fight against terrorism?

- Yes  
 No

Do you think a minimum size threshold would be appropriate if there was such an obligation?

- Yes  
 No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding the liability of online intermediaries and the topics addressed in this section of the questionnaire.

*5000 character(s) maximum*

We welcome the EU initiative to tackle the issue of liability of online intermediaries. However, for the picture industry, this issue is closely related to the following other issues that needs to be met

All these issues are dealt with in great depth in the CEPIC White paper on protecting images Online: <http://bit.ly/1e5tuaU>

- 1) Framing and definition of "communication to the public"
- 2) Implied consent
- 3) Competition online

1) Framing. Online platforms and other websites are increasingly framing images instead of hosting the images and paying for a licence. Framing incorporates an image into a website so that a website visitor perceives the image as appearing on that website, even though the image is technically hosted on a third party site. Framing allows the framing website to gain all of the benefits of having the image appear on its website while bearing none of the costs (of hosting the image, of content licence fee, etc.). Framing fundamentally deprives image creators of recognition of their authorship, revenue and the ability to control where their images appear online. In addition, framing causes consumer confusion as are given the false impression that the content displayed is owned or otherwise licensed by the website operator placing

the link. This in turn has significantly encouraged internet piracy over recent years. Regrettably, European copyright law does not sufficiently protect creators against framing. The current InfoSoc Directive does not allow the courts to make the crucial distinction between: (i) general hyperlinking (acceptable), where the user knowingly clicks through to another website to access the full information; and (ii) framing of images (unacceptable), which relies on the same underlying technology, but which deprives users of any incentive to click through to the source as the frame already reveals the full information directly on the framing website. It must be clarified that framing is reserved to the copyright holder as part of the right of communication to the public. Legislative proposals to ensure legality of hyperlinking must exclude framing.

Implied consent.

2) Implied Consent. Some national courts have assumed that image providers who do not use technical tools to block aggregators from crawling their sites and copying images impliedly consent to such aggregators' use of their images. A website's failure to use an "opt-out" mechanism such as the Robots Exclusion Protocol should not be interpreted as an implied licence. The lack of harmonisation of the (failed) concept of implied licences creates major uncertainty and undermines the idea of a Digital Single Market.

3) Application of competition law.

Any future copyright legislative initiative for a better protection against unauthorized use of visual (or other type of) content should be backed up by a sound application of competition law online. Content providers are unable to enforce their rights in an anti-competitive environment. This issue is at the centre of the EU investigation on Google as a dominant supplier of online search and online advertising. CEPIC, supported by an international coalition of the visual sector, has lodged its own competition claim in November 2013 with regards to content scraping. Getty images, part of the CEPIC claim, has asked and received interested party status in further parts of the investigation. The Commission's current investigation focus on online shopping. We hope that content scraping will be included as copyright legislation will only complementary, not substitutive, to a competition law protection against Google's unauthorized use of images.

## Data and cloud in digital ecosystems

---

### FREE FLOW OF DATA

### ON DATA LOCATION RESTRICTIONS



In the context of the free flow of data in the Union, do you in practice take measures to make a clear distinction between personal and non-personal data?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Have restrictions on the location of data affected your strategy in doing business (e.g. limiting your choice regarding the use of certain digital technologies and services?)

- Yes
- No

Do you think that there are particular reasons in relation to which data location restrictions are or should be justifiable?

- Yes
- No

#### ON DATA ACCESS AND TRANSFER

Do you think that the existing contract law framework and current contractual practices are fit for purpose to facilitate a free flow of data including sufficient and fair access to and use of data in the EU, while safeguarding fundamental interests of parties involved?

- Yes
- No

In order to ensure the free flow of data within the European Union, in your opinion, regulating access to, transfer and the use of non-personal data at European level is:

- Necessary
- Not necessary

When non-personal data is generated by a device in an automated manner, do you think that it should be subject to specific measures (binding or non-binding) at EU level?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding data access, ownership and use

*5000 character(s) maximum*

#### ON DATA MARKETS

What regulatory constraints hold back the development of data markets in Europe and how could the EU encourage the development of such markets?

*3000 character(s) maximum*

#### ON ACCESS TO OPEN DATA

Do you think more could be done to open up public sector data for re-use in addition to the recently revised EU legislation (Directive 2013/37/EU)?

Open by default means: Establish an expectation that all government data be published and made openly re-usable by default, while recognising that there are legitimate reasons why some data cannot be released.

- Introducing the principle of 'open by default'[1]
- Licensing of 'Open Data': help persons/ organisations wishing to re-use public sector information (e.g., Standard European License)
- Further expanding the scope of the Directive (e.g. to include public service broadcasters, public undertakings);
- Improving interoperability (e.g., common data formats);
- Further limiting the possibility to charge for re-use of public sector information
- Remedies available to potential re-users against unfavourable decisions
- Other aspects?

Do you think that there is a case for the opening up of data held by private entities to promote its re-use by public and/or private sector, while respecting the existing provisions on data protection?

- Yes
- No

#### ON ACCESS AND REUSE OF (NON-PERSONAL) SCIENTIFIC DATA

Do you think that data generated by research is sufficiently, findable, accessible identifiable, and re-usable enough?

- Yes
- No

Do you agree with a default policy which would make data generated by publicly funded research available through open access?

- Yes
- No

#### ON LIABILITY IN RELATION TO THE FREE FLOW OF DATA AND THE INTERNET OF THINGS

As a provider/user of Internet of Things (IoT) and/or data driven services and connected tangible devices, have you ever encountered or do you anticipate problems stemming from either an unclear liability regime/non –existence of a clear-cut liability regime?

The "Internet of Things" is an ecosystem of physical objects that contain embedded technology to sense their internal statuses and communicate or interact with the external environment. Basically, Internet of things is the rapidly growing network of everyday objects—eyeglasses, cars, thermostats—made smart with sensors and internet addresses that create a network of everyday objects that communicate with one another, with the eventual capability to take actions on behalf of users.

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

If you did not find the legal framework satisfactory, does this affect in any way your use of these services and tangible goods or your trust in them?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Do you think that the existing legal framework (laws, or guidelines or contractual practices) is fit for purpose in addressing liability issues of IoT or / and Data driven services and connected tangible goods?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

As a user of IoT and/or data driven services and connected tangible devices, does the present legal framework for liability of providers impact your confidence and trust in those services and connected tangible goods?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

In order to ensure the roll-out of IoT and the free flow of data, should liability issues of these services and connected tangible goods be addressed at EU level?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

ON OPEN SERVICE PLATFORMS

What are in your opinion the socio-economic and innovation advantages of open versus closed service platforms and what regulatory or other policy initiatives do you propose to accelerate the emergence and take-up of open service platforms?

*3000 character(s) maximum*

## PERSONAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

The following questions address the issue whether technical innovations should be promoted and further developed in order to improve transparency and implement efficiently the requirements for lawful processing of personal data, in compliance with the current and future EU data protection legal framework. Such innovations can take the form of 'personal data cloud spaces' or trusted frameworks and are often referred to as 'personal data banks/stores/vaults'.

Do you think that technical innovations, such as personal data spaces, should be promoted to improve transparency in compliance with the current and future EU data protection legal framework? Such innovations can take the form of 'personal data cloud spaces' or trusted frameworks and are often referred to as 'personal data banks/stores/vaults'?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Would you be in favour of supporting an initiative considering and promoting the development of personal data management systems at EU Level?

- Yes
- No

## EUROPEAN CLOUD INITIATIVE

What are the key elements for ensuring trust in the use of cloud computing services by European businesses and citizens

"Cloud computing" is a paradigm for enabling network access to a scalable and elastic pool of shareable physical or virtual resources with self-service provisioning and administration on-demand. Examples of such resources include: servers, operating systems, networks, software, applications, and storage equipment.

- Reducing regulatory differences between Member States
- Standards, certification schemes, quality labels or seals
- Use of the cloud by public institutions
- Investment by the European private sector in secure, reliable and high-quality cloud infrastructures

As a (potential) user of cloud computing services, do you think cloud service providers are sufficiently transparent on the security and protection of users' data regarding the services they provide?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

As a (potential) user of cloud computing services, do you think cloud service providers are sufficiently transparent on the security and protection of users' data regarding the services they provide?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

As a (potential) user of cloud computing services, do you agree that existing contractual practices ensure a fair and balanced allocation of legal and technical risks between cloud users and cloud service providers?

- Yes
- No

What would be the benefit of cloud computing services interacting with each other (ensuring interoperability)

- Economic benefits
- Improved trust
- Others:

What would be the benefit of guaranteeing the portability of data, including at European level, between different providers of cloud services

- Economic benefits
- Improved trust
- Others:

Have you encountered any of the following contractual practices in relation to cloud based services? In your view, to what extent could those practices hamper the uptake of cloud based services? Please explain your reasoning.

	Never (Y[es] or N[no])	Sometimes (Y / N)	Often (Y / N)	Always (Y / N)	Why (1500 characters max.)?
Difficulties with negotiating contractual terms and conditions for cloud services stemming from uneven bargaining power of the parties and/or undefined standards					
Limitations as regards the possibility to switch between different cloud service providers					
Possibility for the supplier to unilaterally modify the cloud service					
Far reaching limitations of the supplier's liability for malfunctioning cloud services (including depriving the user of key remedies)					
Other (please explain)					

What are the main benefits of a specific European Open Science Cloud which would facilitate access and make publicly funded research data re-useable?

- Making Science more reliable by better quality assurance of the data
- Making Science more efficient by better sharing of resources at national and international level
- Making Science more efficient by leading faster to scientific discoveries and insights
- Creating economic benefits through better access to data by economic operators
- Making Science more responsive to quickly tackle societal challenges
- Others

Would model contracts for cloud service providers be a useful tool for building trust in cloud services?

- Yes
- No

Would your answer differ for consumer and commercial (i.e. business to business) cloud contracts?

- Yes
- No

Please share your general comments or ideas regarding data, cloud computing and the topics addressed in this section of the questionnaire

*5000 character(s) maximum*

## The collaborative economy

---

The following questions focus on certain issues raised by the collaborative economy and seek to improve the Commission's understanding by collecting the views of stakeholders on the regulatory environment, the effects of collaborative economy platforms on existing suppliers, innovation, and consumer choice. More broadly, they aim also at assessing the impact of the development of the collaborative economy on the rest of the economy and of the opportunities as well as the challenges it raises. They should help devising a European agenda for the collaborative economy to be considered in the context of the forthcoming Internal Market Strategy. The main question is whether EU law is fit to support this new phenomenon and whether existing policy is sufficient to let it develop and grow further, while addressing potential issues that may arise, including public policy objectives that may have already been identified.

### **Terms used for the purposes of this consultation:**

**"Collaborative economy"**

For the purposes of this consultation the collaborative economy links individuals and/or legal persons through online platforms (collaborative economy platforms) allowing them to provide services and/or exchange assets, resources, time, skills, or capital, sometimes for a temporary period and without transferring ownership rights. Typical examples are transport services including the use of domestic vehicles for passenger transport and ride-sharing, accommodation or professional services.

**"Traditional provider"**

Individuals or legal persons who provide their services mainly through other channels, without an extensive involvement of online platforms.

**"Provider in the collaborative economy"**

Individuals or legal persons who provide the service by offering assets, resources, time, skills or capital through an online platform.

**"User in the collaborative economy"**

Individuals or legal persons who access and use the transacted assets, resources, time, skills and capital.

Please indicate your role in the collaborative economy

- Provider or association representing providers
- Traditional provider or association representing traditional providers
- Platform or association representing platforms
- Public authority
- User or consumer association

Which are the main risks and challenges associated with the growth of the collaborative economy and what are the obstacles which could hamper its growth and accessibility? Please rate from 1 to 5 according to their importance (1 – not important; 5 – very important).

- Not sufficiently adapted regulatory framework

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Uncertainty for providers on their rights and obligations

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5



- Uncertainty for users about their rights and obligations

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Weakening of employment and social rights for employees/workers

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Non-compliance with health and safety standards and regulations

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Rise in undeclared work and the black economy

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Opposition from traditional providers

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Uncertainty related to the protection of personal data

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Insufficient funding for start-ups

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- Other, please explain

How do you consider the surge of the collaborative economy will impact on the different forms of employment (self-employment, free lancers, shared workers, economically dependent workers, tele-workers etc) and the creation of jobs?

- Positively across sectors
- Varies depending on the sector
- Varies depending on each case
- Varies according to the national employment laws
- Negatively across sectors
- Other

Do you see any obstacle to the development and scaling-up of collaborative economy across borders in Europe and/or to the emergence of European market leaders?

- Yes
- No

Do you see a need for action at European Union level specifically to promote the collaborative economy, and to foster innovation and entrepreneurship in its context?

- Yes
- No

What action is necessary regarding the current regulatory environment at the level of the EU, including the Services Directive, the E-commerce Directive and the EU legislation on consumer protection law?

- No change is required
- New rules for the collaborative economy are required
- More guidance and better information on the application of the existing rules is required
- I don't know what is the current regulatory environment

## Submission of questionnaire

---

End of public consultation

## Background Documents

BG\_ Въведение (/eusurvey/files/17798068-07b6-4cfb-8c80-a8e6a4f75e29)

BG\_ Декларация за поверителност (/eusurvey/files/0b5a7e6a-5c26-47ca-b263-9ece4aa566ca)

CS\_Prohlášení o ochraně osobních údajů (/eusurvey/files/a93fa8dd-757e-421e-81f9-e1c9bca745af)

CS\_ Úvod (/eusurvey/files/af54c429-c5bf-482f-8525-c156be285051)

DA\_Databeskyttelseserklæring (/eusurvey/files/5dd2c272-17fa-47f4-b0c7-2c207a86235f)

DA\_Introduktion (/eusurvey/files/05c0d888-2d35-4e19-a314-65e8092597d6)

DE\_Datenschutzerklärung (/eusurvey/files/b5e037cf-0350-40c3-b803-04f6357f9603)

DE\_Einleitung (/eusurvey/files/300a2e87-e030-422a-b678-33fe2c7520a6)

EL\_ Δήλωση περί απορρήτου (/eusurvey/files/b408fd27-c292-4fc0-9c2d-fd70c74062c4)

EL\_ Εισαγωγή (/eusurvey/files/0be38358-a600-4568-bfd0-fd9697b1810f)

EN\_Background Information (/eusurvey/files/0873ffeb-56b2-40d7-bf56-5aadbd176c3c)

EN\_Privacy Statement (/eusurvey/files/8861750d-baa1-4113-a832-f8a5454501b5)

ES\_Declaración de confidencialidad (/eusurvey/files/edd31f1e-fe9d-493a-af5e-7a7c793295a9)

ES\_Introducción (/eusurvey/files/600be540-eef2-4bde-bd3a-436360015845)

ET\_Privaatsusteave (/eusurvey/files/294d2e58-3a3d-4e32-905f-74e8b376c5e6)

ET\_Sissejuhatus (/eusurvey/files/4bc0f8b9-febc-478a-b828-b1032dc0117f)

FI\_Johdanto (/eusurvey/files/a971b6fb-94d1-442c-8ad7-41a8e973f2d5)

FI\_Tietosuojaseloste (/eusurvey/files/28a1f27e-3a8e-41f3-ae27-201e29134555)

FR\_Déclaration relative à la protection de la vie privée (/eusurvey/files/1341b7cb-38e5-4b81-b3bc-bd0d5893d298)

FR\_Introduction (/eusurvey/files/308a1cf7-5e78-469c-996a-372b33a1992b)

HR\_Izjava o zaštiti osobnih podataka (/eusurvey/files/618120e1-286a-45d4-bbbd-2493d71617fb)

HR\_Uvod (/eusurvey/files/6bfc9d48-cd5c-4603-9c68-5c45989ce864)

HU\_Adatvédelmi nyilatkozat (/eusurvey/files/76f442e6-3e2d-4af3-acce-5efe8f74932b)

HU\_Bevezetés (/eusurvey/files/3ea8491d-429d-4c8f-be30-82db40fa59c5)

IT\_Informativa sulla privacy (/eusurvey/files/e2eb5a94-9e5e-4391-a8e3-35f9e151310b)

IT\_Introduzione (/eusurvey/files/aa3bf020-9060-43ac-b92b-2ab2b6e41ba8)

LT\_Pareiškimas apie privatumo apsaugą (/eusurvey/files/ab30fabd-4c4e-42bc-85c5-5ee75f45805d)

LT\_Ivadas (/eusurvey/files/d5a34e68-4710-488a-8aa1-d3b39765f624)

LV\_Ievads (/eusurvey/files/3a9bd2b1-7828-4f0e-97f1-d87cf87b7af1)

LV\_Konfidencialitātes paziņojums (/eusurvey/files/7156fdc0-b876-4f73-a670-d97c92e6f464)

MT\_Dikjarazzjoni ta' Privatezza (/eusurvey/files/03139a3f-7b5f-42c0-9d2f-53837c6df306)

MT\_Introduzzjoni (/eusurvey/files/ceb27908-207c-40cf-828a-6cf193731cdf)

NL\_Inleiding (/eusurvey/files/ca756d80-8c02-43e1-9704-3148a13c8503)

NL\_Privacyverklaring (/eusurvey/files/83d9394e-b179-442f-8a1b-41514ad072df)

PL\_Oświadczenie o ochronie prywatności (/eusurvey/files/15612e0b-807d-4c6e-af1c-d65fe4ec9ddb)

PL\_Wprowadzenie (/eusurvey/files/df9e1828-bbd0-4e4a-90bb-ec45a8bf46da)

PT\_Declaração de privacidade (/eusurvey/files/50a6e820-91bc-4531-9a0f-47b3685753d7)

PT\_Introdução (/eusurvey/files/003979c0-5277-41e9-8092-2de66d57ca00)

RO\_Declarație de confidențialitate (/eusurvey/files/25c135c6-ce01-4081-a83e-53e86086797e)

RO\_Introducere (/eusurvey/files/4334379b-e465-43a5-a944-8602090b0bf5)

SK\_Vyhlásenie o ochrane osobných údajov (/eusurvey/files/7fab071c-85f9-47eb-aaa9-949f2239701d)

SK\_Úvod (/eusurvey/files/e45df825-5e71-4172-b2ec-e07789cc3966)

SL\_Izjava o varstvu osebnih podatkov (/eusurvey/files/498ec1f0-3405-4454-9aa6-40607efe118f)

SL\_Uvod (/eusurvey/files/1b0b239a-630d-4d36-a92f-d4b758d41ddc)

SV\_Inledning (/eusurvey/files/e9111c5b-4637-4ea1-b235-ece85ef8fe1a)

SV\_Regler för skydd av personuppgifter (/eusurvey/files/0d8275b2-8344-4895-8c09-51d075671061)

---

## Contact

✉ CNECT-PLATFORMS-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu

---