R1 AM4: Media freedom and independence under attack

Proposers Young Greens of Norway

Motion text

From line 76 to 91:

- The EU ~~should obligate~~obligates member states to guarantee ~~an independent financing of~~ public broadcasters of financial means through implementing licence fees.
- ~~Public broadcasters are owned by an independent foundation, which is overseen by a supervisory board. The number of politically nominated representatives should not exceed a third and should represent both the voted-in majority and the opposition as equally as possible. To fully represent the diversity of the country, the rest should be filled with representatives of civil society, such as trade unions, religious communities, universities, young people, minorities such as migrants and representatives of economic and cultural groups. The foundation's supervisory board should not interfere in editorial decisions.~~
- ~~The Supervisory boards of the public broadcasters themselves should not have any politically nominated members but should be elected among the broadcasters' staff and civil society representatives.~~
- Public ~~service~~ media ~~create~~establish independent ombudspeople with binding powers to investigate censorship, block political interference, and enforce

From line 93 to 98:

- ~~Public broadcasters~~The EU should build and maintain independent European digital infrastructures such as ~~a~~ European AI, social media and streaming ~~platform~~ platforms (such as arte) to reduce ~~dependence from~~dependency on US tech~~-~~[Space]companies.
- ~~A 'Right to Findability' for Public Service Media is established on all digital interfaces and that Algorithmic Neutrality is ensured for democratic content.~~
- The EU driven digital infrastructure includes both a "Right to Findability" for Public Media news and "Algorithmic Neutrality" .

From line 102 to 105:

- **Social media platforms ~~should be~~are obligated to ~~rigorously~~**

delete messages spreading hate and racism ~~through content moderators~~.

- The EU ~~and member states~~ establish mandatory transparency rules for online platforms to expose and dismantle bot farms and disinformation networks,

From line 109 to 124:

- non-compliance. Funding for EDMO's local hubs must be increased and social media companies must ~~be legally required to~~ act on ~~its~~their findings.
- European funding that supports independent journalism should be allocated~~. The size of the funding should be in proportion~~,, to ~~media quality ranking assessments, guaranteeing~~guarantee a stronger support for media in countries with a more critical situation.
- Journalists should be protected from SLAPP suits through the full implementation of the EU Anti-SLAPP Directive by 2027. The EU ~~should~~must put pressure on countries like Italy and Hungary, ~~which~~who are delaying transposition into national law.
- The protection for journalists who work in warzones or critical situations ~~should~~ must be strengthened. The EU Magnitsky Act should be extensively used to sanction states and actors that target journalists. National Governments should push for ICC[Space]-investigations into attacks on media workers as war crimes.
- National Governments ~~should~~must allow digital and media literacy to become a core component of public education from primary school level through

From line 126 to 127:

- The European Commission ~~should~~must launch a ~~sector~~ inquiry into regional media markets, similar to the EU Digital Markets Act inquiry into tech

Delete from line 129 to 132:

- ~~The EU and national governments should develop criteria for "media diversity". Companies holding more than a certain percentage of regional media control in terms of audience and advertising revenue should be required to sell off parts of its business.~~

Reason

I don't believe the suggestion in bullet point two and three will have the impact that is wished for.
In some of the bullet points the acting institution is emphasised.
In bullett point 11 we disagree that the funding should be given along the media quality ranking assesments. Why would we give money to the worst on the ranking? Isn't money also an incentive to do better? Why should the countries be listed from

best to worst (as the Reporters Without Borders, and not divide countries in categories like V-Dem does?
The last bullet point is hard to understand why is a solution and the responsible actor must be picked wisely, instead of listing both the EU and national goverments. Our suggestion is to remove the bullet point.