

Better Internet for Kids

The Better Internet for Kids Policy Map

Implementing the *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* in European Member States

March 2018

Brian O'Neill

Thuy Dinh



The Better Internet for Kids Policy Map: Implementing the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children in European Member States

Under the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), EUN Partnership aisbl (hereinafter called European Schoolnet) is developing and maintaining – on behalf of the European Commission – a Better Internet for Kids (BIK) core service platform to share resources, services and practices between national providers of the services – the European Safer Internet Centres (SICs) – and to provide services to their users, including industry. As part of this contract, the Dublin Institute of Technology (hereinafter referred to as DIT) has been subcontracted by European Schoolnet to carry out the current study.

Please cite this report as:

O'Neill, B., Dinh, T. (2018). The Better Internet for Kids Policy Map: Implementing the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children in European Member States.

<https://www.betterinternetforkids.eu/bikmap>

This report is published in good faith with regards to the validity, accuracy or comprehensiveness of the information contained within it, but please note that the views expressed are not necessarily the views of the the European Commission, European Schoolnet or any partner organisations. Please note also, the authors have no control over third-party references and linked sites, and any referenced links may be subject to change over time.

© - All rights reserved to the European Commission. Copyright protection applies.

DIT is one of the Irish partners in the *EU Kids Online* project. Under the leadership of the London School of Economics, EU Kids Online in a pan-European research initiative investigating how children and young people use the internet and new media, evaluating the social, cultural and regulatory influences affecting both the risks of new media and also children's and parents' responses to them.

Previous reports and publications from *EU Kids Online* include:

- Zaman, B., & Nouwen, M. (2016). Parental controls: advice for parents, researchers and industry. EU Kids Online. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/65388/>
- Dinh, T., Farrugia, L., O'Neill, B., Vandoninck, S., & Velicu, A. (2016). *Insafe Helplines: Operations, effectiveness and emerging issues for internet safety helplines*. Brussels. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/65358/>
- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2015). Developing a framework for researching children's online risks and opportunities in Europe. EU Kids Online. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/64470/>
- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., Dreier, M., Chaudron, S., & Lagae, K. (2015). How parents of young children manage digital devices at home: the role of income, education and parental style. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/63378/>
- Mascheroni, G., Livingstone, S., Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2015). Developing a framework for researching children s online risks and opportunities in Europe. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/64470/>
- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., Ólafsson, K., Haddon, L., Ólafsson, K., & Haddon, L. (2014). Children's online risks and opportunities: Comparative findings from EU Kids Online and Net Children Go Mobile. London, LSE: EU Kids Online, LSE. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/60513/>



- O'Neill, B., Staksrud, E., O'Neill, B., & Staksrud, E. (2014). Final recommendations for policy. EU Kids Online (Report No. D6.4). London, LSE. <https://doi.org/10.21427/D79602>
- O'Neill, B. (2014). Policy influences and country clusters: a comparative analysis of internet safety policy implementation. London, LSE. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/57247/>
- Ólafsson, K., Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2014). Children's Use of Online Technologies in Europe: A review of the European evidence base. LSE, London: EU Kids Online. London. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/60221/>
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Vincent, J., Mascheroni, G., & Ólafsson, K. (2014). Net children go mobile: the UK report: a comparative report with findings from the UK 2010 survey by UK Kids Online. London. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/57598/1/>
- Dürager, A. & Livingstone, S. (2012) How can parents support children's internet safety? <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/id/eprint/42872>
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A. and Ólafsson, K. (2011) Risks and safety on the internet: The perspective of European children. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/33731/>

The *EU Kids Online* network has been funded by the EC Safer Internet Programme in three successive phases of work from 2006-14 to enhance knowledge of children's and parents' experiences and practices regarding risky and safer use of the internet and new online technologies.

For all reports, findings and technical survey information, as well as full details of national partners, please visit www.eukidsonline.net.



Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| List of figures | 5 |
| List of tables | 7 |
| List of acronyms | 8 |
| Executive summary | 9 |
| The BIK Map | 9 |
| BIK policy coordination | 9 |
| BIK policy design | 9 |
| BIK policy actors | 10 |
| Spread of BIK activities | 10 |
| Conclusions | 10 |
| 1. Introduction | 11 |
| Aims and objectives | 12 |
| BIK Map I | 12 |
| The BIK Map Tool | 14 |
| Data collection | 15 |
| Presentation of findings | 16 |
| This report | 17 |
| 2. Findings: Policy governance | 18 |
| Policy frameworks | 18 |
| Policy coordination and design | 23 |
| Summary | 35 |
| 3. Findings: Policy actors | 37 |
| Stakeholder involvement | 37 |
| Lead implementation roles for BIK pillars | 41 |
| Summary | 42 |
| 4. Findings: Breadth of activities | 44 |
| Pillar 1: Child-specific online content and services | 44 |
| Pillar 2 – Digital/media literacy activities | 46 |
| Pillar 3 - Stepping up awareness and empowerment | 50 |

Pillar 4 - Creating a safe environment for children online53

Pillar 5 - Fighting against child sexual abuse and child sexual exploitation.....59

Summary.....60

5. Practices worth sharing 63

 Positive content for children63

 Digital and media literacy64

 Awareness raising and empowerment.....66

 Support for a safer online environment68

6. Conclusions..... 70

 Policy governance70

 Policy actors71

 Activities at the national level to support BIK72

 Recommendations.....73

Annex 1: National contacts 77

Annex 2: BIK Map Advisory Board 78

Annex 3: References 79



List of figures

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Implementation of BIK in national policies (in per cent)..... | 19 |
| Figure 2: How has BIK been implemented? (in per cent) | 19 |
| Figure 3: Types of policy for each BIK pillar (in per cent) | 22 |
| Figure 4: No. of ministries involved in policy design by country (in per cent) | 24 |
| Figure 5: Forms of policy coordination (in per cent)..... | 25 |
| Figure 6: Mechanism to facilitate inter-departmental or inter-agency cooperation (in per cent)..... | 27 |
| Figure 7: Type of coordination platform (in per cent) | 27 |
| Figure 8: Lead responsibility for each pillar (in per cent) | 29 |
| Figure 9: Types of data collection (in per cent) | 30 |
| Figure 10: Data collection impacting on policy (in per cent) | 31 |
| Figure 11: Evaluation on BIK undertaken in the last three years (in per cent)..... | 32 |
| Figure 12: Policy driven by events (in per cent) | 32 |
| Figure 13: Arrangements for children's participation on BIK-related issues (in per cent) | 33 |
| Figure 14: Role of ministry with BIK responsibility (in per cent)..... | 38 |
| Figure 15: Role of public agency with BIK responsibility (in per cent)..... | 38 |
| Figure 16: Role of Safer Internet Centre (in per cent)..... | 39 |
| Figure 17: National public funding for the Safer Internet Centre (in per cent)..... | 39 |
| Figure 18: Role of NGOs/civil society organisations..... | 40 |
| Figure 19: Role of industry (in per cent)..... | 41 |
| Figure 20: Who leads in each pillar? (in per cent) | 41 |
| Figure 21: Availability of initiatives to support child-specific content/activities (in per cent) | 45 |
| Figure 22: Changes in initiatives to support child-specific content/activities (in per cent)..... | 45 |
| Figure 23: Availability of online safety in schools (in per cent) | 47 |
| Figure 24: Changes in teaching online safety (in per cent) | 47 |
| Figure 25: Availability of digital and media literacy activities | 49 |
| Figure 26: Changes in digital and media literacy activities..... | 49 |
| Figure 27: Availability of awareness activities and youth participation | 50 |
| Figure 28: Changes in awareness activities and youth participation..... | 51 |
| Figure 29: Availability of simple and robust reporting tools for users..... | 52 |
| Figure 30: Changes in simple and robust reporting tools for users | 53 |
| Figure 31: Availability of measures to support age-appropriate privacy settings (in per cent)..... | 54 |

Figure 32: Changes in activities supporting age-appropriate privacy settings (in per cent)..... 55

Figure 33: Availability of online content protection measures (in per cent)..... 56

Figure 34: Changes in availability of online content protection measures (in per cent) 57

Figure 35: Availability of activities in relation to online advertising and overspending (in per cent) 58

Figure 36: Changes in activities related to online advertising and overspending (in per cent)..... 58

Figure 37: Activities in relation to fighting online child sexual abuse and exploitation..... 59

Figure 38: Changes in activities related to fighting online child sexual abuse and exploitation..... 60



List of tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Policy implementation of BIK by country..... | 14 |
| Table 2: Pillars of the BIK strategy..... | 14 |
| Table 3: Policy implementation of BIK by country..... | 20 |
| Table 4: No. of ministries by country involved in policy design..... | 24 |
| Table 5: Policy coordination type by country | 26 |
| Table 6: Type of coordination platform by country..... | 27 |
| Table 7: Types of data collection by country..... | 30 |
| Table 8: Arrangements for children’s participation on BIK-related issues by country | 34 |



List of acronyms

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| BIK | Better Internet for Kids |
| CEF | Connecting Europe Facility |
| EC | European Commission |
| EU | European Union |
| EUN | European Schoolnet |
| GDPR | General Data Protection Regulation |
| NGO | Non-governmental organisation |
| SIC | Safer Internet Centre |
| SID | Safer Internet Day |

Executive summary

The BIK Map

- The BIK Map was created to compare and exchange knowledge on policy making and implementation in EU Member States on the themes and recommendations of the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children (or BIK strategy) first set out by the European Commission in May 2012.
- The BIK strategy comprises the following five main fields of activity or pillars:
 1. Stimulating quality content online for young people
 2. Digital/media literacy in education
 3. Stepping up awareness and empowerment
 4. Tools and regulation for an online safe environment
 5. Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation
- 26 countries participated in this version of the BIK mapping exercise with data collected from national teams drawn from the EU Kids Online network and Insafe Safer Internet Centres.

BIK policy coordination

- All participating countries have implemented BIK in some form. However, no country reports the existence of a single policy framework for BIK. BIK is primarily addressed through separate policies which are focussed on BIK-related issues or as part of broader policies.
- National policy covers all themes and pillars of the BIK strategy to some extent. However, the area of positive content for children (Pillar 1) receives less attention. Ten countries report there is no national policy on quality online content for children.
- Coordination at the national level is made complex given the large number of ministries involved in policy development. In most countries, between four and six ministries are involved in the development and design of policies related to BIK.
- Just under a third of countries say there is no formal coordination mechanism for BIK policy. Just three countries report the existence of a multi-stakeholder body with responsibility for BIK.

BIK policy design

- Overall, ministries were found to take the lead in policy development in each of the pillars of BIK strategy.
- Just five countries say there is a regular national survey focussed on BIK-related topics. Half of the countries reported that new policy development had been reactive or had been influenced by specific incidents or events related to children's online safety.

- Most countries confirm that consultation with children takes place in the design of BIK policies. However, only a third state that there is an opportunity for children to be actively involved in policy design.

BIK policy actors

- Ministries and Safer Internet Centres (SICs) are the lead actors in the delivery of activities related to BIK at the national level.
- In nearly a quarter of countries, the primary role defined as delivering more than 90 per cent of activities, is undertaken by the Safer Internet Centre (SIC). SICs also act as the main agency for positive content for children and for awareness-raising activities.
- NGOs also play an important role in supporting and delivering activities related to BIK. However, the role is generally reported to be a minor one.

Spread of BIK activities

- A comprehensive range of activities is reported under key pillars of BIK, particularly in relation to teaching of online safety, awareness raising and empowerment, and in combatting child sexual abuse and exploitation online.
- Despite the lack of policy provision, a range of positive content initiatives are reported in most Member States.
- Activities to support protection measures including age-appropriate privacy settings, age rating and content classification, and the use of parental controls are widely available. However, supports for their functioning at the national level are less in evidence with greater reliance on EU-level provision in this area.
- There are few examples of initiatives reported by Member States that deal with commercial risks associated with children's use of the internet.

Conclusions

- Member States report wide support and policy provision for the BIK strategy, demonstrating many successes for child online safety policies in European Member States.
- However, many gaps remain both in terms of policy governance and in stakeholder participation since the last BIK mapping exercise took place in 2014.
- This report makes three main recommendations to boost national-level policy support and increased opportunities for dialogue on BIK implementation both at the national and European levels:

Firstly, *strengthen national-level policy governance in the area of Better Internet for Kids strategy;*

Secondly, *increase or continue national level support in provision of BIK services, matching the European contribution for BIK; and*

Thirdly, *support further opportunities for dialogue between EU Member States on BIK-related policy making.*

1. Introduction

In May 2012, the European Commission set out a *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* to provide children with the digital skills and tools needed to fully and safely benefit from being online.¹

The so-called *Better Internet for Kids* (or “BIK”) strategy brings together inputs from the European Commission, Member States and industry (mobile phone operators, handset manufacturers and providers of social networking services) to deliver concrete solutions to problems encountered by children in the course of their online use, thereby bringing about a *safer* and a *better* internet for children. Implemented under a number of European Union instruments and initiatives, principally the *Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)*, the BIK strategy comprises a series of grouped actions under the following four main goals that seek to:

- **Stimulate the production of creative and educational online content for children** as well as promoting positive online experiences for young children.
- **Scale up awareness and empowerment** including teaching of digital literacy and online safety in all EU schools.
- **Create a safe environment for children** through age-appropriate privacy settings, wider use of parental controls, and age rating and content classification.
- **Combat child sexual abuse material online** and child sexual exploitation.

The first mapping of progress in the attainment of the goals of the BIK strategy was carried out in 2014 as part of the project *Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States* (European Commission, 2015). The first BIK Map study, undertaken by a consortium of independent consultants on behalf of the European Commission, presented findings on how BIK-related challenges were being addressed at the national level in participating EU Member States. The project also developed a benchmarking tool, the “BIK Map Tool”, and recommended further implementation of the BIK mapping process every two years.

The current report presents findings from the second iteration of the BIK Map. The report was commissioned by European Schoolnet (hereafter EUN) in the context of its work in hosting the Better Internet for Kids (BIK) core service platform,² and was carried by EU Kids Online, in conjunction with EUN and members of the Insafe network.³ The project was coordinated by the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT) on behalf of EU Kids Online.⁴

The second iteration of the BIK Map has its origins in a workshop convened by EUN in June 2016 with representatives of the European Commission, Safer Internet Centres (SICs), the EUN network of Ministries of Education, researchers and European regulatory authorities, which was held to discuss the further development of the BIK Map. With some modifications to the approach, it was agreed to carry out a

¹ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-internet-our-children>

² *Smart 2016/10004 Digital Service Infrastructure For Making A Better And Safer Internet For Children (Lot 1)*

³ Insafe together with INHOPE work through a network of Safer Internet Centres across Europe – typically comprising an awareness centre, helpline, hotline and youth panel.

⁴ EU Kids Online is a multinational research network which seeks to enhance knowledge of European children's online opportunities, risks and safety. It uses multiple methods to map children's and parents' experience of the Internet, in dialogue with national and European policy stakeholders. EU Kids Online It has been funded by the EC's Better Internet for Kids programme.



further BIK Map exercise based on an agreed template and to involve members of the EU Kids Online and Insafe networks to assist in the data collection in each of the Member States.

Aims and objectives

The BIK Map is a data collection tool that allows for the analysis of public policies, concrete initiatives and actions related to the implementation of the *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children*.⁵ The BIK Map allows for the identification of emerging patterns, models, and approaches taken by EU Member States in their implementation of BIK-related policies and initiatives and through the collection of quantitative data, shows developments over time, while also collecting qualitative information on the context and impact of BIK strategy.

The overall aim of the BIK Map is to improve the understanding of BIK-related policy governance, actions and initiatives in European Union Member States. The BIK Map uses a questionnaire to identify emerging patterns, models and approaches taken by EU countries in their policies and initiatives related to children's online safety. Data collected in relation to policy design allows for the compilation of a Europe-wide mapping of the different configurations and approaches to coordination and stakeholder involvement in EU Member States.

BIK Map I

The first BIK Map initiative was undertaken in 2014 as a benchmarking exercise to examine how Member States had approached the implementation of the *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* (European Commission, 2012).⁶ This was the first attempt to comprehensively analyse how issues relating to children's online experiences are addressed in policies and initiatives across Europe. A requirement of the project was also to develop a sustainable benchmarking tool.

The final report of the project (European Commission, 2015) presented the BIK Map, or Better Internet for Kids, benchmarking tool. The aim of the BIK Map was to improve the understanding of BIK policies and initiatives in Member States and to facilitate information sharing between countries of what worked best. With a focus on knowledge exchange rather than benchmarking, the aim of the project was to create greater awareness for both EC and national policy makers with the objective of supporting improved policy making and implementation.

Several overall findings were made in the report with regard to the nature of better internet policy making in Europe.

Firstly, the study observed that, given the "horizontal" nature of the policy issues covered by the BIK strategy (education, regulation, law enforcement), the input of multiple ministries was needed and accordingly a strong policy framework and a high degree of coordination between the ministries involved was required. However, as the study found, this was lacking overall, and most European countries adopted a "silo approach", typically with BIK-related issues forming part of wider policy areas.

⁵ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/communication-european-strategy-make-Internet-better-place-kids>

⁶ The contract for a study of "Benchmarking of Safer Internet policies in Member States and policy indicators" was awarded by the European Commission to a consortium comprising the Technopolis Group, Gide Loyrette Nouel and EUROPE Ltd., and IDATE.

Secondly, the study also found that, except for the EU Kids Online survey, few countries paid sufficient attention to the regular collection of data to support evidence-based policy. As such, there is no common approach to the measurement of online use or risks for children, leading to a lack of comparable or robust data across Europe.

Thirdly, the study also found that only in a minority of countries were all stakeholder groups involved to a significant degree. The study found that the role of the public sector was essential in most European countries – not just for policy development and delivery, but also as the driver for non-public sector involvement. Countries with high public-sector involvement, it was found, also tended to have high non-public sector involvement. At the same time, it was also noted that Safer Internet Centres play a key role in the coordination of BIK-related actions and initiatives. In most countries, SICs were found to be the main platform for the implementation and coordination of actions and initiatives.

Building on these findings, the first BIK Map study made the following recommendations regarding policy making at the European level:

1. **Strengthening the European platform for dialogue on BIK-related issues:** recognising the longstanding commitment to a safer online environment at the European level with an equivalent commitment in evidence at the national level in most Member States, the study recommended the strengthening of opportunities for the sharing of experience and expertise among national policy makers to foster improved governance and policy design, as well as to ensure a consistent approach towards supporting children's online welfare.
2. **Implementing the BIK Map on a regular basis:** to sustain an ongoing commitment to high-quality policy development, the study recommended building on the baseline established by the BIK Map and using the opportunity to further share knowledge and expertise.
3. **Fostering the development of standards for data collection:** the lack of consistent data collection in most European countries – except for the EU Kids Online survey⁷ – was a notable finding of the first BIK Map study. The study recommended that the EC develop common statistical indicators to reflect ICT practices and risks for children to support quality BIK-related policy design.
4. **Fostering dialogue with private stakeholders:** Finally, arising from its findings in relation to stakeholder involvement, BIK Map I advocated continuing support for ongoing dialogue with private sector actors through such initiatives as the CEO Coalition.⁸

The current study follows as a direct next step and takes BIK Map I as its point of departure. It builds on the above recommendations, directly so in relation to Recommendation 2, by carrying out a further round of data collection for the BIK Map, and adds further findings as well as opportunities for knowledge exchange as advocated in the original study. The project updates the original methodology, taking account of feedback from contributors to the first wave of data collection. Further items were added to the questionnaire to allow for closer alignment with BIK. The study also draws on earlier findings to identify trends and patterns, while capturing new developments in order to chart progress in relation to the implementation of the overall BIK strategy.

⁷ Under a Knowledge Enhancement project (2009-11), EU Kids Online developed a survey of 25,142 children aged 9-16 who use the Internet, plus one of their parents, in 25 European countries. Full findings are available from www.eukidsonline.net.

⁸ See <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year>

The BIK Map Tool

The BIK Map Tool comprises a questionnaire template and an analysis tool to collect data under two main headings:

- **Public policy governance**, and
- **Actions/initiatives** to implement the Better Internet for Children Strategy.

A set of variables derived from the original BIK Map study to allow for comparative data as well as new items from the BIK strategy are included.

The questionnaire is organised into two main sections as follows:

Table 1: Policy implementation of BIK by country

| Area | Indicators |
|--------------------------------|---|
| BIK policy governance | A1. The public policy framework A2. Policy design |
| Implementation of BIK strategy | B1. Policy actors B2. Breadth of BIK activities B3. Practices worth sharing |

BIK policy governance encompasses the two specific dimensions of *policy frameworks* and *policy design*.

The **policy framework** refers to the organisational characteristics of national policy as related to BIK strategy and addresses the following issues:

- How the European BIK strategy is framed at the national level and whether BIK policy has been addressed, either in whole or in part;
- How individual pillars of BIK strategy been addressed at the national level?

Throughout the study, the pillars of the BIK strategy refer to the following five fields of activity:

Table 2: Pillars of the BIK strategy⁹

| Pillar | Field of activity |
|----------|--|
| Pillar 1 | Stimulating quality content online for young people. |
| Pillar 2 | Digital/media literacy in education. |
| Pillar 3 | Stepping up awareness and empowerment. |
| Pillar 4 | Tools and regulation for an online safe environment. |
| Pillar 5 | Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation. |

⁹ To maintain consistency with the original BIK Map process, the four "pillars" of BIK strategy are presented as five fields of activity throughout the questionnaire. Thus, digital/media literacy in education is presented as a separate pillar whereas in the BIK it is incorporated within the pillar of *Stepping up awareness and empowerment*.

Policy design refers to how policy is developed at the national level. The questionnaire includes a number of items that ask participating countries to identify:

- How BIK policy is developed at the national level?
- How is national policy on BIK organised and managed?
- How is coordination between stakeholders maintained?
- The extent of children's involvement in the policy-making process;
- The evidence base available to support the development of BIK policy.

Policy frameworks and policy design together provide information about the model of policy governance at the national level and allows for comparison across European countries of the different ways of approaching BIK-related issues and challenges.

Implementation of BIK Strategy is the second main section of the study and sets out to examine:

- The number and role of policy actors in the implementation of BIK;
- The breadth of coverage in terms of specific topics addressed in each of the pillars of BIK;
- Selected initiatives identified as programmes worth sharing.

Policy actors here refer to the full spectrum of stakeholder groups who contribute both to the development of policy and the carrying out of diverse activities fulfilling objectives of the BIK strategy. Drawing on the principle that safer/better internet policies are a shared responsibility, policy actors are taken to include diverse governmental, industry, civil society and end user groups.

Data collection

Research for this study was coordinated by a core team at DIT working in collaboration with national contacts drawn from both the EU Kids Online and Insafe networks. The study commenced in October 2016 and continued to December 2017 with a final report published on the [Better Internet for Kids \(BIK\) public portal](#) in March 2018. Logistical and technical support for the project was provided by EUN.

An Advisory Group comprising researchers, representatives of Safer Internet Centres, ministries and the European Commission supported the work of the team, providing support and independent guidance in the development of the project.¹⁰ Two focus groups with members of the Advisory Board and other relevant participants were held, one at the initiation of the project and one at which the draft findings were presented. In addition, presentations on the project and preliminary findings were presented at meetings of the Insafe network.

¹⁰ See Annex 2 for details of the BIK Map Advisory Board.

A total of 26 countries participated in this iteration of the BIK Map study.¹¹ An invitation to participate was circulated to all European Member States, Norway and Iceland through the networks of Insafe and EU Kids Online. Details of the study were also circulated to contacts through the EUN network of 34 European Ministries of Education.

The collection of data for the project was coordinated by DIT which liaised with national teams in each of the participating countries who undertook to collect the relevant information and complete the questionnaire. National teams comprised a representative of the EU Kids Online network, where available, representatives from the Insafe network, and other relevant stakeholders as deemed necessary to complete the exercise. Teams collected information on the various issues addressed in the questionnaire. Meetings were convened either through face-to-face meetings or other means to agree a final version to be submitted to the project coordinators.

The BIK Map questionnaire builds on the template used in the collection of data for the first BIK Map study. The content, structure and organisation of the questionnaire was validated in a focus group organised by the coordinators with members of the project Advisory Board, representatives of the European Commission and other relevant stakeholders. The questionnaire was prepared for distribution in a simple Microsoft Word format for ease of completion and to enable the document to be saved and reviewed prior to submission.

The questionnaire comprised three simple question types:

- Check box, closed questions for ease of completion.
- Text box, open questions to provide brief details on relevant policies and initiatives.
- A case-study template to capture practices worth sharing and allowing for elaboration of further details.

Following submission, the coordinators collated the data from each of the country teams, cross-checking for consistency and comprehensiveness. Quantitative data was entered into SPSS (statistical tool) for analysis and summary descriptive statistics prepared. Qualitative data was separately compiled and analysed, primarily using Excel, and used to illustrate and contextualise national implementation of BIK strategy.

Presentation of findings

Preliminary findings of the BIK Map study were presented to two separate meetings of the Insafe network, firstly at its regular training meeting, held in Zagreb in May 2017, and subsequently at the training meeting and Steering Group meeting in Berlin in October 2017.

A special focus group workshop, hosted by EUN during the annual Safer Internet Forum, was convened to validate the findings. Here, the first full findings of the study were presented, providing an opportunity for clarification and discussion.

The final report was drafted and circulated for comment and review to the Advisory Board, EUN and the European Commission in advance of Safer Internet Day 2018. Findings for individual country profiles are

¹¹ See Annex 1 for the list of participating countries and national contacts. The following EU countries did not participate in this round of the BIK Map study: France, Slovenia, Sweden. The remaining EU Members States plus Norway make up the 26 countries in this study.



incorporated as part of the Better Internet for Kids portal,¹² providing a readily accessible online source of information about the scope and coverage of BIK policy across European Member States.

This report

This report presents the first full findings of the study with the main focus on European level and comparative findings. Further findings relating to implementation at the Member State level is provided in the individual country profiles. The report is organised around the principal themes of the BIK strategy using the following structure:

Chapter 1 – Introduction provides an account of the background to the project, its aims and objectives and overall structure.

Chapter 2 – Policy governance presents findings from participating countries in relation to the ways in which BIK-related policies have been implemented, designed and managed at the national level.

Chapter 3 – Policy actors presents findings in relation to the different actors involved in the development of policy and delivery of BIK programmes and initiatives. Data is presented both in terms of overall national strategy and in relation to roles of stakeholders within specific BIK pillars.

Chapter 4 – Breadth of activities outlines progress made in Member States delivering initiatives at the national level. Using the full range of recommendations contained in the BIK strategy, this part of the BIK Map highlights which actions are supported and whether they have increased, stayed the same or decreased in prominence in the last three years.

Chapter 5 – Practices worth sharing provides an overview of initiatives put forward by Member States as examples of initiatives worth sharing because of their proven effectiveness and impact.

Chapter 6 – Conclusions presents the conclusions and recommendations of the study.

¹² <https://www.betterInternetforkids.eu>

2. Findings: Policy governance

The overall objective of the BIK Map study is to examine how – and the extent to which – the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children (the BIK strategy) has been implemented in national public policies. Public policy is defined here as “a system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives” (Kilpatrick, 2000). Public policy is taken to include both legally binding outputs in the form of regulations, directives and decisions that are legally binding for the Member States and for private actors, as well as non-binding policy guidelines that have the status of recommendations to guide public action (Treib, Bähr, & Falkner, 2007).

This chapter presents findings in relation to policy governance. Policy governance in this context refers to the organisation and management of policies as well the coordination of the interactions between different sectors of society in the policy process (Althaus, Bridgman, & Davis, 2013), often referred to as networked governance (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). The availability of a policy framework is a central component of overall policy governance and speaks to how Member States have addressed the issues and challenges identified in the BIK strategy. Further aspects of policy governance take into account the development, management and oversight of BIK-related policies. Findings on each of these dimensions are included as part of the BIK mapping process and are presented in the following sections.

Policy frameworks


As defined in the original BIK Map study, a policy framework refers to “the inclusion of BIK-related policy decisions in a single policy document, the level of involvement of different ministries, and the level of coordination among these ministries”.¹³

Participating countries were asked, firstly, if the BIK strategy has been addressed in any way, either in the form of an explicit policy or other relevant initiative at national level; and, secondly, if BIK strategy had been incorporated into public policies.

Figure 1 presents the percentage of countries implementing BIK in any form.

¹³ Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States (European Commission, 2015), p.19.

Figure 1: Implementation of BIK in national policies (in per cent)




All 26 participating countries report that BIK strategy had been addressed in some form in each country (Q1).¹⁴

When asked if BIK strategy and BIK-related issues had been incorporated into public policy or policies, 18 of the 26 countries, or 69 per cent, report that BIK had been incorporated *into public policies*, at least *in part*.

There are differences in interpretation regarding what “implementation” means in this case. Two countries (Portugal and Germany) report that BIK has been fully implemented into public policy, while six countries (Czech Republic, Denmark, Malta, Norway, Romania and UK) state that BIK has not been implemented into national policies. This is not to say that the latter countries do not have policies that address BIK issues, as in fact ample evidence is given of respective policies addressing issues encompassed by BIK. Rather, it is to say that the BIK strategy has not been transposed into national policy as might be the case for instance with EU Directives. Further clarification is given in response to the question of “*how BIK-related issues have been addressed through policy in your country*” (Figure 2).

Figure 2: How has BIK been implemented? (in per cent)



Q3: Which of the following best describes the way in which BIK-related issues have been addressed through policy in your country?

¹⁴ Norway’s response does not specifically reference BIK; however, implementation through a range of public policies is taken to include it here as a country that has addressed BIK “*in any form*”.

As reported by the 26 participating countries:

- No Member State reports the existence of a single policy framework specifically focussed on BIK.
- Just under half, or 12 countries, report that there are separate public policies that directly address BIK.
- An equal number say BIK-related issues are addressed as part of a broader policy. Two countries, Bulgaria and Spain, state that BIK has been addressed in other ways.

A summary of responses from each country is given in Table 3.

Table 3: Policy implementation of BIK by country

| Country | Separate policies for BIK | BIK as part of broader policy | Other |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Austria | | • | |
| Belgium | | • | |
| Bulgaria | | | • |
| Croatia | | • | |
| Cyprus | | • | |
| Czech Republic | | • | |
| Denmark | | • | |
| Estonia | | • | |
| Finland | | • | |
| Germany | • | | |
| Greece | • | | |
| Hungary | • | | |
| Ireland | • | | |
| Italy | • | | |
| Latvia | | • | |
| Lithuania | • | | |
| Luxembourg | | • | |
| Malta | • | | |
| Netherlands | • | | |
| Norway | • | | |
| Poland | • | | |
| Portugal | • | | |
| Romania | | • | |

| Country | Separate policies for BIK | BIK as part of broader policy | Other |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|
| Slovakia | | • | |
| Spain | | | • |
| UK | • | | |
| Total | 12 | 12 | 2 |

Q3: Which of the following best describes the way in which BIK-related issues have been addressed through policy in your country?


The BIK strategy comprises several different policy themes or “pillars” and it is perhaps not surprising that Member States will have different approaches towards its implementation. For the purposes of this study, the following five fields of activity or pillars are referenced throughout this report:

1. *Stimulating quality content online for young people.*
2. *Digital/media literacy in education.*
3. *Stepping up awareness and empowerment.*
4. *Tools and regulation for an online safe environment.*
5. *Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation.*

The European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children (European Commission, 2012) in fact refers to four pillars, with digital/media literacy in education incorporated as part of *Stepping up awareness and empowerment*. The first BIK Map study (2015) identified digital/media literacy in education as a separate pillar. In order to maintain consistency, this is retained in the current report.

Topics incorporated within each of the pillars may be addressed in several different ways, depending on the policy objectives or priorities involved. As noted in Figure 2 above, nearly half of all countries report having developed separate policies that address BIK-related issues. However, this may not apply in all areas. Some policy themes lend themselves to a particular form of implementation, such as legal instruments in the case of combatting online child sexual abuse. To explore further the policy coverage for each of the pillars, countries were asked to identify the principal means by which each pillar of BIK strategy had been implemented into national policy (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Types of policy for each BIK pillar (in per cent)



Q4: For each of the following pillars of the BIK strategy, please identify the principal means by which strategy has been implemented into national policy.

Key findings for the coverage of BIK themes at the national level are as follows:

Pillar 1, Stimulating quality content online for young people, is represented in policy in diverse ways. Just under a quarter (23 per cent) of countries have dedicated BIK-related policies covering positive content for children. A little over a quarter (27 per cent) address this area as part of broader policy or policies. However, 10 countries (39 per cent) report not having any policy on quality online content for children.

Pillar 2, Digital/media literacy in education, is covered in all countries and is primarily addressed as part of broader policies, i.e., in the respective education policies of individual Member States. In one fifth of countries (19 per cent), this takes the form of mandated provision in law or regulation.

Pillar 3, Stepping up awareness and empowerment, covers a diverse set of activities, forming part of broader policies in just over half of countries (54 per cent) and incorporated within BIK-specific initiatives in one third of Member States (31 per cent). Just one country (Romania) reported not having policy in this area.

Pillar 4, Tools and regulation for an online safe environment, represents a similarly broad set of issues including policies dealing with age-appropriate privacy settings, age rating and content classification, and the wider use of parental controls. Just three countries (12 per cent) address this through BIK-specific policy; seven countries (27 per cent) by law or regulation; and eight countries by way of broader policies. Four countries reported other strategies to address these issues while in a further four, this did not apply.

Pillar 5, Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation, is covered in all countries. Three quarters of countries (73 per cent) report it as being covered in law or regulation with the remainder stating this is covered as part of broader policies.

As this section of the survey shows, policy coverage of BIK and BIK-related issues is comprehensively addressed with coverage of most issues represented in public policies of participating countries. However, in no case is the Better Internet for Kids strategy reproduced at the national level as a single, overarching policy framework. Rather, Member States address issues related to children’s online safety

and better internet for children in separate policies, some of which are BIK-specific and some of which are broader in nature. Details of how Member States address BIK issues within specific national policies are contained in the individual country profiles.

With regard to each of the pillars, support for quality online content for children/positive content (Pillar 1) is the most fragmented and not represented at all in 10 of the 26 participating countries.

By contrast, teaching of *Digital/media literacy in education* (Pillar 2) and *Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation* (Pillar 5) are comprehensively covered by Member States. The former is mandated by legislation in five of the countries while, in the case of latter, three quarters of participating countries state that relevant laws and regulation are in place.

Stepping up awareness and empowerment (Pillar 3) as well as *Tools for an online safe environment* (Pillar 4) has more diverse coverage in terms of public policies and is addressed in a variety of ways as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 below.

Policy coordination and design

A second dimension of policy governance relates to the coordination and design of policies at the national level. As well as asking how the BIK strategy has been implemented and the extent to which it covers all five pillars in public policies, the questionnaire asked about the development, oversight and management of BIK policy in each of the Member States.

Of particular interest here from the point of view of policy governance is how coordination is achieved, both between the different elements of policy and between different stakeholders involved in the development and delivery of policy initiatives.

Design issues are also central to the notion of policy governance. As defined in the original BIK Map study, the quality of the policy design refers to "the availability of strategic information, the development of policy assessment indicators, and the implementation of policy monitoring and evaluation exercises."¹⁵ Additional items included in this iteration of the BIK Map study include: participation in the policy-making process, including children's participation, and the availability of an evidence base to support BIK policy.


Number of ministries

Participating countries were first asked to identify the number of ministries involved in the design of policies related to BIK.

Figure 4 shows that the norm among Member States is for design of BIK policies to involve between four and six ministries. Sixteen countries (62 per cent) answered in this category. In the case of six countries (23 per cent), the design of policies was concentrated within one to three ministries. In a further four countries (15 per cent), policy design involved more than six ministries.

¹⁵ *Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States*, p. 19

Figure 4: No. of ministries involved in policy design by country (in per cent)



Q6: How many ministries are involved in the design of the policies listed above?

The responses of individual countries are given in Table 4.

Table 4: No. of ministries by country involved in policy design


| Country | 1-3 ministries | 4-6 ministries | More than 6 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Austria | | • | |
| Belgium | | | • |
| Bulgaria | • | | |
| Croatia | | • | |
| Cyprus | | | • |
| Czech Republic | | • | |
| Denmark | • | | |
| Estonia | | • | |
| Finland | | • | |
| Germany | | | • |
| Greece | | • | |
| Hungary | • | | |
| Ireland | | • | |
| Italy | • | | |
| Latvia | | • | |
| Lithuania | • | | |
| Luxembourg | | • | |
| Malta | | • | |
| Netherlands | | • | |
| Norway | | • | |
| Poland | | • | |
| Portugal | | • | |

| Country | 1-3 ministries | 4-6 ministries | More than 6 |
|----------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Romania | • | | |
| Slovakia | | • | |
| Spain | | | • |
| UK | | • | |
| | 6 | 16 | 4 |

Policy coordination

Countries were also asked to comment further on governance issues in terms of how BIK-related policies were managed or coordinated in the country (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Forms of policy coordination (in per cent)



Q7: Which of the following best describes the manner in which BIK-related policies are managed and coordinated in your country?

Notable findings in relation to policy coordination include:

- 11 of the 26 participating countries (42 per cent) have more than one coordinating body or ministry.
- In the case of five countries (19 per cent), BIK-related policies are overseen by ministries or government departments.
- In seven cases (27 per cent), there is no formal coordinating body at all.
- Just three countries (Cyprus, Portugal and the UK) report the existence of a multi-stakeholder body.

In the first BIK Map study, a silo-approach to BIK-related policy making was found to be the norm with most EU countries reporting more than four ministries involved in BIK policies in some way or another.¹⁶ This pattern is repeated here with a minority of countries reporting a more focused or concentrated form of policy oversight.

¹⁶ Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States, p.20.

Individual responses as given by countries are detailed in Table 5.

Table 5: Policy coordination type by country


| Country | Overseen by ministry | Multi-stakeholder body | More than one coordinating body | No formal coordinating body |
|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Austria | | | • | |
| Belgium | | | | • |
| Bulgaria | | | | • |
| Croatia | | | | • |
| Cyprus | | • | | |
| Czech Republic | | | | • |
| Denmark | | | • | |
| Estonia | | | • | |
| Finland | • | | | |
| Germany | | | • | |
| Greece | | | | • |
| Hungary | | | • | |
| Ireland | • | | | |
| Italy | • | | | |
| Latvia | | | • | |
| Lithuania | | | • | |
| Luxembourg | • | | | |
| Malta | | | | • |
| Netherlands | | | • | |
| Norway | • | | | |
| Poland | | | • | |
| Portugal | | • | | |
| Romania | | | | • |
| Slovakia | | | • | |
| Spain | | | • | |
| UK | | • | | |
| | 5 | 3 | 11 | 7 |

Q7: Which of the following best describes the manner in which BIK-related policies are managed and coordinated in your country?

Given the silo-nature of policy development found in previous studies (European Commission, 2015), countries were asked to identify if any mechanism was in place to facilitate inter-departmental cooperation on BIK-related issues.

Three quarters, or 19 of the 26 countries that responded, report the existence of some mechanism for facilitating cooperation. A further seven say there is no such mechanism or arrangement (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Mechanism to facilitate inter-departmental or inter-agency cooperation (in per cent)




Q9: Is there a mechanism to facilitate inter-departmental or inter-agency cooperation on BIK-related issues?

The actual mechanism for facilitating cooperation (or mechanisms in the case of multiple responses), as shown in Figure 7, is mostly in the form of an inter-departmental working group (35 per cent) or in over a quarter of cases a formal Memorandum of Understanding.

Individual responses by country are given in Table 6.

Figure 7: Type of coordination platform (in per cent)



Q9: Is there a mechanism to facilitate inter-departmental or inter-agency cooperation on BIK-related issues?

Q10: If yes, please specify the form of coordination.

Table 6: Type of coordination platform by country

| Country | Formal MOU | Inter-departmental working group | Informal coordination | Other | N/A |
|----------|------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-----|
| Austria | | | • | • | |
| Belgium | | | | | • |
| Bulgaria | | | | | • |
| Croatia | | | | | • |

| Country | Formal MOU | Inter-departmental working group | Informal coordination | Other | N/A |
|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-----|
| Cyprus | | | | • | |
| Czech Republic | | | | | • |
| Denmark | | | | | • |
| Estonia | • | | • | | |
| Finland | • | | | | |
| Germany | | • | • | • | |
| Greece | | • | | | |
| Hungary | | • | | | |
| Ireland | | • | | | |
| Italy | • | | | | |
| Latvia | | | • | | |
| Lithuania | | • | | | |
| Luxembourg | • | • | | | |
| Malta | | | | • | |
| Netherlands | | • | | | |
| Norway | | • | | | |
| Poland | • | • | | | |
| Portugal | • | | | | |
| Romania | | | | | • |
| Slovakia | | | • | | |
| Spain | | | | | • |
| UK | • | | | | |
| | 7 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 7 |


Q9: Is there a mechanism to facilitate inter-departmental or inter-agency cooperation on BIK-related issues?
Q10: If yes, please specify the form of coordination.

Who leads in policy development?

Recognising that BIK strategy encompasses several distinct policy areas, from digital/media literacy in education to implementation of the criminal code in terms of illegal child abuse content, countries were also asked to identify which body or entity was primarily responsible for the development of policy within each pillar of BIK.



Figure 8: Lead responsibility for each pillar (in per cent)



Q8: Please indicate the key bodies or entities primarily responsible for the development of policy for each pillar.

As illustrated in Figure 8, most countries report that it is ministries that have the lead responsibility for the development of policy under all respective pillars of BIK strategy.

This is overwhelmingly the case with respect to Pillar 5 (**Combatting child sexual abuse and exploitation**) and Pillar 2 (**Digital/media literacy in education**).

With respect to Pillar 3 (**Stepping up awareness and empowerment**) ministries or other public agencies take the lead responsibility. A similar proportion of countries (69 per cent) report that ministries or other public agencies lead in policy development with regard to Pillar 4 (**Tools and regulation for a safer online environment**).

Pillar 1 (**Stimulating quality content online for young people**) remains the most fragmented. In one third of cases, ministries take the lead in developing policy for positive online content. However, in 10 of the 26 countries (39 per cent) there is no policy provision.

Evidence-based policy making


A vital element of policy design is the availability of evidence to support policy making, both at national and European levels. The first BIK Map study found that insufficient attention had been given to the collection of evidence with surveys run on an irregular basis and a lack of continuity from country to country.¹⁷

Countries were again asked to identify which, if any, of the following types of regular national data collection on BIK-related issues were in existence.

¹⁷ Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States, p.iv



Figure 9: Types of data collection (in per cent)



Q11: Which of the following kinds of regular national data collection on BIK-related issues exist in your country?

As detailed in Figure 9, support for evidence-based policy making remains very uneven. Key points include:

- Just five countries (19 per cent) report the availability of a regular national survey specifically focussed on BIK-related issues.
- The majority of countries (65 per cent or 17 of the 26) report that data on some BIK-related issues was collected as part of a broader survey.
- Qualitative data focussed on BIK is collected at the national level in 9 out of the 26 countries.
- However, 10 countries report that there is no regular data collection.

Individual country responses are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Types of data collection by country


| Country | Quantitative survey (BIK-focused) | Qualitative data (BIK-focused) | Data part of broader survey | No regular data collection |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Austria | | • | • | |
| Belgium | | | | • |
| Bulgaria | | | | • |
| Croatia | • | • | • | |
| Cyprus | | • | | • |
| Czech Republic | | | | • |
| Denmark | | | | • |
| Estonia | | | • | • |
| Finland | | | • | |
| Germany | | • | • | |
| Greece | | | • | |
| Hungary | • | • | • | |

| Country | Quantitative survey (BIK-focused) | Qualitative data (BIK-focused) | Data part of broader survey | No regular data collection |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ireland | | | • | |
| Italy | | | | • |
| Latvia | | | | • |
| Lithuania | | | • | |
| Luxembourg | | | • | |
| Malta | | • | | • |
| The Netherlands | • | • | • | |
| Norway | • | • | • | |
| Poland | • | • | • | |
| Portugal | | | | • |
| Romania | | | • | |
| Slovakia | | | • | |
| Spain | | | • | |
| UK | | | • | |
| | 5 | 9 | 17 | 10 |

Q11: Which of the following kinds of regular national data collection on BIK-related issues exist in your country?

National teams were also asked to state if the evidence collected in national surveys or other forms of data collection had impacted on policy in their country.

Figure 10: Data collection impacting on policy (in per cent)




Q12: Has evidence collected in any of the above data collection or surveys impacted on the design of public policy?

As set out in Figure 10, 65 per cent or 17 of the responding countries replied that data collection has influenced the design of public policies. 9 countries reported that the evidence had not had an impact on policy.

The first BIK Map study also found that there was an overall absence of monitoring and evaluation applied to BIK activities. Regular policy monitoring and evaluation was taken to be a characteristic of good policy-making and important for overall policy effectiveness. In this iteration of the BIK Map (Figure 11), 10 countries or 39 per cent reported that an evaluation had taken place in the last three years on

policies related to BIK. The remaining 16 stated that no evaluation had taken place, pointing to an ongoing lack of consistent policy monitoring and evaluation.

Figure 11: Evaluation on BIK undertaken in the last three years (in per cent)



Q15: Has any evaluation taken place in the last three years of policies on BIK-related issues?

A further issue addressed in relation to policy design concerns the extent to which new policy is developed as a reaction to events or episodes that have taken place nationally.


In a free-text part of the questionnaire,¹⁸ countries were asked to highlight any new developments that had taken place at the national level.

Some of the examples cited included the following:

- Development of a “No Hate Speech” National Committee (Austria).
- Creation of a special department within the Ministry of the Interior to analyse “fake news” in cyberspace (Czech Republic).
- Increase in cases of “revenge porn” prompting parliament to legislate to protect individuals against malpractice (Malta).
- IWF (Internet Watch Foundation) granted permission by the UK government to proactively search for images and videos of child sexual abuse (UK).
- Publication of guidelines on the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in 2016 (Italy).

While not all such developments are driven by events that take place in the national arena, 50 per cent or 13 of the 26 countries attributed some recent policy development in BIK-related areas as a response to incidents that had occurred nationally (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Policy driven by events (in per cent)



¹⁸ The question read as follows: Q16: Please describe any new policy developments that have taken place on BIK-related issues in the last three years.

Q17: Have any of the above new policy developments been driven or influenced by any specific incidents or events that have taken place at the national level related to children's online safety?

Consultation with children

The BIK strategy recommends the scaling up of awareness activities and youth participation in recognition of the value of peer education and young people's participation in decision-making processes in matters that affect them.¹⁹


Accordingly, countries were asked to report what arrangements, if any, were in place for:

- a) children to be consulted on BIK-related issues, and
- b) to participate in the design of public policies related to BIK.

The vast majority of countries (81 per cent or 21 of the 26) confirmed the availability of arrangements for children to be consulted on BIK-related issues. However, just under a third, or 8 of the 26 countries, said that opportunities existed for young people to participate in the design of public policies.

A summary of responses is provided in Figure 13.

Figure 13: Arrangements for children's participation on BIK-related issues (in per cent)



21 countries (81 per cent) confirm that arrangements are in place for children to be consulted on BIK-related issues, for example through Youth Advisory Panels attached to Safer Internet Centres. Five countries (19 per cent) state that there are no current arrangements in place.

In relation to actual participation in the design of public policies related to BIK, eight countries (31 per cent) report that this is available. However, nearly two thirds (69 per cent) state that there are no arrangements in place for children to actively participate in the design of public policies related to BIK.

Individual responses by country are given in Table 8.

¹⁹ COM(2012), Sec 2.2.2, p.9

Table 8: Arrangements for children's participation on BIK-related issues by country

| Country | Consulted on BIK | Participate in policy design |
|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| Austria | • | |
| Belgium | • | |
| Bulgaria | | |
| Croatia | • | |
| Cyprus | • | • |
| Czech Republic | | |
| Denmark | • | |
| Estonia | • | • |
| Finland | • | • |
| Germany | • | |
| Greece | • | |
| Hungary | | |
| Ireland | • | • |
| Italy | • | |
| Latvia | • | |
| Lithuania | • | |
| Luxembourg | • | • |
| Malta | • | • |
| Netherlands | • | • |
| Norway | | |
| Poland | • | |
| Portugal | • | |
| Romania | • | |
| Slovakia | • | • |
| Spain | | |
| UK | • | |
| | 21 | 8 |

Q13: Are there any arrangements in place for children to be consulted on BIK-related issues?

Q14: Are there arrangements for children to participate in the design of public policies related to BIK?

Summary

Policy frameworks

- **All countries have implemented the BIK strategy in some form** with a majority reporting that BIK strategy has been incorporated into public policy or policies.
- Two broad approaches are in evidence: approximately half of all Member States say that BIK has been incorporated into **distinct policies that address BIK**. A further half report that BIK-related issues have been **addressed as part of broader policy**.
- No country reports the existence of a single policy framework specifically focussed on BIK.

Policy coverage

- **All pillars of the BIK strategy** are covered in terms of policy provision.
- Pillars 2 and 3, covering digital literacy in education as well as awareness-raising activity tend to be covered by broader policies while Pillar 5, combatting child sexual abuse, is primarily a matter for legislation and law enforcement.
- **Stimulating quality content online for children and young people (Pillar 1) receives least attention**. Ten countries report that there is no national policy relating to positive content.

Policy coordination

- In most countries, **between four and six ministries are involved in the development and design of policies related to BIK**.
- There is also more than one coordinating ministry, body or agency in most countries. **Just three countries report the existence of a multi-stakeholder body with responsibility for BIK**.
- Seven countries state there is **no formal coordinating body** or entity.

Policy design

- Overall, **government ministries take the lead in the development of policy** in each of the pillars of BIK strategy.
- **Gaps in policy design are most apparent in positive content**. Only in a third of cases are ministries reported as taking a lead in policy development.
- **Stepping up awareness activities and promoting tools and regulation for a safer online environment are shared areas of responsibility**, evenly divided between direct government involvement and the involvement of other stakeholders.
- As in the first BIK Map study, **the availability of an evidence base to support policy-making remains very uneven**. Just five countries (19 per cent) say there is a regular national survey focussed on BIK-related topics.
- Half of the countries reported that new policy development has been **driven or influenced by specific incidents or events related to children's online safety**.
- **39 per cent or 10 countries state that monitoring and evaluation of BIK-related policy has taken place in the last three years**.
- Regarding **consultation with children on the design of BIK policies**, most countries confirm that this happens.

- However, **only a third state that children have an opportunity to be actively involved in the design of BIK policies.**



3. Findings: Policy actors

The *Better Internet for Kids Strategy* addresses a number of different types of actors whose involvement in the various strands of better internet policy-making and implementation is widely acknowledged to be important. The strategy outlines a series of commitments and recommendations addressed to the European Commission, Member States and industry while noting the role of various other stakeholders in the delivery of BIK activities.

In the first BIK Map study, the level of stakeholder involvement was identified as an indicator for the quality of policy implementation which measured overall societal commitment to the issue.²⁰ High stakeholder involvement was found to be associated with more activities in general. In addition, the public sector was also found to be an important driver for the involvement of non-public actors.

The level of stakeholder involvement is therefore taken to be an expression of the shared responsibility that underpins the BIK strategy. In this version of the BIK Map, stakeholder involvement is measured in terms of the participation of policy actors in the delivery of activities related to BIK as a whole as well as with reference to the individual pillars or fields of activity.

Stakeholder involvement

In this section of the BIK Map questionnaire, country teams were asked to report on levels of involvement by policy actors in carrying out activities associated with BIK. Levels of involvement were defined as follows:

- **A primary role** defined as more than 90 per cent of activities delivered.
- **A leading role** defined as between 50 per cent – 90 per cent of activities delivered.
- **A complementary role** defined as between 30 per cent – 50 per cent of activities delivered.
- **A minor role** defined as less than 30 per cent of activities delivered.
- No involvement.

Looking to each of the stakeholder groups in turn, the following charts summarise levels of involvement by government ministries (Figure 14), public agencies with BIK responsibility (Figure 15), Safer Internet Centres (Figures 16 and 17), NGOs and civil society (Figure 18) and industry groups (Figure 19).


Ministries and the public sector

As shown in Figure 14, ministries are reported to have the primary role in implementing BIK policy in four countries (15 per cent) and the leading role in a further 10 countries (39 per cent).

As such, in just over half of all Member States, it is ministries or government departments that have lead in implementation of activities under BIK. In seven countries, government ministries are said to have a complementary role while in a further four cases, the role of government is said to be minor.

²⁰ *Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States*, p.30.


Figure 14: Role of ministry with BIK responsibility (in per cent)



Q18: What level of involvement do the following stakeholders have, in your estimation, in carrying out activities or measures to implement BIK-related policy in your country?

The role of the public sector is further underlined in Figure 15. Here, over a quarter of countries identify a public agency as having either a primary or leading role. Additionally, a further 11 countries say that public agencies play a complementary role in the delivery of activities.

Figure 15: Role of public agency with BIK responsibility (in per cent)




Q18: What level of involvement do the following stakeholders have, in your estimation, in carrying out activities or measures to implement BIK-related policy in your country?

Safer Internet Centres

A key finding from the first BIK Map study was the important role that Safer Internet Centres play in the delivery of actions and initiatives in EU Member States. In most countries, SICs were recognised as the main platform for the implementation and coordination of BIK-related activities, particularly in the case of public awareness raising. Figure 16 presents findings from this iteration of the BIK Map and similarly underlines the central role of SICs in carry out activities related to BIK.

- In six countries, Safer Internet Centres are identified having the primary role in delivering more than 90 per cent of activities.
- In just under 70 per cent of countries, the SIC is defined as having the leading role and delivers over half of all BIK-related activity.
- In all but two cases, therefore, the Safer Internet Centre has a leading or primary role in delivering on BIK commitments and in no case is the role of the SIC said to be a minor one.


Figure 16: Role of Safer Internet Centre (in per cent)



Q18: What level of involvement do the following stakeholders have, in your estimation, in carrying out activities or measures to implement BIK-related policy in your country?

Following on from the important role played by Safer Internet Centres, a further question asked in the survey concerned changes in funding for SICs. Countries were asked to report if there had been a substantial change in funding in the last year (Figure 17).

Figure 17: National public funding for the Safer Internet Centre (in per cent)



Q20: In the last year, has there been a substantial change in national public funding of the Safer Internet Centre?


- 19 of the countries (73 per cent) state that there has been no change in funding.
- Seven countries reported that there had been a significant change in funding.
- Five countries overall reported an increase in funding. In four cases, this was more than 25 per cent.
- Two countries reported a decrease in funding, one of less than 25 per cent and one that was more than 25 per cent.

NGOs and civil society

NGOs and civil society organisations (Figure 18) also play an important role in the delivery of many aspects of BIK activities.



Figure 18: Role of NGOs/civil society organisations



Q18: What level of involvement do the following stakeholders have, in your estimation, in carrying out activities or measures to implement BIK-related policy in your country?

As shown in Figure 18:

- In nine countries (35 per cent), civil society organisations are said to have a leading role in delivery of BIK-related activity.
- In a further 11 countries (42 per cent), NGOs and civil society organisations are said to play a complementary role in carrying out activities to implement BIK.


Role of industry

Finally, the role of industry in supporting the implementation of BIK strategy is recognised to be an important one. The BIK strategy contains a number of specific commitments addressed to industry and it is important to note that these are not assessed as part of this BIK Map process. Instead, national teams were asked to make a general overall assessment of the contribution of various industry groups in carrying out activities related to BIK policies at the national level.

An overview of the perceived role of various industry actors is presented in Figure 19.

- In over half of all countries, the role of industry is said to be a minor one.
- 14 countries (54 per cent) on average say that industry plays a minor role in the delivery of BIK activities.
- On average five countries (19 per cent) say that industry plays a complementary role, while in four countries its role is identified as a leading one.
- Among the different industry groups identified, mobile operators are said to play a somewhat more active role. The software industry plays the least active role. Six countries stated that it was not involved.

Figure 19: Role of industry (in per cent)




Q18: What level of involvement do the following stakeholders have, in your estimation, in carrying out activities or measures to implement BIK-related policy in your country?

Lead implementation roles for BIK pillars

Notwithstanding the vital role played by the public sector and by Safer Internet Centres in the delivery of the overall BIK strategy, leadership within the different pillars is open to different stakeholders as appropriate to the field of activity.

Figure 20 reports on who leads in the implementation of activities in each of the BIK pillars.

Figure 20: Who leads in each pillar? (in per cent)



Q19: Which of the following may be described as lead actors in the carrying out of activities related to each pillar of BIK?

Pillar 1, Stimulating quality content online for young people, has the most diverse mix of actors involved in the delivery of activities. In just under a third of cases (31 per cent), it is the Safer Internet

Centre who leads in positive content delivery. In seven countries (27 per cent), it is identified as being jointly shared. Four countries (15 per cent) each state that either a government ministry or NGO takes the lead role in delivering activities under this pillar.

Pillar 2, Digital/media literacy in education, is primarily a matter for government ministries or other public agencies. Just under half (46 per cent) or 12 countries report this to be the case. In 11 countries (42 per cent), it is said to be a jointly shared activity.

Pillar 3, Stepping up awareness and empowerment, is delivered primarily by Safer Internet Centres. 13 of the 26 countries (50 per cent) report that the lead role is taken by SICs. Nine countries (35 per cent) report that this is a jointly shared activity. Two countries (8 per cent) each state that either a government ministry or NGO takes the lead role in delivering activities under this pillar.

Pillar 4, Tools and regulation for an online safe environment, is for the most part identified as a shared activity. Just under half (42 per cent) or 11 countries say this is the case. A further nine (35 per cent) state that a government ministry or other public agency takes the lead role.

Pillar 5, Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation, is for the clear majority of countries an activity that is led at ministerial level. Twenty of the countries or 77 per cent say this is the case. In just one country (4 per cent), the SIC takes the lead role.

Summary

Carrying out activities under the general heading of the Better Internet for Kids strategy is recognised to be a shared responsibility between multiple stakeholders and an area of cooperation between the public and private sector.

Findings from the BIK Map study show that a combination of actors is involved, both in terms of contributing to policy and specifically in the delivery of programmes and initiatives. Previous studies have highlighted a reliance on the public sector and on Safer Internet Centres for supporting and carrying out activities at the national level.

In this iteration of the BIK Map study, the following key findings are reported:

Policy actors

- **Ministries and Safer Internet Centres** stand out in this iteration of the BIK Map as lead actors in the delivery of BIK activities.
- **Safer Internet Centres**, as was the case in the first version of the BIK Map, are claimed by most countries to be the leading platform for delivery of BIK-related activity. **In nearly a quarter of countries, the primary role, delivering more than 90 per cent of activities, is undertaken by the SIC.**
- **NGOs also play an important role** in supporting and delivering activity related to BIK. This is described as a complementary role (between 30 per cent and 50 per cent of activities) in just under half of all countries.
- In this section of the survey, the role of **industry in carrying out BIK activities is reported to be a minor one.** Over half of EU Member States say that industry carries out less than one third of activities related to BIK.



- Among the various industry actors listed in the questionnaire, mobile operators are reported as being more actively involved and in one fifth of countries play a leading role.
- Internet service providers (ISPs) also play a leading role in one fifth of countries and a complementary role in a quarter of cases (27 per cent).

Within each pillar

- **Ministries, SICs and jointly-shared activities** account for the main forms of delivery across each of the pillars of Better Internet for Kids strategy.
- **Safer Internet Centres act as the main agency for positive content** for children and for **awareness-raising activities**.
- In the case of **stepping up awareness raising and empowerment**, SICs take the lead role in carrying out activities in half of all Member States.
- **Combating child sexual abuse and exploitation** is an activity that is led at ministerial level in over three quarters of countries and a shared activity in the remainder.

4. Findings: Breadth of activities

The *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* contains an extensive number of recommendations for actions to be taken at Commission level, by Member States and by industry. An important objective for this version of the BIK Map study was to assess the extent to which actions had been carried out and to gauge the breadth of activities in place to implement the underlying objectives of BIK.

A total of 40 specific action items, as listed in the BIK strategy, were included in the questionnaire. Country teams were asked to state what provision if any existed at the national level under each of the items in turn. Respondents were asked to state whether the activity in question had been newly introduced (i.e. within the last 12 months) or if it had been of longer standing. In addition, country teams were also asked if provision in this area had increased, stayed the same or decreased in the last three years.

A summary of findings is presented in the following, grouped according to the five pillars of BIK strategy. Findings are presented in the form of an overview of activity across Europe. Details of national implementation are provided in the country profiles.²¹

Pillar 1: Child-specific online content and services

Stimulating the production of creative and educational online content for children and promoting positive online experiences for young children are twin aspects of Pillar 1 of the BIK strategy. A stated objective of the BIK strategy is to stimulate the market for children's online content. In addition to Commission and industry action in this area,²² Member States are requested in the BIK strategy to match the Commission's support for and actively promote initiatives aimed at *creating high-quality content online for children*, and through coordination with others to *implement standards for quality content online for children, including measures to enhance its visibility*.²³

Therefore, as a basis for stimulating a growing market for high-quality online content and services for children, the following actions/activities are envisaged:

- Initiatives to stimulate the production and visibility of quality content for children;
- Initiatives to encourage children's creativity and to promote positive use of the internet;
- Initiatives to implement standards for quality online content for children.


Each of these items were included in the questionnaire. National teams were asked to comment on the extent of provision in this area. Figure 21 presents an overview of the availability of initiatives to support this theme.

²¹ Individual country profiles are available on the Better Internet for Kids portal: <https://www.betterinternetforkids.eu/>

²² For example, EUN coordinates a range of positive content activities, including a campaign to involve multiple stakeholders in providing better online experiences for children through high-quality digital content. Details are available at: <https://www.betterinternetforkids.eu/web/positiveonlinecontent/home>

²³ *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children COM(2012)*, p.7

Figure 21: Availability of initiatives to support child-specific content/activities (in per cent)




Q21a: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?

Despite the overall lack of attention to the area of positive content noted in Chapter 2 (for example, 39 per cent of countries have no policy regarding positive content for children), it is interesting to note that:

- 17 of the 26 participating countries (65 per cent) report the availability of initiatives to support the production and visibility of quality content for children. These initiatives appear to be well-established and to have existed before last year.
- 88 per cent of countries report the availability of initiatives to encourage children's creativity and positive use of the internet.
- However, in relation to implementing standards for quality online content for children, no initiatives are reported in 16 out of the 26 countries (61 per cent).

To further assess the extent to which such activities have increased or decreased over time, Figure 22 gives an indication of trends for these same areas over the last three years.

Figure 22: Changes in initiatives to support child-specific content/activities (in per cent)



Q21b: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

- Stimulating the production and visibility of quality content is reported to have increased in over a third (39 per cent) of countries.
- Significantly, activities encouraging children's creativity and to promote positive use of the internet are reported to have increased in over half of all Member States (58 per cent).
- Implementing standards for quality online content is not applicable or not available in 62 per cent of cases.

In summary, despite the general lack of priority given to positive content in policy terms, it appears that in practice there is quite a lot of activity related to supporting high-quality digital content for children and that *encouragement of creativity and positive use* and *stimulating production of positive content* is something that happens in the vast majority of countries. Some examples of the initiatives shared by participating countries are given in Chapter 5.

Pillar 2 – Digital/media literacy activities

Digital/media literacy and the teaching of online safety in schools are the two main themes identified in Pillar 2 of the BIK strategy, and are included in the questionnaire as two distinct sets of activities.

Teaching online safety in schools

The teaching of online safety in schools, also included as an action in the Digital Agenda for Europe, is an important priority of the BIK strategy.²⁴ Schools are identified as best placed for reaching the majority of children, regardless of age, income or background. It is also noted that teaching online safety needs to begin in early childhood and adapted according to the needs and stage of development of children.


In the BIK Map questionnaire, country teams were asked to report on the availability of initiatives and progress in relation to the following specific actions points as identified within the BIK strategy:

- Strategies to include teaching online safety in schools;
- Activities to reinforce informal education about online safety;
- Activities to provide for online safety policies in schools;
- Activities to ensure adequate teacher training in online safety;
- Activities to support public-private partnerships in online safety;
- Other relevant activity.

Figure 23 provides a summary of responses from countries in relation to activities available under each item.

²⁴ See <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/specific-actions-digital-education-action-plan>

Figure 23: Availability of online safety in schools (in per cent)




Q22a: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?

As illustrated in Figure 23, there is extensive provision for the teaching of online safety in schools across EU Member States. As reported by national teams:

- Teaching of online safety in schools is identified as present in over 85 per cent of all countries.
- Teaching online safety has been newly introduced in two countries. It is not available, however, in four countries (15 per cent).
- Informal education about online safety is also well established and present in the vast majority of countries (88 per cent).
- Other support initiatives such as ensuring adequate support for *teacher training in online safety, support for schools' online policies and public-private partnerships in online safety* are all reported to be present in the majority of countries.

Figure 24 charts any identified changes in activities over the last three years under this pillar.

Figure 24: Changes in teaching online safety (in per cent)



Q22a: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

It is noteworthy that activities in all fields of teaching online safety are reported to have increased in the last three years.

- The teaching of online safety in schools has increased in 42 per cent or 11 of the 26 countries.
- In four cases (16 per cent), the teaching of online safety in schools is said to have decreased.
- Support for informal education about online safety has also noticeably increased in 62 per cent or 16 of the 26 countries.
- Supporting schools in the development of their online policies has also increased in over half of countries.

Digital and media literacy activities


Alongside teaching online safety in schools, fostering greater critical awareness and supporting greater civic engagement by young people are further priorities set out within Pillar 2 of the BIK strategy. Children, it is argued, need to develop their critical thinking and digital and media literacy skills to be able to actively contribute in a participatory society.

Five distinct activities to support this objective are outlined in the strategy as follows:

- Activities to support young people's technical skills required to use online media content and services;
- Activities to encourage critical thinking around media industries and evaluating content for truthfulness and reliability;
- Activities that encourage interaction, engagement and participation in the economic, social, creative and cultural aspects of society through online media;
- Activities that promote democratic participation and fundamental rights on the internet;
- Activities that challenge radicalisation and hate speech online.

A summary of responses for availability of services or initiatives to support digital and media literacy activities is given in Figure 25.

Figure 25: Availability of digital and media literacy activities




Q22b: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?

As shown in Figure 25, support for digital and media literacy activities overall is reported to be very well-established in the majority of countries.

- Supporting young people’s technical skills is well established and, in the vast majority of countries (88 per cent), is reported to have been in place before last year.
- Activities to encourage critical thinking and evaluating content for truthfulness and reliability is strongly represented and reported as available in three quarters of countries. In five cases, critical media literacy activity has been newly introduced in the last year.
- Promoting civic engagement activity is also present in three quarters of countries, though in the case of seven countries activities that promote democratic participation or fundamental rights online are not available.
- Of note also is the increased attention to countering radicalisation and hate speech online with one quarter (23 per cent) of countries reporting that they had introduced programmes in the last year.

When looking to reports of any change in support for digital and media literacy, it is interesting to note that activities are reported to have increased in over half of all countries over the last three years.

Figure 26: Changes in digital and media literacy activities



Q22b: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

Pillar 3 - Stepping up awareness and empowerment

Pillar 3 of the BIK strategy addresses the central role of awareness-raising activities and measures to empower users to take responsibility for their own online safety. According to the BIK strategy, it is vital that young people, their carers, parents and teachers are "aware of the risks children can encounter online as well as of the tools and strategies to protect themselves or cope with such risks".²⁵

Two broad fields of activity are put forward: firstly, awareness activities such as the roll out of awareness campaigns that involve all relevant stakeholders; and secondly, reporting mechanisms and tools that can empower users when they encounter issues or challenges online. Both areas were included in the questionnaire and organised according to activities identified in the BIK strategy.


Scaling up awareness activities and youth participation

Under the heading of *Scaling up awareness activities and youth participation*, the following actions are envisaged in the BIK strategy as activities that can be taken up at the national level as well as by industry:

- National support for public awareness-raising campaigns;
- Involvement of children when developing national campaigns;
- Involvement of children when developing legislation with an impact on their online activities;
- Activities or initiatives to match the Commission’s support for the national Youth Panels;
- Industry funding and technical support for NGOs and education providers;
- Industry dissemination of awareness material, either online or at the point of sale.

Figure 27 provides a summary of responses from national teams about the availability of programmes or initiatives at the national level to support this theme within Pillar 3.

Figure 27: Availability of awareness activities and youth participation



Q22c: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?


²⁵ European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children COM(2012), p. 8

Awareness-raising activity as a cornerstone of the European approach towards promoting online safety, both under the Safer Internet Programme and now under the Better Internet for Kids strategy, is strongly represented in the responses of all Member States.

- National support for public awareness campaigns exists in 88 per cent of all countries with a similar number matching the European Commission’s support for national Youth Panels.
- Industry support for awareness raising, both in terms of partnerships with others and through industry own dissemination of awareness material is also notably strong in all countries.
- Children’s involvement in the development of awareness campaigns, as for instance in the role played by national Youth Advisory Panels, exists in over three quarters of all countries.
- As noted in Chapter 2 on *Policy Governance*, support for children’s involvement in policy making is less in evidence and is confirmed by less than one third of countries. 69 per cent say this is not available.

Figure 28 notes changes in levels of support in the last three years for awareness activities and youth participation.

Figure 28: Changes in awareness activities and youth participation



Q22c: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

- It is interesting to note that in nearly half of cases, support for public awareness campaigns has increased in the last three years.
- In just over a third of countries, industry support for dissemination of awareness material has increased.
- Industry support for NGOs and education providers is also reported to have increased in over a quarter (27 per cent) of countries.
- Overall, support for awareness activities has remained the same or increased with just two countries (8 per cent) reporting a decrease in support over the period.

Simple and robust reporting tools for users

The second theme addressed in Pillar 3 is that of simple and robust reporting tools to empower users to keep safe and to report problems they may encounter in the course of their internet use. According to



the BIK strategy, “robust mechanisms for reporting content and contacts that seem harmful to children should be available EU-wide across online services and devices”.²⁶ Industry is therefore recommended to “establish and deploy EU-wide, in cooperation with relevant national actors, a mechanism allowing children using their services to report harmful content and conduct”.²⁷ Member States are asked to provide the necessary support for setting up and deploying the reporting mechanisms, especially where cooperation with partners such as helplines and law enforcement bodies is necessary.


Indicative actions, therefore, under this aspect of Pillar 3 include:

- Support for the mechanisms, as developed by industry, for reporting content and contacts that may be harmful for children such as cyberbullying or grooming;
- Initiatives to facilitate cooperation between helplines and law enforcement, where appropriate;
- Initiatives to monitor the effective functioning of reporting mechanisms at a national level.

In relation to the above, the distinction must be made between mechanisms to report content that may be *harmful* and content that may be *illegal*. This caused some confusion in the survey. With regard to the latter, INHOPE hotlines are available in all Member States to report content that is suspected to be illegal. The reference to reporting mechanisms to “empower children to deal with risks such as cyberbullying” in the BIK strategy (2012, p.9) is less clear and may be taken to refer to either industry reporting tools where available and/or Insafe helplines.

Figure 29 provides a summary of responses from Member States to the above three items.

Figure 29: Availability of simple and robust reporting tools for users



Q22d: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?

As highlighted in Figure 29 with regard to the availability of simple and robust reporting tools for users:

- All countries report the availability of mechanisms for reporting content and contacts that may be harmful for children, though noting that this may also be taken to include hotlines to report illegal content or contacts.
- Most countries also report that national support exists for deploying the reporting mechanisms and facilitating cooperation with partners such as helplines and law


²⁶ European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children COM(2012), p. 9
²⁷ European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children COM(2012), p. 10

enforcement bodies where necessary. Just three countries (12 per cent) report that this is not available.

- Two thirds of countries (69 per cent in total) report that there are initiatives to monitor the effectiveness of reporting mechanisms. This is newly introduced in the last 12 months in the case of three countries. One third (31 per cent) say this is not available.

Figure 30 highlights any changes in support for the above initiatives in the last three years.

Figure 30: Changes in simple and robust reporting tools for users



Q22d: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

- Just under half of countries (46 per cent) report that there has been an increase in support for mechanisms for reporting content and contacts that may be harmful for children with the majority stating that support has remained consistent.
- Monitoring the effective function of reporting mechanisms has increased in nearly 40 per cent of cases.
- Measures to support the deployment of reporting mechanisms and facilitate cooperation between agencies such as helplines and law enforcement have increased in 27 per cent of countries. In the majority of cases (65 per cent), levels of support have remained the same.

Noting that the nature of the reporting mechanisms concerned is not specified in the survey, increased attention to their availability and proven effectiveness is reflected in the findings confirming their wide support.

Pillar 4 - Creating a safe environment for children online

The BIK strategy acknowledges that education and empowerment measures on their own are not enough and that protection measures are also required to create a safe environment for children. Children may not be able to recognise risks that exist or foresee the potential consequence of their actions, resulting in potential harm and distress. Therefore, the BIK strategy states that it is necessary “to

implement measures that would prevent children from coming in contact with such content or behaviour”.²⁸

Reflecting longstanding support at the European level for tools that empower users, relevant fields of activity in Pillar 4 are grouped according to the following categories:

- Age-appropriate privacy settings;
- Wider availability and use of parental controls;
- Wider use of age rating and content classification;
- Online advertising and overspending.

In the BIK Map study, country teams were asked to report the availability of support for activities in each of the above areas.


Age-appropriate privacy settings

Recognising that children are a particularly vulnerable group and that younger children are less likely to understand the consequences of their actions, making sure that privacy controls are available to ensure children are as safe as possible is a key objective of BIK strategy. While industry is expected to implement transparent default age-appropriate settings, Member States are also requested to:

- Ensure the implementation of EU legislation in this field,
- Encourage adoption of self-regulatory measures, and
- Foster greater awareness of privacy risks at the national level.

Figure 31 provides an overview of reporting from national teams on availability of measures to support age-appropriate privacy settings.

Figure 31: Availability of measures to support age-appropriate privacy settings (in per cent)



Q23a: Are the services or activities listed currently available in your country?

- A total of 66 per cent report that there are national efforts to ensure the implementation of EU legislation in the area of age-appropriate privacy settings are in place. For 58 per cent, this has existed before the last year and in two cases (8 per cent) this was newly introduced in the last 12 months. A third of countries (34 per cent)


²⁸ European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children COM(2012), p. 10

say this is not applicable. The mixed response to this item partly reflects the evolving nature of national legislation regarding the coming into effect of GDPR.

- Half of the countries state that they encourage the adoption of self-regulatory measures by industry and follow their implementation at national level. The remaining half state that this is not available.
- Awareness-raising activities regarding age-appropriate settings are reported to be widely available in 85 per cent of countries. Just four countries (15 per cent) say this awareness raising is not available.

Figure 32 highlights any changes in support as reported by national teams.

Figure 32: Changes in activities supporting age-appropriate privacy settings (in per cent)



Q23a: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

The increased attention to privacy risks for children brought about by public attention given to GDPR is reflected both in the increase in awareness-raising measures (10 countries or 38 per cent report that activities have increased in the last three years) and regarding implementation of EU legislation (over a quarter of countries report an increase in activity).

With regard to encouraging the adoption of self-regulatory measures, 10 countries report that this is not applicable.

Content protection measures: age rating, content classification and parental controls

The second area of focus in Pillar 4 relates to online content protection measures such as support for the availability and uptake of parental controls, as well as the use of age rating and content classification systems.


To protect children from seeing inappropriate content, the BIK strategy advocates *wider use of age rating and content classification systems* with the ambition, building on the success of initiatives such as PEGI, of having a generally applicable, transparent and consistent approach across the EU. Whereas industry is asked to take the lead in establishing such a system, Member States are requested to support such initiatives by encouraging relevant stakeholders as well as supporting a complaints process necessary for the proper functioning of such systems.

Parental controls are further identified in the BIK strategy as a complementary measure that can contribute to online safety through restricting children’s access to inappropriate content. It is noted that wider availability of parental control tools in several languages is needed to ensure better supports for

parents across Europe. Industry is recommended to ensure the availability of easily configurable, user-friendly tools on all internet-enabled devices. Member States are asked to support industry's efforts and follow up their implementation, promote their availability and perform certifying tests for parental control products.

Figure 33 summarises responses from national teams on progress against these actions.

Figure 33: Availability of online content protection measures (in per cent)



Q23b and Q23c: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?


- Just over half of countries (54 per cent) report that there is support at the national level to encourage stakeholder activity relating to age rating and content classification. Twelve countries (46 per cent) reported that this was not available.
- Very few countries, however, state that there is a complaints process which, as stated in the BIK strategy, is necessary for the proper functioning of such systems. Over three quarters (77 per cent), 20 of the 26 Member States, reported that this was not available in their country.

At the same time, there is evidence in the responses from national teams of extensive activity at the national level to promote the availability of parental control tools.

- 92 per cent of all countries report that activities were in place to promote the availability of parental control tools. In two cases (8 per cent) this has been newly introduced in the last 12 months. For 84 per cent of cases, support for parental controls existed before last year. Only two countries (8 per cent) stated that promotion of parental control tools was not available.
- By contrast, few countries state that they perform tests and certification cycles for parental control tools as set out in the BIK strategy. Just four countries (15 per cent) say this is the case. In 85 per cent of cases, this is not available.
- There is also limited evidence of national level support for industry's efforts in this regard. Just one third of countries state that they support industry's efforts in this field and follow up their implementation on devices sold on their territory. In 65 per cent of cases, this was not available.

Figure 34 presents an overview of trends for these same areas over the period of the last three years.

Figure 34: Changes in availability of online content protection measures (in per cent)



Q23b Q23c: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

There were fewer responses to the question of any change in the last three years regarding online protection measures and in many instances, this was left answered (marked as N/A).

- The promotion of parental controls at the national level is one area in which an increase is registered. Just under half of the 26 countries (46 per cent) report an increase in such promotion efforts in the last three years.
- Four countries (15 per cent) report an increase in the adoption of age rating and content classification.

Approximately three quarters of countries state that testing of parental control tools and the availability of a complaints process for content classification systems do not apply at the national level. This reflects, to some extent, the fact that support for these policy themes is more likely to take place at the European rather than the national level under such initiatives as the *Alliance to better protect minors online*.²⁹

Online advertising and overspending

The final protection measure included within this Pillar addresses so-called “commercial risks” that may arise from children’s lack of ability to engage critically with advertising messages and commercial content. The BIK strategy aims to ensure that standards for online advertising for children allow a level of protection comparable to that of audiovisual services and that measures are implemented to prevent inadvertent overspending.


Recommendations to industry on this theme include provision of clear, transparent and age-appropriate information about the costs of services, avoiding targeted commercial messages to children to encourage them to buy virtual goods as well as the need for compliance with self-regulatory standards and applicable laws.

Member States are invited to support efforts to ensure compliance with relevant legislation and to support the development at the national level of industry codes of conduct.

²⁹ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/alliance-better-protect-minors-online>

Figure 35 presents a summary of findings from national teams on the availability of activities related to online advertising and overspending.

Figure 35: Availability of activities in relation to online advertising and overspending (in per cent)




Q23d: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?

Based on the evidence from national teams, there is limited activity at the national level in measures to protect children and young people from commercial risks.

- Just over a third of countries (35 per cent) report national initiatives related to compliance with relevant national legislation, particularly regarding online profiling and behavioural advertising.
- Similarly, 38 per cent of countries report activities to support industry in developing codes of conduct regarding inappropriate advertising online.
- A quarter confirm measures to monitor their implementation. There is no apparent provision in the remaining three quarters of countries.

Figure 36 details any changes reported for these same activities.

Figure 36: Changes in activities related to online advertising and overspending (in per cent)



Q23d: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

A similar profile is given in Figure 36 with most countries reporting that activities on this topic are not available at the national level. A third overall report that measures related to online content commercial risks have stayed the same in the last three years. Two countries report an increase in activity on monitoring compliance and supporting industry in developing codes of conduct.

Pillar 5 - Fighting against child sexual abuse and child sexual exploitation

Pillar 5 comprises actions to be undertaken by the European Commission, by industry and by Member States to combat the use of the internet for child sexual abuse and exploitation. Continuing the longstanding priority given to cooperative measures between industry, law enforcement and hotlines in speeding up the detection and removal of child sex abuse images, initiatives at the European level include support for new technical solutions to aid investigation, training for law enforcement and addressing barriers to effective notice and take down procedures.


Member States are asked to support the following actions:

- Increased resources for law enforcement bodies that fight against child abuse material online;
- Effective safeguards in place to ensure democratic accountability in the use of investigative tools to combat child sexual abuse;
- Activities to support the functioning and visibility of hotlines at the national level;
- Activities to support the improvement of cooperation between hotlines and industry for taking down child abuse material.

Figure 37 presents a summary of findings from national teams of activities at the national level to support Pillar 5.

Reflecting the high priority in all countries of efforts to combat online child sexual abuse and exploitation, the respective supporting activities identified in the BIK strategy are reported to be well established in nearly all countries.

Figure 37: Activities in relation to fighting online child sexual abuse and exploitation




Q24: Are the services or activities listed below currently available in your country?

- 92 per cent of countries report that they match the support for the functioning and visibility of hotlines at the national level so that the public can report illegal content online.
- 85 per cent of countries have dedicated increased resources to law enforcement bodies fighting against child abuse material online.

- 71 per cent of countries also state that they have put in place measures to support improved cooperation between hotlines and industry for taking down child abuse material.
- One area where there is less consistency is in terms of oversight arrangements to ensure effective safeguards and accountability of investigative tools used in the fight against online child sexual abuse. Just under 40 per cent of countries say this does not apply.

Changes in levels of support for Pillar 5 as reported by national teams are presented in Figure 38.

Figure 38: Changes in activities related to fighting online child sexual abuse and exploitation



Q24: In the last three years, have the services or activities increased, stayed the same or decreased?

Again, reflecting the high policy priority given to this field of activity, it is noteworthy that activities to support law enforcement, the visibility of hotlines and improved cooperation for taking down child abuse material are all reported to have increased in the last three years.

- Just under half of countries report that there has been an increase in resources for law enforcement bodies.
- 39 per cent of countries report increased support for the functioning and visibility of hotlines
- 35 per cent report an increase in activity to promote improved cooperation between hotlines and industry in the taking down of child abuse material.

Summary

A comprehensive range of activities is reported under key pillars of BIK, particularly in relation to teaching of online safety, awareness raising and empowerment and in combatting child sexual abuse and exploitation online.

Pillar 1

- Despite the lack of policy attention for **quality online content for children**, a range of positive content initiatives are reported in most Member States. 65 per cent of the 26 participating countries reported the availability of initiatives to support the production and visibility of quality content for children.

- Extensive initiatives are also reported in most countries (88 per cent) to **encourage children's creativity and positive use of the internet**. This is an activity that has increased in over half of all Member States (58 per cent).
- However, **few report implementing standards for quality online content** with no initiatives in 16 of the 26 countries (61 per cent).

Pillar 2

- **Teaching of online safety in schools** is present in over 85 per cent of all countries and is an activity that is reported to have increased in nearly half of all countries in the last three years. Supporting schools in the development of their online policies has also increased in 42 per cent of cases.
- **Informal education about online safety** is also well-established and present in the vast majority of countries (88 per cent). Teaching online safety in informal education settings has also increased in 16 of the 26 countries in the last three years.
- **Digital/media literacy education** is reported to have increased in the majority of countries in the last three years. Most countries (88 per cent) support the development of young people's technical skills. Three quarters of countries have activities to **encourage critical thinking and evaluating online content for truthfulness and reliability**. Critical media literacy has also been newly introduced in five countries in the last year.
- **Promoting civic engagement through digital and social media** is also present in three quarters of countries. Educational activity to **promote democratic participation** is also widely represented though seven countries report that this is not available.
- One quarter of countries report that new educational measures have been introduced in the last year to **counter online radicalisation and hate speech**.

Pillar 3

- **Scaling up awareness activities** as advocated in the BIK strategy was found to be widely supported. National support for **public awareness campaigns** is strongly represented in nearly all countries (88 per cent). Nearly half of all countries report an increase in awareness raising in the last three years. **Industry support for NGOs and education providers** in awareness raising is also noticeably strong. In a third of cases, this has noticeably increased in the last three years.
- The BIK strategy also recommends the **empowerment of children through the provision of robust mechanisms for reporting content and contacts that may be harmful for children**. Member States are also asked to provide the necessary support for deploying the mechanisms.
- All countries report the availability of mechanisms to report harmful content and contacts and the vast majority have initiatives to support their deployment. This is largely taken to refer to hotlines available in each country to report illegal activity such as child online grooming. Two thirds of countries also say there are initiatives in place **to monitor the effectiveness of such mechanisms**. Nearly all countries (88 per cent) also say that there are arrangements in place to **facilitate cooperation with partners including helplines and law enforcement**.

Pillar 4

The BIK strategy also advocates protection measures to **create a safer online environment that will prevent children from coming into contact with harmful content or behaviour**. Actions are recommended to promote the wider uptake and use of age-appropriate privacy settings; parental controls; age rating and content classification; and measures to protect children from online advertising and overspending.

- **Awareness-raising activities to promote greater understanding of age-appropriate privacy settings** are available in 85 per cent of countries. Awareness-raising activity has increased in over a third of countries. Just half of countries however state that they encourage the adoption of self-regulatory measures by industry and follow their implementation at national level.
- **The vast majority of countries (92 per cent) promote the availability of parental control tools**. This has increased in nearly half of all countries in the last three years. Just four countries however say that they perform tests and certification at the national level for parental controls as recommended in the BIK strategy. Just one third of countries say they support industry's efforts in this or follow up on implementation of parental controls in devices sold in their territory.
- **Over half of countries (54 per cent) say there is support at the national level for age rating and content classification**. Only a quarter of countries however state there is a complaints process required for the proper functioning of such systems.
- **There is limited evidence of initiatives dealing with commercial risks associated with children's use of the internet**. Just a third of countries say there is any activity related to compliance with national legislation **regarding online profiling and behavioural advertising**. 38 per cent of countries say there is activity to support the **development of industry codes of conduct** regarding inappropriate advertising online. Just a quarter say they monitor the implementation of such measures.

Pillar 5

Fighting against child sexual abuse and combatting child sexual exploitation online is a cornerstone of BIK strategy and is represented through longstanding forms of cooperation between governments, industry and law enforcement.

- **Nearly all countries (92 per cent) match EU support for the functioning and visibility of hotlines at the national level**. 85 per cent of countries have increased resources to law enforcement bodies fighting against child abuse material online. Improved cooperation between hotlines and industry for taking down child abuse material is also reported by 71 per cent of countries.
- **Oversight arrangements to ensure effective safeguards and accountability of investigative tools** used in the fight against online child sexual abuse are reported by over half of all countries. However, this does not apply in just under 40 per cent of cases.

5. Practices worth sharing

The BIK Map study affords a valuable opportunity to share information between Member States not just about how policies are developed and implemented but also about initiatives that are shown to enhance internet experiences for young people. The various member organisations of the Insafe network currently share online safety resources and materials through the *Better Internet for Kids* portal. This is one of the features that helps to underpin Safer Internet Centres as a crucial part of a shared infrastructure for a safer online environment.³⁰

As part of the BIK Map study, national teams were also invited to highlight examples of practices that they believed may be worth sharing. A “practice worth sharing” in this instance was defined as *innovative*, that has had a *positive impact on children’s online experiences* and which could be *reproduced or adapted to other contexts*.³¹ The questionnaire included a template to add details about project aims and outcomes.

A selection of practices put forward by country teams is presented in this section of the report. Grouped according to themes within the BIK strategy, the practices presented serve to demonstrate the breadth of initiatives available and diversity of approaches to implementation, including representative examples of partnership between stakeholder groups.

Positive content for children

A number of projects were put forward in national reports that addressed the theme of positive online content for children.

Ein Netz für Kinder (“A Net for Children”),³² one of several projects described in the German national report, is a joint initiative of the Federal Government for Culture and Media (BKM), the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) and of youth media protection organisations. Since 2008, *Ein Netz für Kinder* has sought to create safe online surfing experiences for children through the provision of a safe search engine for children (fragfinn.de) and by promoting the development of high-quality online content for children. More recently, the project has also supported adaptation of online material for mobile devices and development of new multilingual content for children.

“Datenbank: Apps für Kinder”³³ (a database of apps for children) is another project put forward by the German team as an example of a guide to positive content in the form of German-speaking apps for children. Developed by the Deutsches Jugendinstitut (DJI), the database includes German-language apps of high educational value, as well as content for toddlers, kindergarten and preschool children.

³⁰ See *Insafe Helplines: Operations, effectiveness and emerging issues for internet safety helplines*. (Dinh et al. 2016)

³¹ “Guidelines on completing the template”, *BIK Map II Policy Mapping of the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children*. 2017.

³² <http://www.enfk.de/>

³³ <https://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/apps-fuer-kinder-angebote-und-trendanalysen/datenbank-apps-fuer-kinder.html>

What's Your Story? (Ireland)³⁴ is an example of a platform for young people's content with a focus on giving young people a voice to express themselves on topics related to internet safety. This competition was launched in Ireland in 2012 by the internet security company, Trend Micro, and has run annually since then. It is aimed at children and young people, aged 8-18, and gives them the opportunity to produce their own online digital content on themes related to their digital lives. Participants upload their content to the "What's Your Story" platform. Shortlisting for the competition is based on the highest views and ratings, thereby encouraging sharing of content related to digital safety. With the support of the Safer Internet Centre, schools and youth organisations, the competition has been successful in celebrating the creativity of young people and encouraging them to start and sustain a positive, online dialogue with their peers and with the world.

BEE CREATIVE Makerspaces³⁵ is a project that prepares children and youth for the challenges of a digital society by tackling their curiosity and creativity in the context of ICT. Coordinated by SCRIPT and Service National de la Jeunesse, Luxembourg, one of the main pillars of this governmental initiative is the implementation of makerspaces throughout the country. Through these and other activities, BEE CREATIVE seeks to promote a hands-on, non-formal learning experience in fields such as robotics, 3D printing, programming, reverse engineering, design and many more. The programme fosters a positive relationship with digital technologies, encouraging young people to explore and express their creativity while enhancing their digital skills.

Digital and media literacy

Not surprisingly, digital and media literacy activities and the teaching of online safety in schools were widely cited examples of practices worth sharing in national reports.

The incorporation of internet safety into the school curriculum is a feature of education initiatives in many countries. For example, in Croatia, child online safety has been integrated within the **Croatian Qualifications Framework (HKO)**. A curriculum for internet safety has been developed, specifying learning outcomes and involving a whole-school approach that involves students, parents and teachers to raise awareness and improves skills and expertise across the whole community.

In Malta, the Ministry of Education, with support from the Safer Internet Centre, has similarly sought to integrate online safety into the **Personal, Social and Career Development (PSCD)**³⁶ component of the curriculum at both primary and secondary school level. The aim of PSCD is to foster a range of soft skills, both online and offline, that support children's personal development with regard to sexuality, relationships, respect for self and others, and privacy. The programme has supported the development of resources for students and teachers in print, video and online form.

In Austria, the **School 4.0** strategy, developed by the Federal Ministry of Education, has the objective of preparing children and young people for a digitised world and working environment. A competence framework, *digi.check*³⁷ has been developed to map children's (and adults') levels of digital literacy

³⁴ <https://whatsyourstory.trendmicro.ie/>

³⁵ <http://www.bee-creative.lu/makerspaces>

³⁶ <http://psd.skola.edu.mt/>

³⁷ <https://www.digicheck.at/>



with testing and feedback resources to guide attainment of skills and competence needed for full digital participation.

One of the core activities carried out by the Italian Safer Internet Centre is a **Schools e-Safety Policy** development process in which schools undertake a self-assessment of strengths and weaknesses and areas for improvement in their approach to online safety and positive use of ICTs. The development of an e-Safety Policy consists of three phases. In the first phase, schools complete an online self-review (a questionnaire and check list) and develop an Action Plan, identifying their strengths and weaknesses. In the second phase, schools then proceed to implement the actions set out in their Action Plan. The third phase comprises the implementation of an e-Safety Policy as the final stage of the process. Schools can also get different levels of support from the SIC based on their self-assessment, including online support from SIC staff, access to educational resources, as well as training activities aimed at children, adolescents, teachers and parents.

In Finland, the **Media Literacy School**³⁸ initiative was developed to support competence and capacity building for professional educators in media education. Initiated by the National Audiovisual Institute and the Finnish Safer Internet Centre (FI SIC), the project comprises a web portal which includes a resource database of educational materials, current information on BIK-related issues, a media literacy research database and a blog for educators and media literacy professionals.

Informal education in digital and media literacy is also widely represented among practices identified in national reports. In **Lithuania**, an initiative to support digital and media literacy is actively promoted through **the public library system**. Activities involving children and their parents include competitions, creating short video clips, writing and posting information on blogs, and supporting school projects on issues such as trust in online information, sharing content and privacy. The "**Magic Valley**" is Hungary's first media literacy and education centre and offers free media awareness sessions to children between ages 9 and 16. The Centre, supported by the National Media Authority (NMHH), organises sessions around seven topics to help children develop their competencies in safe and responsible internet use, getting the benefits of online experiences while avoiding risks and managing the sharing of personal information.

The **Cyberscout Training Programme**,³⁹ developed by Bulgaria's Safer Internet Centre, uses peer-to-peer mentoring to support the teaching of online safety in schools. Pupils from different Bulgarian towns undertake a two-day training programme, during which they learn about issues of risks and safety that children face online. The Cyberscouts are also trained to pass on what they have learned to their peers. Cyberscouts are also encouraged to organise events to raise awareness among their peers about online dangers and ways of addressing them. At the Bulgarian national Safer Internet Day event, Cyberscouts with the three best activities receive certificates of achievement from the Ministry of Interior and are awarded prizes by Telenor Bulgaria and the Bulgarian Association for Information Technologies. The Cyberscout Training Programme was ranked ninth in the European Crime Prevention Award in December 2017.

DigiRallye⁴⁰ is an event run twice yearly by BEE SECURE, the Luxembourgish Safer Internet Centre, in which children aged between 8 and 12 are invited to participate in a day-long event to learn how to deal with new media and technologies in a responsible manner, as well as to pick up useful knowledge

³⁸ www.mediataitokoulu.fi

³⁹ <https://www.safenet.bg/en/initiatives/173-cyberscouts-teams>

⁴⁰ <https://www.bee-secure.lu/fr/digirallye>

on the internet, computers and smartphones. The day is organised around workshops with children in groups of 4-7 given the task of visiting twelve stations - each dealing with different topics on safer and responsible internet usage. Through fun and educational activities, children learn about the impact of cyberbullying using the "feelings barometer" resource. Another workshop has used a memory game to teach about the topic of phishing. An educational game in which participants try to text while driving a go-kart through an obstacle course, developed by the Luxembourgish Police, was used to teach about the dangers of texting and driving. Participation in each workshop is documented in the form of a "Digipass" which is completed by the end of the day.

Awareness raising and empowerment

Awareness raising is central to the work of Safer Internet Centres and other organisations involved in supporting better internet policies. This is reflected in the large number of initiatives and projects carried out at national level and put forward in reports as practices worth sharing. Over half of all initiatives put forward in reports fall under the heading of *Stepping up awareness and empowerment*. The following is a brief summary of selected examples only.

Activities around **Safer Internet Day** (SID)⁴¹ form a focal point for awareness raising in general. Globally, Safer Internet Day is celebrated in over 140 countries, coordinated by the joint Insafe/INHOPE network, with the support of the European Commission, and national Safer Internet Centres across Europe. Each February, SID is used to promote the safe and positive use of digital technology for children and young people and to empower young people to speak about concerns they may have about digital life. In the UK for example, over 1,600 organisations supported **Safer Internet Day 2017**, including schools, police services, charities, companies, local/national government, regulators, football clubs and wider.

In Finland, Safer Internet Day is celebrated as **Media Literacy Week**⁴² the aim of which is to advance the media literacy skills of children, young people and adults as well as to support professional educators, guardians and other adults in their important media educational tasks. The week is planned and carried out in co-operation with around 50 partner organisations from all sectors of society, from governmental organisations to NGOs and businesses. *Media Literacy Week* encourages local institutions (such as schools, libraries, youth work centres, museums and kindergartens) to arrange local educational events during the campaign week.

Safer Internet Day is undoubtedly the best-known awareness-raising activity for internet safety. However, numerous other actions and initiatives are undertaken to heighten awareness of online risks and safety, some focussed on particular risk areas and targeted at particular vulnerable populations.

Cyberbullying remains one of the most prevalent risks as reported to helplines and something to which awareness centres have devoted considerable attention. The Croatian national report highlighted the work undertaken by the Association for Communication and Media Culture which, for the last six years, has implemented a programme to raise the awareness of students, teachers and parents about cyberbullying and its implications for children's online safety.

⁴¹ www.saferinternetday.org

⁴² <https://www.betterinternetforkids.eu/web/finland/sid>



The Irish Safer Internet Centre, [Webwise.ie](https://www.webwise.ie), has developed [Lockers](https://www.webwise.ie/lockers/),⁴³ an information and education resource on the issue of “sexting”. This education resource, designed for junior cycle secondary school children, is supported by specially-developed animations and six lesson plans. Lockers was developed to support schools as they address the issue of non-consensual sharing of intimate images (sometimes referred to as “revenge porn”), in the context of classes in Social, Personal and Health Education (SPHE). The resource aims to foster empathy, respect and resilience and to help young people understand the consequences of their actions. Lessons focus specifically on the laws around “sexting”, on the peer pressure and stereotyping that can contribute to non-consensual sharing, and on how students can get help when incidents of non-consensual sharing occur. The resource was launched for Safer Internet Day in 2016 and is supported by the Ministry of Education and Skills, the Health Services Executive and law enforcement.

The Croatian Safer Internet Centre also collaborated with law enforcement, the Ministry of Interior and the Center for Missing and Exploited Children to produce [Web Detectives](#), an initiative to increase awareness of social media abuses. Launched in 2012, the aim of the project is to increase overall levels of knowledge and awareness among parents, professionals and teachers, as well as children, regarding internet safety and positive online use. Addressing all forms of digital technology, a particular emphasis is to raise awareness of cyberbullying and related aspects of harmful digital communication affecting children.

[The Sheeplive project](#)⁴⁴ is an internationally-focussed online portal containing animations and cartoon content to disseminate information in a child-friendly manner on specific issues of online risk and safety. Aimed at children aged 4 to 14 years, the project was initiated by eSlovensko, an NGO in Slovakia, with the support of the Slovak Ministry of the Interior, the Slovak UNICEF National Committee as partners, with further support from the EU Safer Internet Programme. Building on the tradition of animation production in the former Czecho-Slovakia, the content illustrates, in an entertaining and humorous way, problems that arise in cases of inappropriate behaviour and misuse of digital technologies. The first four pilot episodes in Slovak premiered in 2009. This was extended in 2011 to include international language versions such as German (Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Luxemburg, Belgium), Slovene (Slovenia), Hungarian (Slovakia, Hungary), Roma (Slovakia, Hungary), sign language (Slovakia), and Slovak with English subtitles (UK, Ireland, Cyprus, Malta). The portal is designed to be accessible for the visually impaired and for other disability groups. Cartoon stories to date include:

- *Coatless* (dealing with nude videos and images).
- *Don't dance with the wolf* (dealing with misuse of photos and videos).
- *Secret friend* (on the topic of grooming).
- *White sheep* (on the subject of discrimination and racism on the internet).
- *Burping man* (the internet always remembers your past mistakes).
- *Beauty crown* (anorexia, "beauty recipes" on the internet).
- *Speaking trumpet* (phishing).
- *A thousand friends* (virtual friendships).
- *Unknown mobile* (respecting the privacy of your friends and etiquette of mobile communication).

⁴³ <https://www.webwise.ie/lockers/>

⁴⁴ <http://sk.sheeplive.eu/en/>

- *Presents* (online shopping and purchasing only what you can afford).
- *Snow game* ("happy slapping" and recording of violent/humiliating scenes).
- *Muddy heads* (gaming addiction).

Support for a safer online environment

The majority of examples and case studies of practices put forward fall under the heading of awareness raising and education. A limited number of the "practices worth sharing" deal with regulatory instruments and supports under the pillars of BIK that deal respectively with *Tools and regulation for a safer online environment* (Pillar 4) and *Legislation and law enforcement against child sexual abuse and exploitation* (Pillar 5). This is not to suggest that the themes of regulation or combatting child sexual abuse and exploitation are not top priorities for EU Member States. On the contrary, as demonstrated in the policy coverage of this pillar of BIK, these are areas that are comprehensively dealt with at ministerial level and under national laws.

In the area of tools and regulation for a safer online environment, while much of the focus is on action at the European level, a number of relevant examples were put forward to illustrate infrastructure and support at the national level for enabling safer online environments.

Jugend.Support⁴⁵ is an example put forward in the German report of a platform that offers both information and a reporting service to deal with problems that arise when using the internet. Developed by the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) together with the German Centre for Child Protection on the Internet (I-KiZ), this is an integrated online support service providing information and advice for users who have experienced problems. Information material is provided on the most relevant topics for young people with regard to their internet usage and potentially difficult situations, i.e. cyberbullying, sexual molestation, self-harm and suicide, violence, legal questions and practical tips for handling the most popular web applications and platforms. Advice is given by a service guiding the young users to either helplines or the hotline. An easy to use interface and a transparent and comprehensive data protection policy is provided to support children in the process of filing a complaint or asking for counselling.

Helplines, as integral components of Safer Internet Centres, provide a crucial part of the infrastructure to support internet users in each country. Helplines provide information, advice and assistance to children, young people and parents on how to deal with harmful content, harmful contact (such as grooming) and harmful conduct such as (cyberbullying or sexting). Alongside awareness nodes and online resources developed specifically for the national context, these act as tools designed to support a safer online environment.

The **IS4K (Internet Segura for Kids) Helpline**⁴⁶ operated by the Spanish Safer Internet Centre is one such example. IS4K was launched in February 2017 and provides among its services anonymous and confidential counselling for children, teenagers, parents and professionals on any issue related to childhood and digital experience. The service is available across multiple platforms (telephone, email and web form). The IS4K helpline operates in collaboration with the rest of the helpline resources available in Spain and is part of the Insafe network of helplines. In July 2017, the Spanish SIC added an

⁴⁵ <https://www.jugend.support/>

⁴⁶ <https://www.is4k.es/>



additional reporting line to the service which allows users to report child sexual abuse content and other dangerous or harmful online content.

HelpAPP,⁴⁷ developed by UNICEF Hungary, provides information and interactive help to children who are victims of aggression, bullying and other forms of online abuse. Available as an app for mobile devices, the objective is to provide readily-accessible information for victims of abuse directing users towards solutions and sources of support.

In relation to the theme of combatting child online sexual abuse and exploitation, the **Latvian Safer Internet Centre** highlighted the training programme **"Breaches on the internet"** developed for training law enforcement. First published in 2015, the programme includes in-depth information about internet-related crimes and was developed by experts in forensic psychology with previous experience of over 800 police investigations regarding online breaches including sexual harassment and cyberbullying of children. The goal of the training programme is to foster understanding and develop the skills of police officers to respond adequately to violence and other crimes on the internet.

The above represents a small selection of the programmes identified in national reports and illustrates some of the breadth of activity across pillars of BIK, even in those areas where policy is not especially prevalent or where there is limited involvement of stakeholders beyond the public sector and Safer Internet Centres.

Awareness-raising programmes and initiatives to support digital and media literacy activities are the two most widely cited forms of BIK practices worth sharing. There are, however, a range of important content-related actions that, as the example of *The Sheeplive Project* amply demonstrates, have relevance beyond the borders of the specific context in which it was developed.

Areas where practices are much less in evidence relate to tools, mechanisms and aspects of regulation that have their origin in initiatives implemented at the European level. Thus, there is relatively little national-level activity reflected in projects cited in areas dealing with classification or labelling of content, with age rating or certification of parental control tools. Development of complaints processes to facilitate effective functioning of such systems are noticeably absent.

It is somewhat surprising that more actions dealing with commercial risks were not mentioned in national reports. Given the widely-noted state of affairs where children are accessing services at ever-younger ages and having to deal with commercial content that they may not understand, there are few examples mentioned that deal with commercialism, advertising literacy or the potential risks for commercial exploitation. This is reflected also in the relatively low levels of activity identified for ensuring compliance with national legislation regarding behavioural advertising and points to some of the areas in which recommendations may be made for future policy development.

⁴⁷ <https://www.unicef.hu/helpapp/>



6. Conclusions

The BIK Map is an analytical tool to examine in detail how EU Member States have responded to the *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* through their policies and programmes. Bringing together data that is collected by expert contacts at the national level, it offers an opportunity for individual Member States to profile the arrangements for online safety and better internet policies and to mark achievements on BIK-related issues, mapped against the objectives set out in the BIK strategy. The BIK Map further offers, through the provision of comparative data, the facility to share knowledge and to learn from strategies and interventions that have proved successful in other European Member States. In this chapter, the main findings of this edition of the BIK Map are reviewed, concluding with brief recommendations for further development of this work.

Policy governance

One of the first objectives of the BIK Map was to examine implementation of the BIK strategy in terms of policy governance. Policy governance in this context refers to the ways policies are designed, managed and implemented to achieve the objectives as set out in the overarching framework as provided in the BIK strategy. A number of distinct dimensions to policy governance were defined. Firstly, *policy frameworks* were said to comprise the incorporation of BIK-related issues and strategies into a single document, guiding policy at the national level. Secondly, *policy coordination* was taken to refer to the involvement of stakeholders, in particular relevant government ministries, and the methods and degree of coordination introduced to ensure effective working arrangements. The third dimension of policy governance refers to *policy design* which here refers to the availability of evidence to support policy making, the development of appropriate assessment indicators and the carrying out of regular policy monitoring and evaluation.

The BIK Map study found uneven levels of policy governance applying in terms of the implementation of BIK strategy. Notably, no country reported that it had implemented the BIK strategy through a single policy framework at the national level. Instead, BIK-related issues are addressed through separate policy frameworks which in half of the participating countries are said to involve BIK-specific frameworks and in the remaining half form part of broader policies.

The explanation for this primarily lies in the fact that BIK strategy itself contains a number of discrete policy themes which do not easily lend themselves to incorporation within a single policy framework. As such, the five pillars of BIK strategy, as defined for this study, tend to fall within the responsibility of different government departments, while also crossing over into other public policy domains including education, child protection, and areas of law enforcement with responsibility for combatting child sexual abuse and exploitation.

Findings from the BIK Map study confirm that, in over three quarters of all countries, more than four ministries are involved in the design of BIK policies. In 62 per cent of countries, it is between four and six, and in a further 15 per cent, it is more than six. In a quarter of cases, it is between one and three. The number of ministries involved in the development of BIK policy is not itself a quality assessment. However, the challenge of developing coherent, effective policies is made all the more challenging given the number of different departments involved and places greater emphasis on the means of policy coordination. Just under a half of countries (42 per cent) reported that more than one coordinating ministry, public agency or body was in place. In a quarter of cases there was no coordinating body at all. Interestingly, despite the wide acknowledgement of the importance and value of multi-stakeholder

input into the policy process, only three countries reported the existence of a multi-stakeholder body with specific responsibility for BIK.

The lack of regular data collection to inform policy making and the general absence of monitoring and evaluation frameworks are further difficulties in the effective implementation of the goals set out for the BIK strategy. Just one in five countries report the availability of a national survey specifically focussed on BIK-related issues and half of the participating countries say that policy development has tended to be reactive and driven by events rather than by evidence. Just 39 per cent say that an evaluation of BIK-related policy has taken place in the last three years. In terms of informing policy, it is reassuring to see that most countries do report that arrangements are in place for children to be consulted on BIK-related issues. However, only in a third of countries is there an opportunity for children to participate in the design of public policies.

The first BIK Map study carried out in 2014 found that there was room for improvement in most EU countries in BIK-related policy governance and design. This referred specifically to the coordination among ministries involved, efforts to reach a comprehensive view on policies tackling BIK challenges, and assessing their effectiveness. On the evidence of this version of the BIK Map, there is still room for improvement, particularly in areas of policy coordination and in support for evidence-based policy making. Each of the elements included within the BIK Map points to the continuation of a silo-approach to policy development and implementation which, though understandable in light of the distinct fields incorporated within BIK pillars, creates evident challenges for policy coherence.

Policy actors

The involvement of different stakeholders, both in terms of participation in the policy-making cycle and in the implementation of activities under the separate pillars of BIK, is a second main theme of the BIK Map. The involvement of stakeholders is taken to be an expression of the shared responsibility underpinning BIK strategy and includes public and private sectors, civil society, parents and children.

The general absence of a more formal multi-stakeholder approach to BIK strategy notwithstanding, it was found in this version of the BIK Map that public-sector involvement remains crucial to overall implementation of the *Better Internet for Kids* strategy. In over half of all countries, government ministries have a leading or primary role in the carrying out of BIK activities. Civil society organisations are also important policy actors. In just over a third of countries, NGOs are also said to have the leading role in delivering between 50 per cent and 90 per cent of relevant activities for BIK. The role of industry in this regard is said to be a complementary or even a minor one though, importantly, this does not refer to the separate actions and recommendations that the BIK strategy directs to industry alone. In over half of countries, it is reported that the role of industry in carrying out activities related to national BIK policies is minor. In the case of four countries, the role played by industry is however said to be a leading one.

Consistent with the findings of the previous BIK Map study is the important role played by Safer Internet Centres (SICs). The SIC is recognised as the key platform for the implementation and coordination of actions and initiatives. In addition, the SIC Advisory Board, as acknowledged in the original BIK Map study, is a valuable forum for stakeholder dialogue in the absence of any other multi-stakeholder body. In this version of the BIK Map, the role of the Safer Internet Centre is described as a leading one, carrying out between half and 90 per cent of all activities. In just under a quarter of cases, the role of the SIC is vital in carrying out over 90 per cent of all BIK activity. This important role is reflected to some extent in the fact that five countries reported an increase in funding. For three quarters of the participating countries, however, there had been no change in the national funding support for the SIC.



A somewhat more diverse picture emerges in assessing the lead roles associated with each of the pillars of BIK strategy. Country teams were asked to report which stakeholder groups were lead actors in the carrying out of BIK activities. Implementation of BIK remains predominantly public-sector driven when viewed from the perspective of individual pillars. In the case of education activities and in relation to legislation and law enforcement combatting online child sexual abuse, it primarily falls to government ministries in taking the lead in carrying out activities. Safer Internet Centres predominate in stepping up awareness and empowerment, reflecting their central role as national awareness nodes. In the case of Pillar 4 (Tools and regulation for a safe environment) and Pillar 1 (Stimulating quality online content for children) a more diverse set of actors and activities is in evidence. In the case of positive content for children, the lack of available national policies provides for a mixed situation with SICs leading in a third of cases, and NGOs and ministries leading in 15 per cent cases each. Notably, there is no activity in a third of countries. In relation to Pillar 4, tools and regulation for a safer online environment, policy implementation is shared between ministries, SICs and civil society while recognising that the primary activity in this policy field is undertaken at a European level.

Activities at the national level to support BIK

A new aspect of this version of the BIK Map is to capture the range of activities carried out at the national level under each of the pillars of BIK. A total of 40 individual items linked to recommended actions contained in the BIK strategy were included in the questionnaire. Country teams were asked to report on the availability of actions under each item and to assess the extent to which the activity had increased or decreased in the last three years.

While the area of positive content for children was noted to be lacking in terms of available national policies, the majority of countries reported the existence of activities to encourage children's creativity and promote positive use of the internet. This is an area of activity that has increased in over half of all countries in the last three years. Similarly, three quarters of countries reported the availability of initiatives to stimulate the production and visibility of quality online content for children. The lack of policy provision in this area however is reflected in the fact that just one third of countries report the existence of quality standards in place for children's online content.

Teaching online safety and support for digital and media literacy activities are reported to be well established in nearly all participating countries. Teaching of online safety in schools is identified as present in over 85 per cent of all countries. This activity has also increased in nearly half of all countries in the last three years. Support for digital and media literacy activity is also widely available and includes support for children's technical skills, fostering critical thinking and evaluating content for truthfulness. Encouraging online civic engagement and democratic participation is an increasing feature of national-level activity as is activity to challenge radicalisation and hate speech online.

Pillar 3 of the BIK strategy, dealing with awareness raising and young people's empowerment, is comprehensively covered in terms of activities at the national level. Building on the central role of SICs in leading awareness raising, activities on all aspects to support better public awareness are strongly represented, including national support, industry partnerships and matching the European Commission's support of Youth Advisory Panels. In terms of empowerment of children, the involvement of children when developing policy or legislation is noticeably absent in 70 per cent of cases.

A further dimension of empowerment in this context is the provision of and support for simple and robust reporting tools for users. It is recognised that empowering users is not just a matter of making them aware of risks that may be encountered but also providing them with tools to report content or contacts



that may be harmful. The BIK strategy advocates that *robust mechanisms for reporting content and contacts that seem harmful to children should be available EU-wide across online services and devices*. The core infrastructure of helplines and hotlines supported as part of the Connecting Europe Facility provides one aspect of this reporting mechanism. However, further provision across all services and devices is also envisaged with support at the national level to support the effective functioning of such mechanisms. While support for reporting mechanisms is acknowledged at the national level, a third of countries say there is no provision for monitoring their effectiveness.

Activities under Pillar 4, creating a safe environment for children online, entail a range of national measures to support age-appropriate privacy settings, content classification and the wider uptake and use of parental controls. Findings from the study indicate that national-level activity in this area is uneven, accounted for by the fact that this is predominantly an activity that originates at the European level. Awareness-raising support with regard to privacy settings and the use of parental controls is well established. However, there is much less consistency in how national initiatives respond, if at all, in this domain. Few countries, for instance, have a complaints process to support the effective functioning of such systems or undertake monitoring, testing or certification. This is also the case in relation to so-called commercial risks and there is little evidence that countries have adopted concerns regarding children's exposure to potential overspending or commercial exploitation as a policy priority.

By contrast, all countries report strong support and comprehensive provision in the fight against child sexual abuse and exploitation. Resources for law enforcement bodies are reported to have increased in nearly half of cases and all countries report activities to support the functioning and visibility of hotlines at the national level.

Finally, this iteration of the BIK Map includes a selection of examples identified by countries as activities worth sharing. The spread of activities across European Member States offers a valuable opportunity to share best practice, particularly in those areas where policy is less well developed and to illustrate the extent to which the BIK strategy has been realised in practical terms in the form of programmes and initiatives that contribute to the creation of a better internet for children.

Recommendations

In conclusion, the *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* can point to many successes: child safety online policies are present in all Member States, there are significant activities in all countries, and almost all trends show that the Member States are actively contributing to increased activities in children's online safety. The BIK policies are very much alive in general, and not just an artificial policy field dictated by the EU.

However, it is clear that since the last BIK Map exercise, progress in the attainment of the objectives of BIK at the Member State level has been somewhat uneven. Significant gaps remain in terms of policy governance, involvement of stakeholders and in the availability of programmes or activities to underpin some of the key pillars of BIK.

Drawing on the evidence presented in this study and building on the conclusions of the previous version of the BIK Map, the following recommendations are offered to strengthen embedding of BIK policy making in the Member States, to avoid fragmentation in policy responses and to improve implementation of the baseline requirements for better internet provision for children and young people.



Recommendation 1: Strengthen national-level policy governance in the area of Better Internet for Kids strategy

The evidence collected as part of this version of the BIK Map appears to show relatively little progress in terms of improved policy governance and design. Gaps previously identified in terms of the organisation, management and support for policy development appear to remain in place in most countries with insufficient coordination at the national level, and a lack of identifiable coordination entities or agencies providing transparent and effective leadership for policy development. The inadequate level of evidence-based support for policy making and the overall absence of monitoring and evaluation frameworks point to a fragmented and sometimes reactive approach to policy making. Furthermore, the lack of common strategies and methodologies towards policy governance in this field creates a further risk to its long-term sustainability and development, hampering effective knowledge exchange and the ability to leverage the added-value of European coordination.

Accordingly, greater attention should be given by Member States to the following:

- 1.1. *Enhance formal and informal coordination of policy making on BIK strategy*, ensuring effective inter-departmental communication and relationship management with the diversity of stakeholders contributing to BIK objectives.
- 1.2. There is also clear merit in *policy alignment of BIK objectives* with national goals for digitalisation, educational attainment and youth strategy.
- 1.3. It is also important to ensure *that policy objectives are clearly articulated in a distinct policy framework* that provides clarity for stakeholders and guides further development and implementation of actions to support a better and safer internet.
- 1.4. It is also vital that policy making for BIK is supported by *regular research and data collection at the national level* to ensure that policy is appropriately evidence-based and avoids responding reactively to topical events or concerns in the national sphere.

Recommendation 2: Increase or continue national level support in provision of BIK services, matching the European contribution for BIK

The evidence of the BIK Map suggests that in many countries there is a strong reliance on the European contribution to BIK, on Safer Internet Centres, and in public sector delivery of BIK objectives and outcomes. SICs represent a vital infrastructure for reinforcement of better internet strategies and, in many instances, are the sole providers of trusted online safety provision at the national level. Being part of a cross-European cooperation and knowledge exchange structure provides further added value.

As such, Member States should consider the following to strengthen national provision:

- 2.1. *A sustainable and reliable resourcing model for SICs should be established and/or maintained* matching the European level contribution. Essential services of helplines, hotlines and awareness nodes require adequate levels of support to ensure continuity and to build greater visibility for BIK objectives.
- 2.2. *Opportunities to support greater levels of multi-stakeholder participation should be supported and sustained.* The role of SICs in fostering national multi-stakeholder dialogue is important in this regard. In many countries, the Advisory Boards of Safer Internet Centre have played a crucial role in facilitating community-wide dialogue on BIK-related policy discussion and policy development. In some Member States, this is the only platform available for diverse groups to



provide input and share perspectives. Such platforms merit further investment and support to underpin the goal of BIK policy making and implementation as a shared responsibility.

- 2.3. **Further opportunities for cooperation with industry should be developed.** Aside from the direct contributions which industry makes to BIK strategy, partnerships and collaborations involving industry members at the national level are under-represented with the role that industry plays described in many countries as minor. Participation of industry in relevant platforms for stakeholder engagement should be prioritised to ensure effective communication and increase participation. Ways in which this can be realised at the national level should be considered and strengthened.
- 2.4. **Finally, children's participation in the policy-making process should also progress beyond consultation to include meaningful participation in the decision-making process.** Building on the EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child, more attention needs to be given to ensuring the voice of children is heard in the process of developing priorities and programmes of action under BIK. In addition to research at the national level to accurately capture the online experiences of children and young people, it is important that they also have an opportunity to contribute directly as active citizens to the policy dialogue, to have their views represented on matters that affect them, and that opportunities for consultation and participation are supported and developed.

Recommendation 3: Support further opportunities for dialogue between EU Member States on BIK-related policy making

The introduction of the Better Internet for Kids strategy has resulted in the development of a strong European platform for dialogue and for shared services in creating a safer and better internet for children. The development of the BIK platform and the shared expertise, knowledge and delivery of services afforded by Safer Internet Centres have contributed substantial added value to national initiatives in creating safer online environments. Fostering the development of standards for data collection and supporting further research to support policy are further key steps in this regard. The mapping of BIK policies for EU Member States is also an important opportunity to identify opportunities and benefits of BIK implementation while noting gaps and barriers to the implementation of a more cohesive and effective European approach.

In light of the above, the following actions at both the European level and Member States are recommended:

- 3.1. **Further attention to cooperation at the national level regarding tools and regulation for a safe online environment is needed.** Based on the evidence of the BIK Map, while for Pillars 2, 3 and 5, there appears to be clear and effective process of implementation both at EU and Member States level. However, for Pillar 4, dealing with tools and regulation for a safe environment, and to a lesser extent Pillar 1, quality content provision, a coordinated approach is missing. In particular, gaps were revealed in the BIK Map with regard to how Pillar 4 was implemented with a lack of clarity as to how actions initiated at the European level could be further supported or followed through nationally. As such, more attention to a consistent and transparent approach for further developing this objective is needed. Industry plays a crucial role, both in Pillar 1 where the BIK strategy envisages the opening of new market opportunities for positive content, and Pillar 4, in implementing tools for safer online use. As such, the scope of industry contribution needs to be further specified and followed at national and European levels.



- 3.2. **Further develop the range and scope of BIK activities to keep pace with the changing environment for children's digital participation.** The fast pace of change both in terms of technology itself and the environment for children's participation requires an ongoing dialogue on BIK-related issues. Events such as the Safer Internet Forum (SIF) and the establishment of the *Alliance to better protect minors online* are key elements of this effort at the European level. Further initiatives are required to ensure similar opportunities at the national level and that effective dissemination across all Member States occurs. The European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children also needs to be kept under review to ensure that its policies and instruments are still fit for purpose.
- 3.3. **Develop guidelines for Member States in best practice models for policy implementation.** The BIK Map affords an ongoing opportunity to assess progress against the aims of BIK which can offer a timely support to policy at the national level. The sharing of resources and knowledge through the Insafe and INHOPE networks similarly provides a vital opportunity to build greater international cohesion to online safety and better internet policy making. Further development of this objective through a set of guidelines to Member States on best practice models can contribute to more effective policy and implementation.

Annex 1: National contacts

| Country | Lead contact | Organisation |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Austria | Ingrid Paus-Hasebrink | Universität Salzburg |
| Belgium | Leen D'Haenens and Sofie Vandoninck | Institute for Media Studies (KU Leuven) |
| Bulgarian | Georgi Apostolov | Applied Research and Communications Fund, SIC |
| Croatia | Igor Kanizaj | University of Zagreb |
| Cyprus | Yiannis Laouris | Cyprus Neuroscience & Technology Institute |
| Czech Republic | Zdenek Zalis | Narodni Centrum Bezpecnejsiho Internetu (NCBI) |
| Denmark | Katrine K. Pedersen | Det Danske Filminstitut (Danish Film Institute) |
| Estonia | Malle Hallimäe | NPO Estonian Union for Child Welfare |
| Finland | Reijo Kupiainen | University of Tampere, School of Education |
| Germany | Claudia Lambert | Hans-Bredow-Institut for Media Research |
| Greece | Vivi Fragopolou | Safer Internet Centre, Greece |
| Hungary | Bence Ságvári | Information Society and Network Research Center - ITHAKA |
| Ireland | Brian O'Neill | Dublin Institute of Technology |
| Italy | Giovanni Vespoli | Italian Safer Internet Centre |
| Latvia | Maija Katkovska | Latvian Internet Association |
| Lithuania | Vilmante Pakalniskiene | Vilnius University |
| Luxembourg | Andre Meltzer | Université du Luxembourg |
| Malta | Mary Anne Lauri | University of Malta |
| Netherlands | Marjolijn Durinck | ECP Platform voor InformatieSamenleving |
| Norway | Thomas Hepsø | Norwegian Media Authority (NMA) |
| Poland | Anna Ryczyńska | NASK (Research and Academic Computer Network), Polish SIC |
| Portugal | Cristina Ponte | Universidade Nova de Lisboa |
| Romania | Anca Velicu | Institute of Sociology, Romanian Academy |
| Slovakia | Norbert Vrabec | Faculty of Mass Media Communication at the University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius – FMK |
| Spain | Maialen Garmendia Larrañag | Departamento de Sociología, Universidad del País Vasco |
| UK | Will Gardner | Childnet International, UK SIC |

Annex 2: BIK Map Advisory Board

| Name | Institution | Country |
|---------------------|--|---------|
| Sonia Livingstone | LSE | UK |
| Uwe Hasebrink | Hans-Bredow-Institut | DE |
| Stephan Dreyer | Hans-Bredow-Institut | DE |
| Giovanna Mascheroni | EU Kids Online | IT |
| Ellen Helsper | LSE | UK |
| Peter Behrens | Insafe network - Germany | DE |
| Bernhard Jungwirth | Insafe network - Austria | AT |
| Georgi Apostolov | Insafe network - Bulgaria | BG |
| Siobhan McCabe | Department of Justice & Equality Ireland (Ministerial Contact) | IE |
| Monica Bulger | Data & Society | USA |
| Hans Martens | EUN | BE |

Annex 3: References

Althaus, C., Bridgman, P., & Davis, G. (2013). *The Australian policy handbook, 5th edition*. Allen & Unwin.

Dinh, T., Farrugia, L., O'Neill, B., Vandoninck, S., & Velicu, A. (2016). *Insafe Helplines: Operations, effectiveness and emerging issues for internet safety helplines*. Brussels. Retrieved from <https://www.betterinternetforkids.eu/documents/167024/507884/Helpline+Fund+Report+-+Final/4cf8f03a-3a48-4365-af76-f03e01cb505d>

European Commission. (2012). *European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children COM(2012)196*. Brussels. Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0196:FIN:EN:PDF>

European Commission. (2015). *Mapping Safer Internet Policies in the Member States: The Better Internet for Kids (BIK) map : final report*. Brussels. <https://doi.org/10.2759/48712>

Goldsmith, S., & Eggers, W. D. (2004). *Governing by network : the new shape of the public sector*. Brookings Institution Press.

Kilpatrick, D. G. (2000). Definitions of Public Policy and the Law. Retrieved August 27, 2017, from <https://mainweb-v.musc.edu/vawprevention/policy/definition.shtml>

Treib, O., Bähr, H., & Falkner, G. (2007). Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 14(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135017606061071406>

