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Preface - the year 2017

Digital rights - aren’t we just talking about human rights? That’s a question that gets asked a lot. Yes, indeed, there is no such thing as “digital rights”. But there are rights that are uniquely impacted - both positively and negatively - by the opportunities and threats of the digital age. This is why EDRi’s work remained as important in 2017 as it was in 2002, when the network was set up by a small group of prescient national digital rights organisations.

In September 2017, this enduring need to protect rights in the digital environment was neatly demonstrated by the EU Commission’s Communication on “illegal content”. As usual, it used political spin to push restrictive measures - boldly announcing that “what is illegal offline is also illegal online”. What is illegal offline is fought by the rule of law. Restrictions on our free speech or privacy rights that are necessary and proportionate in the fight against illegal activity are clearly circumscribed by our national constitutions and international human rights law. This creates political accountability not just for our rights but also for the effectiveness of the measures being implemented. Offline, it is often difficult to implement measures without being held to account for their effectiveness.

This is not true online. Increasingly, policy is developed using simplistic slogans shouted by politicians - “why can’t Google solve the problem?” If private companies can be persuaded to use their terms of service to restrict our free speech or privacy rights, restrictions that would be illegal offline become legal online. The drive, on both a national and EU level, to privatise law enforcement online was therefore central to our work everywhere that this approach popped up - the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD), the Copyright Directive, in the field of hate speech and terrorism, and so on. It is difficult to come up with one example of where any such measure was analysed for proportionality or effectiveness.

The strange disconnection between what is unacceptable offline somehow being easier to accept online was also tangible in our work on data protection and privacy. Certain companies have created business models out of stalking us online - following us from the online presence of our bank to the doctor to the newsagent... every move we make. They use this data to compare us with millions of other people, to profiles of our personalities to sell to advertisers, to manipulate our emotions and our weaknesses, to sell us products at higher prices if they think that we will pay. Anyone seeking to defend such outlandish activity in the offline world would seem insane. Online, however, the vast profits generated by this stalking lead to huge lobbying capabilities - and to the huge delays in the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) being adopted and the ongoing battle to have the ePrivacy Regulation.

Digital rights are human rights. Digital rights are not new rights. But defending existing rights in the digital world presents new and growing challenges for democracy, for freedom of expression, for privacy and data protection.

Digital rights - aren’t we just talking about human rights? Yes.

Joe McNamee, Executive Director
Our **PRIORITIES** in 2017 were privacy, copyright, surveillance and privatised law enforcement.

Key Achievements 2017

1 | The vote in the EU Parliament’s Civil Liberties Committee (LIBE) rejecting **upload filters** in the Copyright Directive

2 | The plenary vote in the EU Parliament supporting **ePrivacy**

3 | The Council of Europe welcoming our recommendations on the issue of law-enforcement access to data cross-borders
In 2017, we could observe yet another drive from Europe’s governments for platforms to impose arbitrary restrictions with the goal to achieve various political or public policy goals, such as child protection, the fight against copyright infringements, hate speech, terrorism or fake news.

The transfer of state responsibility to big tech companies like Facebook, Google, Twitter or Microsoft continues to undermine democratic values and principles enshrined in human rights law.
Privatised law enforcement and the rule of law

EUROPE

In the past year, the Council of Europe worked on a draft Recommendation [pdf] on the role of internet service providers and platforms. EDRi helped shape the Recommendation by submitting written comments to the Council of Europe, by replying to the Steering Committee on Media and Information Society (CDMSI)’s consultation and by participating in expert meetings in Strasbourg, and the final meeting on 17-18 September in Strasbourg. This draft recommendation represents a step in the right direction.

Moreover, we defended the rule of law in several other fields:

- Tackling “illegal content”: EDRi presented at two EU Commission workshops before the summer break, and at an event in the European Parliament on 6 September. We commented on the leaked draft of the EU Commission and met with the EU Justice Commissioner’s deputy head of cabinet. We also met with the EU’s Digital Economy and Society Commissioner Mariya Gabriel to discuss the final Communication and followed up with a letter.

- Terrorism: We participated in a transposition workshop on the Terrorism Directive to discuss with Member States how they can best transpose EU legislation in line with digital rights – the first time in EDRi’s history.

- Child protection: The final non-legislative report of the EU Parliament on the “implementation of Directive 2011/93/EU on combating the sexual abuse” included many amendments that we recommended - namely a clear message to the EU Commission highlighting the lack of statistics provided to assess the situation.

- Audio-visual media services (AVMS) Directive review: Several amendments that we proposed were adopted in the final EU Parliament’s CULT report and LIBE’s opinion – notably Article
28(al) on “harmful” or illegal content restrictions. Finally, we delivered recommendations for AVMSD trilogue negotiations to key policy-makers.

- Many of our suggestions were included in the draft non-legislative Parliament report “Media freedom and pluralism in the European Union” - notably on intermediary liability, free speech online and whistleblower protection.
- We engaged with the United Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Opinion, participating in his consultation on content regulation in the digital age.
- We authored a chapter in the book “Platform regulations: how platforms are regulated and how they regulate us”.
- Finally, following the African Union – European Union (AU-EU) Civil Society Seminar on Counter-terrorism and Human Rights, EDRi’s expert input was fully integrated in the AU-EU Civil Society recommendations on counter-terrorism and human rights [pdf].

EDRI’S MEMBERS

Austria

epicenter.works advised Greenpeace Austria on its first digital rights campaign, did advocacy on the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, and raised awareness about the danger of privatised law enforcement. Furthermore, the organisation succeeded in preventing the adoption of an internet censorship bill.

Germany

Chaos Computer Club (CCC) participated in an expert hearing in the German Parliament on the Network Enforcement Law („Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz“, NetzDG) and expressed its support of the declaration on freedom of expression.
The Forum InformatikerInnen für Frieden und gesellschaftliche Verantwortung e. V. [FIIF] issued a statement on “NetzDG”.

The Gesellschaft für Freiheitsrechte (gFF) challenged a new Criminal Code provision on handling “stolen” data [s. 202d of the Criminal Code]. It criminalises the handling of leaked data without providing for an adequate protection of the press and thereby threatens an important part of the work of investigative journalists as well as their informants and supporting experts.

Wikimedia Germany worked to ensure that correct notice-and-action procedures are seen as a viable political alternative to weakening intermediary liability, sharing data from its own experience. Moreover, it raised awareness among policy-makers for the issue that including all video sharing sites in the scope of AVMSD would also cover Wikimedia Commons – to impose the obligation of 30% of European content on a media repository seems absurd. Finally, as a counter-narrative to “fake news” Wikimedia put out the slogan “facts matter”.

**Netherlands**

Bits of Freedom filed a number of access to documents requests to enforce transparency of the Dutch Internet Referral Unit, which monitors unlawful content and requests internet service providers to removal identified content.

**Poland**

In Poland, the year 2017 brought a new wave of legislative measures, imposing the blocking of internet websites as a ‘solution’ to complex social problems, such as terrorism, fraud or tax evasion. As a result of Panoptikon’s advocacy, some of those proposals were improved (e.g. by introducing judicial oversight) or abandoned. Panoptikon successfully convinced Polish decision makers to consider community-driven flagging mechanisms rather than hard law. This approach was reflected in draft law on intermediary liability, prepared by the Ministry of Digital Affairs in 2017.

**Serbia**

SHARE Foundation organised the Media Carnival in Kotor, Montenegro, from 14 to 18 July, with the support of OSCE and Embassy of the Kingdom of The Netherlands in Belgrade [conference video and report]. Moreover, SHARE Foundation published a series of short educational videos, one of the topics was fake news.

**Spain**

Xnet (Instituto para la Cultura Democrática en la Era Digital) published many articles and campaigned to defend freedom of speech and freedom of information that were under attack in Spain.

**Turkey**

A few of Alternatif Bilisim’s academic members presented papers in and outside Turkey on fake news and the EU’s terrorism directive.
UK

In 2017, Open Rights Group continued to fight for more transparency regarding web blocking: The “Blocked” project aims to provide information about filters that are put in place by mobile phone companies and Internet Service Providers (ISPs).

International

In March, Access Now held its annual digital rights conference RightsCon in Brussels. Privatised law enforcement and content monitoring was a key topic and RightsCon provided an opportunity for civil society to have in depth discussions with the Council of Europe, members of the EU institutions, national representatives and companies. Access Now also kicked off their work on Artificial Intelligence in the context of data protection and freedom of expression.

Article19 responded to the AVMS consultation and to various EU consultations on notice and action, criticised the EU Code of Conduct on Hate Speech, including at various advocacy meetings (OSCE, GNI), and severely criticised the EU Commission Communication on Illegal Content.

OUR MOST POPULAR PUBLICATIONS

- EDRi’s AVMSD document pool
- EDRi position paper on AVMSD [13.07.2016]
- EDRi’s second position paper on AVMSD [09.02.2017]
- EDRi position on AVMSD trilogue negotiations [14.09.2017]
- Article: Audiovisual Media Services Directive – is it good enough to be a law?
- Article: Should video-sharing platforms be part of the AVMSD?
- Article: AVMS Directive: It isn’t censorship if the content is mostly legal, right?
- ENDitorial: Fake news about fake news being news
More and more devices have the ability to connect to the internet and communicate between themselves. These devices, while making many parts of our everyday life easier, also create major privacy and security risks.

Undoubtedly, the biggest risk come from the collection and processing of personal data by companies, and the combination of “big data” to new data sets in order to establish profiles about us. The use and re-use of our data has become increasingly important from an economic perspective. It has lead to pressure to weaken this fundamental right and also to make legal protections less predictable.
Data protection and privacy

EUROPE

European legislation protecting your personal data (the General Data Protection Regulation, or GDPR in short) has been recently updated, but the battle to keep private information safe is not over yet. In the past year, we concentrated on the national implementation of this legislation. We also worked intensively on the update of rules governing the privacy and confidentiality of electronic communications, the ePrivacy reform.

On 10 January, the European Commission published its proposal for the ePrivacy Regulation. This legislation is crucial to provide clear rules on tracking individuals as they surf the web, and freedom of communication more generally.

To advocate for significant improvements of the draft proposal, we met with Member State representations in Brussels (Permanent Representations), Members of the EU Parliament (such as Claudia Rubach from the EPP, Marju Lauristin from S&D and Jan-Philipp Albrecht from the Greens), as well as with private companies and many other organisations (such as the European Public Health Alliance, Google, Mozilla, ISPA.at, BEUC, Corporate Europe Observatory).

Amongst others, we spoke at the Computers, Privacy and Data Protection conference (CPDP), the European Law Students Association conference, at a seminar at Concord Europe, at an ELSA event and at the event “Achieving a sovereign and trustworthy ICT industry in Europe” organised by European Parliament Research Service.

We also responded to a meeting request by EU Commissioner Vera Jourová and Vice-President Andrus Ansip to discuss the ePrivacy reform, the GDPR, and Privacy Shield.

Our advocacy activities were supported by our Open Web Fellow’s two major projects explaining the dangers that derive from the collection and processing of our metadata: Hakuna Metadata and ALTwitter – profiling with metadata.

Our efforts on the ePrivacy reform contributed to a positive result as many of our demands were reflected in the EU Parliament’s LIBE report – and the subsequent adoption of the final text by the EU Parliament on 19 October.

Finally, we promoted and defended the importance of encryption. In March, we participated in a private meeting with other NGOs to discuss the United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur’s upcoming report, which was to include the issue of encryption. Three months later, we welcomed
its release. In September, we issued a policy paper on encryption workarounds to help policy-makers deal with technology challenges.

**EDRI’S MEMBERS**

- **Austria**
  epicenter.works organised workshops to raise awareness on encryption and held privacy trainings for vulnerable stakeholders.

- **Belgium**
  EDRi’s observer member NURPA organised a screening of the documentary “Nothing to Hide” followed by a vivid discussion with the 50+ participants. NURPA also organised a series of Privacy Cafés to raise awareness on how to secure communications better.

- **Finland**
  Electronic Frontier Finland (Effi) submitted an opinion to the Ministry of Justice’s GDPR national implementation group.

- **Germany**
  CCC continued its project “Chaos macht Schule” (“Chaos goes to School”) and issued demands to increase media literacy in Germany.
Digitalcourage celebrated its 30th anniversary, and organised the 18th annual German Big Brother Awards.

FIIF held its annual Conference on TRUST, organised multiple cryptoparties, and published papers on privacy issues in its quarterly magazine "FIIF-Kommunikation”.

Several Wikimedia chapters in Europe co-drafted a GDPR implementation “to-do” to help smaller chapters. Moreover, Wikimedia updated its donor policy which now enumerates the purposes for which donor information may be used and strictly limited the circumstances under which it may share donor information (such as with online payment processors).

**Denmark**

IT-pol was frequently quoted in Danish media on privacy and data protection issues and contributed heavily to EDRI’s work on the ePrivacy dossier. Also, it issued 13 consultation responses to the Danish government on data protection issues.

**Italy**

Hermes Center for Transparency and Digital Human Rights organised a conference on ePrivacy reform, hate speech and fake news and ran a campaign against online tracking. Finally, Hermes Center gave a security training for journalists at DIG Festival.

**Luxembourg**

Frënn vun der Ënn worked with a collective of artists to combine Tor, Privacy and anti-censorship tools into one big artwork. This not yet finalised project will be shown in a well known museum in Luxembourg City. The organisation also expanded and propagated its bridge programme to allow people to adopt a Tor bridge.

---

**24 April**

EDRi and AccessNow presented at an exchange of views the European Parliament in the field of the fight against Cybercrime

**25 April**

European Parliament Culture Committee takes strong position against upload filtering

**5 April**

We participated in and provided input to the FabLab organised by Article 29 Working Party for the GDPR implementation
Netherlands

Together with Polish EDRi-member Panoptykon, Bits of Freedom ran a small campaign about online tracking by showing people specific ads that make use of tracking.

Bits of Freedom started the project “My Data Done Right” to create a successor to its current access request tool. The organisation also organised another successful edition of the Dutch Big Brother Awards, that the Interior Minister attended to pick up the award.

Poland

Panoptykon raised awareness to expose threats related to the use of big data and algorithms to influence human behaviour. Taking Facebook as example, the organisation created an interactive installation (presented during Media Art Biennale in Wrocław: Facebook Algorithmic Factory) and a video [Monologue of the Algorithm], which explained how profiling based on big data can violate our intimacy.

As regards the implementation of the GDPR, Panoptykon focused on defending EU standards in Poland. The organisation also launched a public debate on ePrivacy Regulation convincing government to open a formal dialogue, including both industry and civil society.

Romania

AptiRo organised Privacy Café, a series of informal meetings open to everybody about how to better protect their online privacy. The organisation also launched ApTI Privacy Tricks, an educational video series about how to use online tools or how to change the settings in various online services.

Serbia

In January 2017, SHARE Foundation received a Certificate of Gratitude from the Commissioner for Information of Public Importance and Personal Data Protection, for its outstanding contribution in affirming the right to personal data protection in Serbia. After almost five years, the working group of the Ministry of Justice of Serbia published the Draft Law on Personal Data Protection in December 2017 and announced a public discussion. 14 civil society organisations led by SHARE Foundation submitted a joint comment and called upon the Ministry to improve the Draft Law and publish a revised version. Finally, towards the end of 2017, SHARE Foundation published a series of short educational videos.

Spain

During the Catalan crisis, Xnet prepared a technical guide with tips and tools addressed to activists, journalists and citizens whose fundamental freedoms and rights on the Internet are being restricted by state powers or authoritarian governments. This guide aimed at protecting the inviolability of communications, the right to privacy and freedom of political opinion, expression and access to information.
Sweden

In 2017, DFRI (Föreningen för digitala fri- och rättigheter) continued running a number of large exit-relays in the Tor network with increased capacity. DFRI also submitted written comments on a number of proposed national laws that affect privacy (such as on data retention). Lastly, DFRI organised a Cryptoparty to pass on knowledge about how to protect oneself in the digital space.

Turkey

Alternative Informatics - Alternatif Bilisim offered privacy trainings to NGOs with urgent needs such as Human Rights Common Platform and Civil Monitor Network. Alternatif Bilisim also organised a national “New Media Congress” in Ankara during State of Emergency in Turkey.

UK

Open Rights Group worked on the proposed Data Protection Bill released by the UK government in September 2017, designed to implement the requirements of the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The organisation publicly critised that the proposal neglected an important option in the GDPR which gives consumer privacy groups the ability to lodge independent data protection complaints.

International

Data protection has remained a priority as Access Now worked to develop their global data protection booklet for lawmakers. The key effort in Brussels was focused on the ePrivacy reform where the organisation provided extensive feedback to legislators, suggested amendments and attended meetings. In autumn, Access Now participated in the International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners held in Hong Kong - and received a grant to support the attendance of other NGOs as well to facilitate civil society participation and representation. Consequently, Access Now applied to be on the advisory committee for the 2018 edition of the event in Brussels.

Privacy International celebrated that, for the first time, the UN recognised that data profiling of people may lead to discrimination or decisions that otherwise have the potential to affect the enjoyment of human rights, including economic, social, and cultural rights. By recognising the consequences of such profiling, the UN has helped advance the debate about limiting data collection and profiling.

Article19 responded to the House of Lords call for evidence on Artificial Intelligence. Moreover, the organisation became part of the “AI partnership”.
OUR MOST POPULAR PUBLICATIONS

- EDRi’s e-Privacy revision: Document pool
- Quick guide on the proposal of an ePrivacy Regulation [09.03.2017]
- EDRi’s position on the proposal of an ePrivacy Regulation [09.03.2017]
- EDRi’s initial proposal for amendments [21.06.2017]
- ePrivacy one-pager: Mythbusting (pdf) [25.10.2017]
- ePrivacy one-pager: Consent (pdf)
- ePrivacy one-pager: Legitimate interest (pdf)
- ePrivacy one-pager: Offline tracking (pdf)
- ePrivacy one-pager: Privacy by default and by design (pdf)
- Running an algorithmic empire: The human fabric of Facebook
According to a 2017 report by the Fundamental Rights Agency, “the mere existence of legislation allowing for surveillance constitutes an interference with the right to private life”.

EDRi has been fighting against corporate and government surveillance since its inception. In the past year, this included pushing back against EU proposals that would enable government agencies to access personal data without appropriate safeguards. In addition, many of EDRi’s member organisations campaigned against proposals in European countries that aimed at broadening state surveillance practices.
Surveillance

**EUROPE**

We started the year with a letter to EU Commissioner Vera Jourová to request the suspension of Privacy Shield, unless US Congress reforms the country’s surveillance laws.

How governments get access to data across Europe’s borders then became a top priority topic for EDRi in 2017.

A big focus of our work was the Council of Europe’s new rules on cross-border access to electronic evidence (“e-evidence”). EDRi led a global coalition of civil rights groups to issue recommendations to ensure that harmonisation in this crucial policy area is in line with the highest human rights standards. The Council of Europe welcomed the global submission and EDRi’s coordinating role (photo).

The issue of access to data also played a big role under the proposed ePrivacy Regulation as it is the subject of heated debates about encryption, data retention and surveillance. Finally, we have been engaging with the European Commission as it prepared a proposal to give law enforcement easier access to data held by tech and telecom companies, and by governments in other European countries.

**EDRI’S MEMBERS**

**Austria**

epicenter.works campaigned against a legislative package introducing mass surveillance (including a ban on face covering), successfully prevented the introduction of data retention and the legalisation of government spyware in Austria.

**Czech Republic**

Iuridicum Remedium (iuRe) focused its work on the DNA database regulation and health registers, and introduced a constitutional complaint on data retention regulation. Finally, the organisation worked on a legislative proposal to strengthen military intelligence service for broad Internet monitoring capabilities.

**Denmark**

IT-Pol was frequently quoted in Danish media on surveillance issues, notably regarding data retention and intelligence services.
Finland

Effi made statements to various parliamentary committees and was on national news and television on the topic.

Germany

CCC fought law enforcement attempts to weaken encryption and continued its campaign against state surveillance via trojans and hacking. The organisation also issued a statement on electronic ID cards for the home affairs committee in Germany. Finally, the organisation published a statement on the hearing of the challenge by several rights groups of UK Government Surveillance in front of the European Court of Human Rights.

Digitalcourage went to court against video surveillance with facial recognition employed at Berlin Südkreuz railway station, and by retailers Real and Post. Moreover, it continued to put pressure on the German government regarding the unlawfulness of the new data retention law. The constitutional complaint is currently pending, the application of the new law was stopped by the courts.

FifF focused on the issues of video and online surveillance and ran a campaign against video surveillance at the Berlin "Südkreuz" railway station. FifF co-organised a "celebrate freedom" demonstration and issued several statements on online surveillance and cyber attacks by state authorities.

GFF brought a challenge against unlimited powers of the Bavarian domestic intelligence service. GFF went to the Federal Constitutional Court against a variety of provisions of the new Bavarian constitution protection law (BayVSG), for example access to data retained under data retention.

Reporter ohne Grenzen celebrated a court decision against the German foreign intelligence agency ruling that the storage of our communication data is unlawful.

---

**3-4 MAY**
Participated in the meeting of the EU Observatory of Copyright Infringements, Alicante

**2-6 MAY**
We spoke at re:publica, Europe’s biggest conference on digital communications

**10 MAY**
EDRi provided oral input to one of the European Commission’s expert roundtables on access to electronic evidence and encryption

**20 MAY**
We spoke at the TEDx Liège on privacy (for kids)

**25 MAY**
We participated in a civil society dialogue with EU Trade Commissioner Malmström
Italy

Hermes Center monitored and mapped governmental surveillance capabilities and presented the results at the 34c3 conference. It ran a campaign against six years of Data Retention Law and requested documents on Europol’s actions on CGNAT surveillance. Moreover, Hermes Center filed a complaint with the national DPA to request an inspection of the data retention practices by telecoms operators.

Luxembourg

Frënn vun der Ënn fought against law enforcement attempts to weaken encryption.

Netherlands

A Bits of Freedom campaign in which citizens were sent fake government letters asking to install surveillance software in their homes made the headlines in November. Bits of Freedom also launched a site helping people to make an informed decision at the upcoming referendum on the intelligence bill. Finally, the organisation expanded its activities on Liberation Day, making internet freedom part of the national celebration.

Poland

Panoptykon was most successful in slowing down and improving new regulations in the area of fiscal surveillance. Initially, the government wanted to create a giant database of bank accounts and a central database of all bills and invoices. Panoptykon’s interventions resulted in a significant limitation of those proposals (e.g. details of bank transactions involving individuals will not be collected).

While joint efforts to stop the PNR Directive failed, Panoptykon monitored its implementation in Poland. Based on the legal arguments regarding the directive’s compliance with the EU Chart of Fundamental Rights (see the CJEU opinion on the PNR agreement between Canada and the

---

**JUNE 2018**

12 JUNE
EDRi spoke at a EU Commission workshop on Notice and Action

26 JUNE
We were invited by the Commission (DG Home) to speak at a Workshop on Transposition of the Directive on Combating terrorism with Member States Ministries representatives

22-23 JUNE
EDRi spoke at the EUPO’s high-level summit on intellectual property, featuring several ministers and EU commissioners in Berlin

7 JUNE
EDRi was invited by the Steering Group of the EU-AU Civil Society Seminar on counter-terrorism
EU), Panoptikon strived to convince decision makers to implement the Directive with maximum guarantees for the passengers’ privacy.

**Romania**

AptiRo contributed to the public debate and sent inquiries about the **new biometric national ID project**.

**Serbia**

SHARE Foundation published research on the practices of state bodies’ (Police, Security Information Agency and Military Security Agency) access to retained communications metadata stored by mobile network and internet operators in Serbia. SHARE continued its practice of obtaining annual reports by submitting FOI requests to publish a research article covering a three-year period (2014-2016) highlighting that direct access of law enforcement and security agencies to communications metadata retained by the operators is still in place, even though this is illegal.

**Spain**

Xnet raised awareness regarding big data and privacy issues of the new platform Aura presented by Telefónica. Xnet raised these concerns with the legal office of the Spanish Data Protection Agency.

**Sweden**

In Sweden, the government was unwilling to suspend general data retention. The Court of Justice of the European Union struck down on the Swedish data retention in the Tele2-ruling. A governmental committee has suggested that the CJEU have misunderstood the Swedish laws and that only some small adjustments are needed to comply with the ruling. DFRi has protested against this.

**Turkey**

Alternative Informatics - Alternatif Bilisim issued a number of press announcements against surveillance measures in Turkey.

**UK**

In May of last year, Open Rights Groups published a document, revealing that the UK government was planning “live” surveillance internet communications and to force companies to break encryption.

**International**

Access Now continued fighting against overbroad border surveillance measures, including PNR proposals at the EU and member states level. It was actively involved in and provided feedback.
to the Commission’s IT Forum round-tables which were focused on government hacking, encryption and cross border access to data. Access Now participated at the Global Conference on Cyber Security held in Delhi, India. For this occasion, they created the **Policymaker’s guide to the GCCS**.

Privacy International published 10 essential safeguards on government hacking for surveillance and welcomed that the UN recognised government hacking as a form of surveillance, as this helped strengthening civil society’s arguments against the use of such invasive government practices. The organisation also reported on the failure of European member states to implement the Tele2/Watson judgment (pdf).

**OUR MOST POPULAR PUBLICATIONS**

- Cross-border access to data: EDRi delivers international NGO position to Council of Europe
- Europe’s governments win the Big Brother Awards 2017 for opening the pandora’s box of surveillance
- Article: PNR: EU Court rules that draft EU/Canada air passenger data deal is unacceptable
- Article: Italy plans to extend telecoms data retention and increase censorship powers
- Article: Illegal surveillance against civil society continues in Macedonia
- Article: Dutch House of Representatives passes dragnet surveillance bill
- Article: Norway introduces forced biometric authentication
- Article: Oversight Board report: Illegal surveillance of Danish citizens
- Article: Secret documents reveal: BND attacked Tor and advises not to use it
- Article: Success Story: A win on Austrian surveillance legislation
The European copyright reform is a chance to empower people to access culture while ensuring authors’ revenues. It is an opportunity to boost the creation of new business models and support authors, creators and journalists, as well as smaller online service providers.

In addition, the reform could represent a unique opportunity to safeguard freedom of expression and privacy by prohibiting the use of filtering technologies.
Copyright reform

EUROPE

The European Commission’s agenda defined reforming copyright as one of the foundations to build the Digital Single Market. EDRi welcomed this goal since the current European copyright system is seriously outdated and broken.

Unfortunately, the Commission’s draft proposal published in 2016 could not have been worse - it even included a proposal to introduce upload filtering, despite the fact that the Court of Justice of the European Union has already rejected this approach. In 2017, the European Parliament and Council discussed the proposal.

In the beginning of the year, we ran a small campaign (Act now to stop Europe from adopting the world’s worst filtering law) which, combined with our direct work in the Parliament, led to a positive outcome in the Committee on Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO): On 24 February 2017, the EU Parliament Rapporteur Catherine Stihler published her draft Opinion on the Copyright Directive.

The IMCO Opinion sent a strong message against the most extremist parts of the European Commission’s proposal: the “CENSORSHIP MACHINE” (AKA UPLOAD FILTER) proposal of the Commission in Article 13 and the suggestion to expand the “ancillary copyright” (aka “link tax”), that failed so miserably in Germany and Spain to every country of the EU.

Throughout the year, we met with numerous Permanent Representations (Portugal, Czech Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria etc.), Members of the European Parliament and their assistants (for instance, with MEPs Kammerervert [S&D], Dietmar Köster [S&D], Michal Boni [EPP]).

In January, EDRi co-organised an event in the European Parliament to raise awareness for the potentials of a progressive reform, together with Communia.

In May, we participated in a public debate at re:publica in Berlin regarding upload filters and went to a meeting of the EU Observatory of Copyright Infringements (EUIPO) in Alicante. In June, we spoke at the EUIPO high-level summit on intellectual property, featuring several ministers and EU Commissioners. In September, we returned to Berlin to present on the Copyright Directive proposal at the “Das ist Netzpolitik” conference and went to Poland to give a workshop and a talk at Copycamp.

Last but not least, EDRi, Communia and Wikimedia co-organised a series of workshops across Europe: The School of Rock[ing] Copyright. The goal was to raise awareness, and to engage local...
activists, researchers and associations interested in copyright to create new spaces of action at the national and EU level. In 2017, the events took place in Slovenia, Hungary and Portugal, and were organised in collaboration with local partners: the Intellectual Property Institute in Slovenia, in Hungary, Center for Independent Journalism, and Direitos Digitais in Portugal.

**EDRI'S MEMBERS**

**Austria**
epicenter.works organised a demonstration against upload filters, raised public awareness about the dangers of ancillary copyright and upload filters and met with government officials and other stakeholders.

**Czech Republic**
Iuridicum Remedium (IuRe) promoted the use of Creative Commons licenses as a basic license for educational projects funded under the governmental Operational Program.

**Finland**
Effi participated in the "copyright letter group” of the Finish Ministry of Education and Culture and gave a dissenting opinion in conclusion. Effi also issued statements and opinions on the matter.

**Germany**
Wikimedia convinced the automobile industry and the game industry to support copyright exceptions. Wikimedia also distributed branded coffee filters in Berlin and Brussels to protest against upload filters. The EUIPO Observatory published a study on public domain uses in film making. The study (pdf) was requested by EDRi and Wikimedia.

**Romania**
In Romania, APTiRo built an awareness-raising campaign about the EU Commission’s copyright reform proposal and produced **11 videos**. APTiRo also created a series of postcards that were...
sent to EU Parliamentarians in Brussels highlighting the wrong approaches of the copyright directive proposal, notably on Articles 11 and 13. Finally, AptiRo organised four debates about the copyright proposal and invited users, creators, journalists, bloggers, NGOs, digital businesses and entrepreneurs, content aggregators.

**Netherlands**

Bits of Freedom launched the site Save the Meme to create awareness about the internet filter proposed in the Copyright Directive and to connect citizens with EU Parliamentarians.

**Poland**

The Modern Poland Foundation organised the 6th CopyCamp conference, under the title „the Internet of Copyrighted Things”. It gathered 60 guests from 21 countries who shared their expertise during presentations and workshops. We listened to stories touching on real-life issues in culture, science, education, medicine and agriculture. And it was a great success - in a post-conference survey, a vast majority of participants evaluated the conference positively with an average grade of 5.15 out of 6.

**Serbia**

A new version of the Strategy on Intellectual Property from 2017 to 2021 was published on the website of the Republic Secretariat for Public Policies of Serbia. The previous version published in 2016 contained some highly controversial measures, removal of “disputed” websites, without regard as to types or purpose of the content in dispute, seizures and takedowns of domain names of websites facilitating copyright infringement, collecting data on transactions from online payment service providers and online advertising providers, seizing of property, and similar provisions. SHARE insisted on a public discussion about any new draft document that might be published.

SHARE Foundation published a series of short educational videos, one of them on the topic of copyright. Finally, SHARE Foundation created an online tool for copyright exceptions.

**Spain**

Xnet remained in constant contact with Spanish deputies and institutions to change the narrative around the IP. The organisation also created several tools to support the European campaign, such as videos.

---

**August 4-8**

Many EDRi network members went to SHA 2017, a non profit outdoor hacker camp in Zeewolde

**August 22**

Hermes Center (Italy) became an observer
Turkey

Alternatif Bilisim made public announcements and ran social media campaigns to raise awareness on copyright reforms and web blocking. The most notable one was the blocking of Wikipedia. The organisation worked with other digital rights advocacy groups, but did not succeed in removing the ban.

International

Article19 supported various efforts, and issued letters criticising upload filters in the Copyright Directive proposal. Furthermore, Article19 was involved in website blocking cases against Russia on the basis of extremism rather than copyright.

OUR MOST POPULAR PUBLICATIONS

- EDRi’s Copyright reform: Document pool
- Paper: Deconstructing the Article 13 of the Copyright proposal of the European Commission
- Censorship Machine: Busting the myths
- Article: Leaked document: EU Presidency calls for massive internet filtering
- Article: Copyright Directive may lead newspapers to become their own censors
- Article: Leak: Three EU countries join forces for restrictions & copyright chaos
- Article: Six states raise concerns about legality of Copyright Directive
- Campaign: Time to stop the #CensorshipMachine: NOW!
- Article: The Civil Liberties Committee rejects #censorshipmachine
In 2015, the most important piece of legislation to safeguard internet freedoms in Europe, the “Net Neutrality Regulation”, was adopted. In 2016, the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) adopted guidelines clarifying what the EU legislators had decided. However, this was not the end of the EDRi’s fight for net neutrality in Europe. The National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) in the Member States now need to enforce the Regulation to ensure that everyone enjoys the full benefits of net neutrality.
Network Neutrality & Telecommunications

EUROPE

In March 2017, BEREC’s Net Neutrality Working Group invited stakeholders to present their views on measurement methodology and net neutrality supervision tools. EDRi was invited to the stakeholder meeting with end-users and Content and Application Providers (CAPs) on 14 March 2017, represented by its members epicenter.works (Austria) and IT-Pol (Denmark).

On 7 June 2017, BEREC presented a draft document on the “Net Neutrality Regulatory Assessment Methodology” for public consultation. Unfortunately, BEREC missed the opportunity to lead the way. EDRi member epicenter.works submitted a consultation response, supported by EDRi members IT-Pol and Access Now, as well as our observer Xnet.

EDRi kept supporting the efforts of the NetCompetition alliance via our participation in the Steering Committee. We took part in Netcompetition’s apéro, where BEREC’s Chair Sébastien Soriano spoke, and met with Member of the EU Parliament José Blanco (S&D) on the European Electronic Communications Code, together with NetCompetition allies.

We also spoke at BEREC’s public debriefing from 33rd BEREC plenary meetings (YouTube).

Finally, EDRi and over 200 organisations and businesses supported net neutrality in the US by sending a joint letter to the FCC “The World is For Net Neutrality”.

6 SEPTEMBER
We presented at an event in the European Parliament on the tackling of “illegal content” online

1 SEPTEMBER
We spoke at Das ist Netzpolitik conference in Berlin on the Copyright Directive and on how to get involved in EU policy-making

18 SEPTEMBER
We participated in expert meetings in Strasbourg, and spoke at the final meeting on 17-18 September in Strasbourg and submitted a global civil society paper commenting on the terms of reference for drafting a new Protocol to the Cybercrime Convention (pdf)

26 SEPTEMBER
European Digital Rights (EDRi) and over 200 other civil society organisations and businesses joined forces to send a letter to the head of the US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) with a clear message: the world is for net neutrality
EDRI’S MEMBERS

Austria
epicenter.works gave a speech at the general assembly of Deutsche Telekom to highlight the dangers of net neutrality violations, it participated in several BEREC consultations and stakeholder meetings and submitted complaints against net neutrality violations to NRAs.

Belgium
In Belgium, NURPA monitored net neutrality violations and analysed the national NRA’s analysis of Proximus’ zero rating practices.

Denmark

Finland
Effi commented on net neutrality in December on national television.

Germany
The CCC exposed net neutrality breaches by German provider Deutsche Telekom.

Italy
In Italy, Hermes Center fought for a device neutrality law.

Luxembourg
Frënn vun der Ënn published a joint press release with the Chaos Computer Club Letzebuerg and Freifunk Letzebuerg about net neutrality implementation in Luxembourg [pdf].

3 OCTOBER
The Fédération FDn (France) became an observer member of EDRi.

6-7 OCTOBER
We organised the School of Rock(ing) Copyright (SOARC) event in Budapest.

9 OCTOBER
EDRi met with Commissioner Gabriel to discuss illegal content.

11 OCTOBER
We participated in a meeting in the Polish Permanent Representation in Brussels on the topic of ePrivacy.

20 OCTOBER
EDRi sent a letter to Commissioner Gabriel on illegal content.

20-21 OCTOBER
We organised the SOARC event in Portugal.

EDRi's Members

1. Austria
2. Belgium
3. Denmark
4. Finland
5. Germany
6. Italy
7. Luxembourg
**Netherlands**

Bits of Freedom forced the Dutch regulatory authority to act on a zero-rating offer of T-Mobile. The authority ruled in favor of T-Mobile, after which Bits of Freedom appealed.

**Serbia**

In Serbia, SHARE Foundation published a series of short educational videos, one of them being on the topic of net neutrality.

**Spain**

Xnet met with the Spanish regulator (CNMC). The organisation raised awareness, monitored and filed complaints regarding the application of net neutrality rules in Spain.

**International**

While the EU monitored implementation, Access Now continued fighting for net neutrality around the globe by inputting to the Indian TRAI consultation and by actively fighting against the repeal of net neutrality protections in the US — joined by several EDRi members.

Furthermore, some European Wikimedia chapters and groups issued explicitly favourable positions on net neutrality. This marked a break from the previous public positioning lead by the Wikimedia Foundation.

**OUR MOST POPULAR PUBLICATIONS**

- Article: Dutch NRA: T-Mobile may continue to violate net neutrality
- Article: Letter to the FCC: The world is for net neutrality
- Article: Net Neutrality: BEREC misses opportunity to lead the way
- Article: Dutch ban on zero-rating struck down – major blow to net neutrality
- Article: Are net neutrality and privacy Europe’s brilliant way of trumping destructionism?
Trade fora and agreements continue to be very important battle grounds for the defence of digital rights. Examples of such agreements are the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) or the EU-Japan Trade deal. They include provisions that would impact human rights online, such as the right to privacy and data protection, the right to freedom of expression and access to knowledge.
Trade

**EUROPE**

The most important development in the area of trade were the discussions at EU level whether or not to include “data flows” in trade agreements. The EU Commission drafted a concept paper on this issue that risked undermining the rights to privacy and data protection. EDRi provided comments to key policy-makers in the European Parliament, in collaboration with BEUC. We also met with DG Justice, DG Trade, staff from the EDPS, nine Permanent Representations and the Council presidency July-December (Estonia) to raise our concerns.

Our efforts led to positive provisions in a non-legislative report of the EU Parliament “**TOWARDS A DIGITAL TRADE STRATEGY**” [2017/2065(INI)] as many of our demands that we advocated for were included [pdf].

In February, EDRi sent a joint letter to all Members of the European Parliament before the plenary vote of the EU Parliament to request the rejection of CETA. We harshly criticised the fact that the Parliamentarians voted in favour of the agreement. In the same month, we became a founding member of the UN Dynamic Coalition on Digital Trade.

In March, EDRi joined a coalition of NGOs (mostly EDRi members) demanding action on export controls. In June, we cooperated with nine other NGOs to push for an alternative trade agenda on digital rights and co-organised an event, “The Civil Society Trade Lab”.

As regards the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA), we responded to two public consultations, on the impact assessment [pdf] and on the Multilateral Investment Court proposals by the Commission [pdf].

For the second time in row, EDRi spoke at the World Trade Organisation (WTO) to ensure privacy and personal data protection are not perceived as EU-only rights. Last but not least, we spoke at the EU Parliament’s EPP Hearing on Digital Trade.

**EDRI’S MEMBERS**

**Germany**

CCC provided technical and organisational support for the Free Media Center for journalists during G20 in Hamburg.
Italy

Hermes Center ran a campaign on export controls.

International

In 2017, Access Now worked on its internal trade strategy for its global team. At the EU level, the focus was on export controls in the European Parliament, where it continued to lead and coordinate an informal coalition of civil society groups in fighting for stronger rules for EU dual-use exports, rules which uphold human rights around the globe and ensure transparency for digital rights defenders.

OUR MOST POPULAR PUBLICATIONS

- Article: Despite large opposition, CETA limps forward in the European Parliament
- Article: Citizens’ rights undermined by flawed CETA deal
Transparency should be a core principle for a functioning democracy that ensures respect of fundamental rights. According to the European Union founding treaties, the EU institutions “shall maintain an open, transparent and regular dialogue with representative associations and civil society”. Unfortunately, the European Commission, and the Council in particular, often understand transparency and law-making as mutually exclusive concepts – as one could see in many of EDRi’s work areas last year.
Transparency

EUROPE

Most of the legislation of the European Union (EU) is currently adopted in an informal, non-democratic, non-accountable and non-transparent process called “trilogues”. These trilogues are a series of negotiations between the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union and the European Commission to fast-track legislation.

In 2017, we therefore continued our advocacy for a reform of the trilogues system, and emphasised publicly and in meetings that this would not only benefit EU law-making, but would also contribute to a greater legitimacy and integrity of the EU institutions.

Furthermore, EDRi kept pushing the European Commission to enshrine whistleblowing protections in legislation. EDRi replied to the Commission’s consultation on the issue, asking for a Directive on whistleblower protection.

Finally, we responded to the European Ombudsman’s consultation on Council transparency.

5 DECEMBER
Article 19 spoke on behalf of EDRi at the second Security Dialogue on “Countering terrorist Narratives” at the European Parliament

19 DECEMBER
We met with EU Commissioner Jourová’s cabinet to discuss illegal content

20-21 DECEMBER
We spoke on several panels during the Internet Governance Forum 2017

27-30 DECEMBER
We participated in the 34th Chaos Communication Congress (34C3), a prominent hacking conference and biggest event on security, privacy and digital culture in Europe
The defence and promotion of digital rights cannot be achieved by only one single organisation. This is why we led and participated in several formal and informal coalitions, including on data protection, e-Privacy, encryption, cross-border access to data, net neutrality (see here, here and here), telecoms, net competition, copyright reform (see here, here and here), free and open source software, and digital trade.
International

In 2017, EDRi spoke at events in 15 countries. We gave numerous expert presentations in the European Parliament, the European Commission, the Council of Europe, national Permanent Representations to the European Union, the European Economic and Social Committee, and other key institutions. We also spoke about our work in many universities to explain the importance of digital rights. In addition, we wrote guest articles in various publications and were quoted in international news outlets.

Furthermore, we participated in key international events, including the Computers, Privacy and Data Protection International Conference (CPDP), the Internet Freedom Festival (IFF), Re:publica, RightsCon, the OSCE-Council of Europe’s Internet Freedom Conference, Council of Europe’s expert meetings on intermediaries, Copycamp, the United Nations Internet Governance Forum, and the Chaos Communication Congress.

We also co-organised several events with international reach, such as the Privacy Camp, the Civil Society Trade Lab, and the School of Rock[ing] Copyright in Slovenia, Hungary and Portugal.

Moreover, we remained an active and proud member of the Trans Atlantic Consumer Dialogue (TACD). Lastly, EDRi became a member of the Non Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) and renewed its mandate in CSISAC’s Steering Committee, the voice of civil society at the OECD’s Committee on the Digital Economy Policy.
In 2017, we focused on invigorating our network. Without our 35 members and many other observer organisations and individuals, we could not have the reach and impact that EDRi has in Europe and worldwide. After launching a network working group in 2016 and seeking internal and external input, we recruited a Community Coordinator.
Our network

A majority of European digital rights NGOs is still either entirely volunteer-based or only has small teams with professional staff. Sources of funding for digital right related work continued to be scarce while the scale of national and international developments in the area of tech policies put pressure on EDRi’s network.

This is why we supported the Renewable Freedom Foundation (RFF) with the launch of the “European Digital Rights Fund” that brought urgently needed support to the EDRi community. This small grants programme is based on peer-led decisions from our digital rights community based on an easy application process that allows for a quick distribution of funds. Thanks to the Fund, among many other projects, our network member Hermes Center received a grant to organise a privacy conference (Italy), ApTI Romania could create audiovisual material with animated messages and visual campaigns, and SHARE Foundation could successfully carry out the Digital-born Media Carnival (Kotor, Montenegro).

In March, we held our annual General Assembly with a record number of 23 voting members from across Europe present. During EDRi’s General Assembly, four organisations became members of the network (Electronic Frontier Norway, Epicenter:works in Austria, SHARE Foundation in Serbia and Wikimedia Germany).

We also organised a two-day meeting with European digital rights groups to agree on how to grow the network, on 24-25 June 2017 (Vienna, Austria). Furthermore, we organised meet-ups of the network at international conferences, such as re:publica, RightsCon, IFF and the IGF.

Towards the end of the year, we launched a pool of pro bono translators in order to facilitate the distribution of campaign material of the network across Europe. Finally, we organised the Rights & Freedoms cluster at 34C3, where members and other organisations had their stand and a small stage for talks.

Finally, a knowledge and experience-sharing platform was set up in EDRi’s internal Wiki, which will be beta tested and evaluated in 2018.

What we learned this year is that capacity building for the network is a long-term commitment – while we helped to provide national groups with small grants via the new Digital Rights Fund, we observed that volunteer-based organizations often are in greater need of human resources and immaterial support, which often means substantially bigger grants to be able to create a first professional position.

Furthermore, real knowledge-exchange between the nodes of our network can often only emerge during face-to-face meetings and can only then be put into a shareable format. While a digital repository of all the common knowledge would help improving the sharing of knowledge, it could not completely substitute the need for regular physical meetings.
**Finances**

**INCOMES 2017**
Audited financial accounts, total 728 816 €

- **Foundation grants**: 533 195 €
  - Open Society Foundation: 139 596 €
  - Ford Foundation: 136 275 €
  - Adessium Foundation: 131 016 €
  - Democracy & Media Foundation: 50 000 €
  - Ford Mozilla Open Web Fellow: 34 327 €
  - Mozilla Advocacy Fund: 21 981 €
  - Renewable Freedom Foundation: 20 000 €

- **Corporate donations**: 81 929 €
  - EDIMA: 27 684 €
  - Mozilla Corporation: 26 897 €
  - Microsoft: 10 000 €
  - TomTom: 7 000 €
  - Twitter: 5 000 €
  - Mozilla Corporation: 4 000 €

- **Other projects**: 5 180 €
  - EDIMA: 27 684 €
  - Mozilla Corporation: 26 897 €
  - Microsoft: 10 000 €
  - TomTom: 7 000 €
  - Twitter: 5 000 €
  - Mozilla Corporation: 4 000 €

- **Other**: 16 932 €

- **CSISAC**: 5 170 €

**Members and observers fees**: 39 941 €

- **Individual donations**: 20 818 €
  - EPIC: 5 000 €
  - Wikimedia Germany: 5 000 €
  - Centr: 2 000 €
  - IT POL: 1 800 €
  - Wikimedia Germany: 793 €
  - Electronic Frontier Foundation: 700 €
  - Union européenne de radiotélévisions: 316 €
  - ALCEI: 42 €

- **Non-corporate donations**: 25 651 €
  - NL Net Foundation: 10 000 €
  - EPIC: 5 000 €
  - Wikimedia Germany: 5 000 €
  - Centr: 2 000 €
  - IT POL: 1 800 €
  - Wikimedia Germany: 793 €
  - Electronic Frontier Foundation: 700 €
  - Union européenne de radiotélévisions: 316 €
  - ALCEI: 42 €

- **Corporate donations**: 81 929 €
  - EDIMA: 27 684 €
  - Mozilla Corporation: 26 897 €
  - Microsoft: 10 000 €
  - TomTom: 7 000 €
  - Twitter: 5 000 €
  - Mozilla Corporation: 4 000 €

- **Foundation grants**: 533 195 €
  - Open Society Foundation: 139 596 €
  - Ford Foundation: 136 275 €
  - Adessium Foundation: 131 016 €
  - Democracy & Media Foundation: 50 000 €
  - Ford Mozilla Open Web Fellow: 34 327 €
  - Mozilla Advocacy Fund: 21 981 €
  - Renewable Freedom Foundation: 20 000 €

- **Other projects**: 5 180 €

- **Other**: 16 932 €

- **CSISAC**: 5 170 €

**TOTAL**: 728 816 €
EXPENSES 2017
Audited financial accounts, total 670 900 €

- **Advocacy work**: 256 824 € (38.2%)
- **Organisational development and administration**: 160 639 € (24.0%)
- **Fundraising**: 76 085 € (11.3%)
- **Communications**: 69 486 € (10.4%)
- **Network development and support for members**: 68 295 € (10.2%)
- **Mozilla Open Web Fellow**: 26 942 € (4.0%)
- **Other**: 6438 € (1.0%)
- **CSISAC**: 6191 € (0.9%)
EDRi’s year in numbers

We counted more than 200 **PRESS MENTIONS**.

We had over 745,000 **unique visits to our WEBSITE**.

The top three downloaded documents were the "**DIGITAL DEFENDERS**", a privacy for kids guide, in English and Turkish, as well as our paper on the upload filter in Article 13 of the copyright proposal [pdf].

Our story “Leaked document: EU Presidency calls for massive internet filtering” was viewed 187,782 times. It was retweeted over 280 times.

We counted 27 **PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS** on issues that have an impact on digital rights! - In 2014, there were only six...

There were 9 **NATIONALITIES** present in the EDRi Brussels team.

There were 18 **LANGUAGES** spoken by the EDRi network.

There were 18 **LANGUAGES** spoken by the EDRi network.

Around 25% of our visitors came from **REDDIT** and 22% from Facebook.

The European Commission **TRIED TO KILL THE INTERNET** 6 times in 2017.

Operating systems that were used to visit our website:

- **43,4%** Windows
- **22,9%** LINUX
- **21%** Macintosh