

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-002571/26
to the Commission
Catherine Griset (PFE)
(22 June 2026)**

Subject: Relationship between the Commission and the ‘civil society organisations’ that supported the decision to fine X

On 5 December 2025, the Commission fined the platform X EUR 120 million for breaching the Digital Services Act (DSA).

This fine was based on correspondence with ‘civil society organisations’ revealed by the Republican Congressman Jim Jordan, who concluded that these organisations were seeking to censor US social media platforms ⁽¹⁾.

1. What guarantees of neutrality and independence do these organisations provide?
2. Is the process for appointing them subject to scrutiny by the European Parliament?
3. Has the Commission not, once again, funded left-wing organisations that have produced biased reports, without respecting the principle of adversarial process — which is essential to ensuring the rights of the defence — in order to support its decision?

Submitted: 22.6.2026

**Answer given by Executive Vice-President Virkkunen on behalf of the European Commission
(7 September 2026)**

Civil society organisations (CSOs) are non-governmental, non-profit and independent entities acting in the public interest. As recognised by the EU Strategy for Civil Society ⁽¹⁾ and the Digital Services Act (DSA) ⁽²⁾, they perform legitimate roles, including researching systemic risks such as the spread of illegal content or risks to fundamental rights online.

The Commission's enforcement of the DSA is evidence-based and respects due process. Its assessments may draw on information from providers of online platforms and search engines, competent authorities, CSOs and other stakeholders, and such evidence is gathered in respect of the fundamental rights ⁽³⁾.

In its investigation into X, the Commission assessed all relevant evidence, considered the arguments presented by the provider of X, gave that provider the opportunity to respond to the Commission's preliminary findings ⁽⁴⁾, and considered that response when adopting a final decision ⁽⁵⁾. The provider of X has challenged the non-compliance decision before the European General Court.

The Commission does not fund CSOs for DSA enforcement. The EU may provide funding to CSOs through transparent procedures such as open calls under programmes including Digital Europe or Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values subject to clear criteria and public scrutiny.

The censorship allegations in the referenced report are unfounded. The DSA strengthens accountability for intermediary services in the EU, while protecting freedom of expression by giving users recourse when content is removed or restricted. By way of illustration, since the DSA became fully applicable, 30% of appealed moderation decisions adopted by online platforms ⁽⁶⁾ have been reversed.

¹ <https://www.techpolicy.press/eu-decision-behind-120m-fine-on-musk-x-released-by-us-lawmakers/>, <https://x.com/JudiciaryGOP/status/2016619751183724789?s=20>, <https://x.com/JudiciaryGOP/status/2016619753717002267?s=20>.

⁽¹⁾ EU Strategy for Civil Society, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52025DC0790>.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 on a Single market for digital services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act), <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj/eng>.

⁽³⁾ Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/treaty/char_2012/oj/eng.

⁽⁴⁾ Commission sends preliminary findings to X for breach of the Digital Services Act, <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/news/commission-sends-preliminary-findings-x-breach-digital-services-act>.

⁽⁵⁾ Commission fines X EUR 120 million under the Digital Services Act, <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/news/commission-fines-x-eu120-million-under-digital-services-act>.

⁽⁶⁾ <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/news/two-years-digital-services-act-allows-50-million-content-moderation-decisions-platforms-be-reversed>.