

Title: Assessment grid appendix for “Accountability in name only: Fact-checking under the EU’s Code of Practice on Disinformation”

Authors: Madalina Botan

Date: July 7th, 2026

Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review.

Appendix A: Assessment grid—Quality, completeness, and verifiability of VLOPSE reported information on selected CoPD commitments

Commitment 30: Cooperation with fact checkers

Part A: Quality and completeness of reported information

A.6.a. Has [name of VLOPSE’s service] provided details for your country on the following aspects of cooperation with fact checkers? (Yes/No)

- List of fact-checking partners and their accreditation (e.g., IFCN, EFCSN)
- Languages and countries covered by these partnerships
- Description of the cooperation framework (e.g., advisory role, content review, moderation workflows)
- Description of any financial or technical support provided to fact checkers
- Any collaborative mechanisms for addressing country-specific misinformation
- Trends

Part B: Evidence in support of reported information

B.6.a. Has [name of VLOPSE’s service] provided the following data for your country? (Yes/No)

- Number of fact checks published by partners
- Number of pieces of content treated based on fact checker input
- Metrics on the visibility or reach of fact checker contributions
- Any evaluations or user research on the effectiveness of these partnerships

B.6.b. Were you able to verify the data provided by the Signatory through independent or public sources? (Yes/No)

Please insert any additional comments you may have:

Commitment 31: Fact-checking integration in services

Part A: Quality and completeness of reported information

A.7.a. Has [name of VLOPSE’s service] documented the following for your country? (Yes/No)

- Description of how fact-checking labels are integrated into content (e.g., labels such as “False Information”)
- Explanation of how visibility or engagement with labeled content is limited (e.g., demotion, warning screens)
- Information on whether creators are notified when their content is labeled
- Description of how these measures are applied across different content formats (e.g., images, videos, links)

Part B: Evidence in support of reported information

B.7.a. Has [name of VLOPSE's service] provided the following data for your country? (Yes/No)

- Number of labeled content items
- Impact metrics (e.g., reduction in shares, visibility)
- User interaction data with labeled content (e.g., click-through, engagement rates)
- Evaluations of user understanding or behavior change

B.7.b. Were you able to verify the data provided by the Signatory through independent or public sources? (Yes/No)

Please insert any additional comments you may have:

Commitment 32: Access to relevant information for fact checkers

Part A: Quality and completeness of reported information

A.8.a. Has [name of VLOPSE's service] described the following support provided to fact checkers for your country? (Yes/No)

- Access to internal dashboards or data reporting tools
- Metrics on labeled content reach, engagement, and reshare rates
- Feedback mechanisms or regular consultations with fact checkers
- Description of any real-time or near real-time data access
- Information on financial or operational support for fact-checking organizations

Part B: Evidence in support of reported information

B.8.a. Has [name of VLOPSE's service] provided verifiable data or evidence of the following? (Yes/No)

- Number of fact checkers with access to internal tools
- Usage metrics of these tools (e.g., frequency, number of accessed items)
- Evaluations or feedback from fact checkers on the usefulness of the tools
- Any independent audits or external evaluations of these support systems

B.8.b. Were you able to verify the data provided by the Signatory through independent or public sources? (Yes/No)

Please insert any additional comments you may have: