

## **Quarterly Report of Appeals, Complaints and Advice**

**The BBFC is the regulator of commercial and internet content delivered via the mobile networks of EE, O2, Three and Vodafone.**

**In the interest of transparency, the BBFC publishes all of its adjudications in relation to cases reported to it of purported underblocking or overblocking, along with requests for advice on whether particular content should go behind parental controls or adult filters.**

**We keep this list updated as and when new cases are reported to us and publish updates every three months.**

**In all cases, the BBFC conveys its adjudication to (i) the complainant, appellant or person or body seeking advice; (ii) the Mobile Broadband Group; and (iii) the relevant mobile network operator(s).**

**The adjudication that a website contains no material that we would classify 18 does not necessarily mean that we believe it is suitable for younger children.**

**In the following cases, the adjudications represent an assessment of the content according to the dates listed below. Any subsequent changes to content have therefore not been viewed by the BBFC, although we reserve the right to change our adjudication should altered content be brought to our attention subsequently.**

### **April 2015**

*2 April 2015*

#### Website

onlinespyshop.co.uk

#### Issue

The website owner revised content on the website on several occasions following our adjudication of 5 January 2015.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC provided the final adjudication when we viewed the website on 2 and 7 April.

We noted that numerous edits had been made across the site. These included text alterations to products, which had removed references to undetected and / or covert use.

The extent of the alterations to the site were such that we found no content on the site which we would classify 18 or R18.

Further information relating to the original adjudication is available in the March 2015 Quarterly Report on the BBFC website.

14 April 2015

Website

chatrecruit.com

Issue

A member of the public contacted the BBFC to complain that the site was blocked by adult filters despite, in the complainant's view, containing no material that would restrict it to access by adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 14 April.

We found that the website offered adults the opportunity to earn money via a range of services. The site noted that the company provided a variety of adult entertainment services including webcam chat and 'TV Babe shows'. Studio managers were also offered extra revenue if they ran studios 'with gorgeous models who love webcam chat and 1-2-1 sexy phone chat'. On the applications page, there was the opportunity to apply for chat services such as 'Adult Phone Chat' and 'Adult WebCam chat'. In addition, another link on the site provided access to an adult web chat site with sight of various models posing for webcam chats, and strong sexualised content, including strong, pornographic sex references.

While the website itself did not feature nudity or strong sex references, the sexualised element of the offered work was clearly stated. Furthermore, the site stated that it was for '*Over 18 years of age only*'. Including in the site's content a direct link to a clearly sexualised sister site reinforced the adult nature of the experience.

Therefore, the BBFC concluded that it would classify the site at least 18.

**May 2015**

4 May 2015

Website

britainfirst.org

Issue

The BBFC originally adjudicated on the website in April 2014. Subsequently in May 2015 the BBFC and Mobile Network Operators received numerous complaints that the website was blocked for people under 18, despite containing no material which in their opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC provided a further adjudication when we viewed the website on 4 May.

As in April 2014, we concluded that the website falls within scope of the Classification Framework. Although Britain First describes itself as a patriotic political movement, it could also be described as a group with views that would be regarded by many to be racist. As noted in our previous adjudication, Britain First's rhetoric espouses taking the law into the groups own hands, plainly stating that the authorities are not doing a good job dealing with what the group judges to be a Muslim threat to the British way of life.

Among the publications on the site there are, for example, several references to "Muslim grooming gangs". While some of this content is based on recent criminal cases, the website suggests that such behaviour is endemic in the Muslim community, stating, "Islamic grooming is happening all over the UK in every town and city with a Muslim population" and that "thousands of young non-Muslim girls are being left to the mercy of hundreds of organised Muslim paedophile gangs".

The site is at pains to suggest that Britain First does not hate all Muslims, but targets some individuals and the doctrine and religion of Islam, stating "we are against these principles of Islam, not individual humans who have been led astray by this barbaric 'religion'". It would confound public expectations and be unacceptable to broad public opinion if we were to classify the site lower than 18.

Further information relating to the original adjudication is available in the June 2014 Quarterly Report on the BBFC website.

*11 May 2015*

#### Website

marijuana-anonymous.org.uk

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from the website owner that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material which in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 11 May 2015.

We noted that the website offered a support mechanism for marijuana addicts. The website did not feature explicit references to drugs or drug use, and the moderated forums primarily related to organising meetings. The site focussed squarely on its stated purpose of providing support to those wishing to stop using marijuana.

As such the BBFC found no content on the site which we would classify 18.

### **June 2015**

*12 June 2015*

#### Website

gilad.co.uk

### Issue

Two mobile network operators contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a third party that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material which in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 12, 15 and 16 June 2015.

We noted that it was a website run by Gilad Atzmon, an Israeli jazz artist, composer and author living in London. Mr. Atzmon is also a political commentator, and his website included numerous articles about Jewish identity politics and Israeli policy.

Much of the site was concerned with Mr. Atzmon's music and was uncontentious. His posts on Jewish and Israeli matters were presented as personal views in the spirit of academic debate and historical, political and cultural examination. While some people might challenge some of Mr Atzmon's views and some people might take offence at some of his posts, his views were nevertheless framed within the overall context of debate. Given the academic nature of Mr Atzmon's posts and the spirit of examination and debate rather than promotion of harmful rhetoric, we found no content that would be unsuitable for older teenagers who might themselves be studying and debating such challenging issues, and consequently we would not classify the website at 18.

*16 June 2015*

### Website

cyndidarnell.com

### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material which in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 16 June 2015.

We noted that it was a sex education and enhancement site offering counselling, tips and advice on sexual activity and relationships, as well as the ability to book courses related to such matters.

The BBFC's Classification Framework notes that content considered only suitable for adults includes sex education and advice which is (i) aimed at adults and (ii) inappropriate for children. Sections of this website included numerous strong references to sexual activity, including an article on pain during anal sex and discussion of harmful behaviour during 'rough' sex. While the BBFC does not doubt

that the website genuinely sought to inform and educate its visitors, it was also clearly aimed at an older audience and the nature of the content was not appropriate for children. As such, the BBFC would not classify the site below the adult (18) level.

**BBFC**

**24 June 2015**