

## **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) Mobile UK; 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.**

### **July 2018**

*2 July 2018*

#### Website

britishcondoms.co.uk

#### Issue

The BBFC originally adjudicated on the website in May 2018. Further to the BBFC's original adjudication, the site owner contacted the BBFC to complain that the website remained behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC provided a further adjudication when we viewed a revised version of the website on 2 July 2018.

As in May 2018, we noted that the site sold various products related to sexual health. The website also sold a range of products intended to enhance sexual pleasure, many of which featured strong sex references in text descriptions. However, on our sampling of the blog section of the website, articles providing adult sex education tips, and a blog section called 'Intimate Stories' – which comprised of a series of erotic posts that included language of a pornographic nature, references to BDSM and very strong language – were no longer present. As such we found no content on the site that the BBFC would classify at 18 or refuse to classify.

Further information relating to the original adjudication is available in the June 2018 Quarterly Report on the BBFC website.

*2 July 2018*

Website

j4mb.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 a member of the public that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 2 July 2018.

We noted that it was a political website which featured articles and blogs on a variety of subjects related to the issue of men's rights, including male genital mutilation and feminism. While the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people may disagree strongly with the positions of the articles and blogs, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. Our sampling of the site did not discover examples of overt hate speech. As such we found no content on the site that the BBFC would classify at 18 or refuse to classify according to the Classification Framework

*6 July 2018*

Website

reagent-tests.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 a member of the public that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 6 July 2018.

We noted that the website focused on the sale of products intended to help consumers test illegal drugs for purity. While the site adopted a fairly neutral position towards drugs, rather than overtly promoting drug misuse, the fact the products being sold relied upon customers breaking the law in order for them to have any efficacy means the site condoned and indirectly encouraged the obtaining and misuse of illegal drugs. As such, we did not consider the website to be suitable for people under the age of 18.

30 July 2018

Website

minichan.org/

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 that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

We noted this was a message board on which people post pictures and discuss a variety of issues. It included repeated uses of aggressive very strong language, and numerous photographs which depicted strong sexualised nudity. We also found material which could be interpreted as having the potential to encourage discriminatory and harmful views, such as comments and blogs which suggested a link between paedophilia and homosexuality. As such, we did not consider the website to be suitable for people under the age of 18.

**September 2018**

19 September 2018

Website

bnp.org.uk

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 19 September 2018.

The website belongs to a far-right group. We noted that the website features information on the group's policies, which included policy areas described as 'British Culture', 'Stopping All Immigration' and 'Local People First'. The website also included several news and current affairs blogs, as well as pages which encouraged supporters to donate to the group.

Among articles evidenced on the site, were several references to 'Muslim rape gangs' and to Muslims 'colonising' the UK. The articles made negative comments about Muslims, as evident in text such as "Muslim Rape Gangs operate in every town and city in Britain with a sizeable Muslim community" and "Muslims have nothing of benefit in the way of culture or trade to bring". We also noted discriminatory attitudes directed towards Muslims in comments left by users of the

site. As a result, we did not consider the website to be suitable for people under the age of 18.

BBFC  
30 September 2018