

Internet Safety Strategy Response

Organisation responding: The Internet Watch Foundation (IWF)

Address: Internet Watch Foundation, Discovery House, Chivers Way, Vision Park, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9ZR.

Contact details of person responding: Michael Tunks, Policy and Public Affairs Manager, mike@iwf.org.uk , Tel: 01223 20 30 30

About the IWF-

The Internet Watch Foundation is a charity and self-regulatory body that is funded by the Internet Industry and the European Union. Our members include internet service providers, mobile operators and manufacturers, content service providers and telecommunications and software companies, as well as blue-chip and other organisations who support the IWF for CSR reasons.

The IWF is the only authorised non-statutory organisation in the UK operating an internet 'Hotline' for the public and IT professionals to report their exposure to potentially illegal content online.

Our vision is to eliminate Child Sexual Abuse Imagery Online, specifically:

- Child Sexual Abuse Content anywhere in the world
- Non-photographic Child Sexual Abuse Imagery hosted in the UK

We aim to:

- Eliminate child sexual abuse images online.
- Help victims by removing images of child sexual abuse from the internet
- Make the internet a safer place for everyone to use.
- Protect our Members' services and brands from misuse.

We work in partnership with UK law enforcement and UK government departments, such as the Home Office and the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, to influence initiatives and programmes developed to combat online abuse. This dialogue goes beyond the UK and Europe to ensure greater awareness of global issues and responsibilities.

Through the hotline reporting system, we help content providers to combat abuse of their services with a 'notice and take-down' service which alerts them to any potentially illegal content on their systems and simultaneously invites the police to investigate the publisher.

We also provide a comprehensive list of websites, images (Hash list) and keywords that are known to contain child abuse content for organisations such as ISPs, mobile network operators, software companies and search engines to block access to potentially illegal child abuse images. We also provide lists of newsgroups which regularly contain or advertise child abuse content.

Response Overview-

We welcome the Government's consultation on the "Internet Safety Strategy" and are supportive of three principles in the paper:

- What is unacceptable offline should be unacceptable online
- All users should be empowered to manage online risks and stay safe online
- Tech companies should have responsibility to their users

DO the **right** thing ✓

We are also pleased to see that the paper recognises the important role that the Internet Watch Foundation (IWF) plays in supporting Government action in the areas of improving internet safety, referencing our partnerships with the Home Office and DCMS through the UKCCIS Executive Board (which our CEO, Susie Hargreaves, attends), the UKCCIS technical working group (chaired by our Deputy CEO, Fred Langford), in acknowledging the role we play in removing Child Sexual Abuse Material (CSAM) from the internet and in the numerous references throughout the paper to the role that the IWF and its partners play in the UK Safer Internet Centre (UKSIC).

We believe that Britain leads the way in this area. In 1996, the year the IWF was founded, 18% of the global CSAM was hosted in the UK, today, that is less than 0.1%. We believe that the IWF's self-regulatory approach in partnership with the internet industry has been hugely effective in addressing the challenges presented by this issue along with our close working relationship with the Home Office, DCMS and UK law enforcement. We are keen to see that our work in this area continues and is enabled to flourish and grow as a result of some of the measures contained within this paper, which we believe have the ability to further complement our work and make Britain a safer place to be online.

We strongly believe that removing CSAM is a global issue and that is why we are pleased to see that the UK Government has led the way not only in monetary terms through its financial investment in schemes such as WeProtect but also the leadership role it plays in UKCCIS by having three Government ministers involved in the Executive Board.

The Role of UKCCIS-

The IWF supports the remodelling of the UKCCIS Executive Board as set out in the consultation and we are pleased to see that the Government recognises both adults and children as part of this remodelling process. Whilst we do not want the Government's focus to move away from children, we fully support measures to educate their parents, carers and family members of the importance of staying safe online. By being much broader in outlook, the Government will naturally be much more effective at improving the nation's overall online safety. We also believe that a smaller but higher profile board will also enable a much clearer strategic direction for online safety, although, we would be keen that the IWF retains its position on the board as we feel we would have valuable advice to offer based on our past successes and relationship with industry partners.

Our Deputy Chief Executive, Fred Langford, also currently chairs the UKCCIS technical working group and is keen to continue in that role. In order for him to be more effective in this role, however, he would appreciate more support from the DCMS in terms of preparing for meetings, hosting meetings and taking minutes of meetings, which would add further weight and organisation to the group's standing. He also would be keen to see much more interaction between the working group and executive board and feels that there also needs to be more engagement across all of the relevant working groups, particularly in areas where there is cross over between the working groups.

DCMS could also consider how to make more use of the expertise that also currently sits within the associate members. The UKCCIS Executive Board could be more consultative in its outlook and more regularly seek views and participation from the associate members on issues of importance or on recommendations made by the relevant working groups. The Government should also consider ensuring that the working groups are open to the widest possible range of technical expertise. The IWF has been disappointed that it has found it difficult to become a member of and participate in the evidence group in particular.

The IWF also believes that the UKCCIS Executive Board once it has been remodelled could also play an active role in helping to define the final social media code of practice and potentially have some role in either determining how the social media levy fund is used or at the very least having some oversight of it, given that the Executive Board has representatives from three different Government Departments, Industry and Civil Society which will help to maintain a balanced approach based on consultation with relevant stakeholders on how any levy should be used.

Engagement Internationally-

The IWF is pleased to see that the Government recognises the importance of engagement internationally. The IWF has played an active part in the WeProtect Global Alliance since it was formed and IWF CEO, Susie Hargreaves is a member of the International Advisory Board. We too see the need to improve the international response to this issue and have established a strong reputation within Europe as being an authoritative voice on child protection issues online. We are involved in a number of committees such as the Lanzarote Convention, CDMSI committee and attend broader events such as IGF, ITU, WSIS and EuroDig to ensure that we positively influence policy in this area outside the UK. The IWF has an impressive network of portals in UK Overseas Territories and has launched reporting portals India, Tanzania, Uganda, Mauritius and Namibia. The Portal in India was recently recognised by a Presidential medal for our partners Aarambh for their work in online safety including the portal. We have plans for a further thirty portals in the least developed countries as a result of funding we have received from the Global Fund to End Violence Against Children.

These portals encourage reporting of CSAM in these countries and the assessment of any reports is carried out in Cambridge by IWF analysts in line with UK Law.

The Need for Transparency-

It is important to recognise that the Internet Industry have taken steps to improve internet safety and the Internet Safety Strategy gives a number of examples from IWF members on where their work with us, our partners in the UKSIC or on their own has helped to improve internet safety.

When members sign-up to the IWF they commit as a general rule to doing everything that they can to disrupt and remove child sexual abuse and the receipt of the services that we offer are crucial to that commitment. However, we acknowledge that we can play a part in reporting more publicly which services and actions they take and would be open to discussions with the UK Government about the possible future provision of a transparency report in this area.

Social Media Levy-

The Internet Safety Strategy sets out proposals for a “Social Media Levy” and the consultation asks a number of questions which helps to guide Government’s initial thinking in this area. The IWF is of course keen to see any funding which may arise as a result of any social media levy directed towards the good work it already carries out in protecting children and young people online and to continue the other functions carried out by our partners in the UKSIC.

The IWF is currently facing a funding gap as a result of Britain’s decision to leave the European Union, which currently contributes 1.2m Euros over an 18-month period. The UKSIC receives 2.3m over the same period and without this funding there will be a significant impact on online safety in the UK. For the IWF this funding equates to 50% of our analyst’s salary. For all of us in the UKSIC this means we would be unable to fund the UK Safer Internet Day which last year reached 2.8 million children and 2.5 million adults. Of those who participated 87% of children said that they felt safer online as a result.

We also believe that the Government should consider what expertise social media companies and the wider industry could offer to Government beyond a monetary levy. We have certainly found as a result

of our partnerships with industry that they are happy to lend support in terms of man-power or insight as well as from a monetary perspective which will also have a positive impact in terms of making the Internet safer. Examples are highlighted throughout the Internet Safety Strategy including Microsoft's Photo-DNA project, Facebook's digital leaders programme and Google and Apple's work on family classification for Apps.

We would however, seek assurances from the Government that any monetary levy that is brought forward wouldn't have any impact on the IWF funding model. The IWF receives 90% of its funding from the internet industry and we wouldn't want it to become a choice for social media companies as to whether they pay the proposed social media levy or pay for the IWF and its services.

Code of practice-

One way that the Government could help guard against this would be to ensure that any company that wishes to sign up to the Code of Practice, the Government could make it a mandatory requirement as part of the code for the company to be a member of the IWF and take some of its services such as our image Hash List, URL List and Keyword List. This should be part of their responsibilities to ensuring a safer internet in the United Kingdom.

Responses to questions contained within the consultation-

Please find below our responses to the consultation questions posed below. We have only answered in areas of relevance to the IWF.

**Q104. Which of the following best describes your organisation?
(tick all that apply)**

- In the education sector (1)
- X In the children's sector (2)**
- X In the technology sector (3)**
- In law enforcement (4)
- In the legal sector (5)
- In the public sector (6)
- X In the charity sector (7)**
- In the private sector (8)
- None of the above (9)

Q105. How did you hear about the survey?

- Discovered survey on gov.uk while browsing (1)
- Saw an article about the survey in the media/online - please tell us where (2)

- Responding as part of a campaign - please tell us which (3)

- X Contacted by DCMS (4)**
- Other (please specify) (5) _____

Q 106. Social Media Code of Practice

Government will work with the industry to secure a more coherent, joined-up approach to online safety across the range of major platforms. A key part of this will be issuing the voluntary code of practice, required by the Digital Economy Act 2017. We are consulting on what this will look like, with an aim of publishing the code of practice in 2018.

The Digital Economy Act 2017 requires that the code addresses conduct that involves bullying or insulting an individual, or other behaviour likely to intimidate or humiliate an individual. This does not include unlawful content which the legal framework already addresses.

IWF Response:

We believe that a code of practice should clearly set out common standards for social media companies to follow, define what the Government's ask and expectations of them are and encourage best practice- all of which should lead to a safer internet.

It is important to recognise, however, that as the code of practice will be voluntary, it must also be realistic, achievable and be designed in partnership with Social Media Companies, taking into account their technical knowledge and expertise.

Whilst the Digital Economy Act (2017) specifies that any code of practice covers those provisions set out in Section 103 (3) of the Act, namely; bullying, harassment, intimidating and bullying behaviour, we would like to see the Code of Practice make a specific reference to tackling the spread of Child Sexual Abuse Material (CSAM) online.

Whilst we understand that this is already covered within the legal framework elsewhere, we believe that it is important that the Government doesn't lose sight of how important this issue is and ensure that Social Media Companies are actively addressing this issue as part of any best practice guidance. We believe that part of the code of practice should require that any social media company to which the code applies, should be a member of the IWF and sign up to taking certain services such as our URL list, image hashes and keywords lists, to demonstrate their commitment to eradicating CSAM from their platforms.

As a partner in the UK Safer Internet Centre (UKSIC) we are also keen to see measures which help children, their parents and professionals who work with children to stay safe online built into the code of practice. We believe it is important for social media companies to promote online safety advice and direct their users accordingly. We also need to ensure that the public know where to turn when they see something that concerns them and would want to see the code of practice make reference to the [IWF's reporting portal](#) if someone stumbles across what they believe to be CSAM on the internet.

*On a more practical level, we believe it is important that the Government provides clarity in its guidance on who exactly the code is applicable, building upon the definition contained within the Digital Economy Act (2017) (**Section 103 (3)**) and more clearly defines what specifically constitutes bullying, harassment and intimidating behaviour, perhaps underpinning this with relevant legislation. The challenge for social media companies acting in these areas is that these issues are not as well defined legally as CSAM and any definitions can often be subjective. By helping to address what the Government's definition of the problem will better enable industry to respond and encourage best practice and a standard for the industry to follow.*

Q107 Which of the following actions/ processes do you consider are already successfully in place on the majority of social media platforms? (Select all that apply)

X Reporting function for users to notify platform (1)

Blocking users who bully or insult other users, or display other behaviours likely to intimidate or humiliate (2)

Terms and conditions of use (3)

Community rules or guidelines (which typically indicate what can be shared) (4)

Privacy settings (5)

X Removal of illegal content (6)

X Provision of online safety advice (7)

Moderation of language/ content (8)

X Removal of material which contravenes the platform's terms and conditions (9)

Other (please specify) (10) _____

None of the above (11)

Don't know (12)

IWF Response:

The IWF provides an [online reporting portal](#) for members of the public, industry and professionals working with children to report confidentially and anonymously any content that they believe may be CSAM to us. We believe that our self-regulatory approach in partnership with the Internet Industry whilst working independently, (but closely with), from UK law enforcement and UK Government has helped us drastically improve the amount of CSAM that is hosted online in the UK. In 1996 18% of the world's CSAM material was hosted in the UK, today it is less than 0.1%.

In terms of the process itself, once we receive a report of suspected CSAM, our analysts based in Cambridgeshire, assess every report in line with UK law and their assessment is quality assured by a second person. If both agree that the content is CSAM the IWF will issue a notice and take down to the operator of that website. In most cases we see take down now taking place within two hours of a report having been assessed and in some cases much quicker than that. The image is then added to our Hash List and the website link to our URL list, which if our industry members are deploying these

services on their systems means that this will prevent the image from being uploaded or displayed again and prevents repeat victimisation.

We know that this approach works in response to CSAM and the IWF and UK are leading the way globally in our approach to this issue.

We are keen to ensure that any Government response to this consultation protects the good work of the IWF in this area and that any code of practice does not hamper what has been a very successful model of self-regulation by industry.

In terms of our response to the above question, we have only answered in areas in which we operate and know to be effective. The IWF could not comment on areas outside of its remit on the success of other measures.

Q108 to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

“Online safety policies are consistent across different platforms.”

Strongly agree (1)

Agree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

X Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q109 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

“Social media platforms have a duty of care to remove and reduce inappropriate behaviour or content on their platforms.”

X Strongly agree (1)

Agree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q110 Within this Green Paper, we have set out additional areas, which we would like the code of practice, or further guidance, to cover (beyond those required in the Digital Economy Act 2017).

Which of these areas do you think are most important? **(Select up to three options)**

Information on standards for user content and conduct, including how community guidelines are developed, enforced and reviewed (1)

Information about the prevention and identification of abuse and misuse of services, including persistent abusers across a range of harms (2)

Reporting mechanism for inappropriate, bullying or harmful content, with clear policies and performance metrics on take-down, including considering the manifesto commitment for content removal on a 'comply or explain' basis, '*Comply or explain*' means that companies need to either comply with a request, or, if they do not comply, explain publicly why they do not. (3)

X Information about how to identify illegal content and contact and report it to the relevant authorities in a local jurisdiction (4)

Privacy and controls - policies, practices and communications (5)

None of the above (6)

IWF response:

We believe that it is important that members of the public know how to report illegal content online. In the case of the public stumbling across what they believe to be CSAM content we would encourage the UK Government to direct members of the public towards the [IWF reporting portal](#).

Q111 Do you think companies should encourage people to use their real identity when using social media?

X Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

IWF response:

We believe that the UK Government should be encouraging people to use their real identities online, although, taking into account relevant safeguards about how much personal data about themselves they share online and encourage them to make the best use of privacy settings that are available to them. We believe it is important to encourage a greater level of educational awareness amongst both children and adults about their online behaviours.

Q112 Do you think the code of practice should include steps to tackle those who use anonymous social media accounts to abuse others?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

**Q113 Which platforms should have a code of practice? Those that enable individuals to...
(Select all that apply)**

Publish public messages which can be viewed by others (1)

Send private messages to others (2)

Live stream video content which is viewable by others (3)

Create a searchable profile to enable connections with other users (4)

Create a dating profile (5)

Play online games (6)

Search the internet (7)

Watch videos (8)

Listen to music (9)

Share content, such as web links, with others (10)

Share images / videos (11)

React to content (12)

Join groups/ communities (13)

Access the news (14)

Add comments to published content (15)

Other (please specify) (16) _____

None of the above (17)

Don't know (18)

Q114 Transparency reporting for social media companies

Not everyone that uses social media is aware of the online safety tools available to them, or how they can keep themselves safe on social media platforms. One way of assessing both the problems and user awareness is through analysing the levels of reporting of abuse and inappropriate behaviour. We therefore would like your views on information which companies should publish as part of an annual transparency report.

We would like companies to provide information about how they have dealt with negative interactions on their platform ('transparency reporting').

Which of these areas do you think are most important? **(Select up to three options)**

X How many complaints have been received, how they have been dealt with and the volume of content that has been taken down from the service (1)

The number of complaints made on a platform by groups and categories (including by under 18s, women, lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender users, on religious grounds) and the volume of content taken down based on complaints by these groups (2)

The number of individuals who have conducted abuse (that is bullying or insulting, or likely to intimidate or humiliate an individual) that has been removed from the platform (3)

How many moderators (those who deal with complaints) are employed by the companies (4)

What moderation policies each site has in place and how these are reviewed (5)

X How social media companies work together to take down and remove content (6)

Information on how you get help and how you access safety centres on their platforms (7)

Any safety initiatives that social media companies are working on (8)

Support that social media companies give to individuals who are victims of abuse (9)

IWF response: *As a rule, IWF members commit to doing everything that they can to disrupt and remove online child sexual abuse, and the receipt of services from the IWF is crucial to this. However, we acknowledge that we can play a part in reporting more publicly which services and actions they take and would be open to discussions with UK Government about the possible future provision of an annual transparency report to the UK Government in this area.*

Q115 Do you think that all social media companies should have the same standards of behaviour?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

DO the **right** thing ✓

IWF response: *As given in the answer above, we set high standards in terms of the expectations of our members and their record on preventing CSAM online. These standards are the same for any company joining the IWF as a member and as a minimum requirement we expect every member to do all that they can to disrupt and remove CSAM online. Of course, in other areas such as bullying, harassment and intimidation whilst it is ideal to have a common standard which would require platforms to have the same standards of behaviour, there is likely to remain wild variation on what is tolerated due to the global nature of the internet and different jurisdictions attitude and culture towards the internet will make it potentially difficult to ensure a common approach.*

Q116 Social media levy

Some companies have already invested heavily to improve the online safety of their users, including working with charities on issues such as cyberbullying.

The introduction of a social media levy would support greater public awareness of online safety and enable preventative measures to counter internet harms.

The social media levy could be used to support both new initiatives proposed in this Strategy and existing online safety programmes. Initially, we would look to secure contributions on a voluntary basis through agreements with industry, and we would seek industry, and others', involvement in the distribution of the resource.

Government will take steps to ensure that any social media levy is proportionate and does not stifle growth or innovation, particularly for smaller companies and start-ups. Any levy should not disincentivise tech companies from investing in the UK.

Q117 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"A centralised social media levy will be an effective way for industry to provide a contribution

to tackling online harms."

Strongly agree (1)

Agree (2)

X Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q118 Please tell us why. (Only answer if you disagree or strongly disagree)

Q119 What would you like to see funded by the social media levy? (Select your top three preferred items)

Peer to peer support network to help children and young people develop their digital literacy skills (1)

Support for 'code clubs', which can teach coding and share online safety messages with children and young people (2)

International engagement on online safety (3)

X Education programmes and resources for children which could be delivered by organisations such as nurseries, schools, civil society organisations, libraries, arts organisations and sports clubs (4)

Education programmes and resources for parents (5)

Education programmes and resources for professionals such as social workers, troubled families key workers and health care providers (6)

Education programmes and resources for all adults (7)

Online safety awareness campaigns (8)

X An independent online safety advice centre (9)

X Support for charities offering online safety advice or other services (10)

Challenge/ Innovation fund for safety related products and designs (11)

Sharing forum(s) for safety ideas in technology (12)

Other (please specify) (13) _____

None of the above (please tell us why) (14)

Don't Know (15)

IWF response: The IWF supports any initiatives which supports the work of the UK Safer Internet Centre (UKSIC). All of the categories above blend the advice and support that the independent UK Safer Internet Centre offers in terms of the provision of a hotline, helpline and outreach services in schools. It is critical that this important work continues and now all three partners in the UKSIC are facing significant challenges over our long-term viability as a result of Britain's decision to leave the European Union.

The IWF will lose 1.2 million Euros over and 18-month period and the wider UKSIC will lose 2.6 million Euros as a result of Brexit. This means that without funding from UK Government to replace our respective funding gaps we may be unable to provide the same level of service that we currently do. For the IWF this grant equates to 50% of our analyst's salary and means we would have to consider reducing our staffing levels.

The UK Safer Internet Day is funded wholly by the EU and if funding cannot be replaced it means the day won't be able to continue in 2019. This means 2.8m children and 2.5m adults will not receive any online safety advice for the first time in eight years. This will have a real impact on the confidence of children online as 87% of them that had engaged with the 2017 event said that they felt more confident online as a result.

We would therefore ask that the Government considers that any social media levy helps to fund the activities of the UKSIC and IWF into the future to guarantee the continuation of the safer internet day, hotline, helpline and outreach in schools. We also believe that the Government could also provide some funding directly to the IWF in order to assist in its objectives of providing further transparency around action social media companies are taking online as mentioned previously.

Q120

There are a large range of companies that can be considered as social media and/ or communications service providers. We are considering which companies should be eligible for a social media levy.

Which social media platforms and/or communication service providers should be eligible to

pay a social media levy? Those that enable individuals to...

(Select all that apply)

X Publish public messages which can be viewed by others (1)

Send private messages to others (2)

X Live stream video content which is viewable by others (3)

Create a searchable profile to enable connections with other users (4)

Create a dating profile (5)

Play online games with chat function (6)

Search the internet (7)

Watch videos (8)

Listen to music (9)

X Share content, such as web links, with others (10)

X Share images/ videos (11)

React to content (12)

Join groups/ communities (13)

Access the news (14)

Add comments to published content (15)

Other (please specify) (16) _____

None of the above (17)

Don't Know (18)

Q121 In your opinion, what would be the best way to distribute a social media levy?

Government should make the decision (1)

A new independent body set up for this purpose (2)

An existing body (please specify) (3)

A body made up of tech industry representatives (4)

Allow companies to control this themselves and submit reports to government detailing their contributions (5)

X Other (please specify) (6) Remodelled UKCCIS Board

Don't know (7)

Q122 Please tell us more about why you provided this answer.

IWF response: We believe that the Government should work in partnership with the Internet Industry, civil society organisations, law enforcement and other interested stakeholders to determine the best use of the social media levy. We believe that the IWF model has been extremely successful in tackling the spread of CSAM online because it brings together the Internet Industry, ensures independence from Government but works closely with law enforcement. Whilst we are not saying that it will work in every case (such as bullying, harassment and intimidation) we believe that a much more inclusive approach is required if the Government is to see progress towards “making Britain the safest place to go online.”

We believe that the remodelled UKCCIS Board could be the perfect vehicle to not only set the strategic direction for online safety but could also potentially oversee the distribution of the new social media levy. A reconstituted UKCCIS Board which ensures that both the needs of adults and children are met would provide balance and the relevant expertise from across civil society, government, law enforcement and tech industry.

Q123 Technological solutions

The major technology companies have started to come together to tackle issues of online safety at an industry level and a market for online safety technology tools for parents already exists. UK technology companies, including Internet Service Providers, mobile network operators, and increasingly smaller firms and start-ups are now providing technological solutions to help keep users safe online.

However, we want to encourage industry to provide more and better technical solutions to improve safety in their products and on their platforms.

Q124 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

“More safety information about digital products and platforms should be available to consumers/ users.”

Strongly agree (1)

X Agree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q125 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

“There should be minimum safety standards which digital products and platforms must meet.”

Strongly agree (1)

X Agree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q126 Are there any specific safety features for products which you would like to see manufacturers introduce?

X Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

Q127 Which specific safety features for products would you like to see introduced by manufacturers? (If Yes)

IWF response: We are seeing a large rise in Self-Generated Indecent Images of Children (SGIIOC) and whilst we are working closely with the NSPCC to enable children and young people to report self-generated images for them to be hashed to prevent them from being uploaded online, we would like to see the Government take steps to prevent these images from occurring in the first place.

We believe that manufacturers could for example disable cameras on devices which are clearly aimed and targeted at children and young people. Whilst it will be difficult to always prevent children from

having access to devices that have camera and video functionality, we do believe that this could have a significant impact, particularly amongst the 0-5 age range.

Q128 Are there any specific safety features for platforms which you would like to see online companies introduce?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

DO the **right** thing ✓

Q129 Which specific safety features for platforms would you like to see introduced by online companies?

IWF response: The IWF is working with the NSPCC to create an online reporting portal for young people under the age of 18 to remove nude images of themselves from the Internet confidentially. We will verify the age of the young person through Yoti and whilst we are still in the process of finalising the functionality of the reporting mechanism, we are hoping that young people will be able to upload images of themselves from the spring 2018. We would like to see online companies promote the use of this reporting mechanism as well as the IWF reporting portal as part of their safety features. We would also welcome online platforms taking IWF services such as image hash list, URL list and keywords deployed on their services as appropriate.

Q135 Developing children's digital literacy

The Internet has fundamentally changed how we interact with each other.

To help children manage online risks, government will ensure that digital literacy plays a role in upcoming new compulsory Relationships Education and Relationships and Sex Education subjects in schools in England.

Peer to peer schemes allow children and young people to learn and support one another.

Evidence from existing initiatives such as Childnet's Digital Leaders scheme shows that peer to peer support schemes can be particularly effective in helping children stay safe online.

Therefore DCMS will encourage and support peer to peer support programmes focussed on

online safety. We are keen to understand which children you think would most benefit from such a programme.

Do you believe that an online safety peer to peer development scheme would be an effective way of helping children stay safe online?

Yes (4)

No (5)

Don't know (6)

Q136 Which of these groups of children do you think would most benefit from a peer to peer online safety support scheme? (Select up to three options)

Those aged 4 - 12 years (1)

Those aged 13 - 16 years (2)

Those aged 17 - 21 years (3)

Girls (4)

Boys (5)

'Children in need' - this refers to children who are aged under 18 and who need local authority services to achieve or maintain a reasonable standard of health or development; need local

authority services to prevent significant or further harm to health or development; are disabled (6)

Children who reside away from home (for example, those at boarding schools) (7)

Children who qualify for free school meals (8)

Children with with Special Educational Needs (SEN)/ Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LDD) (9)

Children with behaviour and school attendance issues (10)

Young offenders (11)

Children with mental health issues (12)

Other (please specify) (13) _____

None of the above (please explain your answer) 14)

X Don't Know (15)

Q137 Do you believe that the technology industry has a role to play in supporting children develop their digital literacy skills?

X Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

**Q138 How do you think the technology industry should do this?
(Select up to three options)**

X Support charities who will develop materials on the industry's behalf (1)

Regularly suggest to under 18 users that they should look at relevant digital literacy materials (2)

X Develop materials and games which promote digital literacy (for example, Google Legends chool programme and Interlands, online game) (3)

Improve moderation and reporting functions on their sites (4)

Enforce existing terms and conditions (5)

Age verify users (6)

X Develop free materials for schools and training for teachers (7)

Develop free materials for parents (8)

Develop free materials for professionals who come into regular contact with children, for example doctors and social workers (9)

Other (please specify) (10) _____

Don't know (11)

Q139 Why do you think this is? (Select all that apply)

The technology industry isn't responsible for the safety or wellbeing of its users (1)

The technology industry already does enough to support users through existing initiatives (2)

Online safety issues are best tackled by others, not the technology industry (3)

Don't trust the technology industry to deliver suitable support (4)

X Other (please specify) (5) A partnership approach between industry, Govt and others is needed

Don't know (6)

Q140 Online dating

There has been significant recent public concern around the use of adult dating sites and apps by children which have resulted in contact abuse.



STOP Child Sexual
Abuse Imagery Online

DO the **right** thing ✓

Do you think social media and application services enabling contact between users on a sexual / romantic basis should have a minimum age rating?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

Q141 What do you think the minimum age rating should be?

14 and above (1)

16 and above (2)

18 and above (3)

21 and above (4)

Q142 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"Social media and application services enabling contact between users on a sexual/romantic basis, do all they can to prevent abuse of young people."

Strongly agree (1)

Agree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q143 To what extent do you agree/ disagree with the following statement?

"Adult-oriented applications or services with terms and conditions applying to users over 18 should be subject to age verification."

Strongly agree (1)

Agree (2)

X Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Disagree (4)

Strongly disagree (5)

Don't know (6)

Q144 Who do you consider should be responsible for ensuring that young people don't use applications for adult dating/ contact between users on a sexual/romantic basis? (Select all that apply)

Parents (1)

Law enforcement (2)

The companies offering such services (3)

Other users (4)

Other (please specify) (5) _____

X All of the above (6)

None of the above (7)

Don't know (8)

Q145 Do you think steps should be put in place to stop young people using applications for adult dating / contact between users on a sexual / romantic basis?

X Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't know (3)

Q146 What steps should social media or application services offering dating or adult-oriented services put in place to prevent use by young people? (Select up to three options)

Clear terms and conditions of use (1)

Providing advertising space or messaging on the legality of sexual communication with children (2)

Age verification (3)

Provide information to users about how to access support if they feel at risk of being exploited (4)

Making it easy for users to report under-18 profiles (5)

Terminating accounts of those reported as under-18 (6)

Responding to law enforcement requests for information (7)

Funding education or responsible behaviour campaigns (8)

Other (please specify) (9) _____

X All of the above (10)

None of the above (11)

Don't know (12)