

**Internet Watch Foundation**

**BOARD MEETING**

**10.20am - Tuesday 24 November 2015**

**Baker & McKenzie  
100 New Bridge Street  
London, EC4V 6JA**

**MINUTES**

- Present:** Sir Richard Tilt (RT) (Chair)  
Mary MacLeod (MM) (Vice Chair)  
Peter Neyroud (PN)  
Jonny Shipp (JS) (Industry Vice-Chair)  
Brian Webb (BW)  
Becky Foreman (BF)  
Sue Pillar (SP)  
Philip Geering (PG)  
Uta Kohl (UTA)  
Jonathan Lea (JL)
- Apologies:** Jonathan Drori (JD)
- IWF Staff:** Susie Hargreaves (SH) (CEO)  
Fred Langford (FL) (Deputy CEO)  
Heidi Kempster (HK) (Director of Business Affairs - DBA)  
Sandrine Harvey (SJH) (Minutes)
- In attendance:** Paul Cording (PC) (FC Chair)  
Ian Walden (IW for item 8)

**IWF Board Closed session**

There was a closed session of the IWF Board from 10.00am to 10.15am.

**1. a) Welcome and Apologies**

The meeting began at 10.15am.

The Chair welcomed Jonathan Lea – new trustee.

There were apologies from Jonathan Drori.

**b) Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## 2. Draft minutes

### a) Amended minutes 13-14 July 2015

The revised minutes were approved.

### b) 29 September 2015

The minutes were approved.

## 3. Actions arising

The Board noted the actions.

## 4. FC communique

The Board noted the communique.

10.25am JL arrived.

## 5. Audit committee report

### a. Management accounts Q2 incl. revised budget for 2015/16

The Board noted the management accounts Q2 and **approved** the revised budget for 2015/16.

There were no other issues reported.

## 6. Chair's report

The Chair informed the Board that he and the Deputy CEO met with Pat Manson, from the European Commission/DG Connect on 02 October 2015 in Luxembourg. During the meeting, they expressed security concerns regarding the new INHOPE reporting system ICCAM and also discussed the possibility that the IWF might bid again for the generic services. The EU commission confirmed that as the IWF had serious security concerns that until these were resolved, we would not be penalised if we ceased to put data in the INHOPE system and this has been confirmed in writing. As Ms Manson is due to retire, a Board member queried if there were any intention to meet with her replacement. The Chair of the Funding Council mentioned that the Assistant Director, Marco Marsella will temporarily fill in the role until there is a confirmed nomination and that Kristof Claesen (KC) was maintaining a watching brief on the situation.

The Chair also attended the INHOPE General Assembly in Lisbon and the FOSI conference in Washington DC:

- a) The main agenda item at the INHOPE General Assembly was the revised strategy. The Chair reported that a number of letters from a number of hotlines were sent to the INHOPE Board, executives and members detailing a range of concerns with the draft strategy that had been shared. Following this, it was agreed the mission statement and strategy would be re-drafted and presented at the General Assembly. There was a workshop run by an outside facilitator who would be contacting all hotlines, collating all responses and representing the mission and strategy at the General Assembly in six months.

A Board member queried whether the situation about the reporting system's security ICCAM had been clarified. The DCEO clarified that he understood the security issues

were not discussed per se at the General Assembly as these had been dealt with in detail at a closed session at the Safer Internet Forum in Luxembourg one week previously. Following this a letter had been sent to INHOPE giving formal notice that IWF would suspend input into the database until security concerns had been addressed.

Following this, the IWF and all other members had received a very general letter from the INHOPE auditor but this fell short of giving the detail and assurances required for the IWF to resume inputting data, INHOPE has given verbal assurance that this letter would follow shortly.

There are also other issues regarding the categorisation of the images, which differ from the UK sentencing guidelines and US legislation. In addition, there are work flow and legal issues that would need to be resolved prior to IWF becoming fully integrated into the full ICCAM system. A Board member suggested to discuss this issue with CEOP.

***Action: RT/PN to talk to Johnny Gwynne about the INHOPE categorisation of the images during their meeting in November.***

- b) The Chair spoke on a panel at FOSI which was very well received. There were no specific issues to report from the FOSI meeting, except that it is a good networking opportunity.

## **7. CEO report**

### **2.1 Revised strategy**

The CEO updated the Board on the revised strategy which was due to be presented with a focus on the international work of the IWF. As previously reported this was on hold until the re-positioning work with the newly appointed agency “Red Lorry Yellow Lorry” was completed. The first meeting will take place in early December 2015.

### **2.4 Relationship with UK law enforcement**

Some concerns about the NCA resources have been raised amongst the Board; the Chair and a Board member are meeting with NCA-CEOP on Thursday 26 November 2015. A Board member reminded the Board that the IWF was an independent organisation and should not get involved in being led by the agenda of either the police or government but should clearly state its position as an independent self-regulatory body.

## **3. International report**

The CEO mentioned that she and the Policy and Public Affairs Manager attended the IGF conference in Brazil. She presented at two sessions. The second presentation was particularly well received where she presented the Self-Generated content research to a capacity audience. There was a lot of positive feedback and in particular many people requesting the IWF to continue with this important area of research.

### **3.1 #WeProtect**

The CEO attended the WeProtect 2<sup>nd</sup> Global Summit on CSE. Although due to the Paris event, a number of high profile politicians didn't attend, including the Home Secretary the event was attended by representatives of over 50 countries.

The CEO reported that the IWF had a high profile at the event – all industry presentations mentioned the IWF and the CEO also presented at the plenary on the first day.

The WeProtect and the Global Alliance will be merged into one event and the IWF will be represented on the Board as a member. The next summit will take place in two years in 2017.

### 3.2 India

The India project is progressing well and implementation of the Portal is likely at the start of the year. There will be two visits to India:

- (i) to meet with key stakeholders; and
- (ii) to launch the portal.

Facebook India has offered to host a roundtable with the major industry Members in India next year as the first stage of building a technology coalition for online safety.

The objective is to start with the portal in one region (Mumbai for Maharashtra) and then as the partnership builds, to develop it to other areas. A Board member suggested to create an IWF umbrella "INHOPE" style in India for the various areas joining the portal.

### 3.3 UK Overseas territories (UKOT)

The CEO is going to attend a reception organised by FCO and meet with some of the representatives of the UKOT.

### 3.5 China

Further to a query from the Chair, the CEO confirmed that the DCEO will attend a roundtable in China in April/May, but he will not sign an MoU.

## 8. Presentation on Code of practice by Ian Walden

Following the Board away day in July, Ian Walden - Professor of Information and Communications Law, Centre for Commercial Law Studies, Queen Mary, University of London - was commissioned to prepare a paper on the possibilities of creating an international code of practice. The final report will be sent mid-December.

IW interviewed a range of people to check the types of issues which needed to be addressed. He presented the various options, which were possible with the compliance required and the length of process to attain recognition. The IWF could decide to have a standard for the content, which would be on how to assess the legality and seriousness of the material or conduct, which could be internal like how long it takes our Members to remove content online or external on who to report to, e.g. the police or a hotline? The Board will need to decide the type of standard it might want to achieve and who it is addressed to. There might be also different codes of practice, e.g. one formal for the Hotline and one informal for the content on what to do if you find some illegal content.

After the presentation, there was a Q&A session.

The Chair asked the CEO to do further work on the subject and suggest the next steps at the Board meeting in March 2016.

**Action: SH to suggest and present next steps at the Board meeting in March 2016.**

## 9. Communications report

The Board noted the report.

## 10. 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary

The CEO reported that the principle of the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary programme would build on the existing/planned programme of activities and events maximising existing resources.

She went through the paper outlining the key elements of the plan. As part of the repositioning work, Red Lorry Yellow Lorry would be asked to consider the creation of an 'umbrella' to bring everything together in a coherent programme.

One new element was the launch of an annual research award. At present the IWF has a budget of £75k to undertake research. It was proposed that from 2016, the IWF should make available up to £50k of this budget to an academic institution to undertake a specific aspect of research. The key criteria for awarding it would be that the research should be able to impact positively on the work of the IWF. The Ethics Committee would form the selection committee.

This was agreed and the CEO charged with drawing up a detailed brief and process.

A detailed plan for the full 20<sup>th</sup> birthday year would be presented at the next Board meeting.

**Action: SH to present a detailed plan at the next Board meeting in March 2016.**

The NSPCC has contacted the IWF to propose a partnership on research and harm reduction campaigns in 2016.

12.15pm BF left the meeting.

The Board **approved** the plan presented.

A Board member suggested the idea of a retrospective of the IWF. This could be a case study for an academic at a Master level who might like to write a case study about the internet and its evolution. The cost should be also low and could be a contribution to a scholarship.

The CEO will look further into this idea.

**Action: SH/PN to talk about the possibilities of a student writing a case study.**

## 11. Technical report

### 1.1.1. Operational trends

Figure 3 – age category of victims

A Board member suggested that the chart about the age category of the victims should be on the IWF website as it was really highlighting the gravity of the issue and self-explanatory. The Board agreed with this suggestion.

**Action: FL to add the chart on the new website.**

It has also been agreed that the UK should be shown on figure 4 "top hosting for actioned websites" to better picture the position of the UK. It has also been suggested to have a percentage per continent.

**Action: FL to add the top 15 or 20 countries on the chart to include the UK and if possible the continents.**

#### 4.4 Security

The DCEO reassured the Board that regular pen testing was being carried out regularly as part of ISO27001 accreditation.

#### 7. IT Usage project and ICA Alert

The DCEO updated the Board on the project as it is in its final phase of testing before being introduced. He also mentioned that he was awaiting to receive the contract, which should stipulate that there was no liability for the IWF and a profit which could be 50% or more.

The Board **agreed** to the commercialisation of the product.

#### 11. INHOPE options

The Board discussed the INHOPE membership and agreed to follow the recommendations.

#### 12. Hashing list update and future resource implications

There are concerns about the volume of hashes to process for the Hotline and discussions on resources available. Currently, it is not possible to commit to more cost without a budget.

The Chair suggested to discuss this issue at the next Board meeting once the DCEO has a more precise figures regarding the volume and how it is going to be managed.

**Action: FL to report at the next Board meeting in March 2016 with further information.**

The implication the IWF hash list will have on resources will be presented at the next FC meeting by FL.

**Action: FL to present the benefits/costs of the IWF hash list at the next FC meeting in January 2016.**

The CEO mentioned that the support for the "Google in Residence" programme has been costed out and they say that it is ca. \$1m.

4.4 FL clarified that the intention is that the IWF hash list will be available to all our Members and not to the US only as it is currently the case with the CAID hash list.

4.7 Further to a Board member's query regarding whether the cost involved in the project could be met by the HO, the DCEO mentioned that he would prefer to remain independent from the government as the organisation's current status depends on this arm's length relationship. It has been **agreed** that the DCEO will present details of the pros/cons and costs in his paper for the next Board meeting.

**Action: FL to present the pros/cons of the HO's involvement in the cost of the project.**

6.2 A Board member suggested to use military analysts on a temporary basis to reduce the cost of training and other. This idea should be further explored and presented at the next Board meeting.

**Action: FL to explore the idea of using other resources to help on a temporary basis.**

### 13. Director of Business Affairs report

#### 2.2.2 Member resignations and terminations

The Board was informed that a Member had had their services suspended due to non-payment of fees. The Board further discussed what actions should be taken in case of non-payment.

### 5. HR

- 5.2 Further to a query from a Board member, the DBA informed that the lockers for the mobile devices for the Hotline had been installed and that the implementation went in general smoothly.

The Board noted the paper and **approved** the revised budget 2015/16 as mentioned in item 5a.

### 14. Draft budget 2016/17

There were no significant changes to the budget for 2016/17. The Board **approved** the draft, which will be presented at the next FC meeting in January 2016.

**Action: HK to present the draft budget for 2016/17 to the FC.**

### 15. Membership model review

The DBA explained the bandings for the membership were agreed and that the review was almost complete. The outstanding issue to resolve was whether the parent company metrics should always be used to calculate the member's fee. The DBA would like to bring back the decision to the executives (the CEO and herself) on which fee a company should join according to a set of "secondary metrics" and data gathered on the individual company. If the company involved doesn't agree with the banding, they can always evoke the established appeal process.

A discussion took place around the issue of how to control where the services were used within companies where the main parent was not the member. The Chair asked the DBA to write a set of principles about the restrictions and use of the services.

**Action: HK to write a set of "secondary metrics" to determine parent company membership and the principles about the use of the services and sanctions to be presented to RT and PC.**

It has also been **agreed** that the set of "secondary metrics" should be flexible and transparent to evolve with the changing environment the industry is growing in. Trust is also an important part of the principles.

**Action: HK to present the model review with FC Comments and the set of principles at the next Board meeting in March 2016.**

### 16. Updated values paper

The Board **approved** the revised paper.

## 17. AOB

The CEO mentioned that she had a discussion with an Industry Board member about the difference in culture between the Board and the Funding Council and suggested the Board and FC members should be meeting once a year. After discussion, it has been **agreed** that it could be a good idea to have an opportunity to debate issues going on in the organisation – this could be done at the AGM in as a forum.

***Action: SH and RT to organise a forum for the next AGM.***

The Chair thanked MM for her contribution to the Board and it had been a huge pleasure to work with her. MM will be greatly missed and the Board is very pleased that she will remain the Chair of the Ethics Committee. MM said it had been one of her most challenging experiences at a Board level and was very happy to leave when the Board was working so well.

The meeting ended at 1.20pm.