

**INTERNET WATCH FOUNDATION
Board Meeting**

10.30 am, Tuesday 22nd May 2007

At the SMART Company, 78 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6HE

MINUTES

Present: Amanda Jordan (Chair), Emma Ascroft, Sonia Livingstone, Hamish MacLeod (by telephone for part) Ian Walden,

IWF Staff: Peter Robbins, Brian Wegg

Apologies: Tink Palmer, Jim Reynolds, Camille de Stempel

1 Welcome

Amanda Jordan opened the meeting and noted the apologies.

2 Minutes of previous Board meeting – 20th March 2007

These were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

3 Matters arising - including action summary from 20th March

Action 3: Ian Walden reported that he had met with the IWF General Manger and they had identified some issues in the CAIC supply contract which needed clarification. These would be addressed with the IWF's lawyers in this matter.

Action 5: Chief Executive explained that the discussion paper on extreme pornography had not been circulated because of the uncertainty on definitions and timescales. Board would need to take a position on any legislative proposals before consultation.

It was noted that all other actions were completed, ongoing or matters on the main agenda.

There were no other matters arising.

4 Minutes from Executive Committee of 2nd May - for information

To be circulated for information at a future date.

Policy matters:

5 CAIC:

a) Validation – options paper

Chief Executive introduced the paper, outlined the three broad options and explained the background to the recommendation that validation should be carried out by self-certification. It was acknowledged that frequencies in the options were not consistent and staff had found it extremely difficult to assemble and estimate accurate costs. However it was clear that two of the options would require significant IWF expenditure.

It was confirmed that self-certification could be carried out by a third party and that IWF could offer this service at 'arms length' through IWL to avoid any conflict of interest. However this would need to be done on a full cost recovery basis.

Chief Executive confirmed that the recommendation was subject to further development and consultation in order to set out frequencies and processes. Board



considered the likely causes of failure in a blocking process and the risks involved which would determine the frequencies.

Board acknowledged that validation may be subject to wider scrutiny by government and the media and although self-certification was within the spirit of trust and partnership with the UK internet industry, the process must be sufficiently robust. The importance of developing an affordable but robust option for smaller ISPs was noted.

Following further discussion, Chair summarised as follows Board's conclusions on preferred options on which to base consultation:

- i) The preferred option is self-certification;
- ii) This could be carried out in a variety of ways and the onus was on each company to develop the most appropriate method for them;
- iii) IWF monitors;
- iv) The frequency of checking should be monthly;
- v) In the event of a failure some form of 'breach procedure' is activated - the onus is on the company to notify;
- vi) A senior officer of the company signs and forwards to the Board an annual compliance return;
- vii) The annual return would be published to the IWF Board only.

Chair asked the Chief Executive to liaise with industry Board members and rework the validation paper for further discussion in accordance with the conclusions shown above.

ACTION 1 - Chief Executive to:

- a) Check with FSN how they validate with regard to online content in Germany;
- b) Redraft validation paper for further discussion and consultation.

With regard to remedial action, Board confirmed that should any failures occur they wished to see a process which resulted in a proportionate response and assisted industry in preventing the publication of potentially illegal child sexual abuse images.

It was agreed that the target date for implementation of validation should be 1 January 2008. However it was noted that following publication on 1 July questions may be put to IWF on how it was checking that blocking was working successfully.

b) Transparency – statement to accompany publication of company list

Industry Board members explained that concerns had been expressed about bringing forward the 'transparency date' by six months and including the words 'deploy the CAIC list' in the statement. This would exclude some companies unfairly which were working hard to implement a solution by 1 January 2008. Without some form of validation it was also not possible to say with confidence that a company was deploying the list. They explained that during a recent teleconference the transparency statement had been amended to accommodate these concerns and the amended text was tabled. Following further discussion Board supported the amended text on the understanding that this would be replaced on 1 January 2008. Board noted that the industry teleconference meeting would reconvene in order to vote formally on the amended text.

Board noted that they had previously signed off the relevant FAQs and agreed that a further FAQ referring to small ISPs should be added.

ACTION 2: Secretariat to add FAQ on small ISPs



6 Response to HO Consultation Paper on the possession of non-photographic visual depictions of child sexual abuse.

Board noted that there appeared to be a significant volume of such content hosted outside the UK and public uncertainty on where the content was hosted may result in an increase in reports to the IWF. Subject to some minor presentational amendments and the addition of an outline impact summary, Board supported the response. The amended response would be forwarded to Funding Council for comment and in order to meet the consultation deadline, signed off electronically by Board.

ACTION 3: Secretariat to amend response, circulate to Funding Council, sign off with Board and forward to the Home Office.

7 Response to EU consultation on the Safer Internet and online technologies for children

Chief Executive explained the background to the consultation and how it was part of a wider discussion and assessment process the Commission was engaged in with regard to safer internet programmes. He explained that IWF would only be responding to questionnaire 1 which dealt with illegal online content and that the bullet points were a summary of our responses to each of the relevant questions.

In answer to a question, the Chief Executive outlined how IWF was working in partnership with Nominet with regard to issues within our remit. He added that it was important to note that in questionnaire 1 on illegal content, the Commission was asking for suggestions in question 1.3 for how they might extend their activities in combating illegal online content. From its day to day investigative work, IWF was aware that specific IP blocks regularly hosted potentially illegal child abuse content and that some domain name registries were not as careful as Nominet with regard to the name of domains or the registration information. This had been the basis of the two last bullet points. Board noted some presentational issues to address.

Subject to the presentational points being addressed and Nominet supporting the comments on domain name registration, Board supported the draft consultation response as a basis for consulting with industry and forwarding to the European Commission.

ACTION 4: Secretariat to amend, circulate to Funding Council and forward to the Commission following any industry comments.

Governance matters:

8 Audit Sub-committee

a) Recommendation on auditor appointment

The tendering process for the appointment was outlined and following a selection process, the Audit Sub-committee would be recommending to Board and the AGM that Peters Elworthy and Moore be re-appointed as company auditors. Board endorsed the recommendation.

b) Provisional 2006/7 year end management accounts and balance sheet

c) Exception report to April 2007

d) Balance sheet to April 2007

The above financial reports were noted.

9 Application to Charity Commission for remuneration for Board members

The executive reported that received no written response from the Commission had been received and they had exceeded their own deadline timescales for responding.



He reported that he had telephoned the Commission and they were indicating that they were not minded to approve remuneration for our non-industry Board members. They were taking the view that although we are a unique organisation, we had not provided sufficient evidence that we were unable to recruit unpaid Trustees or that we could not buy in the necessary expertise to advise Board at appropriate times. They took a similar stance with regard to the attendance allowance. The executive was asked to push for a written reply and to pursue the option of attendance allowances.

ACTION 5: Secretariat to pursue attendance allowance option with the Commission

10 Appointment of replacement public interest Board members

The discussions with the three recruitment consultancies were outlined and Board were notified that the Board Executive Committee had resolved to appoint Rockpools subject to a negotiation on the fee and advertising costs. Board endorsed this recommendation and noted the appointment timetable.

11 Confirmation on format for strategic Board and FC meeting 3rd July 2007

Board endorsed the view that the international dimension should be the focus of presentations and subsequent discussion, with particular emphasis on the US, Russia and INHOPE. Board Executive Committee had asked the Chief Executive to investigate appropriate speakers who could focus on the international themes identified.

Membership:

12 Member update report

Board approved the membership applications by Redstone Communications, Tempero and Smoothwall and noted the helpful report.

Chair and CEO matters:

13 Chair's report

Board noted the Chair's comments.

14 Chief Executive's report

Chief Executive outlined some issues and Board noted the helpful briefing paper.

Operational matters:

15 Hotline:

a) Hotline Operational report

The report was noted.

b) Communications issues

The media and press cuttings were noted.

It was reported that the industry communications meeting had taken place and a number of important communications developments would be brought forward to the Sub-committee and Board in a cooperative plan.

16 AOB

Emma Ascroft informed the Board that the industry governance review was proceeding and further documents for discussion would be circulated shortly to



industry members. Emma asked if an email list could be set up solely for industry members to debate these matters.

ACTION 6: Secretariat to arrange industry email list
There was no further business.

17 Board dates:

Board dates for 2007:

3rd July, 18th September, 27th November – all Tuesdays, start time **10.30 am**

The next meeting will be at the BT Tower.

The meeting closed at 1 pm.