Internet Watch Foundation

BOARD MEETING

10.20am - Tuesday 29 September 2015

Telefonica
20 Air Street
London, W1B 5AN

<u>**MINUTES**</u>

Apologies:	Uta Kohl
Present:	Sir Richard Tilt (RT) (Chair) Mary MacLeod (MM) (Vice Chair) Jonathan Drori (JD) Peter Neyroud (PN) Jonny Shipp (JS) (Industry Vice-Chair) Brian Webb (BW) Becky Foreman (BF) Sue Pillar (SP) Philip Geering (PG)
IWF Staff:	Susie Hargreaves (SH) (CEO) Fred Langford (FL) (Deputy CEO) Emma Hardy (EH) (Director of External Relations - DER) Heidi Kempster (HK) (Director of Business Affairs - DBA) Sandrine Harvey (SJH) (Minutes)
In attendance:	Paul Cording (PC) (FC Chair) Lisa Stacey (LS) (Temporary Communications Manager) Nicky Peachment (NP) (Commercial Relationship Manager)

IWF Board Closed session

There was a closed session of the IWF Board from 10.00am to 10.20am.

1. a) Welcome and Apologies

The meeting began at 10.20am.

The Chair welcomed Paul Cording, FC Chair and Lisa Stacey, Communications Manager, who will be replacing EH during her maternity leave.

There were apologies from Uta Kohl.

b) Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest. The Chair confirmed that there was no conflict of interest for JD to be a member of iRights.

2. Draft minutes

a) 16 June 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2015 were **approved** by the Board subject to the following typo being amended:

"3. Actions arising

Action 3 draft minutes – 25.11.14: …as we were aware they were going through a reorganisation and some reorganisation" should read as "…as we were aware they were going through a reorganisation."

Action: SJH to amend accordingly.

b) 13-14 July 2015

The minutes were not approved as some amendments need to be made in the audit committee report on points b and c. The Chair suggested to re-write the points as follows: "The Board discussed further security issues."

The list of participants needs to be reviewed as they were a number of corrections required.

These minutes will be represented at the next Board meeting for approval on 24 November 2015

Action: SJH to amend accordingly and represent the minutes at the next Board meeting in November.

3. **Actions arising**

   Action 5. Audit report 5a. IWF accounts Q3: The Chair of the audit committee updated verbally the Board that the market was not favourable at the moment and these will be reviewed as soon as there is a shift in the situation.

4. **FC Communique**

   The Board noted the communique.

   A Board member queried the reasons for not accepting companies which were supplying device testing services to law enforcement into membership. An industry member informed the Board that the FC's view was that these companies are not hosting content and therefore not eligible. It was suggested that we could allow these companies to use the IWF URL List subject to a charge.

   Action: Industry Board members to report to the next FC meeting in November.

5. **Audit committee report**

   1. Draft Year-end Accounts

   a. Draft IWF accounts

   The Board noted and **approved** the year-end accounts for IWF. It was clarified that the "debtors" in the consolidated balance sheet (page 11) were the outstanding membership fees.

b. Draft IWL accounts

The Board noted and **approved** the Year-end accounts for IWL. It has been confirmed that the last date of trading for IWL was 31 March 2015.

c. Draft Key issues memorandum

The Board **approved** the key issues memorandum.

2. **Q1 Management accounts**

Further to a query from a Board member, it was clarified that the £1m grant from Google is received in four annual payments. The last payment is due in July 2016.

The Chair also informed the Board that due to some unplanned expenditure, a revised budget will be presented at the next Board meeting.

Action: HK to prepare and present a revised budget.

6. **Chair's report**

The Chair informed the Board that he was meeting the CEO regularly regarding the security review and INHOPE. He also gave an update on the recruitment of the new trustees.

7. **CEO report**

The CEO reported that no further progress had been made on the Obscene Adult Content issue. She also reported that her attendance to the Annual Crimes against Children Conference in Dallas had been a good opportunity to meet the US counterparts and NCMEC colleagues, particularly members of the US Technology Coalition and she recommended that the IWF attend annually submitting ideas for presentations in future. In 2016, FL would attend to share progress on the hash list project.

2.1.5 Google grant

A Board member asked whether a DBS check for the 'Googler in Residence' had been received and the DCEO confirmed that Google provided the US equivalent, an official police check from the state the engineer is resident.

The Board noted the paper.

8. **Communications report**

The DER highlighted that the BBC radio 4 programme and blog about the hash list had been well received and brought a lot of interest, which will be followed up in autumn/winter when the list will be pushed out.

3. **Public Affairs Update**

3.1 Net Neutrality

The Chair of the Funding Council (FC) raised the concern that the net neutrality regulation might have a negative impact on the Members. This EU directive could potentially go against the legality of the use of the list and Members are concerned of eventually being taken to court. The Chair of the FC suggested that the IWF list might not be well understood at a government level and therefore, not be promoted as it should. Another Board member proposed that more work is done at EU level developing a greater understanding of the IWF,

its Members and how the list is deployed. The outcome was still, open to interpretation. The Board felt a clearer line from the UK government would be helpful and asked the IWF to raise the issue directly with Minister Bradley and ask her to make a statement in the house clarifying the UK position and giving assurances in regard to the IWF list. It was also suggested that a question might be raised in the house by the opposition, and again, IWF as was asked to prepare a question and possible answers.

4. Website

The DER informed the new website had been commissioned with completion within the financial year.

5. Visit

The Board noted that the parents of a victim had made a private visit to the IWF to understand more about the problem of online CSAM. The DER informed the Board that when appropriate we would offer similar visits. This was important as often people who have been personally affected by the issue, were not fully informed about all the work that was being undertaken by the IWF, industry and other partners so it helped them to know something was being done and also briefed them so that were able to cope with media request.

6. Offender behaviour change campaign

A deterrent campaign will go out under Stop it Now! banner. There are three videos which have some really strong messages about the implications of looking at content.

A Board member still felts that a campaign is needed to encourage a change of behaviour among young men and reporting to IWF and raise the IWF profile. Ideally, the campaign should be led by another organisation in the field and the IWF should work alongside. The Chair asked whether this issue had been brought up by the UKCCIS Board. The CEO replied it had not and will bring it up at the next meeting.

Action: SH to bring up the issue of an awareness campaign at the next UKCCIS meeting.

A Board member wished all the best to the DER for the birth of her baby.

9. Technical report

1. Background

1.1. Hotline

1.1.1 Operational Trends

The DCEO clarified the term "accuracy" in the paper, further to a Board member's request, as public accuracy, reports received from the public. There is currently no explanation for the reason why the public accuracy has increased. It has also been suggested that an awareness campaign could be an efficient way of increasing the accuracy of the reports received.

Another Board member queried the reasons behind the increase of Canada's hosting percentage. The DCEO's view is that it might be a political issue related to jurisdiction issues between USA and Canada. However, when a notification is sent by the IWF, the content is generally removed quickly. The Chair of the FC suggested to discuss this issue at the WePROTECT summit as many countries will be represented.

4. IWF Network and Technology

4.2 IWF Hash list project

4.2.3 The DCEO confirmed that the first stage of the project was restricted to 1,000 hashes, which were not part of any ongoing investigations, which would be used to understand what the overall impact would be on law enforcement resources. It has not been an easy process to date. The Board agreed that it was essential to maintain a good close working relationship with the NCA as a key partner. It was therefore agreed that the Chair and Chair of Audit would meet with the CEO of CEOP to discuss.

4.2.4. A Board member queried the welfare of the analysts and suggested that options were considered on how to manage future volumes of images for the hash list. The following possibilities had been discussed:

> 1) To retain the same number of analysts and process the images on a longer period of time; or
>
> 2) Hire more analysts on a temporary basis to process the images on a shorter period of time, but the financial impact could not be currently supported.

The Google grant, which allowed to hire more staff to do the proactive work has been discussed with Google and there is a possibility it might renewed, but they also feel that the burden should not be borne by Google only, but also other big Members.

 Another source of funding suggested is the EU Daphne project.

The Chair requested that a business case is presented with the various possibilities and impacts.

Action: SH to present a business case at the next Board meeting in November.

4.2.6 The CEO also informed the Board that one of the WePROTECT aims for the next Summit to be held in Abu Dhabi in November was the establishment of a 'global hash list'. The IWF had been working hard to establish itself as the agreed global industry solution in order to be adopted as the trusted global standard. It has been acknowledged that some groups would rather use a law enforcement system and others would prefer a non-governmental body.so the current discussions were to have two lists.

11. Security

11.2 Nettitude has successfully penetration-tested RMS and carried out a code review.

Studio 24, which is re-designing the new website, has carried out an analysis of the reporting pages associated with the IWF website and has highlighted a live threat. The threat has been neutralised in accordance with their advice. As a result of both areas of testing/analysis, it is recommended that a third party code audit is carried out on an annual basis.

A Board member raised again the issue of mobile devices in the Hotline and the risk of screen shot being taken. Although there was some resistance from the management to implement this policy last year, the Executives and Board now unanimously **agreed** that, mobile devices would be kept in lockers out of the Hotline room.

Action: HK to implement new policy.

The DCEO informed the Board that the organisation had passed the ISO 27001 2013 standard.

10. **DBA report**

2.3 Contractual update

The DBA confirmed that the contract with the company, which had previously provided technical support to the RMS system, had been legally terminated and alternative arrangement put in place as agreed.

The company is claiming that a 6k invoice is outstanding. The DBA does not agree with the claim. The Board **approved** a decision not to pay the invoice.

Action: HK not to pay the invoice.

2. Strategic development

2.1. Membership review

The membership review by the working group is nearing conclusion despite an on-going discussion with two companies, who disagree with the new metrics. The Board agreed that a conclusion needs to be reached quickly and we need to maintain a fair and consistent process even if this does mean going against the wishes of the two companies currently in disagreement.

The Board **approved** the adjustments to the model by applying:

> a) the use of Commscore data;
>
> b) the use of secondary metric data , including the UK rankings of the companies;
>
> c) the right for affiliate companies to join in their own right as long as the Parent company is in membership

2.2 Non-Member Licensees

The Board has agreed to delay the review for non-Member licensees as the process is more complex as there is no operation in the UK. The Board also agreed that the fees will remain the same until further notice. A Board member suggested that some big companies operating outside UK could have a big impact on the disruption of the distribution of the images around the world and it should be considered as fair that they pay as much as UK companies.

11. **International report**

1. **International programme**

The CEO presented the current international objectives and strategy of the IWF globally as requested at the last Board meeting in July 2015. Further to a query from the Chair of the FC, it has been confirmed that the IWF was the only organisation which had an MoU with NCMEC.

The Commercial Relationship Manager joined the meeting at 12.10pm.

3. **Global Industry Standard Scoping Study**

The CEO informed the Board that Ian Walden (IW) – Professor of Information and Communication Law and head of the Institute of Computer and Communications Law (ICCL) in the Centre for Commercial Law Studies, Queen Mary University of London - has been commissioned to do a scoping study exercise for the creation of a global voluntary industry standard for the reporting and removal of CSAM. IW will present his findings at the next Board meeting in November with a further presentation to FC at a date to be agreed.

After the presentation, an open discussion took place.

A discussion around the process of getting an industry standard to assess images occurred; this will be explained in the study. A Board member mentioned that the code of practice for Members in relation to the FC could be a powerful reference.

There was a discussion about the current relationship with INHOPE. The Board was aware that the IWF had raised a number of major concerns over the past two years and these were still ongoing. In particular, a number of security concerns related to inputting into the INHOPE IC-CAM database had not been responded to. At present the IWF cannot join the project as the security would fail ISO 27001 accreditation requirements. These concerns would be discussed with the Commission at the forthcoming meeting between RT/FL and Pat Manson.

The IWF had made an unsuccessful bid last year for the core platform and was aware that this would be going tendered again in early 2016. The Board discussed the pros and cons of the IWF submitting a tender.

Action: SH to present an options paper INHOPE database at the next Board meeting in November.

12. **Youth-produced research project companies**

The Commercial Relationship Manager informed the Board that the actionable content depicting children aged 15 years and below as identified during the course of the study has all been removed. This includes the content that was on the cyberlockers identified in the study. The Chair will meet with a stakeholder who had raised this issue to explain how the situation has improved and the reasons for not naming some of the companies whose services were abused.

Action: RT to arrange a meeting with the stakeholder and update on the situation.

13. **INHOPE Quality Assurance Report**

The Board **agreed** to publish the executive summary of the INHOPE Quality Assurance report on the website.

Action: EH to publish the INHOPE Quality Assurance report on the website.

14. **AOB**

The CEO confirmed that the guest speaker at the AGM in November will be Baroness Joanna Shields, Minister for Internet Safety and Security at the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

The Board elected Brian Webb as member of the Self-Certification committee.

The CEO gave her apologies for her absence at the next AGM as she will be attending the IGF in Brazil and going straight from there to WePROTECT in the UAE.

15. Date of next meetings

The Board **agreed** the dates suggested by the Executive Assistant for the Board and Audit committee meetings for 2015/16.

Action: SJH to circulate a schedule.

AGM – Tuesday 10 November 2015 followed by lunch in London;

Tuesday 24 November 2015, London.

The meeting ended at 1.00pm.