In November 2017, the European Parliament’s Committee for Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs released its report on the implementation of Directive 2011/93/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography. Rapporteur Anna Maria Corazza Bildt specifically mentioned the Internet Watch Foundation as an example of better cooperation between Member States and helplines/hotlines to ensure the protection of children and minors who are the victims of sexual exploitation and abuse. As recently as this year, the good practices of the IWF has also been highlighted during plenary debates in the European Parliament and in the Parliament’s Committee on Culture and Education. We look forward to continuing this close cooperation with both the Government of our own Member State and with European policy makers who are equally dedicated in their fight against CSAM.

We consider ourselves to be world leaders in tackling the spread of Child Sexual Abuse Material online, based on our model of self-regulation, working in partnership with the Internet Industry, Law Enforcement and Government. In 1996, when the IWF was founded 18% of the world’s Child Sexual Abuse Material was hosted in the UK and today that figure is below 1% demonstrating the IWFs impact over the last twenty-one years helping to make the UK the safest place to go online and the most hostile place in the world for the hosting of this content.

While we welcome the Commission’s inclusion of a definition of ‘Trusted Flagger’, we believe that the role of a ‘Trusted Flagger’ should be independent from industry while also being subject to some form of judicial review. This type of oversight ensures that the highest possible standards are maintained. In January 2014, the Internet Watch Foundation published a human rights audit which was carried out by former Director of Public Prosecutions Lord Ken Macdonald. This was to ensure that the IWF’s work was entirely consistent with human rights and European law.