Quarterly Report of Appeals, Complaints and Advice – EE Strict

The BBFC is the regulator of commercial and internet content delivered via the mobile network of EE for its 'Strict' level of mobile content.

In the interest of transparency, the BBFC publishes all of its adjudications in relation to cases reported to it of purported underblocking or overblocking, along with requests for advice on whether particular content should go behind parental controls or adult filters.

We keep this list updated as and when new cases are reported to us and publish updates every three months.

In all cases, the BBFC conveys its adjudication to (i) the complainant, appellant or person or body seeking advice; and (ii) the mobile network operator EE.

In the following cases, the adjudications represent an assessment of the content according to the terms of the BBFC's EE Strict Classification Framework. Any subsequent changes to content have therefore not been viewed by the BBFC, although we reserve the right to change our adjudication should altered content be brought to our attention subsequently.

All websites that the BBFC would classify 18 or R18, or refuse to classify, would be automatically considered unsuitable for the EE Strict Classification Framework. Further information on the original Quarterly Report adjudications are available on the BBFC's website here.

October 2018

5 October 2018

Website

futuregeneration.com

<u>Issue</u>

A member of the public contacted the BBFC directly to complain that a website was placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

<u>Adjudication</u>

The BBFC viewed the website on 5 October 2018.

We noted that the website advertised services of a company that designs, builds and manages student accommodation. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

November 2018

01 November 2018

<u>Website</u>

bbcoheadwear.com

Issue

A member of the public contacted the BBFC directly to complain that a website was placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

We noted that the website was a retail site specialising in outdoor head wear and accessories. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

19 November 2018

Website

chrisalyas.co.uk

<u>Issue</u>

A member of the public contacted the BBFC directly to complain that a website was placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

<u>Adjudication</u>

We noted that the website advertised the services of a beauty salon, including microdermabrasion and acne treatments. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

December 2018

20 December 2018

Website

freelancerfinancials.co.uk

Issue

A member of the public contacted the BBFC directly to complain that a website was placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

We noted that the website was a financial services website which offered a range of financial services products, including mortgage broking. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

BBFC 31 December 2018