

## **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.**

### **January 2019**

*18 January 2019*

#### Website

kegel8.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 an online retailer of a range of products, including pelvic floor toners and trainers, as well as accessories such as vaginal and anal probes, intended to improve pelvic health. The website also featured a range of articles about pelvic health, which offered support and advice for those suffering from conditions such as prolapses, incontinence and pelvic pain. The website included strong references to sex, including to orgasms and sexual positions. Accordingly, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

*24 January 2019*

Website

durex.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 retailed a range of sexual health products, as well as products which aid sexual stimulation, including lubricants and sex toys. The website also featured a range of articles which provided sex and relationship advice, including those which focused on sexual health. Due to the frequent strong sex references evident across the site, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

**February 2019**

*6 February 2019*

Website

hashtagorganics.co.uk

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been 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 retailed a range of products containing CBD. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

*11 February 2019*

Website

synervacbd oils.co.uk

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been 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 retailed a range of products containing CBD. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

### **March 2019**

*4 March 2019*

### Website

sextherapylancashire.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 provided information about the services of Sex Therapy Lancashire, an organisation which offers individuals and couples a range of support services relating to sex and relationship wellbeing. Text across the website contained detailed references to sex and sexual abuse. Accordingly, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

*4 March 2019*

### Website

hentastic.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 an event planning website which specialised in organising hen parties. The company offered hen parties the chance to attend a club night featuring drag acts and male strippers. Due to the moderately sexualised images of male striptease performers, as well as uses of moderate innuendo used to describe their performances, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

*5 March 2019*

### Website

hg-hydroponics.co.uk

Issue

The BBFC originally adjudicated on the website in September 2014 and April 2018. Further to the BBFC's previous adjudications, the site owner contacted the BBFC to complain that the website remained behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC provided a further adjudication when we viewed a revised version of the website on 5 March 2019.

As in September 2014 and April 2019, we noted that the site sold various products related to hydroponics, including lighting equipment, feed and grow cabinets. However, there was no longer any evidence which strongly suggested that the hydroponic items were being sold primarily with the intention of growing illegal drugs. The content on the website did not overtly encourage, glamorise or promote drug misuse or other related illegal activities. Accordingly, we found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

*6 March 2019*

Website

nordvpn.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 offered a paid-for VPN service. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

*6 March 2019*

Website

wonderproxy.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 offered a paid for proxy service. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

*8 March 2019*

### Website

hackthissite.org

### 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 an online community focused on white hat hacking. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

*25 March 2019*

### Website

paradisecbd.co.uk

### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been 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 retailed a range of products containing CBD. We found no content that we would consider unsuitable for children under 12.

**BBFC**

**31 March 2019**