Quarterly Report of Appeals, Complaints and Advice

The BBFC is the regulator of commercial and internet content delivered via the mobile networks of EE, O2, Three and Vodafone.

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; (ii) Mobile UK; and (iii) the relevant mobile network operator(s).

The adjudication that a website contains no material that we would classify 18 does not necessarily mean that we believe it is suitable for younger children.

In the following cases, the adjudications represent an assessment of the content according to the dates listed below. 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.

October 2018

5 October 2018

Website

futuregeneration.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

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 which we would classify 18 or refuse to classify.

10 October 2018

Website

archive.org
Issue

The BBFC originally adjudicated on the website in September 2015. Further to the BBFC's original adjudication, a mobile network operator contacted the BBFC 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

The BBFC provided a further adjudication when we viewed the website on 10 October 2018.

As in September 2015, we determined that the site was a digital archive which hosted a range of media including video, books and articles. We found a range of pornography across the archive which featured explicit images of sexual activity, in both animated and non-animated contexts. The site also contained repeated uses of very strong language. Additionally, out of copyright film and video material which the BBFC has passed 18 was also present on the site. As such, we concluded that we would continue to classify the site 18.

Further information relating to the original adjudication is available in the September 2015 Quarterly Report on the BBFC website.

November 2018

01 November 2018

Website

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 which we would classify 18 or refuse to classify.

19 November 2018

Website

chrisalyas.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 advertised the services of a beauty salon, including microdermabrasion and acne treatments. We found no content which we would classify 18 or refuse to classify.

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. Based on our sampling of the site, we found no material that the BBFC would classify 18 or refuse to classify.

BBFC

31 December 2018