

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.

The BBFC took on the responsibility of making adjudications for the EE Strict level on 16 March 2015. At EE's request, we subsequently looked at all websites that we had previously adjudicated as not requiring an adult rating, to see if their content was suitable for younger children. 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 at <http://www.bbfc.co.uk/what-classification/mobile-content/quarterly-report>.

Previous adjudications

Website

bsd-online.co.uk

Adjudication

We found that the website sold office supplies. We found no content on the site which we would classify at 12 or above.

Websites

lifeneews.com, spuc.org.uk, rhrealitycheck.org, mariestopes.org.uk, plannedparenthood.org

Adjudication

We found that the information present on the various sites related to the issue of abortion. The sites also included references to sexual activity (such as masturbation) and / or sexually transmitted infections. We did not consider such content suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

not606.com

Adjudication

Much of the humorous content was aimed at adolescents and was suitable, under BBFC Guidelines, for 15 year olds and above. Therefore, we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

dignityindying.org.uk

Adjudication

The website included discussion of the laws relating to assisted dying and issues such as assisted suicide. As such, we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

girlguiding.org.uk

Adjudication

While the majority of the site was suitable for EE Strict customers, some areas included references to sexually transmitted infections, safe sex, sexual relationships and sexual assault. While such references were not graphic, we did not consider the content within these specific areas to be suitable for children under the age of 12, and access to them was restricted for EE Strict customers as a result.

Website

movingwithoutshaking.com

Adjudication

We found the site to contain information relating to studying or working abroad. We found no content on the site which we would classify at 12 or above.

Website

getvau.it/

Adjudication

We found that the site featured a tool for generating passwords. We found no content on the site which we would classify 12 or above.

Website

jointlyapp.com

Adjudication

We found the site to contain promotional material for an App tool to help carers. The site also contained a short animated video promoting the functions of the App and a Q&A. We found no content on the site which we would classify at 12 or above.

Website

reports.havenclaims.co.uk

Adjudication

We found the site to contain information related to motor insurance (and associated domains to IP address checkers and motor parts). We found no content on the site which we would classify at 12 or above.

Websites

thecrabbiesgrandnational.co.uk, aintree.co.uk, grand-national2014.co.uk, grand-national-guide.co.uk, grandnational.racingpost.com, grand-national.net, grand-national.me.uk, aintree-grand-national.net

Adjudication

We found that the websites provided information relating to racing events and venues. While gambling on linked regulated sites is possible, the websites listed above do not directly facilitate it. Therefore we found no content on the sites which we would classify at 12.

Website

bodyjewellery.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that the website offered information and retail products related to body piercing. These include a range of jewellery, from fake piercings to skin divers. As some of the items being sold related to genital piercings, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

forbidden-nights.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that the website promoted a male variety show for adults. As some of the content was sexualised (for example, sight of apparently naked dancers on stage and partial buttock nudity) we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

adandachi.com/istanbul

Adjudication

The blog featured the thoughts of Syrian activist About Dandachi. It contained news updates relating to events in Syria and Iraq among other countries, and a 'One Stop Resource Page' which included descriptions of chemical weapons attacks in Syria with various external links to news stories covering the issue. The presence of strong language ('f**k') in some areas of the blog meant that we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

veraplayfriends.com

Adjudication

We noted that the website promoted a naturist location and holiday destination, with information pertaining to the resort itself, along with possible accommodation and travel choices for those visiting. As there was discussion of sexual activity (including masturbation) on the forum section of the website, we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

carmageddon.com

Adjudication

We noted that the website promoted a new version of the video game *Carmageddon* which is available on mobile devices as an app. Some bloody violence present in videos on the site meant that we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

shootinguk.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that the website focused on shooting and hunting, with information provided about weapons, shooting (clay, game, rabbiting for example), training gun dogs, and hunting seasons among other things. There were also advertisements for hunting apparel and a section on buying and selling guns, along with links to external weapons sites. As the website contained a focus on realistic weapons, we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

moseleybog.org.uk

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 19 and 20 November. We noted that the website provided information about the Moseley Bog and Joy's Wood Nature Reserve in Birmingham. This included information for schools and children as to how they might become involved in the work of the nature reserve. We found no content that would lead us to classify the website 12 or above.

Website

christianconcern.com

Adjudication

We noted that Christian Concern contained a large number of articles and links to other sources, which provided news stories and comment related to its areas of interest, such as abortion, sexual orientation, religious freedom and same sex marriage. The site contained news stories and articles with references to subjects such as prostitution, lap dancing and pornography, and contained some opinions concerning sexual orientation that might be viewed as discriminatory. As such, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

Maximumfun.org

Adjudication

We noted that the website provided a network resource for podcasts covering a wide range of topics including the media, medical conditions and comedy shows. Access to podcasts was provided through embedded links and external links to iTunes. As some areas of the site contained strong language ('f**k'), we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

battlelog.battlefield.com

Adjudication

We noted that the site offered players of the Battlefield video games series the ability to track their stats for various games, compare achievements, monitor game servers and so on. It featured a video promoting the companion App for smartphones and

tablets, and a trailer for the Battlefield 4 game itself. This trailer featured some strong violence and language from the game, and the sampled forum pages contained strong sex references and language ('f**k') in some discussions. Therefore, we did not consider the site suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

thatfox.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that it was an information resource focusing on the LGBT community and covering issues such as depression, suicide and anorexia. As some areas of the site contained strong language ('f**k') and sex references relating to sex toys, we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

wisdomofwhores.com

Adjudication

We noted that the site is a blog by Elizabeth Pisani, an epidemiologist and writer. The blog reflects her public health interests, in particular HIV/AIDS, and carries numerous articles concerning prostitution, trafficking and pornography, specifically the health of sex workers and performers in the porn industry. As the website contained numerous sex references and some moderate language ('bitch', 'whore'), we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

thehavens.org.uk

Adjudication

We noted that the website provided information about a network of specialist sexual assault referral centres in London. It provided information and support for those affected by sexual assault and rape. It detailed the process of visiting one of the centres, which may involve counselling, tests and treatment. As the site discussed issues of sexual assault in some detail (for example, by detailing the legal definition of rape), we did not consider it suitable for children under the age of 12.

Websites

mybedes.org, bedes.org

Adjudication

We noted that the intranet section was an internal educational and information site for students and staff of the school, with various resources, including papers and video links, for education and student information. We found no content which would lead us to classify the sites 12 or above.

Websites

guntrader.co.uk, gunstar.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that both sites offered the selling and trade of various guns, ranging from BB guns up to shotguns and rifles. As they contained a focus on realistic weapons, we did not consider them suitable for children under the age of 12.

Website

Prettycity.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that the site was a digital portfolio featuring various images and external links to twitter and Vimeo among others. While the site did include some genital nudity it was clearly stylised and was not placed within a sexualised context. As such, we found no content which would lead us to classify the website 12 or above.

March 2015

20 March

Website

pulsin.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that it was a website selling various food products such as snack bars and protein powders. One section on the website sold hemp protein powders in various sizes, and the accompanying information detailed the health benefits of using such products. In the Q&A section on the site it was explicitly stated that these products contain food grade hemp seed which is tested for a psychoactive ingredient and does not cause any doping issues. The website also stated that 'there are no pharmaceutical drugs in our factory'. As such the BBFC found no content on the site which we would classify 12 or above.

2 April

Website

onlinespyshop.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that the site offered for sale various items that were capable of recording discreetly. Following alterations to the description of some products by the website owner, which removed references to undetected and / or covert use, we found no content which we would classify 12 or above.

11 May

Website

marijuana-anonymous.org.uk

Adjudication

We noted that it was a website offering a support mechanism for marijuana addicts. The website did not feature explicit references to drugs or drug use. As the references to illegal drugs or drug misuse carried a suitable anti-drug message, we found no content on the site which we would classify 12 or above.

12 June

Website

gilad.co.uk

Adjudication

We noted that this was a website run by Gilad Atzmon, an Israeli jazz artist, composer and author living in London. Mr. Atzmon is also a political commentator, and his website included numerous articles about Jewish identity politics and Israeli

policy. As some content might upset younger children, for example a photograph of a bloody and apparently dead child, we did not consider the website suitable for children under the age of 12.

BBFC
31 July 2015