

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.

November 2016

1 November 2016

Website

urbandictionary.com

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following complaints from members of the public that the site had not been placed behind adult filters, despite containing material that in the complainants' opinions would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 31 October and 1 November 2016.

We noted that it was an online dictionary of slang words and phrases. While a broad range of terms were explained (with definitions from a broad range of contributors), we found that very strong language and sex references were present in a significant minority of these explanations. Sex references included crude descriptions of activities including masturbation, oral sex, and urination and defecation during sex. In addition, there were references to rape and paedophilia, and definitions of discriminatory terms, which were delivered in an irreverent tone intended to shock or amuse. Given the crude and potentially offensive nature of this content, and the lack

of context that accompanied it, we did not consider the website suitable for people under the age of 18.

22 November 2016

Website

danielpipes.org

Issue

The website owner contacted the BBFC to complain that the site was blocked by adult filters despite, in the complainant's view, containing no material that would restrict it to access by adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 21 and 22 November 2016.

We noted that it was a politically minded site containing a large number of articles and posts. While the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the positions of the articles and blogs, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. We found no content on the site that would we would classify 18.

BBFC

31 December 2016