UKCCIS Executive Board Meeting Minutes  
14:30 – 15:30, Tuesday 8th March 2016  
Committee Room 20  
Chair: Edward Timpson MP

Attendees:  
Edward Timpson, MP - Minister for Children and Families (Chair)  
Karen Bradley, MP - Minister for Preventing Abuse and Exploitation  
David Austin - BBFC  
Will Gardner - Safer Internet Centre  
Susie Hargreaves - IWF  
Aleyne Johnson - Samsung  
Adam Kinsley - Sky  
Alan Wardle - NSPCC  
Tony Close - Ofcom  
Rishi Saha - Facebook  
Vicki Shotbolt - ParentZone  
Jo Twist - UKIE  
Sonia Livingstone - LSE  
Julian Ashworth - BT  
Iain Wood - TalkTalk  
Rachel O’Connell - Trust Elevate (Age Verification Working Group Chair)  
Anna Payne - UKCCIS Secretariat

Substitutions:  
Jonathan Baggaley for Jonny Gwynn - CEOP  
Becky Foreman for Nicola Hodson - Microsoft  
Paul Morris for Cindy Rose - Vodafone  
Emma Morris for Stephen Balkam - FOSI  
Daniel Butler for Emilie Boman - Virgin Media

Apologies received from:  
Baroness Joanna Shields - Co-Chair  
Katie O’Donovan - Google  
John Carr - CHIS  
Tink Palmer - Marie Collins Foundation  
Representative of the Scottish Executive

Observers:  
Other than members of the UKCCIS Secretariat, no observers were invited to this meeting.

Item 1 - Welcome, introductions, apologies and declaring interests:

1. The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. He apologised for the change in venue resulting in a shorter meeting with a reduced agenda. He also gave apologies for co-Chair Baroness Shields. Tink Palmer’s planned presentation on the Digital Dangers report will be carried forward to the next meeting.
2. Dave Miles has left FOSI and therefore is no longer its representative at UKCCIS. The Chair expressed his thanks to Dave for Dave’s strong contribution to UKCCIS. FOSI has proposed that Dave be replaced by Stephen Balkam, who was not present at the meeting - Emma Morris substituted for him.

3. The Chair invited Executive Board (EB) members’ approval for Stephen Balkam, and Tony Close as the Ofcom representative. No objections were noted.

4. The chair noted that only EB members were invited to attend the day’s meeting, in order to have an open and frank discussion about how the Board can continue to add value in this area, and to discuss the forthcoming membership review.

5. The Chair invited members to declare any interests and reminded them of their responsibilities to represent and promote the views of the Board.

6. The chair informed the EB about:
   
   6.1. The Crown Prosecution Service’s (CPS) update of guidelines on false or offensive social media profiles and that there was an exercise underway. The Government welcomes the decision to update the guidelines and hoped that many would agree. The consultation exercise ends in mid May.

   6.2. The Keeping Children Safe in Education consultation received over 300 responses. The relevant parts for the EB were the proposed changes to Part 2 of the guidance, including a new section covering online safety. The Government hopes to publish revised guidance in late spring.

   6.3. The UK Internet Governance Forum regularly features sessions on Child Internet Safety, and the Government is looking to increase representation of young people at the event. Childnet have been supportive, and we’re grateful for their support.

7. The Chair noted the success of Safer Internet Day. Will Gardner provided leaflets summarising the day, including that it had reached 40% of children and young people on the day, and there were over 300,000 downloads of the schools resources. Share a Heart was the theme of the day.

Item 2 – Child Safety Online: Age Verification for Pornography

8. Anna Payne (UKCCIS Secretariat) provided a brief summary. The consultation launched on 16 February and ends on 12 April - DCMS is keen to receive views and contributions. The Government doesn’t see this is as the only solution to child protection issues online, however with its approach, the UK will be leading the way internationally.

9. DCMS has asked Brook and The Mix (previously known as Youthnet) to gather insights from young people about their experiences, and have launched a questionnaire. Please let the secretariat know if you can help promote this and the consultation through your networks.

10. Rachel O’Connell informed the EB that the first version of the PAS (Publicly Available Specification) which outlines how companies can implement age checking has been developed. It is currently being
reviewed and the steering committee is meeting on 12 April. Get in touch with Rachel for further information.

Item 3 – The Year Ahead: UKCCIS priorities for 2016/17

11. The Chair noted that a paper had been circulated setting out the background to the review. UKCCIS has been around for a while and has achieved some important things. Over time, the landscape has evolved - we will always be playing catch up, to understand what’s working and where awareness needs to be improved. He noted that we haven’t done a review of the remit of the EB for some time and would like to consider the direction for the next year, so that we can keep our finger on the pulse.

12. The Chair suggested we consider what we are already doing that can be built on, and what government is doing that we can add value to. We are conscious that UKCCIS members and others are already doing a huge amount in this space - for example, can we better coordinate to deliver consistent messages.

13. It is clear that over the next year, various issues will require dedicated focus - including children’s personal data, in the context of the General Data Protection Regulation, and age verification.

14. Three key areas for the EB’s consideration were identified in the paper - the working groups, digital resilience, and awareness. Other thoughts on priorities are also welcome.

15. The filters working group is long running and has made significant progress. Does the board feel the group still has work to do and should continue? And should Dave Miles continue as Chair, as he has volunteered to do?

16. Discussion followed with these points raised:
   16.1. Julian Ashworth – some issues should continue to be considered, although potentially through other working groups, for instance around awareness, evidence and education. Net neutrality regulation impact is a key issue currently - the group could continue to cover that, and then pass other bits of work to other groups.
   16.2. Sonia Livingstone felt a continued focus on over and under blocking is needed, and wasn’t sure this could be taken forward by any other groups – it requires a watching brief.
   16.3. Iain Wood felt that now filters are established, concerns about over and under blocking have lessened. The principal issues for TalkTalk concern are net neutrality and parental awareness of technical tools. Internet Matters has a huge part to play here. How do we get to the point where parents are aware of and comfortable using filters?
   16.4. David Austin expressed his support for Dave Miles to continue as chair. Other issues that the group might consider include the move to https from http, and how search functions fit in. The BBFC finds it useful to discuss these issues in the filtering group, and believes the mobiles agree.
   16.5. Daniel Butler suggested that as Ofcom has been measuring overblocking as part of its recent series of reports on parental controls, the potential is that this work is duplicated.
16.6. Adam Kinsley felt that the group has served a real purpose and that it has helped deliver better understanding, however that in the last 6-12 months, it hasn’t really moved on or had a clear focus. If we want to rationalise, residual work might be wrapped up elsewhere.

16.7. Vicki Shotbolt thought that the filters group had done a fantastic job, and current issues for consideration now include developments around encryption, VPNS, and the wider toolkit for parents. Might the group reform and take a wider view of different technical solutions?

16.8. Paul Morris thought that reform is needed. Things have moved on and the Government is being more proactive around filters - this is a self-regulatory group therefore our focus could be elsewhere.

16.9. Jonathan Baggaley pointed out that the Education Group had reformed in 2015, with awareness raising no longer within the remit - but that this didn’t mean that awareness raising shouldn’t be addressed elsewhere.

16.10. Tony Close noted that Ofcom will continue to provide regular reporting of this area, but that this may take a different shape going forwards.

16.11. Adam Kinsley said that the filters group was set up as a consequence of a self-regulatory initiative. The government now has proposals for another way. We shouldn’t keep focusing on yesterday’s battle, we need to keep ahead of the curve.

17. The Chair noted that there would be an opportunity to discuss these points and questions further with the Secretariat over the next month or so - this wouldn’t be the last chance EB members had to contribute.

18. The Chair asked what the focus of the Age Verification (AV) group should be, and asked Rachel O’Connell to provide an update.

19. Rachel referred to the PAS technical standard which was mentioned earlier. There are three workstreams for the group, and she invited the EB to consider getting re-engaged. The group was initially set up in 2011, for a year, at which time, it was concluded that technology was not yet at the right stage - Rachel would now like to reconvene discussions as the technological context has significantly changed.

20. The Digital Policy Alliance also has an AV group bringing together various representatives including from gambling, porn, and alcohol sectors. The gov.uk verify technical platform which enables third parties to be suppliers of data has launched. Up until now, credit reference agencies were the major providers of age verification online, but this business model is about to be disrupted as providers are turning to attribute checking.

21. Mindgeek has 23 million UK users who regularly access their sites – they are developing their own AV system. In the retail sector there are commercial and legislative drivers which seek to enhance service delivery. AV solutions are more sophisticated than in 2011, and the price point will be driven down. There is a huge amount of innovation in this area.

22. Rachel is also talking to platform providers for under 18s and under 13s. The European General Data Protection (GDPR) regulation will require companies to age verify under 13s or under 16s, and has the capability to leverage the connection between parents and children. Rachel has spoken to Lego and Disney to see what they are doing in this area. Rachel has been looking at whether data from education sources might be made
available to assist verification - this would be underpinned by eight identified security principles and could be more privacy preserving than existing systems. Plans are being developed to dovetail with implementation across Europe.

23. Amazon and Paypal are also looking into verification - in the way that Facebook log-ins work. There is a tremendous amount happening.

24. The Chair asked where UKCCIS fits into this work, where it can add value and how the work fits with the Government’s agenda. We need to decide how engaged the EB should be - where do members feel they can contribute, to steer the projects? Aware that this is tricky due to commercial sensitivities. There is a need for a foolproof system that is universally accepted. Perhaps the working group should focus on something more specific rather than trying to be all things for all people. How can it best influence priorities? Discussion followed.

24.1. Jo Twist thought that the UKCCIS should continue to be involved in this area. She expressed some reservations on behalf of the games sector in terms of Europe’s agenda. Europe is looking for a solution to advance an agenda that isn’t as straightforward as it may initially seem. Jo said she would like to get more involved in order to understand these technical issues, and how it works with the games sector, to avoid unnecessary burdens.

24.2. Alan Wardle noted that AV is important and that child protection needs to be a strong focus within developments.

24.3. Jono said this was a complicated area, and the detail is difficult for most organisations to understand. UKCCIS should be asking whether AV is broadly a good thing or a bad thing for child protection, and thinking about any potential unintended consequences of AV.

24.4. Sonia Livingstone agreed with Jono’s point, and said she’d like to understand more about the European GDPR and data protection, also how this might affect equality - what will happen to children whose parents don’t consent to their being online, for example?

24.5. Adam Kinsley said that there is so much out there already, noting that UKCCIS’s unique contribution on AV should be about what UKCCIS members are doing and what policy makers are thinking – whether on data protection or AV. The other things that have been mentioned on AV are possibly a bit out of scope.

24.6. Rachel would like to create a steering committee to input insights and help shape this - the Commission will be looking at this over the next two years, so now is timely opportunity to provide industry input. She has also been engaging with David Wright of the South West Grid for Learning about this work.

24.7. The Chair summarised by saying that in relation to AV, we want to consider how we can better link policy to practice, with a clear remit around child protection. Some streams are already in place. The AV group needs a clearer focus to make an impact. Also the EB needs to think about how people can get involved - we can’t dismiss or avoid this, but need to figure out where to pitch ourselves.

25. The Chair noted that the social media guide was launched and now needs to be socialised. The suggestion is that the focus should be on outreach
for the next 6 to 9 months. What other aspects might the group cover, for instance moderation guidelines?

25.1. Vicki Shotbolt said that the guide was fantastic – but is concerned that we’re not getting to the bad guys, we’re just reaching good guys.

25.2. Tony Close agreed that they don’t want to preach to the converted, and the group is progressing this.

25.3. Rachel wants to organise a roundtable to bring together data scientists to leverage algorithms and to run a hackathon – with lawmakers too. The outputs would be processes to protect vulnerable children - it might for example be possible to use face recognition software and technical tools to identify vulnerable young people attempting to log in under a different ID. This might involve putting providers under a legal duty of care through the Children’s Act.

25.4. The Chair said he thought the roundtable proposal sounded interesting and might reap some important rewards, however we need to be clear about under what auspices actions such as this would happen. Rather than looking to secure legal changes, the UKCCIS group is aimed primarily at delivering change through corporate social responsibility.

25.5. Does the outreach focus over the coming months make sense? No objections were raised.

25.6. Rishi Saha noted that the NSPCC Net Aware guide is great - the question is how to involve the peripheral fringe groups and make sure it is well distributed to that part of the community.

25.7. Sonia agreed that outreach should be the next priority, but noted that further evidence is needed concerning how the guide has delivered and made a difference to young people, and that independent evaluation should be built in.

26. The Chair moved the discussion on to digital resilience and awareness raising. How do we reach out to parents and children, raising awareness of products that are available, and empowering resilience, and how will we know that we are having an effect? Extremism and radicalisation are also part of the discussion here - we do not want to only focus on one type of exploitation or harm. How can the EB help increase awareness efforts and disseminate best practice? Can we help to coordinate efforts better, and how should Internet Matters be involved?

27. Karen Bradley said that the Board's contribution to dealing with illegal activity is incredibly important - the UKCCIS represents a genuine partnership between government and industry. There are many opportunities around child protection where the EB can help make the internet a safer place for children. She thanked members for their contributions. [Karen Bradley had to leave at this point in the meeting]

28. The Chair asked what we know about what works in building online resilience.

28.1. Vicki Shotbolt thought that resilience is absolutely the right agenda – the evidence tells us that resilience really makes a difference. It is driven by good-enough parenting and young people’s confidence in their technical skills and the spaces they enjoy. It is about empowering and raising young people able to navigate the
digital world confidently and safely. The question for us is how best we can coordinate the noise that parents are hearing in a positive and empowering way, rather than just scaring them and their children.

28.2. Alan Wardle suggested that children should be at the heart of this and questioned if their voices have been listened to through UKCCIS - can we gather a group of children to ensure their voices are heard?

28.3. Jo Twist agreed. Resilience is a practice, for example, schools have a tendency to over-block. Jo also suggested that schools were not practising the safe use of cloud services.

28.4. Susie Hargreaves supported the concept of empowerment but was concerned about bringing illegal abuse into that – this needs to be kept entirely separate.

28.5. Will Gardner pointed out that resilience doesn’t mean ‘toughening up’, it means empowering young people. The Centre’s work about online hate shows that lots of young people do support others online and are responding to these issues. We need to tap into what they’re doing online, and give them advice without scaring them.

28.6. Jonathan Baggaley pointed out that clarity is needed about what we mean by resilience and what it is that young people need to know. There isn’t much evaluation of the things that work digitally. He would love to see research about what makes children resilient online and how much risk they can and should be exposed to.

28.7. Rachel O’Connell said that anonymous apps like Whisper and Secret are concerning - we need to think about how to triage and get more mental health organisations and moderation companies involved.

28.8. Daniel Butler said that Virgin Media, Parentzone and the Oxford Internet Institute’s research looked into identifying what works. Resilience doesn’t come with very easily identifiable levers. The research showed that more active mediation of online behaviours correlates negatively to resilience.

28.9. Sonia Livingstone asked where and how in schools a digital resilience programme will happen.

28.10. The Chair noted that workforce development is part of this. The PSHE Association is looking at how we can improve teaching about online safety.

28.11. Jonathan Baggaley noted that the Education Working Group is developing a curriculum framework - this UKCCIS product will help teachers identify learning goals at each Key Stage.

29. The Chair noted that we need to be clearer about what we mean by resilience and what makes a child safer online. Then we can move on to technical solutions and training. We need to gather evidence about what we have, what more we need to do, and we need to listen to and learn from children. We will develop next steps around this work over the next month.
Item 4 – Membership Review

30. The Chair noted that the membership of the EB had not been reviewed for quite some time. Most members have fixed terms which have now expired and we want to think where to go next - including whether others are needed at the table. To do that properly, we need to start from a clean sheet of paper.

31. He stated that all EB members have a valuable part to play. We also want to make sure UKCCIS is not just about the EB - how do we better utilise Associate members?

32. There are some sectors where government believes value could be added, including: education and children’s services - a suggestion here would be the Association for the Directors of Children’s Services; mental health - the Chair noted he is keen to have practitioners’ input; the Information Commissioner’s Office; and potentially further law enforcement representation.

33. He asked if people were content for us to commence the process as set out in paper circulated prior to the meeting. If anyone has any deep concerns, they should let us know. We want to end up with a perfectly formed group who share a commitment to the work.

33.1. Jo Twist suggested UKCCIS develop an annual report which is publically circulated, and also would support an annual gathering in order to avoid it seeming exclusive.

33.2. The Chair wanted to ensure the Board resonates and is saying useful things - we want to be outward facing and achieve things. The review will consider these suggestions.

33.3. Rachel suggested representation from the Law Society and the data science community, to help us understand the art of what is possible.

34. The Chair suggested that there might be a case for a technical working group.

Action - Board members to consider the case for a technical working group.

35. He also mentioned that Basit Ahmed at DCMS will be taking forward the membership review, so please contact him if you want to discuss this further.

Action - Board members to contact Basit Ahmed if they have any thoughts on the membership review.
36. The Chair asked if the Board were content to approve UKCCIS Associate Membership applications as circulated prior to the meeting. None were raised, but he asked the board to let the Secretariat know of any objections. He noted that we were trying to be inclusive.

37. The Chair invited board members to raise any other business to discuss. Nothing was raised.

38. The proposed date of the next meeting was 7th June, with Karen Bradley in the chair. The September date is to be confirmed.

39. The Chair informed the board that there would be some changes to the UKCCIS Secretariat shortly, as Anna Payne and Ellie Mond will be taking maternity leave before the next meeting. Their replacements are being recruited. Samantha Kelly will continue in her role within the Secretariat.

40. The Chair asked the board to get in touch with the Secretariat if they wanted to set up any meetings to discuss any issues raised here further – as this was a shorter meeting than normal, we want members to have a chance to air views about priorities over next 12 months.