

## EURIM E-CRIME WORKING GROUP

**Report of Meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> June  
(including subsequent updates  
as at 19<sup>th</sup> August)**

THE EUROPEAN  
INFORMATION  
SOCIETY GROUP

EURIM



### **On-line Child Safety and Good Citizenship Initiatives**

#### **1) Meeting Objectives**

To identify the current situation regarding Internet Safety and On-line Child Protection initiatives within the UK:

- What is currently live or planned?
- Who is currently supporting what and how?
- How could/should ICT suppliers and users make best use of any CSR (corporate social responsibility) resources (commonly people and resources rather than cash)?
- What, if anything, can EURIM contribute in this space?

#### **2) Summary**

There are a variety of “awareness” exercises and many websites offering advice and guidance to parents and children (including Becta for schools) but the means of embedding Internet Safety and Good Citizenship into mainstream ICT courses and qualifications is unclear. The ICT Sector Skills councils do not yet have input channels to the QCA, Teacher Training Authority or those responsible for qualifications and courses for child care or youth work professionals.

The Home Office Child Protection Task Force is supporting research into the scale and nature of problems and good practice with regard to advice and guidance.

Some schools have security handled professionally as part of a service package (which may variously cover hardware, software, communications and/or content). A number of industry players run schools support programmes, commonly using volunteers from among their own staff with privileged routines for use of their own training materials, but these rarely include safety issues and there appear to be no mechanisms for exchanging experience between programmes.

The EURIM E-Crime group has agreed to work with Home Office in updating the brief produced for MPs in 2004 in response to the two Early Day Motions calling for action on harmful content.

A sub-group will also look at the practicality of an exercise to help corporate members exchange experience, better target their support efforts and work with customers and suppliers who also have schools and youth support programmes. This should begin by identifying relevant education and

support programmes already under way or planned and avoid duplication of effort with those looking at good practice in awareness and guidance.

### **3) The changing role of the Internet Watch Foundation**

Some law enforcement agencies still forward incidents to the IWF in the (apparent) belief that it is an investigatory agency.

The IWF currently:

- operates and maintains a hotline for the public, police, ISP's etc to report instances of illegal content they find and outside of the police, the IWF are the only "body" in the UK authorised to take such reports;
- provides a universal notice and takedown service to UK ISP's for websites hosted in the UK that contain child abuse images, criminally obscene content & criminally racist content;
- notifies sister Hotlines and international police of websites containing child abuse images assessed as illegal under UK law;
- operates a universal notice and takedown service to UK ISP's that deliver newsgroup feeds of newsgroups that contain or advertise child abuse images;
- provides a list of verified URL's that contain illegal child abuse images to IWF members who sign up to the CAI service, which is used to provide effective filtering and blocking to those URLs;
- provides a list of key words and phrases to allow Search engines to filter searches for potential illegal content.

The IWF does NOT;

- provide a universal signpost service to web-users who have problems they want to report. To address this area, they provide a best of breed service within their FAQ's, where they point users to credible organisations, such as Government sites, NGO's and IWF members.
- take reports on areas outside their remit, such as Peer to Peer services, Chat and Instant Messaging, financial scams, internet abuse, bullying and so on. In such instances they try to point users to sites where they may find support and advice but there is no one organisation that covers all, nor given the scope of the problem, is one likely in the foreseeable future.

### **4) The role of BECTA**

DfES ICT in Schools division passes generic Internet safety queries with regard to schools programmes to Becta to help co-ordinate a response. Becta's role vis a vis Internet Safety is the provision of non-mandatory advice and guidance, developed (including international inputs) in collaboration with a range of agencies who make up the Safe Use of ICT in Education Steering Group. Becta has also worked with ICTiS to deliver a programme of advice and guidance to schools on E-safety issues, policy and strategy, technical solutions and practitioner education.

The Becta accreditation of ISPs is now in its second round and currently there are 3 listed suppliers [http://ispsafety.ngfl.gov.uk/matrix\\_home.php](http://ispsafety.ngfl.gov.uk/matrix_home.php). More are due to be added, including all the Regional Broadband Consortia - which account for network provision to the vast majority of English schools. Materials are available to all schools via the Becta publications service. However the principle of inundating schools with materials is not deemed to be the best way to highlight issues. Star Chamber regulations have been set up to control and collate the information that schools

receive and prevent information overload. Becta has plans to apply to the DfES “Star Chamber” (who regulate the issue of material to schools) to send out one of their new policy documents to all schools during this next academic year.

## **5) Home Office funded survey of Best Practice**

The Cyberspace Research Unit, headed by Rachel O'Connell, is funded by Home Office and European Commission to survey best practice with regard to child protection guidance and represents the UK in the European safer Internet network.

In partnership with the Home Office Internet Task Force Sub Group G, they are to lead the ISCA Project which is focusing on raising awareness of internet safety issues throughout various target audiences, disseminating information and materials across the UK using a variety of platforms and strategies (on and off line). They are currently undertaking a data gathering exercise to co-ordinate the activity of a wide range of organisations with an interest and resources in this arena. It should be noted, however, that the EU agenda is focussed on protecting children from adults (including from inappropriate advertising and content) and not from each other or on good cyber-citizenship.

Exercises in other continents tend to address child protection in the context of overall good practice including the protection of children from each other and issues such as cyberbullying, stalking, child-hackers, piracy and wide variety of supposedly harmful content. The Oxford Internet Institute Conference on Internet safety (September 8 – 10) will include papers on a variety of approaches.

## **6) The audiences that need to be educated (as well as made aware)**

The target audiences identified during the meeting included:

- children (all ages)
- teachers (primary and secondary)
- parents
- professionals who might volunteer to assist their local school/college

## **7) The channels that might be used**

The channels by which they might be educated and/or supported were:

- schools (via the curriculum and/or other activities);
- teacher training (including in-service updates etc.);
- service providers (including management and support as well as communications);
- voluntary sector (Scouts, Teenangels etc.);
- commercial suppliers;
- Industry support on a non-commercial basis (several large organisations have significant numbers of professional staff who would like to assist as part of the organisations corporate social responsibility and other programmes, if only they knew what to offer and to whom, i.e. resources rather money).

There appear to be a relatively small number of key players:

- Communications Providers to the education market (e.g. BT, C&W, Easynet, Telewest, NTL, UKERNA, the former regional broadband consortia);
- Support and Management and Content Providers to the education sector (e.g. BBC, RM, Fujitsu, Pearson, Harcourt/Reed-Elsevier);

- ISPs (top half dozen or so);
- Mobile operators;
- Child support/protection charities;
- Law Enforcement;
- Course and curricula authorities and suppliers.

The mechanisms for exchanging good practice and/or co-operating on issues of common concern, other than for those subsets of the industry that are used to working with each other) do not appear to be well developed.

There is discussion about use of Ofcom “Media Literacy” funding but the overall budget is very modest. It is unclear whether child safety awareness will come within the remit of “Get Safe Online” (the new name for “Project Endurance”).

## **8) The problems of co-ordination**

The main mechanism for cross departmental/agency co-operation is the Home Office Task Force on Child Safety on the Internet. Over the last couple of years it has achieved a number of codes of practice with its members to help self regulate the industry but it is said that some key players (particularly those supplying managed services and support to schools and those planning or mandating course and curricula content) are not involved, directly or indirectly.

Policy responsibility appears to split across:

- DTI : Minister Alun Michael, Co-ordinating Official: Geoff Smith;
- HO: Minister Paul Goggins, Co-ordinating Official: Tim Wright;
- DfES: Minister Lord Adonis, Co-ordinating Official: Owen McConnell.

Skills for Justice and E-Skills are co-operating in an exercise to set the occupational standards (used for DfES funding approval) on E-Crime prevention and investigation skills but the roles of the Learning and Skills Councils, whether Sector or Regional, vis a vis what is taught in schools (or to teachers) is unclear. Their remit may be 16+ but appears to include the new generation of vocational qualifications for schools. The relevant section of the SFIA is geared towards the computer security skills of ICT professionals and/or adult users.

The linkages between Skills for Justice and those responsible for Child Welfare are not yet well developed. IEE makes its inputs on curricula activities direct to the QCA. QCA is said to have “invited” the sector Skills councils to make proposals for means of inputting to their decisions processes.

Questions include:

a) Who is responsible for specifying curriculum content for schools, what are the current channels for employers/industry to input their views to the QCA and what is the timescale for any change?

Many employers appear to be expecting to make these through their Sector Skills Council as a “one stop shop” for employer consultation. Previous Ministers have encouraged them in this belief. A cursory reading of the Skills Compacts would not correct this impression.

b) Who is responsible for specifying content for teacher training and updating and what are the routines for employer/industry input to the Teacher Training Authority. Once again there was an expectation on the part of industry that this would be done via the Skills Councils.

c) Who is currently looking at which aspects of the educational space:

- protection from adult predators?
- protection from inappropriate material?
- protection from bullying/stalking/happy-slapping?
- guidance on good cyber-citizenship?

Becta is responsible for providing guidance and/or setting standards for schools, colleges, youth groups, child welfare agencies and law enforcement. Information on all these aspects of e-safety plus others can be found on the DfES Superhighway Safety site [safety.ngfl.gov.uk/schools/](http://safety.ngfl.gov.uk/schools/) which is maintained by Becta. But many other organisations also carry material on such topics and there appears to be widespread ignorance of the role of Becta on the part of law enforcement agencies as well as of industry.

The Oxford Internet Institute Conference (8<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> September) will be covering a number of the issues in international context and will also provide a good opportunity for progressing debate: [www.oii.ox.ac.uk/cybersafety](http://www.oii.ox.ac.uk/cybersafety)

## 9) Action

The group agreed that this was a very large problem space and its actions should be confined to that which was realistically achievable given the times and resources available.

- Paul King (Cisco) will contact those unable to be present to identify who is currently monitoring or researching practice in which areas, what the gaps are, and who might be interested in covering those gaps.
- Graham Paterson (now head of public affairs for IEE overall) will sound out support for an exercise using the IEE position vis a vis QCA on schools curricula, as well as its professional membership and connections and has offered help with relevant material for IEE members.
- Tony Fagelman (IWF) and Jenny Wade (BECTA) will liaise on any inputs from the Group to the Home Office Task Force.
- EURIM will cover the relevant issues in the update of the paper produced for MPs in response to the Early Day Motions on harmful content. At a meeting with Paul Goggins MP it was agreed that this should be produced in the Autumn by which time Home Office should have additional material for inclusion)

## 10) Next meeting

6<sup>th</sup> October (provisional).