

Nigel Williams, Director Childnet International

Using Hard Cases for Good Purposes - the example of Chatdanger.com

Sydney Forum 2000 Wednesday 29th November



ABSTRACT

Internet chat has become a very popular communication tool among teenagers. But in addition to providing much pleasure it also opens the way for adults who want to contact and exploit children. The parents of a 13 year-old girl who had been contacted by a 33 year-old man in a chat room and then sexually abused asked Childnet International to help them respond to the issues raised. This paper describes Childnet's response to these tragic circumstances and the attempt to ensure that some public good came from the publicity surrounding the sentencing of the perpetrator.

Introduction

The title of this paper alludes to the well known proverb "Hard cases make bad law". In June 2000, the author received an e-mail out of the blue from a parent (1) describing what had happened to his 13 year old daughter. In a few devastating paragraphs, this father told of how his daughter had been contacted by a 33 year old man in a chat room provided by a popular Internet portal (2). The initial contact in February led to e-mails every day over a 2 month period and then to regular conversations on a mobile phone.

The man had no previous criminal record and worked as an export clerk for a freight forwarding company in the South of England. He convinced the girl through a clever process of manipulation that he was in love with her. He sent her pornographic photographs including one allegedly of his own genitals. The girl initially resisted his requests for a meeting - he immediately backed off when he thought he had pressed her too hard. But eventually in early April she agreed to skip school and he took her to his flat, some miles from her home. On this first meeting he indecently assaulted her, and at three further meetings over the next few weeks he had sexual intercourse with her.

The young girl was increasingly confused as to what to do and after the third meeting broke down and told everything to her mother. The father, who worked in the computer industry and was familiar with the Internet, spent the next morning examining their home computer and was horrified by the e-mails he saw. Ironically in January, when he had suspected his daughter might be spending too long in chat rooms he had attempted to block access to them but sadly the technology found a way round his efforts.

The parents called in the police, who took some time to work out how best to handle the case. The local police lacked expertise and had to be helped by the father to understand some of the steps they needed to take. The

perpetrator, Patrick Green was arrested, but released on police bail. While on bail he used his work computer to contact another girl aged 14 living in the North of England and arranged to meet her and planned to take her to a hotel room for sex. Thankfully the police were tipped off by work colleagues who discovered the e-mail arranging the meeting and were able to arrest Green for a second time, just as the girl was going to get into his car.

Background to Childnet

This is a tragic story but one that, in a sense, Childnet (3) had been expecting to happen. As an international non-profit organization established in 1995 with the exclusive purpose of helping make the Internet a great place for children we were well aware of the potential dangers in chat rooms. Indeed while undertaking a research project for the European Commission (4) examining effective ways of communicating about net literacy and Internet safety (5) we described the three significant dangers affecting children online as Content, Contact, and Commerce. Of these we highlighted Contact as the greatest threat.

Through our work and contacts in the USA (6) we knew that Internet Chat had led to numerous cases there of children being contacted by adults seeking to exploit them for sexual purposes. There had already been at least one "near miss" in the UK when a girl from Milton Keynes had met a 47 year-old man - but in that case her parents knew about the meeting and her mother was able to intervene and report it to the police.

Moreover, there was some official recognition of the issue - the author had raised it at the board of the Internet Watch Foundation (7) (the UK industry funded hotline for illegal content online) as early as 1998. Following a government review of the IWF's work in 1999 it was decided to establish a special group to examine the nature and extent of the threat posed by Internet Chat Rooms and what the appropriate policy response should be. A group representing the Internet Service Providers, police, child welfare agencies, and civil liberties groups was brought together under the auspices of the Internet Crime Forum (8). But this group was still meeting when this incident took place.

The Stages of Responding to the Concern

1. Examining the Problem

The immediate reaction of the Childnet staff to this e-mail was one of shock and concern. Although we were aware that such things could happen, hearing it at first hand brought home to us the devastating impact of "stranger danger" online. Our first priority was to respond to the parent's questions and to try and reassure and help them as they came to terms with what had happened. At this early stage they did not know what the court proceedings would bring, were very wary of the media, were angry about the Internet industry's apparent disinterest in safety in chat rooms, and all the while were wondering how their daughter would recover.

Between June and early September 2000 we exchanged a number of e-mails with the parents and spoke on the phone to the father on a couple of occasions. We decided to undertake a survey of UK hosted Internet chat rooms to establish what safety measures were in place and what the general milieu of the rooms was. Childnet asked a 16 yr old volunteer whom we knew as a winner of the annual international awards program to help undertake this research. (9) This volunteer was a regular chat user and Childnet felt it would be better to get his perspective on the rooms rather than the potentially patronizing view of adults. A template was designed for assessing the rooms against key criteria eg moderated or unmoderated; real time or bulletin board format (10); terms and conditions of service; sign in procedures and age verification; safety advice; themed or open topic discussion; and nature of the messages posted.

This exercise revealed considerable disparities in how Chat Rooms were run. A few had excellent safety procedures, well-structured discussions and no or little potentially disturbing content. (11) But most of those hosted by commercial companies had no safety messages other than a few warnings buried in complicated legal "terms of service agreements"; no moderation; a lot of openly sexual content; and lots of exchanging of personal details like e-mail addresses and phone numbers. We were surprised at how bad the picture was and feared that another case like the Smith (12) family had suffered was inevitable unless further action was taken.

Throughout this period we maintained contact with the Internet Crime Forum Sub -Group on chat, and shared the story of what had happened with the Chair. It seemed the forum's main conclusion was likely to be the need for much greater awareness of the potential dangers of chat rooms. In August Childnet was contacted by a researcher from a respected TV news analysis programme (13) which was preparing a feature on paedophiles online. We outlined in broad terms what had happened to the family, focusing on the publicly available details. The reaction of the researcher confirmed our suspicion that this story was "dynamite" in news terms as it had a mixture of the Internet, children, sex and paedophiles. (14)

The author met the parents for the first time at Green's court hearing in September where he was due to enter his plea to the charges. (15) After the hearing where Green pleaded guilty to the main charges, the parents discussed

with the author the information that Childnet had collated about the very limited general level of protection offered by Internet chat rooms; the lack of knowledge on the part of both parents and teenagers about the dangers; and the likely intense interest of the press in the case. The parents were keen to use the potential publicity for the hearing when Green was to be sentenced, to get across a safety message to other parents. They asked Childnet to help them do this, and at the same time to attempt to protect them from media intrusion.

Stage 2 - Preparing for the Publicity Opportunity

Childnet was anxious not to fall in to the trap of sensationalizing the story of the Smith family, but we did want to use it as a springboard for getting the attention of parents and the industry. Somehow we wanted to put across a positive message about how the Internet, including chat rooms, could be used by children for many fun and educational purposes, but that precautions needed to be taken. In the little time we had available (16) the view of Childnet staff was that a carefully pitched web site would be the most effective initial response. We secured the support of the family for this idea, and began preparations. We had a very limited budget and so persuaded a web design company we had used before to help us at very favourable rates and with some part sponsorship. (17)

At the same time we decided to follow up on our survey of chat companies and write to them formally, warning them about the impending court hearing, and inviting them to adopt new precautions within their chat rooms, and especially to carry safety warnings. This letter went to eight companies three weeks before the sentencing, including the portal where the original contact in the Green case had taken place.

In preparing the website Childnet decided to adopt an open policy in seeking advice and help from other agencies and individuals. These included the Internet Crime Forum sub-group, the NCMEC (18), NCH Action for Children (19), Jean Armor Polly (20), Childline (21), NSPCC (22), and the Internet Watch Foundation (23). A number of teenagers also reviewed sections of the site. As a result the content was richer and more authoritative.

Childnet faced an immediate dilemma in choosing a domain name for the web site. Various options were discussed but the two simplest and most memorable names were chatsafety and chatdanger. Previous research (24) had indicated that in general names that were too negative would not appeal to children. Some in the industry also favoured a more positive name. However, given the nature of the story being featured on the site, and in order to intrigue teenagers, Childnet judged that the chatdanger name would have more resonance, especially given the well known concept of "stranger danger". It was also decided that since this site was aimed very much at the general public that it should have a dot com (rather than a dot org as all other Childnet web sites are known) address - the best known domain name suffix.

From Childnet's earlier research we were very conscious that to have impact the site would need to be tailored to the two very different markets it was seeking to address - parents and teenage chat users. In consultation with the designers we decided to make the feel of the site as simple as possible with separate areas for these two key groups. Two key features were developed with the teenage chat user in mind:

* The main safety messages would be communicated through a revolving banner (25) based on the mnemonic C-H-A-T written in the abbreviated language used by teenagers in chat rooms, viz:

C	CAREFUL - ppl online may not b who they say they r
H	HANG ON TO YOR PERSONAL INFORMATION - Never give out yor e-mail or home address, phone number, or where u go 2 school
A	ARRANGING TO MEET IS DANGEROUS - Never meet some 1 offline unless u are sure who they r, and then only if u r with a parent and meet in a public place.
T	TELL YOUR FRIENDS or an adult if u come across something that makes you feel uncomfortable.

* A series of cartoons based on each of these messages.

The parent's section was written in as non-technical language as possible. Most parents are very unfamiliar with Internet Chat and indeed find the concept of a typed conversation in real time somewhat strange.

One area of difficulty was the question of how to handle the Smith family story, and especially that of Lucy. There were superficial attractions in the idea of asking Lucy to address her peers and warn them of the dangers of chat. Indeed, she had herself suggested that she might do this. But Childnet was cautious, and this caution was reinforced by specialist advice (26) that it would be inappropriate, and could seriously set back Lucy's recovery.

The Smith parents had also expressed a desire to get the message about the dangers of chat rooms across to the government. Childnet responded to this by arranging a private meeting with the family's MP. He then wrote to the Prime Minister setting out the family's concerns and requesting a meeting. (27) Preparing this letter also helped Childnet sharpen the public policy agenda (28) that it was seeking to promote, including:

- A national computer crime squad with the protection of children online as a top priority; and better training for police
- A review of UK legislation in two key areas - ability of the police to carry out pre-emptive sting operations; and the prosecution of those grooming and enticing children online where no offline sexual offence takes place.
- Examination of the use of chat rooms in schools.
- A government funded awareness campaign about internet safety especially in chat rooms.

Three weeks before the sentencing the author recorded an interview with Granada TV - the company who had originally been in touch in August. One week before sentencing the BBC contacted Childnet having somehow heard about our involvement with the case and recorded an interview for transmission on the leading early morning radio news programme (29). After this we anticipated that the media interest would be considerable, as this radio programme is generally considered as an agenda setter for other media outlets.

Five days before the sentencing the Smith parents were getting nervous that the media might not report their story accurately or that it would not get across their major concern to warn parents rather than just sensationalizing the events. They decided to do an exclusive interview with the celebrity journalist Carol Vorderman (who was also recording the reports for the Granada TV program) whom they felt they could trust. They asked the author to try and set this up and be there with them. The interview, which was published in the Daily Mirror (30), was undertaken the day before sentencing.

Stage 3 - The sentencing and Media blitz

Childnet had decided to launch the web site on the same day as the sentencing of Patrick Green at Aylesbury Crown Court. (31) A press release giving the details was issued on the previous day but embargoed until noon on the day of the court case - there was real anxiety not to say anything that would in any way prejudice the sentencing. This release led with the story of what had happened to the Smith family (32) but then focused on the launch of chatdanger.com.

The release prompted a flurry of media calls, many from TV and radio stations seeking interviews on the day of the sentencing. The author and a colleague traveled to Aylesbury for the court hearing - we were once again concerned to protect the Smith family. Some of the media knew their identity and although court orders prevented this being revealed it would not stop journalists from pestering them for comments.

The judge sentenced Green to 5 years and made very clear in his summing up that he considered the guilt to lie entirely with him. He had manipulated and groomed Lucy for one purpose only - sex. Moreover the judge also criticized Green for his possession of child pornography, stressing that people like Green created the demand for such "vile pictures" and thus contributed directly to the abuse of more children.

As soon as the sentencing was over, the media storm broke. Over the next two days the author gave 16 television and 13 radio interviews (33), many of them live. The story was carried on all the main television networks news that evening, and nearly all mentioned the launch of the web site and gave out the chatdanger URL. Interviews were syndicated to many local radio stations. The next morning two national newspapers gave over their front pages to the story, and most carried in depth articles inside.

The most satisfying interview was on BBC online - a live 15 minute interview with questions from many viewers e-mailed in before hand. This was of course available online globally, and later Childnet heard of many instances of this being seen by people around the world. (34) This was also available for some days afterwards.

The press was universally positive about the chatdanger web site. Childnet had achieved its goal of ensuring that some resource was immediately available for parents and teens having heard the sad story of Lucy, so that they could see how to respond without panicking.

The other goal of diverting attention from the Smith family was also largely achieved. Some time previously they had decided to go on holiday immediately after the sentencing. They left early the day following the court case.

Thus they avoided much of the media hype on the case, although one reporter did attempt to "doorstep" the mother. The Childnet press release with details of the family story also prompted calls to be made to us, rather than the family. Four offers of exclusive stories in national daily or Sunday newspapers were made, including requests to interview Lucy. These could all be met with a simple "They are out of the UK on holiday".

Stage 4 - The Follow Up and further Action

Chat danger had launched successfully at 12 noon on the 24 October. Within a few days it had had 80,000 hits, and 200 e-mails had been sent to the contact e-mail address on the site. The site is still attracting many hits and a steady stream of e-mails. The e-mails breakdown into a number of different categories:

- Parents and professionals saying thank you for the information provided.
- Teens expressing concern for Lucy, and welcoming the site.
- Questions from adults and teens about aspects of safety in chat rooms eg can people find out my e-mail address even if I don't give it out personally?
- Constructive comments and suggestions about additional information that would be helpful, details of safe moderated chat rooms etc

These kinds of comments made up 90% of the e-mails received. The remainder fell into two further categories:

- Destructive criticism some from civil liberty advocates, but mostly just plain negativity. Childnet referred one e-mail to our solicitors because of its libellous nature, but we decided not to pursue action.
- Reports of incidents that were similar to Lucy's story or where the reporter was concerned for a friend, husband, son or daughter. If the police were not already involved in these cases, Childnet referred these e-mails directly to them. The stories certainly confirmed the concerns we had but also demonstrated that problems in chat could be very serious but were thankfully fairly rare.

A few days after the web site was launched a further indicator of its success came to our notice. An e-mail correspondent reported that when he had typed the web site address wrongly as www.chat-danger.com it turned out to be a pornography site claiming to have pictures of young teenage girls. Sadly, this proved to be true although the latter claim was clearly fictitious given the nubile nature of the women concerned. Through using standard Internet search tools [\(35\)](#) it was clear that this domain name had been registered in New York, 24 hours after chatdanger. While annoying and frustrating it was decided to treat this mimicry as a compliment that Chatdanger was getting attention and lots of hits; rather than a direct attack on the purpose of the web site.

The media hype gradually subsided, although a number of more detailed feature articles appeared [\(36\)](#), and international enquiries came in. A number of articles appeared where journalists had been into chat rooms to see for themselves what they were like. The court case had put on public record that the original contact had been in a Yahoo! chat room, and one journalist in particular started a detailed investigation of chat rooms and other interactive products on Yahoo!

Indeed this journalist [\(37\)](#) broadened her enquiries to the policy agenda affecting chat rooms, and provided the very useful service of getting a number of solicitors to comment on the position the Government was taking on there being no need to reform the law.

Childnet now found itself in the position of having set out a policy agenda and needing to follow it through. Of course, other organizations had been active in looking at these concerns and the general media attention had allowed them to speak out as well. [\(38\)](#)

Action in the last month since the sentencing has focused on three areas:

1. Legislative Review -

Childnet had been aware that the Conservative front bench [\(39\)](#) had been tabling a series of amendments at successive stages of a bill [\(40\)](#) before Parliament seeking to introduce new offences against the exploitation of children on the Internet. The bill was in its final stages when Patrick Green was sentenced, and this case gave new life to these particular amendments. Childnet provided the Conservative party with briefing on the Green case and suggestions for how the amendments might be improved.

2. Government Actions -

the Smith family's MP who had written to the Prime Minister on their behalf, suggested he could table a number of questions [\(41\)](#) to government Ministers on the non-legislative aspects of the policy agenda. Childnet helped prepare a dozen questions on the main policy issues addressed to three different Government departments. An indication that the concerns were hitting home came when an official in one Department telephoned Childnet to discuss the position on the Green case and its aftermath. A key outcome that may have been brought forward by the media

interest and the parliamentary questions was the announcement by the Government on 14 November that they were establishing a new National Hi-Tech Crime Unit with tackling paedophilia online one of its key tasks. This unit with over (40) officers nationally and a local specialist in each force holds the potential to transform the UK's approach to crime on the Internet especially against children.

3. Industry response -

Childnet feared that with the passing of the media blitz at the time of the sentencing that companies who host Internet chat rooms would not bother to take any further action. Six of the eight companies Childnet had written to in early October had not responded by the time of the sentencing. In fact, none of these six has since responded although one had ceased carrying chat rooms for unrelated reasons. But there have been two other significant developments which provide a basis for Childnet working with others to seek further action:

a) The portal Yahoo! kept in touch and outlined a number of new safety measures at a meeting with Childnet on 22 November including appointing an "inspector" to investigate terms of service breaches in chat rooms. The inspector would focus on risks to children. Yahoo! had also devised its own safety banner for teenage chat rooms based on the Childnet safety information.

b) A teenage girls e-zine (42) Mykindaplace.com launched an advertising campaign trying to persuade boys to join its chat rooms. The adverts were risquŽ with slogans like "Want to score?" and "Get 15 hot dates in one night". The trade journal Marketing Week approached Childnet for a comment on the campaign and our response was to label it "irresponsible". (43) This led to a dialogue with the e-zine management who agreed to place the chatdanger banner on their site.

Reflections and observations

It is much too early to assess whether the Green case has marked a watershed in the way that the safety of children in chat rooms is addressed in the UK and indeed elsewhere. Nor is it possible to judge as yet if chatdanger.com and the accompanying publicity has made a significant impact on perceptions of parents and teenagers about Internet chat rooms and helped them act more safely. Childnet hopes to conduct a more formal review of this in 6 months to a year's time.

This paper has been largely narrative rather than analytical. After little more than a month since the launch of chatdanger.com it is only possible to make some tentative observations about the events:

- a) Without the launch of chatdanger.com it is likely the publicity would have focused on stranger danger without a clear positive safety message getting through.
- b) Channelling the Smith family's anger and frustration was a very challenging task. Their story was very newsworthy, but they were (and will be for some time) recovering from something they wish had never happened. It was particularly helpful that they were able to go on holiday immediately after the sentencing.
- c) Being prepared for the media blitz was vital. Childnet did not know how intense it would be - much depended on the news agenda that day - but 4 staff were able to focus exclusively on this project for the week of the sentencing. The timing was extremely fortunate - had the sentencing been two weeks later staff would have been in the middle of the shortlisting process for the annual Cable and Wireless Childnet Awards.
- d) "There is safety in many advisers" (44) - a number of agencies and individuals gave Childnet excellent advice in supporting the family, writing and designing the web site, dealing with the media, and preparing a policy response. Had Childnet tried to deal with the issue exclusively the outcome would have been very different and had much less impact.
- e) High profile media interest does fuel policy change - politicians are sensitive to public concerns as portrayed in the media and the safety of children is a potent issue.
- f) Research and preparation is vital to avoid being sidelined - the media demand information and comment. Childnet had been able to do its homework in three key areas :
 1. the review of what was actually happening in chat rooms by the teenage volunteer made our comments difficult for the industry to gainsay.
 2. the approach adopted on Chatdanger.com was rooted in the research on internet safety initiatives we had undertaken the previous year.
 3. Childnet's policy agenda was not a series of knee jerk requests - it had been fashioned over the 5 years of our existence, drawing on lessons learned elsewhere. Thus Government showed itself receptive to the ideas being put forward.

Childnet is acutely aware that the problem of safety in Internet chat rooms is not solved by all that has happened; rather the work in many ways has just begun. Legislation is still being reviewed; many chat sites still carry no safety warnings; many teenagers still give out their personal details without thinking; the police still require more resources and training; and the position about the use of chat rooms in schools is still unclear. But with the launch

of chatdanger.com a significant start has been made and perhaps a good foundation laid for future actions.

For further details see www.chatdanger.com or e-mail the author at nigel@childnet-int.org

REFERENCES

- 1 The identities of the family in this case are the subject of a Court Order preventing them from being published. Childnet has used the pseudonyms John and Julie Smith and their daughter Lucy.
- 2 The family have approved a more personal version of this story published at www.chatdanger.com
- 3 For full background on the work of Childnet International see the web site www.childnet-int.org which details our work in the areas of promoting access to quality content and highlighting innovative use of the net by and for children; promoting awareness of net literacy and safety issues to parents, teachers and other "gatekeepers" of children's internet use as well as children themselves; undertaking research and policy work into how the Internet impacts on children; and initiating strategic protection work to help ensure children are safe online.
- 4 DGXIII under the Action Plan for Safe Use of the Internet see www.cec.be/iap
- 5 See www.netaware.org for the full report of this project. The executive summary is also available in 11 languages.
- 6 Especially through safety initiatives like Getnetwise www.getnetwise.org and individual commentators like Larry Magid (see www.safekids.com and www.safeteens.com) and Jean Armor Polly "Netmom" who invented the term "surfing the net". We also had had much discussion and information sharing with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children NCMEC (www.missingkids.org) and their Cybertipline. Indeed, the first we heard of the Green case before being contacted by the family was in an online news story reporting his first court appearance, sent to us by a staff member of the NCMEC in Washington DC!
- 7 Known in short as the IWF - see www.iwf.org.uk
- 8 A joint Internet Industry and law enforcement forum for discussing issues of common concern see www.internetcrimeforum.org.uk
- 9 The Cable and Wireless Childnet International Awards www.childnet-int.org/awards
- 10 Not everything that claims to be an Internet Chat Room is actually in real time; a number are more like message boards where content is vetted before posting.
- 11 An example of these services was the message boards run by the BBC for children connected with individual television programmes
- 12 The pseudonym we used for the family - see footnote 1.
- 13 Tonight with Trevor McDonald produced by Granada Television
- 14 The UK had witnessed over the summer near hysteria about paedophiles following a case of a 7 year old girl, Sarah Payne, being abducted and murdered. A national newspaper The News of the World had published photographs of known paedophiles and campaigned for a law similar to "Megan's Law" in the USA allowing publicly available register of convicted child sex offenders.
- 15 Green was charged with four counts of sexual intercourse with a minor; ten counts of possession of child pornography (found on his home computer); and four charges of abduction. He pleaded guilty to three of the counts of sex with a minor; all the child pornography offences but not guilty to the abduction charges. He also faced an abduction charge in the case of the other girl he tried to meet and pleaded not guilty to that charge too. The abduction charges were not pressed by the prosecution to avoid the girls having to give evidence
- 16 We learned in mid September that the sentencing hearing would be a month hence on 24th October
- 17 Moore Wilson Design www.m-w.co.uk The site was hosted for free by Net Benefit www.netbenefit.co.uk
- 18 National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, USA see note 6.
- 19 One of the major UK children's charities which has taken a particular interest in online safety issues.
- 20 Known as Netmom - see note 6. Author of the best seller "Family and Children's Yellow Pages Guide to the Internet published annually by Osborne. Jean contributed an excellent quote for the site on the positive uses of chat.
- 21 A national telephone helpline for children suffering abuse of any kind, who agreed to their contact details being on the site.
- 22 The UK National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.
- 23 See note 7.
- 24 Childnet's Netaware project www.netaware.org see notes 4 & 5.
- 25 It was decided that this banner should be "open source" i.e. the html code would be freely available on the chatdanger site and encouragement given to chat companies or indeed any other organization to use the banner on their web site. It thus served the twin purposes of getting across the safety messages but also acting as a hyperlink to the chatdanger site.
- 26 One of Childnet's trustees (Board members), Dr Alice Swann is a pediatrician and specialist in child abuse. Alice is also a qualified lawyer and often appears as an expert witness in child sexual abuse court cases. Alice's advice not to publish anything written by the daughter and prepare the family statement in the third person was supported by the child welfare charities with which Childnet staff were also working - see notes 18, 20 & 21.
- 27 At the time of writing (end November 2000) this letter had been acknowledged but had not received a full reply.
- 28 Full details are given in the recommendations section of www.chatdanger.com
- 29 BBC Radio 4, Today
- 30 A left of centre tabloid.
- 31 Aylesbury is a town in Buckinghamshire, north west of London.
- 32 The family approved summary of events publishes on the web site was attached to the release.
- 33 A colleague also undertook a local radio interview.
- 34 A number of people attending the G8 internet crime conference in Berlin gathered to watch it, including the chair of the Internet Crime Sub-Group on Chat.
- 35 Whois? - a search facility to check who has registered domain names. The whois look up at www.geektools.com covers all the main domain registries.
- 36 There was an especially comprehensive and constructive report in the Interface section of The Times on 13 November.
- 37 Wendy McAuliffe of the online news service ZD Net
- 38 NCH Action for Children gave a number of media interviews at the time of the sentencing and thereafter. The Internet Crime Forum subgroup came under increasing pressure to speak out - although they had prepared a briefing note that was supposed to be publicly available at the time of the sentencing it was completely overlooked. This was probably because the Chair was out of the country and no press release was issued with the statement.
- 39 The Conservative Party is currently the official opposition party in both chambers of the UK parliament.
- 40 The Criminal Justice and Court Services Bill - all UK parliamentary debates are available on the Houses of Parliament web site www.parliament.uk
- 41 Any MP in the UK parliament can submit a question for answer either orally in the chamber of the House, or more frequently in writing. In either case the answers are published in Hansard (the official record of parliament) and on the parliament web site see note 34.
- 42 An online magazine. This was not included in the original survey of Chat Rooms undertaken by Childnet in the summer of 2000.
- 43 The chat rooms in mykindaplace.com were in fact moderated by adults. Childnet argued that either the company was guilty of false advertising claims as they would not allow the kind of conversations the slogans suggested to take place, or their moderators were not doing their job.

44 Traditional proverb, origin The Bible.