



# **Blocking access to child pornography**

## **The Danish Case**



**Rikke Frank Jørgensen**

**Danish Institute for Human Rights  
Digital Rights  
European Digital Rights**

**[rfj@humanrights.dk](mailto:rfj@humanrights.dk)**

# Summary

**ISPs in DK have agreed on common filter solution targeting all users**

**Aim: block access to websites containing child pornography**

**Partners: Save The Children DK and the Danish police**

**Is this a feasible way forward ?**

# Background

**Innovation Lab Report 2005: Pornography is 80 % of webtraffic**

**Oct 2005: TDC install filter (previous state telecom provider)  
TDC announce that 36000 users seek access to child porn daily**

**Ministry of Technology starts investigation, incl. poss. ISP initiatives**

**”I will have to consider whether we can continue a voluntary scheme”  
Minister Helge Sander, nov. 2005**

**Since TDC only covers 3/5 of internet traffic in dk, other providers are  
”encouraged” to install the filter as well**

**99 % of providers comply**

# **The filter solution**

**Save the children report sites to the police  
(5760 reported / 2173 poss. Illegal for the first 6 months)**

**The police validates and submits info to the TDC "black list"  
(The list is "secret", but has currently app. 3000 blocked sites)**

**The users are blocked from access by "stop sign" (1700 times a day)**

**Information is shared with Norway and Sweden that has a similar  
solution**

**The arrangement is based on a written agreement btw the police and  
the other parties**

# **Why problematic**

**The Police as the judging power  
The ISP as the executing power**

# For example

**Danish site bizar.dk blocked -> complain by owner**  
**No child pornography on site**  
**Police had to apologize**  
**Who was responsible ?**

**Police "we only make suggestions to ISPs"**  
**ISPs "not our decision, we rely on the police"**  
**Lawyers "cant have a zone with no legal protection"**

# **Rule of law**

**Blocking is de facto a judgement by the police  
Name, adress, phone no. of "the accused" accesible through  
dk.hostmaster**

**The "accused" is not notified,  
nor able to try the verdict before a court**

**"This is a prize we have to pay" (some MPs)**

**What happened to the rule of law ?**

# Status

**Increasing concern from lawyers, civil society, and some MPs**

**Save The Children receive 30 % more notifications a year  
(7200 in 2005)**

**A number of questions in parliament – await response**

**Scope of filter is extending to "happy slapping"**

**Danish NGO denied access to list of blocked sites  
(freedom of information request)**

# Conclusion

**The fight against child pornography is important**

**The fight against child porn is a "good" political case.. Noone can disagree and its difficult to even raise concern**

**But.. Solutions have to respect and build on rule of law**

**This is not the case with the Danish model**