

RESEARCH OUTPUTS / RÉSULTATS DE RECHERCHE

ONCE Project - Deliverable 3.3: Comparison of rating initiatives

Van Bastelaer, Béatrice; De Keyser, Sophie; Samyn, Virginie

Publication date:
2002

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (HARVARD):

Van Bastelaer, B, De Keyser, S & Samyn, V 2002, *ONCE Project - Deliverable 3.3: Comparison of rating initiatives*. MAPI/CITA - FUNDP, Namur.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ONCE Project - Deliverable 3.3

COMPARISON OF RATING INITIATIVES

Béatrice van Bastelaer

With the help of Sophie De Keyser & Virginie Samyn

MAPI/CITA - FUNDP Namur

February 6th 2002

Introduction

The objective of this deliverable was to compare criteria used in existing rating initiatives with criteria used by children. In fact, it rapidly appears that these criteria are not of the same kind and of the same level. In existing rating initiatives, made by adults, criteria help to describe potential dangerous content or content perceived as dangerous by adults (sex, violence, nudity, ...) while criteria used by children qualify a web site (good, bad, interesting, ...), sometimes without referring to its exact content. However, FUNDP/MAPI finds interesting to specify more precisely, in this document, how rating initiatives work and which criteria they used. In order to do so, co-operation has been made actively with the 3W3S project of the IAP program, mainly with Virginie Samyn. Contacts have also been taken with ICRA and with CISA, especially with Ann Davison regarding the recent report (28 Nov. 2001) published by the European Economic and Social Council¹.

This deliverable will then

- Explain rating and filters (point 1);
- Underline how children perceive danger on the Internet and if their perceptions are coherent with adults' views (point 2);
- Check if 'kewl' sites given by Belgian children (see deliverable 3.2) and some referenced web sites given in the resource centre of the ONCE web site are rated (point 3).

1. Rating and filtering

The aim of this deliverable is not to explain in details how rating and filtering works. There are already some articles and books covering this subject deeply. The aim is only to give enough explanation in order that the reader could understand what is said in this paper.

¹ Comité économique et social - TEN/078 — Protection de l'enfance Internet (2001), *A VIS du Comité économique et social sur "Un programme pour la protection de l'enfance sur Internet"* (supplément d'avis), Bruxelles, le 28 novembre 2001.

1.1. Brief explanation

The first thing to understand is the difference between rating (labelling) and filtering. Resnick (1998)² precised very clearly that "*a label describes the content of something and a filter makes the content accessible to some audience*".

There are different types of filters (d'Udekem-Gevers, 1998³ & 1999⁴). Some work at the entry point, i.e. on the URLs. This means that there is a black list of URLs that are censored and that the navigator does not show or a white list of URLs that are accepted and opened by the navigator or a PICS labelling (see below). Other filters work by checking the content itself. The existence of rating is very important for this kind of filters.

Here are some examples of existing filters⁵: Cyber Patrol, Net Nanny, X-Stop, SurfWatch, SurfControl, Net Shepherd, ...

Some filters use rating. As underlined by Marie d'Udekem-Gevers (2001)⁶, rating is similar to classifying and this implies that criteria have been defined before. This list of criteria, of words is exactly what interested us in order to see if they are close to criteria given by children.

As explained in other articles by Marie d'Udekem-Gevers (1998, 1999), there are two main rating systems. The first one is self-rating. This means that content providers voluntarily label the content of their web site. The other possibility is third-party rating. In this case, specialised rating organisms rate the content of web sites made by others. Both solutions have their advantages and disadvantages. In self-rating, people have to do that on a volunteer basis. It should be interesting to make a survey amongst content providers to see, first, if they know what filtering and labelling is; second, if they are interested by rating their web sites, i.e. if they see the value added of self-rating, and third, if they know how to process. On the ICRA web site, ICRA being a self-rating initiative, they give the following argument in favour of rating: "*there are a number of compelling reasons why a web author would label his/her site with ICRA*". They give some examples:

- ❑ "*Commercial sites, with little or no objectionable material will want to label their site so as not to be blocked "by default"*." Let us mention that currently, as explained below, navigators reading labels give access to labelled web sites corresponding to the choice of the user but also to all other non labelled sites;
- ❑ "*Operators of sites designed specifically for children*" that want to label their sites. Indeed, ICRA said that some search engines build their database of "child-friendly sites" by looking for ICRA labels;

² Resnick P. (1998), *Pics, Censorship & Intellectual Freedom FAQ*, <http://www.si.umich.edu/~presnick/pics/intfree/faq.htm>

³ d'Udekem-Gevers Marie (1998), "What can be regulated on the Internet by control/filtering software?", in *Proceedings of Fifth World Conference Human Choice and Computers (HCC-5)*, Geneva, 25-28 August 1998, pp. 315-334.

⁴ d'Udekem-Gevers Marie (1999), "The Internet Filtering Criteria: a Survey Raising Ethical Issues", in *Proceedings of the 4th ETHICOMP - International Conference on the Social and Ethical Impacts of Information and Communication Technologies (ETHICOMP 99)*, 6-8 October 1999, Roma, Luiss CeRSIL, ISBN 88-900396-0-4.

⁵ See <http://www.saferinternet.org/filtering/filters.asp> for a more extensive list of filters and an explanation of their main functions.

⁶ d'Udekem-Gevers Marie, Pouillet Yves (2001), 'Concerns from a European User Empowerment Perspective in Internet Content Regulation', in *Communications & Stratégies*, issue 43, 3rd quarter 2001, pp. 143-190.

- ❑ *"The majority of operators of "adults only" sites" that do not necessarily want to be accessed by young children. As underlined by the European Economic and Social Council (2001), children are not good consumers since they cannot pay and most operators of these kinds of web sites prefer not to have visits from children. According to ICRA, "labelling their site sends a clear signal to governments that the World Wide Web is willing and able to self-regulate". However, we take this argument very cautiously since we are not convinced by this kind of self-regulation mainly because of the real capacity and necessary knowledge of parents to use filters to restrict the access for their children. The Economic and Social Council 2001 report underlines that parents need help because currently, they have lower Internet knowledge than their children;*
- ❑ Finally, ICRA mentions that *"a site carrying an ICRA label is more likely to be perceived as trustworthy than one which is not labelled"*. Let us underline that they are not totally objective in asserting such argument and, moreover, that most "standard" Internet users do not know ICRA and will then not be particularly attracted by an ICRA label.

The other problem with self-rating is the control. Again on the ICRA web site, it is specified that *"About a week after you rate your site (or a week after a date you give as the predicted publication date) the ICRA system will check whether the label is in place. If so, all well and good. If not, we'll contact you and see whether you need any further help. Ultimately however, sites not carrying the label will be deleted from the database"*. Moreover, *"displaying an ICRA logo button or "Labelled with ICRA" text link without carrying the label is a breach of our terms and conditions"*. Finally, *"ICRA makes both automated and manual checks on sites to verify that labels are in place and that they are applied appropriately"*.

Organisations like ICRA do a lot of efforts to increase self-rating and to control that labelling with ICRA is correctly done. More precisely, they do not really control that the label is correct in terms of which content is on a site but whether the label is present and technically correct⁷. However, it must be said that it is difficult to control the effectiveness of self-rating. According to Ola-Kristian Hoff from ICRA⁸, ICRA does not control the content for several reasons. First, the amount of work would be overwhelming. Second, this would induce moral judgements from ICRA on the content, which they do not want to do. Third, there are actually very few misleading labels on web sites.

More globally, a recent survey made by the European Economic and Social Council⁹ stresses that there are very few self-rated web sites. This body asks for a mandatory rating of Internet sites.¹⁰

Regarding third-party rating, the major disadvantages are the load of work given the millions of existing web sites and the fact that this is made by private agencies without any legitimacy to do so and with their own values¹¹.

⁷ Cf. e-mail from Ola-Kristian Hoff, from ICRA, February 5th 2002.

⁸ Cf. e-mail of February 5th 2002.

⁹ Comité économique et social - TEN/078 — Protection de l'enfance Internet (2001), *op.cit.*

¹⁰ Comité économique et social - TEN/078 — Protection de l'enfance Internet (2001), *op.cit.* See also Euractiv.com web site, *ECOSOC wants mandatory rating of internet sites*, <http://www.euractiv.com/cgi-bin/cgint.exe/112418-606?1100=1&204&OIDN=1502643>

¹¹ For a deeper explanation and comparison of the different types of control, see d'Udekem-Gevers Marie, Poulet Yves (2001), *op.cit.* For the description of the criteria used in third-party rating, see d'Udekem-Gevers (1998, 1999).

All rating systems used PICS, *Platform for Internet Content Selection*. PICS can be understood as a kind of common grammar that is then used by specific labels like RSACi¹², ICRA (that extends RSACi), Safesurf, ... As underlined by Marie d'Udekem-Gevers and Virginie Samyn¹³, from the 3W3S IAP project, quoting the W3 consortium, PICS is "*a set of technical specifications (/standards) that allows the ratings from any source to work with all filtering software PICS compliant. It establishes Internet conventions for labels formats and distribution methods, while dictating neither a labelling vocabulary nor who should pay attention to which labels. It is analogous to specifying where on a package a label should appear, and in what font it should be printed, without specifying what it would say*".

Specific labels have their own criteria, for some of them based on the PICS common vocabulary. In Safesurf, a self-rating PICS based label, the major adult themes¹⁴ are

- Profanity
- Heterosexual themes
- Homosexual themes
- Nudity
- Violence
- Intolerance
- Glorifying drug use
- Gambling
- ...

These themes are then subdivided in sub-themes¹⁵. Here is the example for Nudity:

- Subtle Innuendo
- Explicit Innuendo
- Technical Reference
- Non-Graphic-Artistic
- Graphic-Artistic
- Graphic
- Detailed Graphic
- Explicit Vulgarly
- Explicit and Crude

In the ICRA label, the broad topics are:

- Chat
- The language used on the site
- The nudity and sexual content of a site

¹² Recreational Software Advisory Council for Internet.

¹³ d'Udekem-Gevers Marie, Samyn Virginie (2001), *PICS Rating Services: evolution since 1998-1999 and state in 2001*.

¹⁴ See <http://www.safesurf.com/classify/index.html> for the description of every sub theme.

¹⁵ See <http://www.safesurf.com/classify/index.html> for the description of every sub theme.

- The violence depicted on the site
- Others such as gambling, drugs and alcohol.

On the ICRA web site¹⁶, there is a definition of these words and of what they include. These descriptors are, for instance:

- For violence
 - "Sexual violence / rape"*
 - Blood and gore, human beings*
 - Blood and gore, animals*
 - Blood and gore, fantasy characters (including animation)*
 - Killing of human beings*
 - Killing of animals*
 - Killing of fantasy characters (including animation)*
 - Deliberate injury to human beings*
 - Deliberate injury to animals*
 - Deliberate injury to fantasy characters (including animations)*
 - Deliberate damage to objects*
 - None of the above"*

It is also possible to put the material in context

- "appears in a context intended to be artistic and is suitable for young children"*
- appears in a context intended to be educational and is suitable for young children"*
- appears in a context intended to be medical and is suitable for young children"*
- only appears in a sports related context"*

1.2. How to self-rate sites and to use filters?

Content providers who want to self-rate their web site can go to existing systems like SafeSurf or ICRA and follow the instructions. Generally, this means

- Give the URL of their web site
- Give the title of the site
- Choose a recommended age range (this is possible with Safesurf but not with ICRA due to the fact that, according to them, it is impossible to judge what different cultures accept and do not accept regarding age levels¹⁷)
- Identify adult themes contained in their web site
- Fill in a form
- Create the rating.

¹⁶ <http://www.icra.org>

¹⁷ Cf. e-mail from Ola-Kristian Hoff, from ICRA, February 5th 2002.

They will then receive a code, a metatag, to add at the top of their web pages, in the html source. Here is the example of the rating of <http://fr.yahoo.com>:

```
meta http-equiv="PICS-Label" content='(PICS-1.1  
"http://www.rsac.org/ratingsv01.html" l gen true for "http://fr.yahoo.com" r (n 0  
s 0 v 0 l 0))'
```

This means that the site uses the RSACi label and that there is no nudity (n=0), no sex (s=0), no violence (v=0) and no offensive language (l=0). But it concerns the front page of the French yahoo site and not the overall content, i.e. all the web sites listed in Yahoo ! To avoid this kind of restricted information, ICRA offers the possibility to rate an entire site (ex. <http://www.icra.org>), what they call a branch or directory (ex. <http://www.icra.org/support>) or a single page (<http://www.icra.org/support/index.html>).

People who want to restrict the access to some Internet web sites, for instance, parents towards their children or employers towards their employees, may decide to use filters. Nowadays, these filters are proposed in navigators. This is the case for Internet Explorer (with the Content Advisor function) and Netscape 4.7¹⁸ that supports one label, RSACi¹⁹. But they have to be configured, i.e. the user must specify his degree of tolerance regarding violence, nudity, sex, offending language, ... The navigator will then access the rated web sites that are compliant with the criteria precised by the user but also all the web sites that are not rated. Today, there are indeed very few web sites that are labelled. If the navigator would only access labelled web sites that moreover correspond to the choice of the user, there will be very few web sites available. Currently then, what the filter does is not to give access to labelled web sites that do not correspond to the choice of the user.

Let us mention here, following the European Economic and Social Council, that none of these filters will effectively and totally exclude the access to non required content. Their main objective is to give the power to final users, i.e. to empower them, "to make choice about what should or should not appear on their computer or on their child computer" (p. 7).

1.3. Filtering and rating initiatives in the IAP programme

Within the IAP programme, there is a specific action line on filtering and rating. This action line is subdivided into two parts²⁰:

- Demonstrating the benefits of filtering and rating;
- Facilitating international agreement on rating systems.

Currently, the projects financed by the European Commission are the following²¹:

- NETPROTECT : A European Prototype of Internet Access Filtering
- EUFORBIA: Experiments about the Filtering of Internet Documents According to an Unbiased and Semantic-rich Approach
- MED-CERTAIN: MedPICS Certification and Rating of Trustful and Assessed Health Information on the Net
- 3W3S: World Wide Web Safe Surfing Service

¹⁸ According to the ICRA web site, Netscape 6 does not support ICRA.

¹⁹ RSACi, standing for Recreational Software Advisory Council on the internet, is a label that exists before ICRA but that has been integrated into ICRA.

²⁰ Cf. <http://www.saferinternet.org/filtering/index.asp>

²¹ <http://www.saferinternet.org/filtering/projects.asp>

- ICRA SAFE: Internet Content Rating Association System for Europe.

2. Perception of danger by children

We have seen in deliverable 3.1 that the use of the repertory grid did not give us many criteria. Only some criteria have been underlined: *super*, *chouette*/great, *bien*/good, *super bien*/super good, *beau*/nice, *drôle*/funny, *intéressant*/interesting, *pas pratique*/not practical, *lent*/slow, *embêtant*/annoying, *ennuyeux*/boring, They cannot be compared with the criteria used in rating initiatives, as presented above.

2.1. Existing surveys

We then thought that analysing some existing surveys²² about the use of Internet by children could provide us with the way they perceive danger. However, the problem is that the surveys that we collected and analysed are based on questionnaires, made by adults, where children answer to specific questions. We then cannot find exactly how they perceive and express danger with their own words, without being "guided" by adults in formulating their answer.

In the recent Canadian survey for instance, *Jeunes canadiens dans un monde branché*²³, there are some information about the way children see harmful content on the Internet but the kind of harmful content available is proposed by the interviewers (pornography, violence, hate, ...). Children have then to react or explain if they have already seen such content and how they feel about that.

Regarding pornography, most of the young people have once had access to a porn web site, often by hazard. 13% of the students have received a photo or an image that make them feel uneasy. For 61% of them, it was a sexual image. An important minority has visited a violent and horrible web site but there is no precision about what was the exact content, i.e. what they consider as violent and horrible. Most of the students have never visited a full of hatred web site. And those who have visited one were not particularly upset by what they have seen.

Based on the Canadian survey, an international study has been conducted in different countries, including Belgium, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Quebec, Switzerland and France, on the theme 'Young people and Internet: representations, use and appropriation'. This international survey is co-ordinated by Canadian researchers. We have analysed the French report²⁴. The French research has been conducted between November 1999 and May 2000 and implied 524 students from 11 to 19 years old.

This survey concerned the representation of Internet by students. In general, these representations are rather positive. Internet is good, great, easy, quick. Those, rather few, that have a negative representation mainly said that it is useless. There are almost

²² ° Lenhart Amanda, Rainie Lee and Lewis Olivier (2001), *Teenage life online. The rise of the instant-message generation and the Internet's impact on friendships and family relationships*, Pew Research Center, June 2001, available at <http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/toc.asp?Report=36>

° *Jeunes canadiens dans un monde branché : la perspective des élèves*, survey made by the Media-Awareness Network and the Canadian government, available on www.media-awareness.ca

° CLEMI (2001), *Les jeunes et Internet. Représentations, usages et appropriations*, study available on www.clemi.org/recherche/jeunes_internet/ji_intro.html

° Comité économique et social - TEN/078 — Protection de l'enfance Internet (2001), *op.cit.*

²³ *Jeunes canadiens dans un monde branché : la perspective des élèves*, *op.cit.*

²⁴ CLEMI (2001), *op. cit.*

no words about the potential dangers of Internet. When questioned about the content of Internet, they mainly said that it is a means of entertainment and, as far as they grew, as an educational means, useful for the school work. Regarding filters, what is interesting in this study is the position of students towards a control of the web sites. As far as they do not really trust the content diffused on web sites, some of them think that the content of web sites has to be controlled. Questioned on what should be controlled (with some examples given in the question itself), they gave some examples: 'dangerous' sites (what does it mean exactly?), racist sites, sites on alcohol and cigarettes, commercial sites (to avoid swindling), hacking, ... but not necessarily porn sites.

According to the survey, young people are rather open and tolerant. They said that there are attached to human rights and free speech, without always perceiving that it could be contradictory, as underlined in the study. They are not necessarily in favour of an interdiction, they prefer a good information. Regarding potential dangers, they are more strict with racist sites than with pornographic sites. Some of them think that one should control false information in order, for young people for instance, to be sure that the information they found is liable and correct.

Finally, the report on child protection on the Internet made by the European Economic and Social Council takes some information from a survey conducted near 1,000 children aged between 11 and 14 years old by ERICA, EKATO and the Austrian Institute for Media Education²⁵. This survey mainly focuses on what children find on the Internet and how, on how they surf (with or without their parents) and on the question of the child protection and the knowledge and effective use of security guidelines. The survey also underlines the gap between parents and children knowledge of Internet.

Given the survey, it seems that children from United Kingdom, Austria and Greece want to be protected, from rude images, from violence and from games. Some of them also want to be protected from e-commerce.

2.2. ONCE surveys in Belgium

During our visits in schools, we have asked several open questions to children about what they think about the Internet. We have also asked them to describe a positive or negative experience that they have lived on the Internet. We analyse the answers to these questions to try to find interesting things about their perception of danger.

The answers to the question 'Have you seen on Internet things that shocked you or that might shock somebody younger than you?' are very interesting. Answers are qualitative and do not say what kinds of thing, according to them, are more offending than others. But they give clue on what children find acceptable on the Internet and what they dislike.

Answers to this question 'Have you seen on Internet things that shocked you or that might shock somebody younger than you?' are the following:

- Nudity - sex - pornography, especially when they are not searching for this kind of material and that is comes without asking (open of a new window, images that appear while chating, hacking of URL, ...)
- Pedopornography

²⁵ To order the complete report of the survey "*Children want protection on the Internet: results of the schools' survey*" - November 2001, see <http://www.net-consumers.org/erica/public.htm>

- Violence, especially pictures showing violence on human beings (automutilation for instance, suicide), accidents and attacks (like the terror attacks of September 11th 2001) but also violence on animals
- Death: pictures of dead people (in car accidents for instance)
- Insults and swearwords
- Advertisements either on sites that, according to them, should not propose any advertisement banner (without precision) or on things that should not be advertised (like weapons).

Another question was interesting to analyse in order to get more idea on what children dislike on the Internet: "can you tell us a negative experience that you had on or due to the Internet?" In the answers given by children to this second question, it is interesting to underline that the major problems seem to be technical: viruses, downloading too low, costs of using (inducing remarks from the parents), bugs and problems with the computer, web sites that are hacked (the content is not what is announced or expected), URLs that do not work, ...

Besides this kind of problem, children listed in their answers to this qualitative question regarding their negative experience:

- Sexual and pornographic sites and e-mails
- Insults received
- The fact that people lie (especially on chats, and even if they do the same)
- The fact that they are lost on the Internet, i.e. they cannot find what they are looking for.

In conclusion, to a certain extent, there are some links between the criteria chosen by adults and used in rating initiatives and the perception of danger by children: violence, racism, ...

Regarding the position of children and teenagers towards pornography and sexual material, according to us, the following hypotheses should be tested in a quantitative survey:

- The younger children are, the more they are offended. When they grew, they think that everybody can look at sexual material and pornography if they want, as it is the case with traditional material in magazines, ...
- They are much less tolerant with pornography including children.
- Being 'traditional' or child pornography, they do not like to see or to receive sexual material when they do not want to: unexpected e-mails, pictures, web sites that are hacked. They do not like to be "surprised by pornography".

It should be interesting for rating initiatives to make an exhaustive survey to confirm or infirm these hypotheses. However, their favourite target seems to be more the parents than the children and teenagers themselves. Their conception of the danger and of what can be seen by their children is probably different.

3. Rating of 'kewl' sites and resource centre

It is interesting to know more about the criteria of adults as implemented in rating initiatives and the criteria of children as we have underlined them, even if very partially. But a major question to raise is if web sites for children use existing rating and especially ICRA (or RSACi, the former version of ICRA). We have then looked at the web sites provided by children as their favourite ones (see Deliverable 3.2 *Database*

of 'kewl' sites) as well as the web sites that we have selected for the resource centre of the ONCE web site.

In order to see if web sites are rated, they are two possibilities :

- See if there is a logo of a specific label (ICRA, RSACi or other) or a text like "Labelled with ..." on the front page of the web site.



Example : logo of ICRA

- Look at the html source. To do so, open the web site, view page source and then see the metatags in the head of the page (between the <head> and </head> tags).

Based on this method, we checked the list of 'kewl' sites provided by children to see if they are labelled or not and in case they are, which label is used. ICRA precised to us that it is sometimes hard to determine whether a site is labelled only by looking at the code. Then it is not possible to see the label, but filtering still works²⁶.

The following table summarises the result of this exercise, given the precision just given above about the difficulty of such exercise.

Web sites given by children	Rating System Used
http://fan.starwars.com/YodaMac/SimsCity.html	None
http://messenger.msn.fr	RSACi
http://michelvaillant.free.fr/	None
http://wws.yahoo.fr	RSACi
http://www.annegeddes.com/	None
http://www.apreslecole.fr/	None
http://www.belrtl.be/	None
http://www.britneyspears.com	None
http://www.caramail.com	None
http://www.cars.com	None
http://www.chez.com/phifou/charmed/charmed.htm	None
http://www.clubrtl.be	None
http://www.disney.com/	RSACi
http://www.dreamworks.com	None
http://www.ferrari.com	None
http://www.finalfantasy.com	None
http://www.flanby.com/	None
http://www.flipside.com/	None
http://www.foxkids.fr	None
http://www.france3.fr/	None
http://www.goa.com/	None
http://www.google.com	None
http://www.jeuxvideos.com/	None
http://www.jurassicpark.com	None
http://www.kazibao.net/	None
http://www.kazoo3d.com	None
http://www.kidcity.be	None
http://www.kidcity.fr	None
http://www.lacinq.net/	None
http://www.lego.com/	None
http://www.m6.fr	None
http://www.mcm.net	None
http://www.micromania.fr/	None
http://www.miko.fr/	None
http://www.msn.com	RSACi and ICRA

²⁶ Cf. e-mail from Ola-Kristian Hoff, from ICRA, February 5th 2002.

DELIVERABLE 3.3
COMPARISON OF RATING INITIATIVES

http://www.mtv.com	None
http://www.multimania.fr/	None
http://www.nasa.gov/	None
http://www.nba.com/	None
http://www.nintendo.com	None
http://www.playstation.com/	None
http://www.pokemon.com	None
http://www.rendez-vous.be/	None
http://www.rigoler.com/	None
http://www.romeoetjuliette.net/	None
http://www.rotten.com/	None
http://www.rtl.be	None
http://www.shrek.com/	None
http://www.sjgames.com/gurps/books/Grimoire/	None
http://www.standard.be	None
http://www.starwars.com/	None
http://www.tf1.fr	None
http://www.TFOU.fr	None
http://www.titanicmovie.com/	None
http://www.voila.fr/	None
http://www.yahoo.com	RSACi and ICRA
http://www.yahoo.fr	RSACi and ICRA
http://www.zidane.fr/	None
http://www.zonesega.platomic.com	None
http://zone.msn.com/	RSACi
www.alpinerenault.com	None
www.altavista.com	None
www.astonmartin.com	None
www.auto-couture.com	None
www.belgacom.net	None
www.cartoonnetwork.com	None
www.chevrolet.com	None
www.copernic.com	None
www.counter-strike.net	None
www.download.com	None
www.dragonballz.com	None
www.dupuis-entertainment.com (kid paddle, cédric, Spirou)	None
www.eidos.com	None
www.eurosport.com	None
www.fl-live.com	None
www.figurine.free.fr	None
www.fnac.be	None
www.games.workshop.com	None
www.gorilaz.com	None
www.hotmail.com	None
www.humour.com	None
www.iBazar.com	None
www.indexplorian.be	None
www.lamborghini.com	None
www.lyrics.com	None
www.mine.be	None
www.misscara.com	None
www.mondial-karting.com	None
www.morphius.com	None
www.napster.com	None
www.nioki.com	None
www.nokia.com	None
www.nrj.be	None
www.nrj.fr	None
www.opel.com	None

DELIVERABLE 3.3
COMPARISON OF RATING INITIATIVES

www.porsche.com	None
www.proximus.be	None
www.proximus.com	None
www.saab.com	None
www.skynet.be	None
www.snpp.com (Simpson)	None
www.splatch.net/	None
www.sports.com	None
www.wanadoo.fr	None
www.warez.com	None
www.warhammer.net	None
www.zonejeux.com/	None
www.zou.be	None

Out of these 108 web sites, only 7 are labelled, 4 with RSACi and 3 with both RSACi and ICRA. None has a logo or a text "labelled with ...".

We made the same test for the web sites that we found relevant for children and that we put in our resource centre (<http://www.theonceproject.com/be/cdr.asp>).

Web sites of the resource centre	Rating System Used
http://pbskids.org/caillou_french	None
http://perso.club-internet.fr/vale/index.htm	None
http://www.ann.jussieu.fr/llann/1.html#web	None
http://www.apreslecole.fr	None
http://www.boowakwala.com/french	None
http://www.cfc-efc.ca/index.html	None
http://www.inforjeunes.be	None
http://www.kazibao.net/francais/services/plan	None
http://www.kidcomics.com/fr/index.htm	None
http://www.kutchuk.com/index.htm	RSACi and ICRA
http://www.lescale.net	None
http://www.rocler.qc.ca/pixeletpica	None
http://www.tralalere.com	None
http://www.ulg.ac.be/aquarium	None
http://www.explorian.be	None

Out of these 15 sites, one is labelled, with RSACi and ICRA.

Conclusion

Even if it is based on qualitative information and analysis, this deliverable stresses that there are some common features between the criteria used in rating initiatives and decided by adults and the perception of danger by children. This is the case for violence for instance. The major difference seems to be linked to pornography but this should be deepened in further research.

Moreover, it should be interesting to deepen this question of the perception of danger by children to adapt criteria used in labelling. However, this is not necessarily

DELIVERABLE 3.3
COMPARISON OF RATING INITIATIVES

the purpose of these rating initiatives since their core business and their major targets are probably more the parents than the children themselves and parents tend maybe to be more restrictive in the access to Internet content than their children.

□□□