IGF 2104 Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety	02-05 September 2014	Istanbul, Turkey	Report submitted by Marie-laure Lemineur, ECPAT International 05 Sept. 2014
Speakers and moderator	-Marie-laure Lemineur, ECPAT International, moderator; -Stuart Aston, Chief Security Advisor, Microsoft, UK; -John Carr, Senior Technical Adviser to ECPAT International; -Amy Crocker, Hotline Development Coordinator, INHOPE Foundation; -Preetam Maloor, Strategy and Policy Advisor, Corporate Strategy Division, ITU General Secretariat; -Marco Pancini, Senior Policy Counsel, Google.		
Session title: **Disrupting and reducing the availability of child sexual abuse materias on the Internet - How can technology help?** Wednesday September 3, 2014 2:30pm - 4:00pm Workshop Room 05 (Rumeli -1 Floor / Room 3)	The session addressed the issue of the positive use of technology to combat child abuse materials available online. It has been conducted as a Q&A session. No presentation were made. The following questions were asked to the presenters: 1/May we take it there is a consensus that it is impossible to contemplate a future where, through knocking on doors and police officers arresting individuals who are involved in downloading or distributing (in a broad sense) CAM that we will reach a point where child abuse materials are no longer a feature of the internet? The volumes of downloaders and images are just too large. 2/What are the technical challenges to tackling emerging forms of sexual exploitation online such as for example live streaming of children 3/The technological solutions used, such as databases, applications, softwares for facial recognition, etc. are costly to develop. 1/Who should be paying for its development and once available 2/ what type of business models are used-or should be used, so that for example, LEAs or an NGO operating a hotline operator should not have to bare with the costs of licensing ? 4/Google and Microsoft both made changes to the way their search engines work in relation to CAM: how is that going in terms o rolling it out to languages other than English? And where it is working has there been any discernible impact/changes in behaviour?□		

IGF 2104 **Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety**	**02-05 September 2014**	**Istanbul, Turkey**	**Report submitted by Marie-laure Lemineur, ECPAT International 05 Sept. 2014**
	5/ Do you consider that an ever evolving technological/ICT context where for example, we are seeing the implementation of IPV6 i.e. multiplication of IP addresses, the increasing use of virtual currencies and the appearance on the market of almost 2000 new generic domain name impact (positive or negative) on the technological tools we currently use for tracking, disrupting, etc. CAM on the networks? If yes, could you provide examples? **CONCLUSIONS**: -The volume of materials of sexual abuse available on the Internet is growing enormously according to law enforcement sources; Law enforcement does not have the ressources to arrest every individual user. This is why need automated tools such as photoDNA; -Creating a similiar tool to PhotoDNA that would apply to videos of sexual abuse available online is challenging. The main issue is building the original database since this solution implies the use of comparative hash values; -They are technical dificulties in tracking down materials and live sexual shows of children when they are being broadcasted through encrypted channels such as skype. In those cases, maybe the solution is to use other strategies such looking for financial traces of the transactions made to purchase the ilegal content; In that regards, existing financial coalitions are key initiatives in the field; -There are social and legal limits to the use of technology that are as important or maybe even more important that the technology itself; We must decide how far we ready to go to implement technological solutions in order to protect our children. We also have to remember the environment in which these crimes are taking place. It is more of a social debate more than a technical debate; -Companies like Google, donate the use of technical tools they develop since it is in the public interest to disrupt the circulation of CAM online. In that regards, we can not speak of a business model since there is none being applied; -We must adopt a multistakeholder approach to the issue and have an ongoing continious dialogue and collaboration among all stakeholders; -It looks like, in a near future, encryption, rather than other technological trends that we are foreseeing, is going to be a challenge to track down materials of sexual abuse online; -Technology is not the solution it is part of the solution.		

IGF 2104 **Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety**	02-05 September 2014	Istanbul, Turkey	Report submitted by Marie-laure Lemineur, ECPAT International 05 Sept. 2014
Link to transcript	<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/174-igf-2014/transcripts/1965-2014-09-03-dynamic-coalition-on-child-online-safety-room-5>		