



International Centre
FOR MISSING & EXPLOITED CHILDREN

Child Pornography: Model Legislation & Global Review

2006

Child Pornography:
Model Legislation & Global Review

Copyright © 2006, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank the following organizations and individuals for their outstanding assistance and guidance with researching national legislation relevant to child pornography:

- Interpol;
- the Microsoft Corporation;
- Ambassadors and staff of Interpol Member Country Embassies and Consulates in the United States;
- Ambassadors and staff of Interpol Member Country Permanent Missions to the United Nations in New York;
- the global law firm of Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP;
- nongovernmental and charity organizations committed to child protection throughout the world;
- various law -enforcement agencies, officers, and attorneys around the world who answered our requests for assistance;
- the staff of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children; and
- the staff of the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children, in particular Jessica Derder, *Director of Administration*, and Elizabeth Sharp, former *Legal Intern*.

Points of view and opinions presented in this publication are those of the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children and the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the other organizations and individuals who assisted with research.

FOREWORD

The lives of children exploited through child pornography are forever altered, not only by the molestation, but by the permanent record of the exploitation. Once sexual exploitation takes place, the molester may document these encounters on film or video. This documentation can then become the “ammunition” needed to blackmail the child into further submission, which is necessary to continue the relationship and maintain secrecy. These documented images also allow molesters to “relive” their sexual fantasies.

A greater number of child molesters are now using computer technology to organize, maintain, and increase the size of their child-pornography collections. Personally-manufactured illegal images of children are especially valuable on the Internet, and oftentimes molesters will trade images of their own sexual exploits. When these images reach cyberspace, they are irretrievable and can continue to circulate forever; thus, the child is revictimized as the images are viewed again and again.

The Internet has created an exciting, new world of information and communication for anyone with access to online services. While this technology offers unparalleled opportunities for children and adults to learn about the universe in which we live, it has also had an immeasurable impact on the sexual exploitation of children, specifically through the distribution of sexually exploitive images of children. The development, increasing accessibility, and use of home-computer technology have revolutionized the distribution of these images by increasing the ease of possession and dissemination and decreasing the cost of production and distribution, especially across international borders.

No country is immune from this form of child sexual exploitation, and it will take a concerted effort from governments, law enforcement, and civil society to ensure that the world’s children are protected. Such is why we have undertaken this project to propose model legislation relevant to child pornography.

It is important to note that the legislative review accompanying our model legislation is not about criticism, but rather about assessing the current state and awareness of the problem and learning from one another’s experiences. Additionally, a lack of legislation specific to child pornography does not mean that other forms of child sexual exploitation and child abuse are not criminalized.

Realizing the importance of taking into consideration varying cultural, religious, socio-economic, and political norms, our model legislation resembles more of a menu of concepts that can be applied in all countries throughout the world, as opposed to actual statutory language. We are optimistic that our research, report, and recommendations will increase global understanding and concern, and will ultimately enable governments around the world to adopt and enact much needed legislation to protect the most innocent victims from the most heinous of crimes.



Ernie Allen
President and Chief Executive Officer
International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children, in collaboration with Interpol, is working to create an International Resource Centre (IRC) on the issue of child pornography. The IRC, scheduled to launch in the Fall of 2006, will be based on the Internet and will contain public information as well as private, investigative resources for law enforcement.

Developing and championing “model legislation” with regards to child pornography is crucial to the success of the IRC and to successfully combating child-pornography crimes around the world.

Consequently, the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children has conducted research into the child-pornography legislation currently in place in the 184 Interpol Member Countries to gain a better understanding of existing legislation and to gauge where the issue stands on national political agendas.

In particular, we were looking to see if national legislation:

- (1) exists with specific regard to child pornography;
- (2) provides a definition of child pornography;
- (3) criminalizes computer-facilitated offenses;
- (4) criminalizes possession of child pornography, regardless of the intent to distribute; and
- (5) requires Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to report suspected child pornography to law enforcement or to some other mandated agency.

Defining “Child Pornography”

While the term “child pornography” implies conventional pornography with child subjects, and does not aptly describe the true nature and extent of sexually exploitive images of child victims, use of this term throughout the report should not be taken to imply that children “consented” to any sexual acts depicted in any images.¹ The term is retained because it is the expression most readily recognized by the public at large, at this point in time, to describe this form of child sexual exploitation.²

For purposes of this report, “child pornography” includes, but is not limited to, “any representation, by whatever means, of a child engaged in real or simulated explicit sexual activities or any representation of the sexual parts of a child for primarily sexual purposes,”³ as well as the use of a child to create such representation.

Methodology

Research into national child-pornography legislation began in November 2004. Primary sources of information included: LexisNexis; a survey of Member Countries previously conducted by Interpol regarding national child-sexual-exploitation legislation; government submissions to the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution, and Child Pornography in conjunction with a

¹ Janis Wolak et al., *Child -Pornography Possessors Arrested in Internet-Related Crimes: Findings from the National Juvenile Online Victimization Study*vii, n.1 (Nat'l Ctr. for Missing & Exploited Children ed., 2005) [hereinafter *Child -Pornography Possessors*].

² *Id.*

³ Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution, and Child Pornography, G.A. Res. 54/263, Annex II, U.N. Doc. A/54/49, Vol. III, art. 2, para. c, *entered into force* Jan. 18, 2002.

U.N. report on child pornography on the Internet; and direct contact with in-country nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), law-enforcement agencies and officers, and attorneys.

Once the relevant information was assembled, legal analysis was conducted, and the preliminary results were compiled. In January 2006, letters were sent to the attention of Ambassadors of the Interpol Member Country Embassies in Washington, D.C.; if no Embassy listing was available, a letter was sent to the Ambassador at the Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York City. All letters consisted of a summary of the model-legislation project as well as country-specific results. Ambassadors were asked to verify our research and provide us with corrected information by a certain date, if such was necessary.

Results

Our end results are, to say the least, shocking:

- ❖ only **5** Countries meet all of the criteria set forth above;
- ❖ only **22** Countries meet all but the last criteria, pertaining to ISP reporting;
- ❖ **95** countries have no legislation at all that specifically addresses child pornography.

Of the remaining Countries that do have legislation specifically addressing child pornography:

- ❖ **54** Countries do not define child pornography in national legislation;
- ❖ **27** Countries do not provide for computer-facilitated offenses; and
- ❖ **41** Countries do not criminalize possession of child pornography, regardless of the intent to distribute.

Fundamental topics addressed in the model-legislation portion of this report include:

- (1) Defining “child” for the purposes of child pornography as anyone under the age of 18, regardless of the age of sexual consent;
- (2) Defining “child pornography,” and ensuring that the definition includes computer- and Internet-specific terminology;
- (3) Creating offenses specific to child pornography in the national penal code, including criminalizing the possession of child pornography, regardless of one’s intent to distribute, and including provisions specific to downloading or viewing images on the Internet;
- (4) Ensuring criminal penalties for parents or legal guardians who acquiesce to their child’s participation in child pornography;
- (5) Penalizing those who make known to others where to find child pornography;
- (6) Including grooming provisions;
- (7) Punishing attempt crimes;
- (8) Establishing mandatory-reporting requirements for healthcare and social-service professionals, teachers, law-enforcement officers, photo developers, information-technology (IT) professionals, ISPs, credit-card companies, and banks;
- (9) Addressing the criminal liability of children involved in pornography; and
- (10) Enhancing penalties for repeat offenders, organized-crime participants, and other aggravated factors considered upon sentencing.

MODEL LEGISLATION

A comprehensive legislative strategy that is aimed at combating child pornography and that allows law enforcement to aggressively investigate and prosecute offenders must extend beyond the criminalization of certain actions by child-sex offenders. While such is of obvious importance, of equal value are *inter alia*: adequately defining the terminology that is used in national penal code; legislating corporate social responsibility; enhancing sanctions; forfeiting assets; and strengthening sentencing provisions.

The model-legislation component of this publication is broken down into four parts:

- (1) Definitions;
- (2) Offenses;
- (3) Mandatory Reporting; and
- (4) Sanctions and Sentencing.

DEFINITIONS

Define “child,” for the purposes of child pornography, as “anyone under the age of 18,” regardless of the age of sexual consent.

The age at which a person can consent to sexual activity varies from country to country, a challenging obstacle to the consistent and harmonized protection of children from sexual exploitation on the international level. While a person under the age of 18 may be able to freely consent to sexual relations, such an individual is not legally able to consent to any form of sexual exploitation, including child pornography.

Moreover, in circumstances that require “dual criminality” – when a crime committed abroad must also be a crime in an offender’s home country in order for the offender to be prosecuted in his or her home country – agreement on a common age for what is a “child” is crucial. Any discrepancy will prevent a child-sex offender from being prosecuted.

For these reasons, “child,” for purposes of child pornography, should be defined as “anyone under the age of 18 years.”

Define “child pornography” and include computer- and Internet-specific terminology.

So that there can be no question in the mind of the offender or on the part of law enforcement, a judge, or the jury, child pornography should be adequately defined in national legislation. The definition should include, at a minimum, the visual representation or depiction of a child engaged in a (real or simulated) sexual display or act or performance. Moreover, it is imperative that, with the advent of the Internet and new technology, mention be made of all the forms child pornography can take including, but not limited to, film, DVD, CD-ROM, diskette, CD-R, and other electronic media; of all the ways child pornography can be distributed, including via Internet; and of all the ways child pornography can be possessed, including by simply viewing an image on the Internet or by downloading an image to one’s computer.

OFFENSES

Incorporate child-pornography offenses into the penal code.

Mere labor legislation that bans the worst forms of child labor, including child pornography, without detailing specific criminal offenses, criminal sanctions, and criminal punishments is not enough. The same is true for national legislation that defines “sexual exploitation” to include child pornography (usually in the child-protection code) but, once again, does not enumerate criminal offenses or specify criminal penalties. While such provisions are positive first steps in that the problem of child pornography is being recognized as an evil that affects child welfare, child pornography is a crime and must be recognized as such. Child pornography represents nothing less than the memorialization of the sexual degradation/molestation/abuse/assault of a child.

Further, countries in which there is a general ban on pornography, regardless of whether the individuals being depicted are adults or children, are not considered to have “legislation specific to child pornography,” for purposes of this report, unless there is also a sentencing enhancement in the national legislation that increases penalties for those who commit pornography offenses against children. A country cannot be penalized for banning all pornography and a sentencing enhancement for child victims makes the necessary distinction between adult and child pornography.

Criminalize simple possession of child pornography, regardless of the intent to distribute.

Every image of child pornography that is acquired encourages the further growth of this illicit industry, from “custom” child pornography – the sale of images of child rape created to order for the consumer – to “real-time” child pornography, where subscribers pay to watch the streamed online rape of children as it occurs.⁴

Victims portrayed in the images are getting younger and younger and the images are becoming more graphic and more violent. A recent study out of the United States demonstrated that 83% of arrested child-pornography possessors had images of children 6 to 12 years old; 39% had images of children 3 to 5 years old; and 19% had images of infants and toddlers under age 3.⁵ 92% had images of minors focusing on genitals or showing explicit sexual activity; 80% had pictures showing the sexual penetration of a child, including oral sex; and 21% had child pornography depicting violence such as rape, bondage, and torture.⁶ Most of these images involved children who were gagged, bound, blindfolded, or otherwise suffering sadistic sex.⁷

The same study also showed that 40% of arrested child-pornography possessors were “dual offenders,” who sexually victimized children and possessed child pornography,⁸ suggesting there may be a correlation between simple possession and committing sexual abuse upon a child.

⁴ Andrew Vachss, *Let's Fight This Terrible Crime Against Our Children*, PARADE, Feb. 19, 2006, at http://www.parade.com/articles/editions/2006/edition_02-19-2006/Andrew_Vachss (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁵ *Child-Pornography Possessors*, *supra* note 1, at 4.

⁶ *Id.* at 5.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.* at viii.

Criminalizing simple possession of child pornography may not only curb industry growth but also prevent further incidents of sexual abuse.

Criminalize the downloading or viewing of child-pornography images on the Internet and using the Internet to distribute child pornography.

Offenders use the Internet to view, download, distribute, acquire, and trade child pornography on a daily basis. Therefore, as stated earlier, it is imperative that specific mention be made, in some way, of computer or Internet technology being used to make, view, possess, or distribute child pornography, or in some other way commit a child-pornography offense.

Note that there is a difference between viewing an image on the Internet and downloading an image from the Internet. Both viewing and downloading should be criminalized as separate and distinct offenses.

Penalize those who make known to others where to find child pornography.

Offering information on where to find child pornography by providing a web site address, for example, should be penalized. An individual who assists in the commission of a crime (*i.e.*, possession or downloading of child pornography) through offering advice or taking actions necessary to facilitate the possession or downloading of illegal content should be, at a minimum, fined.

Criminalize the actions of parents or legal guardians who acquiesce to their child's participation in child pornography.

Similar to aiding and abetting in the commission of a crime, a parent or legal guardian who acquiesces to his or her child's participation in pornography is supporting and taking actions towards the commission of multiple crimes: rape, sexual exploitation, sexual assault, sexual abuse, and the manufacture of child pornography, all of which are being committed against his or her own child.

There can be no transfer of consent from the parent or guardian to the child to participate in child pornography. Just as a parent or guardian cannot lawfully consent to a child driving a motor vehicle underage, neither can a parent or guardian consent on behalf of a child to the child's participation in child pornography.

Turning one's child over to the pornography industry, whether for monetary profit or not, is the ultimate betrayal and violation of trust and parental duty and responsibility. The child's health and overall welfare are endangered, and such exposure to abuse and ill-treatment cannot go unpunished.

Grooming offenses must be criminalized.

Grooming represents the initial actions taken by a child-sex offender to "prepare" the child for a sexual relationship. There are generally two forms of grooming: online enticement and distributing or showing pornography (adult or child) to a child.

Online enticement of a child for sexual acts occurs when a child-sex offender uses the Internet to lure, invite, or persuade the child to meet for sexual acts. Child-sex offenders use e-mail, instant messaging, bulletin boards, and chat rooms to gain a child's trust and then arrange a face-to-face meeting.

Child-sex offenders will show pornography (adult or child) to a child in order to lower his or her inhibitions, to “normalize” what is not normal, and to instruct the child in sexual activities.⁹

The enactment of online grooming or online enticement legislation may help to identify latent child-sex offenders and preclude later victimization of children.

Punish attempt crimes.

The rationale behind criminalizing an attempt would be to punish an individual who has demonstrated an inclination to commit a crime without having to wait for the completion of the crime. Punishing attempt crimes can serve as an early warning for not only law enforcement and society as a whole, but also for the offender, who is put on notice from his or her first misstep that even incomplete crimes will not be tolerated and will be punished. Hopefully this will serve as a deterrent and will avert worse crimes.

MANDATORY REPORTING

Mandate healthcare and social-services professionals, teachers, law-enforcement officers, photo developers, IT professionals, ISPs, credit-card companies, and banks to report suspected child pornography to law enforcement or another agency.

There are three classes of individuals and organizations that should be required to report suspected child-pornography activities and offenses to law enforcement or another mandated agency:

- (1) individuals who, in their everyday, professional capacity, come into contact with children and owe a certain duty of care to those children;
- (2) individuals who, in their everyday, professional capacity, do not come into contact with children, but may potentially be exposed to child pornography as a result of their job responsibilities; and
- (3) organizations or corporations whose services are being used to proliferate child-pornography activities and who, as a result, should exercise a certain amount of industry responsibility/corporate citizenship/corporate social responsibility in their day-to-day business operations.

The first group is rather self-explanatory. Members include, but are not necessarily limited to healthcare and social-services professionals, teachers, school counselors, and law-enforcement officers. Based on daily interactions with children, these individuals may develop well-founded suspicions about potential child victims.

The second group is comprised primarily of photo developers and IT professionals, who may accidentally discover child pornography images while processing film, repairing a computer that has been brought in, or servicing a company computer in an employee’s office. This class of individuals should not be required to search for the illegal material, but rather only to report it to the appropriate authorities if found.

Finally, the last group consists mostly of ISPs, credit-card companies, and banks. In many circumstances, law enforcement would never know about many child-pornography offenses if ISPs did not report (either voluntarily or under legal obligation). Given the heavy traffic in child pornography over the Internet, ISPs are in an almost ideal position to report suspected child-pornography offenses to law enforcement. A “notice and takedown” requirement should be enacted within national legislation, and consideration

⁹ Eva J. Klain et al., *Child Pornography: The Criminal-Justice-System Response* 6 (Nat’l Ctr. for Missing & Exploited Children ed., 2001).

should be given to statutory protections that would allow ISPs to fully and effectively report child pornography, including the transmission of images, to law enforcement or another designated agency.

With regards to members of the financial industry, the ability to use credit cards and other payment methods to purchase child pornography has made it easier than ever to obtain child pornography. Child pornography has become a multi-billion dollar commercial enterprise and is among the fastest growing businesses on the Internet. Distribution over the Internet has facilitated instant access by thousands and possibly millions of individuals throughout the world. Financial companies must be vigilant and they should be required to proactively look for and report child pornography to law enforcement or another mandated agency.

SANCTIONS AND SENTENCING

Address the criminal liability of children involved in pornography.

There should be no criminal liability for children involved in pornography, and such should be clearly stated in national legislation. Regardless of whether a child is a compliant victim or a non-cooperative witness, the fact remains that he or she is a **child victim**.

Criminal liability must focus on the adult offender, who is responsible for the exploitation of the child, and on the crimes he or she committed against that child.

Legal provisions should be enacted that would allow for protections of the child victim as a witness in any judicial proceedings that may occur, including permitting closed-circuit testimony in certain circumstances and establishing guidelines for the presence of victim advocates in the courtroom.

Enhance penalties for repeat offenders, organized-crime participants, and other factors that may be considered upon sentencing.

All violations of enacted child-pornography legislation should carry strict sentences that will be enforced, thereby guaranteeing a true deterrent effect.¹⁰ Mere fines and misdemeanor classifications are not enough.

Sentencing provisions should take into account aggravating factors and enhancements.¹¹ Aggravating factors may include the number of images manufactured/produced/distributed/possessed; the severity of the offender's existing criminal record; the sexual violence toward children (including rape, torture, and bondage) being depicted in the images that were manufactured/produced/distributed/possessed; and any potential threat or risk the offender may pose to the community upon release.

A recent news article out of Russia has reported that organized criminals, among others, are increasingly moving into child pornography to generate revenue to support their activities.¹² Several reasons explain this trend: children are plentiful and easily accessible; child pornography is easy and inexpensive to produce; there is a huge consumer market for it; it is enormously profitable; and there is virtually no risk,

¹⁰ Eva J. Klain, *Prostitution of Children and Child-Sex Tourism: An Analysis of Domestic and International Responses* 47 (Nat'l Ctr. for Missing & Exploited Children ed., 1999) [hereinafter *Prostitution of Children and Child-Sex Tourism*].

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Sergey Stefanov, *Russia Fights Child Porn and Terrorism on the Internet*, PRAVDA, Dec. 4, 2002, at <http://english.pravda.ru/main/2002/12/04/40373.html> (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

far less than weapons and drugs. A sentencing enhancement for organized-crime activity could either have a deterrent effect or could disrupt the flow of the organization should an offender actually be sentenced to time in prison.

Assets must be forfeited.

Convicted defendants should be subject to forfeiture provisions that allow for the confiscation of property, proceeds, or assets that resulted from child-pornography activities.¹³ Confiscated funds could, in turn, be used to support programs for formerly sexually-exploited children, children at risk of being sexually exploited, and child victims who are in need of special care.¹⁴

¹³ *Prostitution of Children and Child-Sex Tourism*, *supra* note 10, at 47.

¹⁴ *Id.*

GLOBAL LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

✘ = No
 ✓ = Yes

Country	Legislation Specific to Child Pornography ¹⁵	“Child Pornography” Defined	Computer-Facilitated Offenses ¹⁶	Simple Possession ¹⁷	ISP Reporting ¹⁸
Afghanistan	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘
Albania	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘
Algeria	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘
Andorra	✓	✘	✘	✓	✘
Angola	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘

¹⁵ For the purposes of this report, we were looking for specific laws that proscribe and/or penalize child-pornography offenses. Mere labor legislation that simply bans the “worst forms of child labor,” among which is child pornography, is not considered “legislation specific to child pornography.”

Further, countries in which there is a general ban on pornography, regardless of whether the individuals being depicted are adults or children, are not considered to have “legislation specific to child pornography,” unless there is a sentencing enhancement provided for offenses committed against a child victim.

¹⁶ In order to qualify as a computer-facilitated offense, we were looking for specific mention of a computer, computer system, Internet, or similar language (even if such mention is of a “computer image” or something similar in the definition of “child pornography”). In cases where other language is used in national legislation, an explanatory footnote is provided.

¹⁷ “Simple possession,” for the purposes of this report, refers to possession regardless of the intent to distribute.

¹⁸ While some countries may have general reporting laws (*i.e.*, anyone with knowledge of any crime must report the crime to the appropriate authorities), only those countries that specifically require ISPs to report suspected child pornography to law enforcement (or another mandated agency) are included as having ISP reporting laws. Note that there are also provisions in some national laws (mostly within the European Union) that limit ISP liability as long as an ISP removes illegal content once it learns of its presence; however, such legislation is not included in this section.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Antigua & Barbuda	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Argentina	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Armenia	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
Aruba	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Australia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Austria	✓	✓	✓ ¹⁹	✓	✗
Azerbaijan	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Bahamas	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Bahrain	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Bangladesh	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Barbados	✓	✗ ²⁰	✗	✓	✗

¹⁹ Section 207a(1)(3) of the Austrian Penal Code criminalizes “mak[ing] available in **any other manner**...a pornographic depiction of a minor.” *Emphasis added.*

²⁰ The Computer Misuse Bill of 2005, which would define “child pornography,” was debated in the House of Assembly on 15 February 2005. See Albert Brandford, *Computer Crackdown*, DAILY NATION, Feb. 15, 2005 (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Belarus	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Belgium	✓	✓	✓ ²¹	✓	✓
Belize	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Benin	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Bhutan	✓	✗	✓ ²²	✗	✗
Bolivia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Bosnia-Herzegovina	✓	✗	✓ ²³	✓	✗
Botswana	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Brazil	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗

²¹ Article 383bis of the Belgian Penal Code, as amended on 1 April 2001, criminalizes, *inter alia*, the dissemination of child pornography, thereby including dissemination via computers. Letter from Jan Luykx, Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Belgium, Washington, D.C., to Ernie Allen, President and CEO, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 24, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

²² According to Article 225(b) of the Penal Code of Bhutan, “[a] defendant shall be guilty of the offense of pedophilia if the defendant...sells, manufactures, distributes, or **otherwise deals** in material that contains any depiction of a child engaged in sexual contact.” *Emphasis added*.

²³ Articles 189 and 211 of the Penal Code of Bosnia-Herzegovina reference “other pornographic materials” in addition to photographs and audio-visual tapes.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Brunei	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗ ²⁴
Bulgaria	✓	✗	✓ ²⁵	✓	✗
Burkina-Faso	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Burundi	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Cambodia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Cameroon	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

²⁴ While there is no mandatory-reporting requirement specific to ISPs, under the laws of Brunei all ISPs and Internet Content Providers (ICPs) licensed under the Broadcasting (Class License) Notification of 2001 must comply with the Code of Practice set forth in the Broadcasting Act (Cap 181). ISPs and ICPs are required to satisfy the Minister responsible for broadcasting matters that they have taken responsible steps to fulfill this requirement. Under the Broadcasting Act such Minister has the power to impose sanctions. Content that should not be allowed includes, *inter alia*, that which depicts or propagates pedophilia.

The Licensee must remove or prohibit the broadcast of the whole or any part of a program included in its service if the Minister informs the Licensee that the broadcast of the whole or part of the program is contrary to a Code of Practice applicable to the Licensee, or if the program is against the public’s interest, public order, or national harmony, or offends against good taste or decency.

The Licensee must also assist the Minister responsible for broadcasting matters in the investigation into any breach of its license or any alleged violation of any law committed by the Licensee or any other person; and shall also produce such information, records, documents, data, or other materials as may be required by the Minister for the purposes of the investigation. E-mail from Salmaya Salleh, Second Secretary, Embassy of Brunei, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Mar. 21, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

²⁵ Article 159(3) of the Bulgarian Penal Code, when read in conjunction with Article 159(1), criminalizes, *inter alia*, “**otherwise circulat[ing]** works with a [child] pornography content.” *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Canada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗ ²⁶
Cape Verde	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Central African Republic	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Chad	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Chile	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
China	✓ ²⁷	✗	✓ ²⁸	✗	✗

²⁶ While there is no mandatory reporting requirement specific to ISPs, ISPs in Canada collaborate with law enforcement and work closely to facilitate the deletion of offending material, if detected. Additionally, there is a national, public tipline (www.Cybertip.ca) that works closely with ISPs and law enforcement in following up on reports of child pornography. Letter from Bernard Li, First Secretary, Congressional and Legal Affairs, Washington, D.C., to Ernie Allen, President and CEO, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 24, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

²⁷ While China does not have any specific child-pornography legislation, there is a general prohibition on obscene and pornographic materials in the Criminal Code. In 2004, with the aim of better protecting minors, the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Protectorate promulgated an “Interpretation On Several Issues Regarding the Implementation of Laws in Dealing with Criminal Cases Involving the Production, Duplication, Publication, Sale, Dissemination of Pornographic Electronic Information Using Internet, Mobile Communications Terminals, Radio Stations.” Article 6 of this Interpretation explicitly stipulates that, “whoever disseminates, duplicates, publishes, or sells pornographic electronic information that depicts sexual behaviors of adolescents under the age of 18, or provides direct linkage in the Internet server or websites owned, managed, or used by himself/herself, to the electronic information with the knowledge that such information depicts sexual behaviors of adolescents under the age of 18, shall be severely punished in accordance with Article 363 of the Criminal Law regulating the punishment of crimes of production, duplication, publication, sale, and dissemination of pornographic materials, or Article 364 regulating the punishment of crimes of dissemination of pornographic materials with serious circumstances.” E-mail from Chen Feng, Police Liaison Officer, Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Mar. 17, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

²⁸ The 2004 Interpretation by the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Protectorate applies to computer-facilitated offenses.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Colombia	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Comoros	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Congo	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Costa Rica	✓	✓	✗	✗ ²⁹	✗
Côte d’Ivoire	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Croatia	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Cuba	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Cyprus	✓ ³⁰	✗	✓ ³¹	✓	✗

²⁹ In 2005, a legislative proposal was presented to the Costa Rican Legislative Assembly in order to modify several articles of the Penal Code, including criminalizing owning or being found in possession of child pornography. E-mail from Verónica Garcia, Attaché, Embassy of Costa Rica, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 10, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

³⁰ Section 4(1) of Law No. 3(1)/2000 on Combating of Trafficking in Persons and Sexual Exploitation of Children applies only to persons using children for purposes of trafficking.

³¹ Section 4(1) criminalizes the actions of anyone who, using a child for purposes of trafficking, “makes, possesses, carries, imports, or exports **by any means**...printed material, literary works, drawings, paintings, emblems, photographs, movies, or **other indecent objects of any kind** or uses **any means of publication** for the facilitation of the circulation or the trading of the indecent objects.” *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Czech Republic	✓	✗	✓	✗ ³²	✗ ³³
Democratic Republic of Congo	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Denmark	✓	✓	✓ ³⁴	✓	✗
Djibouti	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Dominica	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Dominican Republic	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Ecuador	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Egypt	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

³² An amendment to the Czech Criminal Code, which would make the mere possession of child pornography a criminal offense, was approved by Government Resolution No. 593 on 9 June 2004 and it, at present, is being considered by the Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Parliament.

³³ While there is no ISP-reporting requirement in Czech law, the Czech National Plan on the Fight Against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, available online at http://www.mvcr.cz/prevence/priority/kszd/en_tab.html, names the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the Ministry of the Interior as the national agencies charged with specifying the statutory obligation of Internet providers included in the Telecommunications Act (No. 151/2000) to file the necessary data on illegal websites and to hand them over to Czech law enforcement. The expected result of this measure is to secure “evidentiary facts against those who spread child pornography on the Internet.”

³⁴ Section 235 of the Danish Criminal Code criminalizes, *inter alia*, dissemination and possession of “other...visual reproductions” of pornographic materials concerning children under the age of 18.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
El Salvador	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Equatorial Guinea	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Eritrea	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Estonia	✓	✗	✓ ³⁵	✓	✗
Ethiopia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Fiji	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Finland	✓	✓	✓ ³⁶	✓	✗
France	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gabon	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Gambia	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Georgia	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗

³⁵ Article s 177 and 178 of the Estonian Penal Code criminalize using a minor in “other works” or using “any other manner” to manufacture, store, hand over, display, or make available child pornography.

³⁶ Chapter 17, section 18 of the Finnish Criminal Act criminalizes “any person who...otherwise distributes obscene pictures or visual recordings depicting children.”

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Germany	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗ ³⁷
Ghana	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Greece	✓	✓	✓ ³⁸	✓	✗
Grenada	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Guatemala	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Guinea	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Guinea Bissau	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Guyana	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Haiti	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Honduras	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

³⁷ While there is no explicit obligation for an ISP to report to law enforcement or another mandated agency, in most cases ISPs will file reports with law enforcement. It is a punishable offense for an ISP that knows of child pornographic material on its websites to not delete the illegal content. Factors considered include whether it was possible and reasonable for the ISP to detect the data and to delete or block it, as there are many ISPs in Germany that offer large storage capacities for commercial purposes. E-mail from Klaus Hermann, Counselor/Police Liaison, Embassy of Germany, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 9, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

³⁸ Article 348a of the Greek Penal Code criminalizes various child-pornography offenses, including possession, purchase, transfer, and sale of child pornography “in any way.”

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Hong Kong ³⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Hungary	✓	✓	✓ ⁴⁰	✓	✗
Iceland	✓	✗	✓ ⁴¹	✓	✗
India	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Indonesia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Iran	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Iraq	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Ireland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Israel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

³⁹ Hong Kong is not a separate Member Country of Interpol; Hong Kong relies on China for memberships.

⁴⁰ Under Section 195/A(3) of the Hungarian Criminal Code, a person making, distributing, or trading pornographic pictures of a minor by video, film, photograph, or “by any other means,” or making such pictures available to the public, commits a felony. Further, according to a recent decision of the Hungarian Appellate Court (Nr. BH 133/2005), the reference to “any other means” and “making available to the public” includes distribution through the Internet. Letter from Viktor Szederkényi, Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of the Republic of Hungary, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 6, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁴¹ Article 210 of the Penal Code of Iceland criminalizes the “possession of photographs, films, or **comparable items** depicting children in a sexual or obscene manner.” *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Italy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Jamaica	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Japan	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Jordan	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Kazakhstan	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Kenya	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Korea	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Kuwait	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Kyrgyzstan	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Laos	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Latvia	✓	✗	✓ ⁴²	✗	✗
Lebanon	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

⁴² Article 166(2) of the Criminal Law of Latvia criminalizes “the importation production, public demonstration, advertising, or **other distribution** of such pornographic...materials as relate or portray the sexual abuse of children.” *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Lesotho	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Liberia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Libya	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Liechtenstein	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗ ⁴³
Lithuania	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Luxembourg	✓	✗	✓ ⁴⁴	✓	✗
Macedonia	✓	✗	✓ ⁴⁵	✗	✗
Madagascar	✓	✗	✓ ⁴⁶	✗	✗
Malawi	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

⁴³ While there is no specific mention of ISP reporting in the Penal Code of Liechtenstein, in the draft of the new Children and Youth Act, a reporting requirement is foreseen that would apply to “anyone learning of the endangerment of the welfare of a child or young person.” E-mail from Claudia Fritsche, Ambassador, Embassy of Liechtenstein, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 7, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁴⁴ Article 383 of the Penal Code of Luxembourg criminalizes not only the manufacture and possession (for trade, distribution, or public display) of “writings, printings, images, photographs, films, or **other objects** of a pornographic nature,” but also the commission of a variety of other child-pornography offenses in “any way.” *Emphasis added.*

⁴⁵ Article 193(3) of the Macedonian Penal Code criminalizes the abuse of a “juvenile” in the “production of...other objects with a pornography content.”

⁴⁶ Article 346 of the Penal Code of Madagascar criminalizes the use of “any means” to disseminate child pornography.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Malaysia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Maldives	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Mali	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Malta	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Marshall Islands	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Mauritania	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Mauritius	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
Mexico	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Moldova	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Monaco	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Mongolia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Morocco	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Mozambique	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Myanmar	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Namibia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Nauru	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Nepal	✓	✗	✗ ⁴⁷	✗	✗
Netherlands	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗ ⁴⁸
Netherlands Antilles	✗ ⁴⁹	✗	✗ ⁵⁰	✗ ⁵¹	✗

⁴⁷ While not specific to child pornography, section 47 of the Electronic Transaction Ordinance of 2004 does prohibit the publishing or displaying on computers, the Internet, or other electronic media, materials that are prohibited by law to be published or displayed because they are against public morality and decency.

⁴⁸ While there is no legal or contractual obligation for ISPs to report suspected child pornography to law enforcement, Netherlands-based ISPs do have a practice of reporting their findings of child pornography immediately to law enforcement and the ISPs remove the content from the concerned web site. Further, on the request of law enforcement, ISPs hand over their logs concerning the web site(s) under suspicion. E-mails from Richard Gerding, Counselor for Police and Judicial Affairs, Royal Embassy of The Netherlands, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 8, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁴⁹ While legislation specific to child pornography does not yet exist, a committee has been installed to revise the current Netherlands Antilles Penal Code. Specific legislation on child pornography will be introduced (Proposed Article 2.13.4). E-mail from Richard Gerding, Counselor for Police and Judicial Affairs, Royal Embassy of The Netherlands, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 22, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁵⁰ Proposed Article 2.13.4 would criminalize computer-facilitated offenses.

⁵¹ Proposed Article 2.13.4 would criminalize simple possession.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
New Zealand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Nicaragua	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Niger	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Nigeria	✗ ⁵²	✗	✗	✗	✗
Norway	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Oman	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Pakistan	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Panama	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗ ⁵³
Papua New Guinea	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗

⁵² A proposed “spammer” law would include child pornography as an offense. See Camillus Eboh, *New Nigerian Law Would Jail Spammers*, at <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9768247/from/RL.2/> (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁵³ While there is no mandatory-reporting requirement specific to ISPs, Article 231-I of the Panamanian Penal Code establishes that anyone who has knowledge of the use of minors in pornography, whether the person obtained that information by means of his or her duties, job, business, profession, or by any other means, and does not make a report to authorities, he or she will be held liable and will be sentenced to prison; however, if the commission of a crime cannot be proved, there is no legal liability to report. E-mail from Isabel Fernández, Embassy of Panama, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 23, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Paraguay	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Peru	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Philippines	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Poland	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Portugal	✓	✗	✓ ⁵⁴	✗	✗
Qatar	✓	✗	✓ ⁵⁵	✗	✗
Romania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Russia	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Rwanda	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
St. Kitts & Nevis	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

⁵⁴ It can be inferred from Article 172 of the Portuguese Penal Law that the expression “by any means” allows a Prosecutor to view information and communication technologies as a means to commit the crime of circulating images, sounds, or movies clearly showing minors younger than 14 years old engaged in sexual acts. Letter from Pedro Catarino, Ambassador, Embassy of Portugal, Washington, D.C., to Ernie Allen, President and CEO, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 22, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁵⁵ Article 292 of the Penal Code of Qatar specifically mentions “books, publications, **other written materials**, pictures, photographs, films, symbols, or **other items**.” *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
St. Lucia	×	×	×	×	×
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	×	×	×	×	×
Sao Tome & Principe	×	×	×	×	×
Saudi Arabia	×	×	×	×	×
Senegal	×	×	×	×	×
Serbia & Montenegro	✓	×	✓ ⁵⁶	×	×
Seychelles	×	×	×	×	×
Sierra Leone	×	×	×	×	×
Singapore	×	×	×	×	×

⁵⁶ Article 111a of the Serbian Penal Code criminalizes making a “photograph, film, or **some other picture**” of a minor for the purpose of making an item of pornographic content. Additionally, Article 185 criminalizes using a minor for producing “pictures, audio-visual, or **other items** of pornographic content.” *Emphasis added.*

Article 211(2) of the Penal Code of Montenegro criminalizes “exploit[ing] a child for the production of pictures, audio-visual, or **other items** of pornographic content.” *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Slovak Republic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Slovenia	✓	✓	✓ ⁵⁷	✗	✗
Somalia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
South Africa	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Spain	✓	✗	✓ ⁵⁸	✓	✗
Sri Lanka	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Sudan	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Suriname	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Swaziland	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

⁵⁷ Article 187(2) of the Penal Code of Slovenia criminalizes the abuse of a minor “to produce pictures, audio-visual, or **other items** of a pornographic nature”; Article 187(3) criminalizes the actions of anyone who “produces, distributes, sells, imports, exports, ... or supplies [pornographic material depicting minors] **in any other way**, or who possesses such material with the intention of producing, distributing, selling, importing, exporting, or supplying it **in any other way**.” *Emphasis added.*

⁵⁸ Article 189(1)(a) of the Spanish Penal Code criminalizes using a minor “to prepare **any type** of pornography material”; Article 189(1)(b) criminalizes producing, selling, distributing, displaying, or facilitating the production, sale, dissemination, or exhibition, of “any type” of child pornography by “any means”; and Article 189(7) repeats the “any type” and “any means” language previously used. *Emphasis added.*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Sweden	✓	✗	✓ ⁵⁹	✓	✗ ⁶⁰
Switzerland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Syria	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Tajikistan	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Tanzania	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Thailand	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Timor Leste	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Togo	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Tonga	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

⁵⁹ Swedish criminal legislation is, in principle, formulated so that it will apply regardless of technical prerequisites. The criminalization of child pornography is no exception and accordingly, Chapter 16, Section 10a, of the Swedish Penal Code extends to computer-facilitated offenses. Letter from Anette Nilsson, First Secretary, Embassy of Sweden, Washington D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 23, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

⁶⁰ In 1998, Sweden enacted the Bulletin Board System (BBS) Liability Act (1998:112), which aims to prevent the spread of child pornography by obligating BBS providers to supervise BBS content. BBS providers are also obligated to remove or in some other way prevent the dissemination of messages with a criminal content, including those with child pornography. Letter from Anette Nilsson, First Secretary, Embassy of Sweden, Washington, D.C., to Jessica Derder, Director of Administration, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 23, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Trinidad & Tobago	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Tunisia	✓	✗	✓ ⁶¹	✗	✗
Turkey	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Turkmenistan	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Uganda	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Ukraine	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
United Arab Emirates	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
United Kingdom ⁶²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗ ⁶³
United States	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

⁶¹ Article 234 of the Tunisian Penal Code criminalizes *inter alia* the use of “any visual recordings or photographs” depicting pornographic images of children.

⁶² For the purposes of this report, the United Kingdom includes England and Wales.

⁶³ The United Kingdom operates a voluntary “notice and takedown” procedure overseen by the Internet Watch Foundation (IWF), an independent industry-funded body, endorsed by the police and government. U.K. ISPs “take down” images of child pornography when notified of them by IWF. Failure to do so could make them liable to prosecution. Letter from Tony Lord, First Secretary, Justice & Home Affairs, Embassy of Great Britain, Washington, D.C., to Ernie Allen, President and CEO, International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (Feb. 9, 2006) (on file with the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children).

<u>Country</u>	<u>Legislation Specific to Child Pornography</u>	<u>“Child Pornography” Defined</u>	<u>Computer-Facilitated Offenses</u>	<u>Simple Possession</u>	<u>ISP Reporting</u>
Uruguay	✓	✗	✓ ⁶⁴	✗	✗
Uzbekistan	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Venezuela	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Vietnam	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Yemen	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Zambia	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Zimbabwe	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

⁶⁴ Law 17.815 of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay criminalizes certain child-pornography offenses regardless of how they are committed (i.e., Article 1: “in any way makes or produces child pornography”; Article 2: “in any way facilitates the commercialization, diffusion, exhibition, storage, or acquisition of child pornography”).

CONCLUSION

Combating child pornography at home and abroad is a daunting task and harmonization of laws is essential in order to effectively address this growing, international phenomenon. Only by combining efforts will we be able to secure a safer future for our children.



International Centre
FOR MISSING & EXPLOITED CHILDREN

Charles B. Wang International Children's Building

699 Prince Street

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3175 USA

Tel 001.703.274.3900 Fax 001.703.549.4504

www.icmec.org