

Google - 4-430

Friday, 1 November 2024 4:04 PM

Reasonable steps

- 'reasonable steps' to be articulated somewhere?
- 'age assurance' - accuracy, reliability, privacy security

Regulatory guidance

- Consulting?

'account'

- Access through parents account -


In europe

- Designated as a video service
- ACCC also recognised that YouTube differential offering - keen to understand how it looks and how
- Europe delineates video from social media platforms


Released under the FOI Act 1982 by the Department of Infrastructure,
Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts

Social media minimum age legislation: Design principles


s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)




s22(1)(a)(ii)



s47E(d), s47G(1)(b)



s47E(d), s47G(1)(b)



From: s22(1)(a)(ii)
Sent: Thursday, 23 January 2025 4:40 PM
To: Age Assurance Trial Taskforce
Cc: Irwin, Andrew
Subject: Notes from meeting with YouTube today [SEC=OFFICIAL]

OFFICIAL

Hey team,

Sharing my notes from the convo we had just now with YouTube for vis.

Attendees:

Google/Youtube – s47F, s47F
 DITRDCA – Andrew Irwin, s22(1)(a)(ii)

Notes:

s47F

- s47E(d)
- Recognise not only industry sector relevant to output but we are main one and engagement has been haphazard
- Could be good to have a formalised - right contact deets and ensure they're in touch with us
- Posting on linkedin not enough
- s47E(d)
- Don't know how they secured
- They run a diff narrative on age assurance etc. that we don't agree with
- We're worried about how this might impact the ultimate outcomes of the review
- s47E(d)
- s47E(d)
- Some competitors have a competitive advantage in terms of time re trial?
 - About participation and not advisory board
- Unclear what outcome of the trial will be and how government intends to use it
- What motivation would be for Google to submit age assurance tools for assessment

AI

- trial will not nominate a single tech or put forward gov identified/preferred tech
- Assessing against some criteria - privacy, data security, human rights, accessibility
- Intention is to provide a reference point for eSafety when looking at reasonable steps

s47F

- What happens if don't submit tool for trial - how

s47F

- Providers and relies

s47F

- We need to have a convo on whether we would submit to participate
- Not clear on why we would
- Still confused about how outcome meshes with ultimate reg approach
- Exemption for YouTube not locked in of course
- Noting also that this trial will affect codes

AI

Released under the FOI Act 1982 by the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts

- You would get an independent look over
- Does all assessment process now rather than later so reduce reg burden that way
- Also have that continuous engagement through trial process as a relier to see how testing things

s2

2(

- Advisory board self selected - assume that Meta and Snap opted in - advice from ACCS is that they were disinclined to refuse any volunteers
- If Google/YouTube wants to be a part of it, can let ACCS know

s47F

- Will consider internally and come back - concern is that we didn't even know you could put your hand up
- BOSE notices - what will be shared with ACCS? Confidential version? What to ensure

AI

- Can talk to eSafety
- From what I know, timing of when sharing suggests that not raw data

s47F

- Concern about submitting tools for assessment is whether would be comfortable giving over that information
- Lots of propriety info - would we be able to withdraw?

AI

- Suggest incrementally providing info - so control each stage
- Trying to remember exactly what was in the tender but included specific IP protections in
- Quite big from the AA tech provider side cause they don't want
- Strong controls but don't know detail about withdrawal

s47F

- Legislative rules- Suggesting drafts with a month public consult?
- Rules are disallowable

To do

- Talk to s22(1)(a) about communications with stakeholders

s22(1)(a)(ii)

Specialist Advisor • Age Assurance Trial Taskforce • Online Safety Branch • Digital Platforms, Safety and Classification Division

s22(1)(a)(ii) [@infrastructure.gov.au](mailto:s22(1)(a)(ii)@infrastructure.gov.au)

P s22(1)(a)(ii) • M s22(1)(a)(ii)

GPO Box 594 Canberra, ACT 2601

Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
CONNECTING AUSTRALIANS • ENRICHING COMMUNITIES • EMPOWERING REGIONS

infrastructure.gov.au



*I acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land on which we meet, work and live.
I recognise and respect their continuing connection to the land, waters and communities.
I pay my respects to Elders past and present and to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.*

OFFICIAL

s22(1)(a)(ii)



Youtube.

- Google

s47F

23/1/25

s22(1)(a)(ii)

s47F

- non Youtube

- Concern about trial (provider) process
- Haven't been approached about being on. Stakeholder Advisory
- ↳ media, they are

→ Google, Apple not
 • DGL appropriate → none Band.

Google may not participate.
 advisory board - discuss internally

A.A.T.T.

s20 BOSE. - yday submitted
 response

not on data

L

Ⓟ talk to
 e safety.

submit

withdrawal

→
Exemption.

- early next week.

5th 12th
 April.

s22(1)(a)(ii)

