

From: Samuel E. Trosow <strosow@uwo.ca>  
To: London Public Library Board Chairperson Svetlana MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson David Winninger, Board Members Gina Barber, Nancy Branscombe, Jerry Colwell, Jo Deslippe, Jan Lubell, Josh Morgan, and Joanne Tilly; CEO Susanna Hubbard Krimmer and Jan White  
Re: Internet Filtering Policy - Request for Delegation Status at June 18, 2008 LPL Board Meeting  
Dated: June 12, 2007

Through this letter I am requesting delegation status to address the London Public Library Board at its June 18, 2008 meeting on the topic of LPL's Internet filtering policy.

According to the draft agenda for the June 2008 meeting, this item is on your agenda as an "update." It is unclear from this whether or not the Board will receive and approve a six-month review of the project at the June meeting and it is not clear what is meant by "update."

I would urge the Board to defer the actual review of the project until it has more information before it, information that should be shared with the public well in advance of the meeting. In my presentation, I will discuss the types of information resources that the Board should have in front of it to properly evaluate the project in greater detail.

At a minimum, the board (and the public) should be provided with information that discloses:

- The manner by which the Netsweeper software makes determinations about what classification should be assigned to any particular webpage.
- The process that is used by the Netsweeper software to review requests that certain classification decisions be reviewed.
- An analysis of the webpage urls that have been requested by LPL patrons and which have been classified as (23-pornography) by the Netsweeper system and therefore blocked. This is crucial information for the Board and the public to have access to in order to properly evaluate how the system has been working.
- An analysis of whatever testing of the system has been conducted on an ongoing manner.
- An analysis of the nature of the pages that have been blocked by the Netsweeper system, that is, to what degree are these blocked pages of the sort that the LPL board intended to block when it instituted the policy last year.

All of this information must be provided to the Board and the public in order for you to properly determine whether there is adequate justification for the continuation of the filtering project. Since the project results in the blocking of materials which your patrons have a lawful right to access, it is the continuing duty of the board to ensure that these restraints are as minimal as possible, that the processes by which the blocking decisions are made remain transparent and open to public scrutiny and review, and that all reasonable alternatives that pose less of a burden to protected expression be considered on an ongoing basis.

I would request approximately 15 minutes to make this presentation. Thank you for your attention to this request.

Samuel Trosow  
[strosow@uwo.ca](mailto:strosow@uwo.ca)