



Subject:



Submission from Civil Society and Independent Research: Children's Online Privacy Code 2026. AI Filming Systems in Australian Community Sport

Date:

Sunday, 24 May 2026 10:26:20 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

1. About the Submitter

[REDACTED]. I am an independent researcher, child safety professional, early childhood educator and parent of children who participate in junior community sport. I hold 25 years of experience in education including early childhood, primary, secondary and specialist disability education in New South Wales, with specialist qualifications in vision and sensory disability. My qualifications include a Bachelor of Education, a Master of Disability Studies and a Certificate IV in Training and Assessment. I have conducted and presented research on children's voice in early childhood at the Early Childhood Australia national conference, with research that contributed to the design of the new 100 public preschools in New South Wales. I am currently completing certifications in artificial intelligence through DeepLearning.AI, reflecting my commitment to understanding the technology that is increasingly affecting the children and communities I work with.

This submission is the outcome of independent research conducted in May 2026 into AI-enabled filming systems in Australian community sport. That research includes a comprehensive literature review of over 38 sources, direct engagement with AI filming vendors including a direct sales call with Veo Technologies, formal enquiries to the Office of the Children's Guardian NSW (reference WEB-GEN-26-05044) and Sport Integrity Australia, analysis of the privacy policies of the four major AI filming and tracking technology providers operating in Australian junior sport, and my own lived experience as a parent whose child has been filmed at junior sport competitions without consent or knowledge.

As an early childhood educator I bring specific professional expertise in how information is communicated to and understood by very young children. I participated in the Office of the Children's Guardian NSW Child Safe series professional learning and received the accompanying book series. While these resources represented a genuine attempt to communicate child safe principles in accessible language, they remained too wordy and complex for children under five years old to meaningfully engage with. This experience directly informs my recommendations regarding age appropriate communication under the Code, particularly for the youngest children whose privacy is at greatest risk and whose capacity to understand and exercise their own rights is most limited.

I strongly support the Code's commitment to age appropriate communication but submit that current approaches to privacy communication, even those specifically designed for children, do not yet meet the needs of children under five. Very young children require visual communication, social stories, adult facilitation and repeated reinforcement to understand concepts relating to their privacy and safety. A written privacy notice, however simply worded, is not accessible to a preschool aged child. The Code should acknowledge this and require that organisations working with very young children develop genuinely

age appropriate communication that goes beyond simplified text.

I am also the Principal Consultant of Little Voices Advisory, a child safety and digital governance consultancy established in 2026 to address gaps in child safeguarding policy in relation to emerging technology.

I have an existing enquiry with the OAIC, [REDACTED], relating to the issues raised in this submission.

2. Summary

I strongly support the Children's Online Privacy Code and welcome its development as a critical step toward protecting children's privacy in digital environments. I make this submission to draw the OAIC's attention to a specific and significant gap in the current scope of the Code.

AI-enabled filming systems are being widely deployed at junior community sport competitions across Australia. These systems continuously and automatically film children, upload footage to overseas servers operated by foreign companies under foreign law, use footage to train commercial AI models, and provide access to footage for large numbers of platform users. This is happening without parental consent, without child consultation, without data governance frameworks at any level of the governance chain, and without any awareness by the clubs deploying these systems that they are acting as APP entities with privacy obligations.

The current draft Code does not address this category of service. I submit that it should.

3. The Gap: AI Filming Systems in Community Sport

Section 5 of the draft Code extends its application to entities providing services primarily concerned with the activities of children, including family photo sharing applications and internet-connected baby monitors. AI filming systems deployed at junior sport competitions are services primarily concerned with the activities of children. They film children continuously, automatically and seasonally. They upload children's footage to overseas servers. They use footage to train commercial AI models. They provide access to footage for large numbers of users whose identities and suitability to access footage of children are not verified.

The four major AI filming and tracking technology providers I identified as operating in Australian junior sport are:

Vevo Technologies ApS, located in Denmark, data stored in the European Union under GDPR. Up to 150 app users can access, download and share footage per club subscription. No WWCC verification required for platform users. Footage used to train AI models. Platform states it is not designed for children under 13 but routinely films children of all ages at junior competitions. Vevo is a proud sponsor of Northern NSW Football, creating a structural conflict of interest at regional governing body level.

Hudl, operated by Agile Sports Technologies Inc, headquartered in Lincoln, Nebraska, USA. Data stored under US law. AI tracks athletes by jersey numbers or general appearance. Footage used to train AI models. Has a public live streaming platform. Child protections in Hudl's privacy policy apply only to registered platform users, not to children who are filmed by cameras at sporting events without being users.

Pixellot Ltd, incorporated under Israeli law, headquartered in Israel. Uses facial

recognition to identify specific individuals including children. Explicitly acknowledges collecting biometric data from children. States parental consent must be obtained before using services where athletes are minors but provides no mechanism, template or process for clubs to obtain that consent.

Catapult Group International, originally Australian, now headquartered in Boston, USA. Primarily wearable tracking devices collecting biometric data from junior athletes including GPS, heart rate and velocity. Data stored on US servers.

In every case Australian children's footage or biometric data is transferred to an overseas company under foreign law without parental knowledge, without meaningful consent and without any Australian policy framework governing the transfer.

4. The Evidence of System Failure

My research found the following across every level of the governance chain:

No Australian sport governing body has published a specific AI filming policy. Football Australia, Netball Australia, Basketball Australia, Swimming Australia and Volleyball Australia have all been contacted as part of this research. None have AI-specific governance in place.

The primary national resource most governing bodies direct clubs to for photography guidance, Play by the Rules, has acknowledged its own photography guidance is out of date since 2021 and has not updated it.

The CSIRO and Australian Sports Commission AI for Australian Sport Roadmap 2026 explicitly names Veo, Hudl and Pixellot and states that ethical guidelines on the capture and use of video footage are required to guide responsible implementation of these technologies in community sporting contexts. Those guidelines do not yet exist.

No club or governing body identified in my research is conducting Privacy Impact Assessments before deploying AI filming systems, despite this being a requirement under the draft Code.

As a parent whose child has been filmed by AI cameras at opposing club games, I was never asked for consent, never informed where footage was stored, and could find no policy at any level that answered basic questions about data governance.

A direct sales call with Veo Technologies confirmed that data governance obligations, consent requirements, child safe risk management and WWCC obligations for platform users were not raised at any point in the sales process. These questions were not addressed until directly asked. Clubs are purchasing and deploying AI filming technology without the information they need to do so safely.

5. Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Explicitly include AI filming systems in the Code's scope

I recommend the OAIC explicitly confirm in the final Code or accompanying guidance that AI filming systems deployed in community settings involving children, including sporting clubs, dance schools, early childhood services and schools, are services primarily concerned with the activities of children and are therefore bound by the Code. The current list of examples in Section 5 should be expanded to include automated AI filming and tracking systems used in community sport and recreation.

Recommendation 2: Address the jurisdiction gap

The Code should include specific guidance for Australian APP entities, including community sport clubs, on their obligations when contracting with overseas AI technology providers. Australian clubs are the contracting parties with these overseas vendors. They are the APP entities. They bear responsibility for compliance but currently have no guidance on what that compliance requires when data is transferred to Denmark, the USA or Israel. The Code should make clear that overseas storage does not reduce Australian compliance obligations and that clubs must conduct Privacy Impact Assessments before contracting with any overseas AI technology provider.

Recommendation 3: Address the WWCC gap for platform users

The Code should address the risk created by AI filming platforms providing access to footage of children to large numbers of unverified users. Up to 150 users can access, download and share footage of children through a single Veo club subscription with no verification of their suitability to access footage of children. The Code should require that access to footage of children on AI filming platforms be limited to verified individuals and that organisations deploying these systems maintain and review access registers.

Recommendation 4: Require child consultation

Standard 2 of the NSW Child Safe Standards and the UNICEF Guidance on AI and Children Version 3.0 both require that children participate in decisions affecting them. No community sport organisation identified in my research has consulted children about AI filming at their competitions. The Code should require that organisations deploying services primarily concerned with the activities of children actively seek and consider the views of those children in age-appropriate ways before deployment.

Recommendation 5: Address age appropriate communication for very young children

The Code's requirement for age appropriate communication must extend beyond simplified text for very young children. As an early childhood educator with direct experience of child safe professional learning resources, current approaches to privacy communication do not meet the needs of children under five. Very young children require visual communication, social stories, adult facilitation and repeated reinforcement. Organisations working with children under five must be required to develop and use genuinely age appropriate communication tools that go beyond written notices, however simply worded. The OAIC should develop guidance on what age appropriate communication looks like for different developmental stages, in consultation with early childhood education experts.

Recommendation 6: Provide sport-specific guidance

I recommend the OAIC work with Sport Integrity Australia, the Australian Sports Commission and relevant governing bodies to develop sport-specific guidance on AI filming governance that translates the Code's requirements into practical operational guidance for community sport clubs and their volunteers. Volunteers running community clubs do not have the legal or technical expertise to navigate the Code without practical support. The guidance should include model consent forms, privacy impact assessment templates and data governance checklists tailored to the community sport context.

Recommendation 7: Commencement date and transition period

I recommend a commencement date of no later than December 2027 following registration

in December 2026, with a twelve-month transition period. This provides sufficient time for organisations to understand their obligations and begin compliance without creating an extended window in which children continue to be filmed without the protections the Code provides. However I note that Privacy Act obligations apply now and recommend the OAIC issue interim guidance on AI filming systems in community sport before the Code commences.

Recommendation 8: Enforcement with genuine consequences and accessible complaints

I strongly recommend that enforcement mechanisms be designed to make non-compliance genuinely unprofitable. Fixed penalty amounts that represent a small fraction of global revenue do not deter large technology companies. Penalties should be calculated as a percentage of global annual revenue for large entities so that the consequence is proportionate to the benefit obtained from non-compliance.

The complaints process for children and families must be genuinely easy to use. Not buried in a help menu, not requiring the creation of another account, not a lengthy form written in legal language. A child or parent who believes their privacy rights have been breached should be able to lodge a complaint in plain language in a matter of minutes. The process should be clearly accessible from any platform bound by the Code with a single visible button or link. Responses must be in plain language and within a timeframe that feels meaningful to a family, not just legally sufficient.

The OAIC should publish a public register of entities found to have breached the Code, what they did wrong, what the consequence was and whether they have complied with any remediation requirement. Parents and families should be able to check in thirty seconds whether a platform has a history of non-compliance before allowing their child to use it. Transparency about enforcement is itself a deterrent and a form of consumer protection.

6. Conclusion

Children participating in community sport in Australia are being filmed continuously, automatically and without consent by AI systems that transfer their footage to overseas servers, use it to train commercial AI models and provide access to it for large numbers of unverified users. This is happening now, before the Code comes into force, and it will continue to happen after the Code is registered unless the Code explicitly addresses this category of service and provides practical guidance for the community organisations deploying these systems.

The same child who cannot use a social media platform without parental consent under Australian law has their image filmed at their football game, stored on a Danish, USA, Israeli server and used to train a commercial AI model without anyone asking anything. That is the gap this Code has an opportunity to close.

I strongly urge the OAIC to explicitly include AI filming systems in community sport within the Code's scope, to provide sport-specific guidance for community organisations, and to ensure enforcement mechanisms that give the Code genuine teeth.

I would welcome the opportunity to contribute further to this process and to participate in a roundtable discussion. I am available to provide my full literature review and gap analysis as supporting evidence.



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Little Voices Advisory

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]