See Me Please

(Digital Discovery Pty Ltd)

Modern Slavery Statement

Reporting period: *1 July 2025 – 30 June 2025*

Statement type: *Voluntary statement, submitted under the Modern Slavery Act 2018 (Cth)*

Entity: Digital Discovery Pty Ltd, trading as See Me Please, ABN 22 668 639 156 (ACN 668 639 156)

In brief: *See Me Please pays testers at least 50% above minimum wage (targeting double), guarantees a minimum three-hour session payment, empowers testers with control and choice by allowing them to decline any project without penalty, and is voluntarily reporting on this ahead of any legal requirement to do so.*

1. Introduction

See Me Please ("SMP", "we", "us") is an Australian social enterprise developing an inclusive user testing and research platform. We connect organisations with a deliberately diverse community of testers — including people with disability, older adults, neurodivergent people, and people who speak English as an additional language — to validate the real-world accessibility and usability of digital products, rather than relying on a convenience sample of "typical" users. We describe ourselves as an inclusive user research platform because who we test with is the point: digital products are used by everyone, so testing should reflect that.

This statement is also our account of what we consider ethical user research to look like in practice. To us, that means two things at once: methodologically rigorous insight for our clients, and fair, transparent, dignified treatment of the people who provide it.

Our consolidated annual revenue is below the AUD $100 million threshold that triggers mandatory reporting under the Modern Slavery Act 2018 (Cth).

We are publishing this statement on a voluntary basis because organisations choosing an accessibility-testing partner deserve to see how we treat the people who make that testing possible.

This statement addresses each of the seven mandatory criteria under section 16 of the Act and covers the reporting period stated above. It was approved by our sole director on 9 July 2026 and is signed by Katherine McDermott below.

2. Our Structure, Operations and Supply Chains

Structure

Digital Discovery Pty Ltd (ABN 22 668 639 156, ACN 668 639 156) is a privately held Australian proprietary company limited by shares, headquartered at Suite 306, 75 King St,

Sydney NSW 2000. It is the See Me Please group's original operating entity, engaging testers and employing the product team for the Australian and broader APAC business. Related entities in the group include See Me Please Limited (UK, company no. 16953184, registered at 10 John Street, London WC1N 2EB) and See Me Please Limited (Ireland, company no. 805305, registered at 51 Bracken Road, Dublin D18 CV48), which engage testers and employ staff in their respective jurisdictions.

Operations

We operate a two-sided inclusive user testing platform:

- Client organisations — businesses and government agencies who engage us to test the accessibility and usability of their websites, apps and products with real, diverse users.
- Our testing community — a panel of 300+ individually contracted testers across Australia, the UK, and Ireland, recruited specifically for their lived experience across six cohorts: blind, low vision, Deaf/hard of hearing, neurodivergent, older adults, and people who speak English as an additional language. Testers complete paid, moderated and unmoderated testing sessions, structured written feedback, surveys, and video-recorded usability studies.

Our own workforce consists of less than 10 employees and contractors, engaged in software engineering, testing operations, customer success and administration, predominantly based in Australia, with a UK/EMEA presence supporting our UK and Ireland markets.

Supply chains

Our direct supply chain includes cloud infrastructure and SaaS providers (e.g. AWS), professional services (legal, accounting, recruitment), payment processing and international payout providers (including Airwallex, used for cross-border payments), and office equipment, IT hardware and corporate travel.

We consider our most distinctive workforce-related exposure to sit not in this conventional corporate supply chain, but in how we engage, pay, and safeguard our testing community — addressed below.

3. Our Approach to Human Rights

We support the objectives of the Modern Slavery Act 2018 (Cth), the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

As a company whose entire commercial value comes from the participation of people — many of whom experience disability, chronic illness, or other circumstances that can increase vulnerability to exploitation — we treat fair treatment of our testing community as core to our product, not an adjacent compliance exercise.

We also recognise that language can itself be a barrier to a tester understanding and asserting their rights. Because our testing community includes people who speak English as an additional language, we provide task briefs, rate information, and our tester agreement in plain, unambiguous English, and we do not treat "the tester agreed to the terms" as sufficient if there is reason to think the terms were not actually understood.

4. Modern Slavery Risks in Our Operations and Supply Chains

We assess our risk across two categories: our conventional corporate supply chain, and our testing community.

4.1 Corporate supply chain

Consistent with comparable small technology and SaaS businesses, we assess the inherent risk of modern slavery in our direct corporate supply chain as low, reflecting that our primary suppliers operate in jurisdictions with strong labour protections and are themselves large, reputable technology and professional-services firms. We recognise that risk can still exist

further down these supply chains, and we do not treat "low risk" as "no risk."

4.2 Our testing community — where we believe closer attention is warranted

We consider this the area of highest relevance to our business. Our testers are engaged as independent contractors, paid at an agreed hourly or per-task rate for user testing sessions and related work (e.g. demo content). We recognise that this model carries well-documented risks if managed poorly, including:

- **Underpayment relative to time worked**, where a fixed per-task fee does not reflect the actual time a testing session takes — a particular risk where a tester's disability means a task reasonably takes longer than it would for a non-disabled tester *(mitigated by our minimum engagement and floor-rate policy — see 5.1)*;
- **Excessive or unpaid "waiting" or admin time** around a paid session *(mitigated by capping session duration — see 5.1)*;
- **Precarity and power imbalance**, where testers who rely on this income, or who face barriers to other employment because of disability or discrimination, may feel unable to decline unsuitable work or raise concerns *(mitigated by guaranteed choice over projects and a no-penalty decline policy — see 5.2)*;
- **Vulnerable testers specifically** — for example, testers with cognitive or communication disability, testers experiencing mental illness, testers in insecure housing, testers for whom English is an additional language, or testers who rely on a carer or support worker to help manage bookings, communication, or payments *(mitigated by our privacy-by-design approach and minimal-disclosure policy — see 5.2)*;
- **Cross-border payment risk**, given we pay testers across Australia, the UK and Ireland in multiple currencies via providers including Airwallex, where payout delays or fees can materially erode take-home pay.

We do not consider any of the above to constitute modern slavery as it presently occurs in our operations. We name these risks explicitly because a credible modern slavery statement should describe the risks that actually attach to a business's specific model, not a generic list

borrowed from a different industry — and because most comparable statements we reviewed omit their contributor base from risk assessment entirely, even where it is core to the business.

5. Actions Taken to Assess and Address These Risks

5.1 Fair and transparent payment, regardless of gig-style engagement

- We guarantee a floor pay rate of at least 50% above the applicable open-employment minimum wage in every country in which we operate, and we aim for — and typically exceed — a target floor of double the open-employment minimum wage, with many testers earning significantly more depending on task complexity and cohort-specific expertise.
- We guarantee a minimum three-hour engagement payment for every session, regardless of how much less time the task actually takes.
- Session length is capped at the outset and testers are not permitted to work beyond that cap — this removes the incentive for unpaid overtime to creep in around a fixed-fee task, rather than relying on goodwill to prevent it.
- Testers choose which projects they take on; no tester is assigned work without their agreement, which limits the power imbalance that comes with income precarity.
- Payments are made directly into the tester's own nominated account, so a tester's earnings cannot be intercepted or diverted by a third party without our knowledge.

5.2 Safeguarding testers who may be in a vulnerable position

- We treat testers as valued contributors of expert, lived-experience insight, not as a disposable data source.
- Testers can decline any task, at any stage, without penalty or being deprioritised for future work.
- We do not require testers to disclose more about their disability or personal circumstances than is necessary to match them appropriately to a task.

- We build tester privacy into our platform and processes by design — including the underlying system architecture — rather than treating it as a policy statement layered on top. This matters particularly for testers who disclose sensitive information (a disability, a mental health condition, or reliance on a carer) as part of being matched to relevant work.

5.3 Due diligence over corporate suppliers

- We select cloud, professional-services, and payment-processing suppliers based in jurisdictions with strong labour-rights enforcement;
- We do not currently include a standard right to request labour-practice information in supplier contracts. We are introducing this as a standard clause in new and renewed supplier agreements above $25,000 per annum, giving us the right to request information about a supplier's labour practices and to terminate the arrangement if a credible modern slavery concern isn't addressed. We expect to have this in place for new contracts from 30 October 2026.

5.4 Remediation

If we identify a practice — in our own operations or a supplier's — that we believe places a worker (employee, contractor, or tester) at risk of exploitation, we will: pause the arrangement causing the risk, remediate any underpayment identified (including back-payment), and, where appropriate, support the affected individual to access external advice (e.g. Fair Work Ombudsman, Australian Human Rights Commission). No remediation actions were required during this reporting period.

6. Assessing the Effectiveness of Our Actions

We assess effectiveness through:

- Tester payment audits — periodic review of a sample of completed sessions against actual time spent;
- Tester feedback loops — surveying our testing community on whether they feel fairly

paid, fairly treated, and able to raise concerns without fear of losing future work;

- Grievance and complaint tracking — the number and nature of concerns raised, tracked to resolution;
- Supplier review cadence — periodic review of key suppliers against our due diligence criteria.

We recognise this is our first voluntary statement and that our effectiveness measures will mature over subsequent reporting periods. We will report progress against each of the above in next year's statement.

7. Consultation

This statement is made on behalf of Digital Discovery Pty Ltd, trading as See Me Please only, covering our Australian operations. Digital Discovery Pty Ltd does not own or control See Me Please Limited (UK) or See Me Please Limited (Ireland), so no consultation under section 16(1)(f) of the Act was required for this statement.

See Me Please intends to lodge separate, equivalent voluntary statements covering its UK and Irish operations in due course. Where relevant, those statements will describe the risks and actions specific to testers and suppliers engaged in those jurisdictions.

8. Other Relevant Information

What we mean by inclusive user testing. Inclusive user testing is testing conducted with a deliberately diverse panel of real users — including people with disability, older adults, neurodivergent people, and people who speak English as an additional language — rather than a convenience sample of testers assumed to represent "everyone."

Why ethical user research matters to the organisations we work with. Accessibility and usability testing is only as credible as the treatment of the people providing it. When a client partners with See Me Please, they are engaging a testing community that is paid fairly, briefed

respectfully, and free to decline or flag work without consequence.

In short: See Me Please is an Australian inclusive user testing and research platform. We test digital products with people with disabilities, older adults, neurodivergent people, and people who speak English as an additional language, and we pay and treat every one of those testers fairly.

This statement, and future annual updates, will be published at seemeplease.com/modern-slavery-statement-au

9. Being a Social Enterprise: Amplifying Lived Experience, Even Under Commercial Pressure

Everything above in this statement is about risk and compliance. This section is different — it's about why See Me Please exists at all, and the commitments we hold ourselves to that go beyond what the Act requires.

9.1 Choosing lived experience over convenience, even when it costs us

There is a persistent commercial temptation in this industry: it is faster, cheaper, and easier to test with a narrow, easy-to-recruit sample — testers who are online, English-speaking by default, based in a capital city, and available on short notice — and simply not mention the gap. Many of the comparable statements we reviewed on the Modern Slavery Register describe test panels or contributor bases only in the abstract, if at all.

We take the opposite position: the value we sell to clients is the diversity of who tests, not the speed of testing. When a client's timeline or budget pushes toward a narrower sample, we treat that as a conversation to have openly with the client, not a compromise to make quietly on their behalf. *[Confirm: is there a documented internal process for when a project brief pushes toward narrowing the panel? If yes, describe it here — a concrete example strengthens this section considerably.]*

9.2 Designing work around tester success, not the other way around

Independent-contractor, gig-style engagement usually asks the worker to adapt to the platform. We have tried to build the platform to adapt to the tester instead:

- **Method flexibility.** Testers can participate via moderated or unmoderated sessions, live video, or structured written feedback — so a tester who finds live video calls fatiguing, or who has caring responsibilities that make a fixed appointment time difficult, still has a way to contribute that works for them.
- **Location flexibility.** Testing is conducted remotely wherever possible, removing the transport, cost, and access barriers that disproportionately affect disabled testers, testers in regional and remote areas, and testers managing chronic health conditions.
- Choice over projects, as described in Section 5.1 — testers are never assigned work without agreement, and can decline without penalty.

We consider this a tester-success strategy, not a perk: a testing panel that only works for testers who can show up in person, on camera, at a fixed time, is a panel that quietly excludes the very people SMP exists to include.

9.3 A commitment to genuine diversity, not a convenience sample

"Diverse" is easy to claim and easy to under-deliver. We commit to actively recruiting and maintaining a testing community that reflects the real breadth of the population using digital products — not just concentrated in one cohort, one age bracket, one gender, one racial or ethnic background, or one metropolitan area. *[Confirm: do we currently track and report on the geographic (metro/regional/remote), age, gender, and cultural spread of the panel? If this data exists, a real figure here — even approximate — would make this claim verifiable rather than aspirational. If it doesn't exist yet, this is worth stating as a commitment to start measuring, rather than a claim we're already meeting it.]*

We recruit through disability employment services, refugee and migrant settlement services, and community organisations specifically because relying on our own networks, or on whoever finds us first, tends to reproduce exactly the narrow sample we're trying to move away from.

9.4 Doing good with our data: open, lived-experience-led resources for the wider tech community

Insight generated by our testers has value far beyond the individual client engagement it was collected for. We are developing an open-source, MIT-licensed accessibility component library — built and validated by our tester panel across all six cohorts — so that the patterns our testers have identified as genuinely accessible are freely available to any developer, not locked inside a paid report. *[This is a real initiative already in planning/early build — confirm current status and whether "in development" or a specific public-launch milestone is accurate before publishing, since overclaiming a live public resource that isn't out yet would undermine an otherwise strong claim.]*

Where testers contribute to public-facing evidence — video, quotes, or named case studies — participation is voluntary, separately consented to, and separately compensated from their standard testing rate. Testers are credited as experts demonstrating their own expertise, not as subjects being studied, and can withdraw consent for any public material at any time.

Approved by the principal governing body of See Me Please on 9 July 2026



Signed:

Katherine McDermott

Director and Managing Principal

9 July 2026