

CI 1636 G Marshall

First name: Geoffrey

Last name: Marshall

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

Protection of minors from that which they do not understand or protection of minors from from material whose implications they are not equipped to emotionally comprehend. This applies to both sex and violence. This does not apply to political or religious matters.

Q3:

Yes. Some platforms are public, some are private or in-house. These require different standards. Copyright law already provides an example; when I purchase music or video it is for my in-home consumption, unless otherwise specified (such as in a library) public access would breach copyright law. The situation is similar.

Q4:

Yes. Any material that does not bring forth a complaint does not need classification as it is clearly with in the standards of society.

Q5:

What sort of impact? Political? Social? Content designed for children should be examined and labeled as safe for children.

Q6:

No. But the process of classification should not impact on a distributor in either time or cost.

Q7:

No

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

Yes. The very notion of "privacy in one's own home" mandates this.

Q11:

That something give offence to some segment of the population is not sufficient reason for classification. That something cause harm to some segment of the population is sufficient reason.

Q12:

There are no effective methods of controlling online content only limiting but not elimination access.

Q13:

By requiring parental supervision. The Internet is not a baby-sitting service. This can be accomplished by many means. Separate logins for adults and children on a single machine are more than possible.

Q14:

There is no way of doing this except at the source. If the source is unwilling to comply you can do nothing. Even if the source does comply there is nothing to prevent copies circulating. As King Alfred tried to tell people; even a king cannot regulate the tide.

Q15:

If it does not become a financial impost on distributor of consumer then yes.

Q16:

Advisory only.

Q17:

Most probably. It depends on the specifics of regulation.

Q18:

Content for children of different ages. Legality for adults.

Q19:

All classification should be both government funded and timely.

Q20:

They are understood by me (I believe). I cannot speak for others.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Access to content cannot be prevented. Child pornography, hate speech and the like should be tracked, and the perpetrators dealt with by current law.

Q25:

No

Q26:

Yes. All classification should be federal. Border hopping should not change classification or laws.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Greater funds for law enforcement.

Other comments:

It is important to remember that attempts to control the internet will prove futile. This is not a political statement but a technical one. Nevertheless there are obviously things that should never be created, seen or transmitted. This is a matter for enforcement not prevention as the latter is impossible.