

CI 1446 K Lyon

First name: Kim

Last name: Lyon

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework .

Q2:

Just classification of movies , DVD's and games .

Q3:

Yes . In the sense that the Internet should not be censored .

Q4:

No , not necessarily . Classification should occur anyway . However , with few exceptions , classification should not prevent distribution .

Q5:

Yes - extreme violence , child pornography - sex involving children .

Q6:

No .

Q7:

Generally no .

Q8:

Definitely not .n A point - where censorship has operated in the past it is one area that it is often operated wrongly - the wrong things censored \ not censored .

Q9:

No .

Q10:

The form classified should be restricted to publicly sold movies , DVD's and games .

Q11:

None .

Q12:

The Internet should be completely free from censorship .

Q13:

Best by filters installed by parents . If a government filter is installed there must be a portal \ method for access to a completely uncensored Internet - this is vital for democracy .

Q14:

Top shelf .

Q15:

On the front or side .

Q16:

The industry bodies should not , as much as is technically possible , be involved in censorship .
Ideally a parental filter installed on the PC that is linked to a list compiled by the government , that can be overridden by the parent .

Q17:

No - the industry should not be involved if at all possible .

Q18:

None .

Q19:

It should be possible to classify movies , DVD's and games quite cheaply - it just needs one person to check it out - half a day's work . If there are any issues afterwards - complaints - they can then be handled then .

Q20:

No - looks ok.

Q21:

No .

Q22:

Looks ok.

Q23:

Possibly .

Q24:

None .

Q25:

No . It's not as simple as that .

Q26:

Not an issue - voters can address any issues at the state level .

Q27:

Parliament + regulation .

Q28:

Up to the states . However I prefer that the states retain maximum powers .

Q29:

No censorship .

Other comments:

Censorship :-

It should not be the government that is doing the dictating . I have no problems with a child safe Internet . However like all these things it's the implementation that is always the issue .

Governments are notoriously bad at censorship and often misuse it for political purposes . Censorship is often a cop out . Instead of dealing with the offenders - eg. paedophiles sites , it allows the offenders to continue offending whilst at the same time penalising all consumers .

Censorship has a long history of misuse - being used by governments for political purposes . It also has a long history of being misapplied - the wrong things being censored and things that 'should' be censored not being censored . During the 60's and 70's there were quite a few incidents where songs were wrongly banned and others that were not banned that theoretically should have been . The classic being Drinkin Rum & Coca Cola by the Andrew Sisters - WWII time . These days we live in a more enlightened age so we don't have those censorship problems .

If you want to remove paedophilia then you need to track down the actual paedophiles themselves and prosecute them , stop them doing what they are doing and rescue the children . If it means getting tough with Russia get tough with Russia . Just don't sweep it under the carpet .

There are filters available for parents to install on their family computers - this is by far the best way to go .

If the government insists on introducing censorship what I would propose is that a portal \ method be available for any adult to be able to bypass this default censored access so to be able to access the whole of the Internet in a completely uncensored way . Not to do so endangers democracy .

Incidentally - the main public Internet has many ways around it . There are so many ways of getting past the controls that it is almost impossible to police . There are many different ways of coding data and accessing data . There is also the Deep Web which is much larger than the Google indexed surface web . And driving it all underground just makes it harder to find and police .

Ref.:

http://www.reddit.com/r/technology/comments/in43p/few_bother_to_contribute_to_australias_official

Copyright :-

Copyright is not a black and white situation . If one bought an album in record format and then when the technology advanced one bought the same album on CD one is paying twice for the same copyright license . This is no different that converting a CD to MP3 format - different format , however , this time , same copyright license payment .

You also have the "legitimate use" concept - very important . It is why say 10% of books could be photocopied - legitimate use for academic research .

However My concerns go a lot further than just copyright . I am primarily concerned that this legislation will be a cop out - it will be the same as the paedophile influenced censorship movements which , instead of dealing with the offenders , it allows the offenders to continue offending whilst at the same time penalising all consumers . Censorship , which is what this is , has a long history of misuse

- being used by governments for political purposes . It also has a long history of being misapplied - the wrong things being censored and things that 'should' be censored not being censored . During the 60's and 70's there were quite a few incidents where songs were wrongly banned and others that were not banned that theoretically should have been . The classic being Drinkin Rum & Coca Cola by the Andrew Sisters - WWII time . These days we live in a more enlightened age so we don't have those censorship problems .

You've also got the situation where the main public Internet has a lot of ways around it . There are so many ways of getting past the controls that it is almost impossible to police . There are many different ways of coding data and accessing data . There is also the Deep Web which is much larger than the Google indexed surface web . And driving it all underground just makes it harder to find and police .

A lot of these legislations are often very one sided . They not only protect the large corporate concerns they allow the large corporate concerns to game the system against the small concerns and against the private person . And they do not protect the small concerns and the private person .

You need to have clear legislation and you need to go after the prime offenders . If you want to prevent illegal copyright violations then use technical means - if it's done right then it is a very possible thing to do . What I am talking about here is coding the download files such that they can only be accessed within a licensed environment - ie. you download the file and the license onto your 'mp3' player and you can then play the track.

You have the further problem of lack of availability of material . It is often very difficult for people to get DVD's and CD's that they want - HMV and the like don't sell a large range , even on their web sites . Also many Internet sites only allow region based access . This is why quite a lot of people resort to torrenting movies .

Now this is another issue - programs such as bittorrent and associated link sites have a huge legitimate use . Accessing movies maybe a misuse but is actually only a part of the usage that is alongside many other legitimate uses . It's important that these technologies and websites are not penalised for any illegitimate use by their customers .

And - another issue - link sites - agglomeration sites - are not publishers - they do not hold the files - they only hold links to the files . The files are held on hosted web servers within specific domain areas . The hosted web servers are not publishers . Only the domain area is a publisher . When you get into technology , especially new technology , all sorts of new understandings and new distinctions have to be made .

Web neutrality is a vital principle that must be adhered to . If the corporations start gaming the Internet - eg. by filtering and by bandwidth shaping - they will destroy the openness and the flat playing field of the Internet . IE. basically they will destroy the Internet . The Internet is the success that it is purely because it was , right from the start , completely open , low cost and a flat playing field . There were

other 'Internets' before the Internet but they weren't as successful and widespread and they didn't survive . CompuServe is probably the classic example .

Simple question - "How does a major studio control a minor independent studio ?" - quite simple - filter them out . How does Hollywood control Pinewood ? - quite simple - filter them out .

And what - ie. whose - standards do you use to filter out ?

If you want to remove paedophilia then you need to track down the actual paedophiles themselves and prosecute them , stop them doing what they are doing and rescue the children . If it means getting tough with Russia get tough with Russia . Just don't sweep it under the carpet .

Likewise copyright infringement - use sensible policing . Also , don't forget , there has been a lot of infringement by the major players that hasn't been prosecuted by the governments - case going on in Canada.

You also have a whole host of situations where people's private copyright is frequently violated . Posting photos onto private websites or private areas - such as Facebook - and those photos being 'stolen' by news organisations , for example - happens quite commonly . And then there is the issue of chain emails - emails doing the rounds - eg. containing jokes , photos etc. - what happens with the copyright in these ? It is not uncommon for people to nick parts of photos to use as their 'avatar' on blog sites - what happens with the copyright in these situations ? What happens when people copy photos from web sites into emails to send to friends ?

You - the government - need to do the policing yourself - not fob it off onto other companies and organisations . And you must be fully transparent with it - basic justice principle .

You've also got the whole evidence issue . The way that the Internet works is that households are normally assigned a dynamic IP address with a short lease - eg. 11 hours . After the lease expires a new address is assigned . This is all due to the restricted number of IP addresses available . Further within each household there are local IP addresses assigned to each unit connected in to the household's network . Each of these units share the external IP address . They can be , and often are , multiple computers - PC's , laptops etc. - each with different users . And if the household network is open , or even partially open - there is a technical facility for this , then anyone else can also be sharing in the household's IP address . So all of a sudden you have a great difficulty , in practice , in proving who is the offender - so you penalise the whole household ? - not exactly natural justice !

You have also got the whole issue of 'innocent access' . People can quite easily find sites , that you would perhaps like to ban , and watch movies that they might think are perfectly ok. to watch - eg. no copyright problems - but they might be violating the law without realising it . It is actually quite easy , even with Google searches , to find sites that should perhaps be avoided .

And there is the issue of where illegitimate access can end up promoting sales . YouTube is a classic example in this. People often , myself included , use You Tube to listen to tracks before buying an album . It is also useful to find out who the singer or band is and what the album is . Going through places such as <http://www.reddit.com/r/Jazz/> one can get all sorts of leads to all sorts of interesting music , listen to it on YouTube and then maybe buy the album . And then what about sites such as Imgur , Flickr and mp3tube ?

And there is the issue of 'non copyright' material passing into the domain of 'copyright' material . A good example of this is the Linux operating system . Linux has been developed under the GNU GPL license which is basically :- software developed freely - many of the developers don't charge for their work , software source code made freely - ie. publically - available , software machine code available free of charge and freely available . Canonical is very good in respecting these principles and they have spent a lot of their own money developing the Ubuntu variant . However with some of the corporations making a lot of money out of Linux - for example Google with Android - one has to ask the questions :- are they using code that has been developed free of charge ? , are they paying for that code ? , do they make all of their Linux OS level source code and machine code freely available and free of charge ? This same principle can be applied in other areas where commercial operations have used freely developed and obtained creative output . This may be in movies - eg. Life in a Day - or it may be on web sites - eg. Huffington Post .

Ref.:

http://www.reddit.com/r/unitedkingdom/comments/ic6pi/digital_economy_act_facts_required_for_local_mp/