CI 1691 D Pickett

First name: Deborah
Last name: Pickett

Q1:
I don't believe that the existing framework is broken.
Q2:
- Informing consumers about content so that they can make reasoned decisions about whether to use the content.
- Ensuring a level playing field so that the (monetary and administrative) costs of producing content doesn't stop small producers from releasing content.
Q3:
This is a leading question, and begs the questions "should the quantity of content affect whether it should be classified", "should the permanence of content affect whether it should be classified", and "should the monetary cost of classifying content affect whether content should be classified". Those are, in my opinion, more important questions. The technology or platform is largely irrelevant, and it will always outpace any legislation.
Q4:
That's dangerous. It could be used to silence dissent or for corporate backstabbing. Perhaps if the complainer is required to pay the cost of classification...
Q5:
Potential impact is impossible to measure quantitatively. Almost any content can be made to appear to have a greater impact by selection bias in a population sample.
"Content designed for children" is really "content designed to be used by children's legal guardians, for them to onsupply it to their children". Parenting can't be eliminated from the picture, and should be considered in all "content designed for children".
Q6:
Market position is hard to measure quantitatively. Almost any content can be made to appear to have a greater market position or size by selection bias in a population sample.
In "small" size or market position (however you choose to measure that) producers, classification should not become a monetary or administrative burden; this could have a chilling effect on less mainstream voices.
Q7:
I thought they already were. If not, then whatever voluntary code of practice they are following seems to be working.
Q8:
I thought they already were. If not, then whatever voluntary code of practice they are following seems to be working.
Q9:
Size of the audience is hard to measure quantitatively. Almost any content can be made to appear to have a greater audience size by selection bias in a population sample.

Q10:

Define "in public". Is reading a book on a train "in public"? Is reading the book on a e-book reader in a cafe "in public"? Is looking at a website on one's smartphone "in public"? There is a continuum here which the question is begging.

Q11:

Whether large or influential corporations or individuals can wield classification as a blunt weapon for silencing dissent.

Whether international distributors can use classification as an excuse to prevent importation of content produced overseas, creating a system of geographic restriction.

Q12:

The most *effective* methods are used in totalitarian regimes around the world. They involve vast expenditure to maintain a blacklist of sites and to pay off informants. They also don't work very well, because they do not account for advances in technology, of steganography or of people's creativity in sidestepping censorship.

My understanding is that honeypots are usually the easiest way of entrapping the people who want to consume prohibited content, followed by legal proceedings, thereby reducing the demand for this content to be created.

Q13:

The responsibility lies entirely with the legal guardian. The guardian chooses to install content-restriction software on the computer that the child has access to, and the child and guardian can agree to what is allowed and what is not. (I note that this answer applies to most aspects of parenting. There does not need to be a special rule for online content.)

Q14:

I think it already is well controlled.

Q15:

Before money changes hands. The correctness of the classification (if any) is part of the contract of sale.

Q16:

I find it difficult to understand the intent of this question. If you are suggesting a purely top-down approach (such as ISP-based web filtering) then no, that is exactly how it *shouldn't* be. There is a plurality of views in industry bodies and in users, and they need a say in what happens. But on the other hand, astroturfing is rife in some content industries and it's impossible to average out all of the opinions and be confident in your answer.

Q17:

Provided that they are not subject to abuse by political interests, religious interference or chilling effects.

Q18:

Content which does not change over time (books, movies, music) would be easier to classify. Content which changes almost daily (blogs) or even more often (comments on blogs) are probably impossible to justify the expense of classification.

Q19:

I would prefer to see a self-rating system (like hotel stars). Checks and balances, such as independent review and financial disincentives to lie, would need to be in place.

Q20:

"Refused Classification" (big r, big c) is a misnomer. The content *was* classified, and the classification it was given is "Refused Classification". This does not mean the same thing as "refused classification" (small r, small c).

Q21:

I like the European system of printing an age as a number. It's got more flexibility than the C, G, PG, M, etc. system.

Q22:

If a work has been classified in one format, its classification should be similar (perhaps the same) in other formats. Cinema, TV, DVD, iTunes store downloads, ...

Q23:

I don't think so. *Harmonized* perhaps.

Q24:

Define "online". The Web? FTP or BitTorrent? NNTP? Email? Digital downloads of ebooks from Amazon.com? Over Skype? Using a VOIP phone? This list is not exhaustive, and it can't be. Technology will always outpace legislation, so legislation that specifically mentions "online" is already out of date.

Q25:

This question begs the question of whether content should be prohibited *online* specifically.

Q26:

Forcing all states to keep consistent classification tends to guarantee that the most conservative opinion prevails (example: South Australia and video game R ratings). I don't like the chilling effect that this produces.

Q27:

I do not agree that the current scheme should be replaced.

Q28:

No. I think that the current shared approach has more checks and balances.

Q29:

Independence from politicians, from lobby groups, from the entrenched content producers.

Other comments:

Please don't waste my taxpayer money. I read somewhere that the ISP-based filter equates to several thousand dollars per blocked URL. This isn't a good way to spend money.