First name: Tal
Last name: Rotbart

Q1:
I think that the classification framework we have is good enough as far as the classification levels are concerned. The levels require improved consistency across different types of media and to ensure that with the exception of criminal content such as pedophile videos and snuff films, adults should not be prevented from using their discretion to consume any content they desire.

Due to the world moving towards content delivered internationally over the Internet, any framework that ignores that would soon become completely irrelevant.

A default model should be adopted across all media:

1. Unclassified content is meant for adults consumption only.
2. Voluntary classifications if you mean to allow access to children and teens to your content or wish to allow adults to make more informed decisions.
3. For Internet content, a voluntary, opt-in (preferably by installation of localised software) filter that would allow parents to limit their children to classified content only.

Q2:
The underlying principle should be to limit the effect of any classification system on informed adults.

Thus the primary objectives should be:
1. For adults, classifications should mean additional information to make informed decision, and naught else.
Thus with the exception of criminal content such as pedophile videos and snuff films, adults should not be prevented from using their discretion to consume any content they wish.

2. For children, the goal of the classification system should be to allow their parents/guardians to make informed decisions regarding what content they wish their children to consume.

Q3:
It would simply be impossible to classify all the content on the Internet, for example. However, one-way broadcast media such as television and radio content could be classified as it is produced.

However, as the world is moving towards video & radio over the Internet, this would become impossible to enforce as most content would come from overseas.

Q4:
I believe that all classifications should be voluntary. Therefore if content is the subject of a complaint, it is either criminal content or has been misclassified.

Q5:

Content designed for children should be classified across all broadcast media.

However, enforcing that on the Internet would be impossible. Parents could install software that would enable them to limit their children to classified content only. That will leave it to market forces to drive sites designed for children to get classification.

Q6:

No

Q7:

Never for restricting of access. A model in which by default an exhibition is meant for adults, with voluntary classifications if they wish to allow access to children would cover that scenario.

Q8:

As with all other types of content, the world is moving to a global market place over the Internet. Therefore:

1. Unclassified content is meant for adults consumption only.
2. Voluntary classifications if you mean to allow access to children and teens to your content or wish to allow adults to make more informed decisions.
3. For Internet content, a voluntary, opt-in (preferably by installation of localised software) filter that would allow parents to limit their children to classified content only.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No. But a person should be criminally liable if he is allowing children to view content which has been classified as not-for-children. Or if it hasn't been classified for their viewing and would have been classified as not-for-children if classified.

Q11:

See above. Classification should be voluntary.

Q12:

It is impossible to prevent criminals from accessing criminal content online. Therefore there is no point in mandatory access control / filtering.

For Internet content, a voluntary, opt-in (preferably by installation of localised software) filter should be made available that would allow parents to limit their children to classified content only.

Q13:

For Internet content, a voluntary, opt-in (preferably by installation of localised software) filter should be made available that would allow parents to limit their children to classified content only.

Q14:

Current access control is sufficient.

Q15:

Content should require classification when it is meant to be accessible for children.

Q16:

Police agencies should find criminal content consumers, such as pedophiles.

A Federal classification agency should be available to perform voluntary classification, consistently across all media.

Users should be criminally liable if he is allowing children to view content which has been classified as not-for-children. Or if it hasn't been classified for their viewing and would have been classified as not-for-children if classified.

Q17:

Q18:

Adult content, should even require classification under this proposed system as it is by default meant to adults only.

Q19:

All classification should be subsidised completely.

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

All classification markings and criteria and guidelines should be made consistent across all media.

Q23:

All classification markings and criteria and guidelines should be made consistent across all media.

Q24:

Criminal content, such as pedophile videos and snuff films. Should be prohibited. Enforcement should be by police investigation of potential breaches only and not by attempting to prevent access.

Q25:

Q26:

There should be one, federal classification law. Content respects no state-boundaries or even country boundaries.

Q27:

A default model should be adopted across all media:

1. Unclassified content is meant for adults consumption only.
2. Voluntary classifications if you mean to allow access to children and teens to your content or wish to allow adults to make more informed decisions.
3. For Internet content, a voluntary, opt-in (preferably by installation of localised software) filter that would allow parents to limit their children to classified content only.

Criminally liability for actively allowing children to view content which has been classified as not-for-children. Or if it hasn't been classified for their viewing and would have been classified as not-for-children if classified.

Criminal liability for consuming and/or distributing criminal content such as pedophile videos and snuff films.

Q28:

Yes, the classification should be federal.

Q29:

A default model should be adopted across all media:

1. Unclassified content is meant for adults consumption only.

2. Voluntary classifications if you mean to allow access to children and teens to your content or wish to allow adults to make more informed decisions.

3. For Internet content, a voluntary, opt-in (preferably by installation of localised software) filter that would allow parents to limit their children to classified content only.

Criminally liability for actively allowing children to view content which has been classified as not-for-children. Or if it hasn't been classified for their viewing and would have been classified as not-for-children if classified.

Criminal liability for consuming and/or distributing criminal content such as pedophile videos and snuff films.

Other comments: