

CI 2429 J Wilson

First name:

Jonathan

Last name:

Wilson

Q1:

Improving the existing framework

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to ensure that those who want to control what content they (or their children) access have accurate information about the content they are accessing so they can make an informed decision

Q3:

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

Yes. In particular, content being distributed for free over the internet should not require any classification at all. Content being distributed through limited distribution channels (such as film festivals or bands selling special live DVD recordings of themselves at concerts) should have special classification applied to them (to account for the fact that passing this content through a full classification might be difficult or expensive due to how the content is produced and distributed). In some cases it may be appropriate to not have any classification applied (especially where the content is being produced and then distributed in a very short space of time)

Q7:

No, artworks should not be classified or restricted at all.

Q8:

No, such content should not be regulated unless the content is being played in public or over free-to-air radio stations in which case limited restrictions on the content are acceptable.

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Access to online content should not be restricted. Where content that is clearly illegal (such as child pornography or instructions on how to produce illegal drugs) exists online, police agencies (such as the AFP) should work with the owner of the computer or hosting provider that is hosting the content to get it removed (e.g. if its been uploaded without the consent of the computer owner/hosting provider). Where that fails (i.e. hosting provider refuses to remove the content), agencies here should work with law enforcement in the country where the hosting is located (and with international agencies like Interpol) to get the content taken down. Where necessary (e.g. where there is police corruption or lax laws) political pressure (or trade/economic pressure) can be applied to the government to get them to change the law or clean up the corruption and to get the content taken down.

Q13:

The decision as to what content children can access online should be made by the adult responsible for the internet connection. So in the case of a home internet connection, the parent or guardian. In the case of a school internet connection, the principal/school authority (with input from parents as to what content the parents find inappropriate). in the case of a public library, the library administrators (taking input from the council or other body that runs the library). In the case of an internet cafe, the owners of the internet cafe.

All parents and other groups (e.g. school authorities) should be given the option by ISPs to opt into an ISP provided filter for their internet connection (computer filtering software is not available for all platforms such as mobile phones or game consoles and is far easier to bypass than an ISP level option)

Q14:

Access to such content should be controlled by requiring retailers to keep such content out of sight behind the counter and by requiring purchasers to show ID in order to purchase it.

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

The government should subsidize the classification of content where that content is distributed to a limited audience, distributed for free or low-cost (e.g. sold for a small fee only to cover the cost of creating the media being used to distribute it) or is otherwise being

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

No content should be restricted completely from access. As mentioned in my answer to question 12, governments and police agencies should work to get content that is illegal taken down instead of implementing a mandatory filtering system that wont prevent access to any of the encrypted private online file sharing systems where much of the illegal content (such as child porn, stolen information or criminal/terrorist instructions) is distributed. And also to go after those who create, distribute and download this illegal content.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

The current powers held by the states should be given to the commonwealth with the commonwealth having sole responsibility for classification of content and the sole power to change the rules regarding what content is classified and how its classified.

Q29:

Other comments: