

CI 417 E Man

First name: Eric

Last name: Man

Q1:

Improve key elements.

Q2:

Protection of citizens, but maintaining accountability and transparency at all times.

Q3:

Yes. The internet in particular. If content should be classified it will be incredibly difficult to enforce because almost every internet user is a publisher. Also access to content can be achieved easily, such as via technologies like encrypted VPN.

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Yes.

Q11:

Whether the material is political in nature. There should be a special legislation to protect against the classification of political statements. Also, whether it is feasible to enforce the classification.

Q12:

Educating parents on how to control their children's access to online content. A public, optional opt-in blacklist, as well as a public list of classified online content.

Q13:

Educating parents on how to control their children's access to online content. A public, optional opt-in blacklist, as well as a public list of classified online content.

Q14:

Q15:

If the content were a product: On the actual product itself, as well as the product listing.

Q16:

The body responsible for classification of content should be independent of government control. Industry bodies should be creating guidelines on how to inform users suitability of content. Users remain free to access content through other means if they so wished (e.g. online purchase of classified content). (Or if user is a minor, with permission from their parents or guardians.)

Q17:

Q18:

Adult and violence content.

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

No content should be entirely prohibited. This will only prevent normal internet users from accessing the content, rather than purveyors of illegal material. The latter will be able to access prohibited content regardless. E.g. via email, via VPN. Some content can be hidden but not prohibited (e.g. information on euthanasia). This allows citizens to evaluate whether to support or be against a classification on, following the example, euthanasia, and be able appeal to politicians and justify to others if a classification should be modified.

Child pornography should ideally be prohibited but this is only possible to enforce for normal internet users, making it pointless.

Q25:

It exceeds the scope of content that should be prohibited online.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

No. It is a possible danger to centralise classification of materials to one entity. The scope of classification content may expand faster than if classification is the responsibility of many entities. This can lead to potentially over classification of content. E.g. in the beginning only euthanasia is classified, but later on successive governments begin to expand the scope of classified content, one day to include, for example, condoms. (If a particular government who is radically catholic becomes in power, some time in the far future.)

Q29:

A public list of classified content shall be made accessible, to ensure accountability. There should

also be a path of owners of classified content to appeal the decision. (e.g. owners of online content that was forcibly classified by the government)

Other comments: