CI 451 DataBasics

First name: Linda

Last name: Rouse

Name of organisation: DataBasics

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework specifically in relation to online content

Q2:

To protect the community and particularly children as far as is possible from harmful content such as extreme violence, sexual abuse, cyber bullying, pornography and the like, via all media - internet, TV, film and print media as well as art exhibitions and other public events.

Q3:

Generally no but in the case of the internet where it is not possible to filter content so readily as print, film or TV, then other measures need to be looked at. For example chat rooms can not be filtered as the content is live. I think educational measures with the community and parents in particular should be employed regarding internet content.

Q4:

Yes - obviously paedophile sites, pornographic sites and similar should be classified where possible and when complaints are made.

Q5:

This is very difficult to determine. There are articles in most media on suicide, anorexia, selfharm, euthanasia and other topics that may be unsuitable for children but which adults wish to access for a variety of reasons - eg medical and health workers, counselors, - it is impossible to classify all content successfully. Content specifically designed for children could be labelled so that adults know that the information contained therein has been screened. However, applying this to the web and internet is probably not possible unless the providers of the content do so.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No. I dont see how this would work in practice.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

No. Unless it is know to be a children's audience.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

Education. There is no technological solution as websites can be moved, live chat rooms and similar can be setup elsewhere and cannot be filtered.

Q13:

Education of parents and community. There is no technological solution - the internet was built that way.

Q14:

I am not sure of the process now with classification of magazines so cannot respond except it seems to work at the moment.

Q15:

Much the same as now. However this will not work for the internet except for tags in the provider material. Internet Service Providers cannot be held responsible for labelling contact.

Q16:

Refer next question

Q17:

Yes - I would think this a better way to manage content .

Q18:

Q19:

Yes

Q20:

The categories are understood, but I am not clear on who decides and how the classification is done.

Q21:

No but merging them makes sense refer next question

Q22:

refer next question

Q23:

Yes. eg as most of the print content may find its way online, then it makes sense to have an overall classification code.

Q24:

Extreme porn, violence sites,

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Do not proceed with the proposed Internet filtering scheme.

Other comments:

The plan to force Internet Service Providers [ISPs] to censor the Internet for all Australians will waste tens of millions of taxpayer dollars and will not make anyone safer.

The filter will do almost nothing to prevent the people who are willfully making, trading, and accessing child sexual abuse material. This type of material is not distributed in the open and we need to fund police to continue to infiltrate and prosecute the groups of people responsible for creating and distributing such material.

The filter will not prevent children from accessing inappropriate material. The proposed category of censored sites will not be wide enough to provide assurances to parents. Parents will be much better served by installing one of the many voluntary filters that are currently available and ensuring that their children are adequately supervised and aware of risks they may face online.

The list of material to be banned includes much more than child sexual abuse material. The category of material that has been 'refused classification' includes websites about euthanasia, controversial movies such as 'Ken Park' and 'Baise-moi', and many games that are designed for people over 16 years of age.