

Morning,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Discussion Paper – Enhancing Online Safety for Children. Please read my responses below...

- Q1 Not sure that the Commissioner should take responsibility for existing programmes, however having a central place to access the existing programmes would be a fantastic start.
- Q2 Option 4 – this way the role doesn't become political or potentially violate the rights of the Australia public in the future.
- Q3 The Office of the Australian Information Commissioner definition is the best definition for defining social media sites.
- Q4 Yes online games with a chat function should be covered by the proposed scheme
- Q5 Don't think it should be defined just by the number of Australian's participating. We all know predators lie about their details. What is stopping them lying about their whereabouts... Think it should be defined by the number of registered users. Asking the sites to provide this information (most boast about the number of users anyway)
- Q6 Until the scheme is operational I suspect that it will be hard to ascertain if the proposal is appropriate and workable – a review will need to be done a year into the scheme.
- Q7 A public statement directed to children would only fuel the child to join or make the child aware of a site that they may not have had knowledge of. Statements need to be directed to parents and teachers. I don't believe that a parent, guardian or other person in authority needs the consent of the child especially seeing it is harmful to the child.
- Q8 The concern with requiring basic information including contact details will be children would not lodge complaints. When we teach cyber safety in schools we tell students not to provide personal information including birthdate, surnames, addresses. I do agree that their needs to be a process. Offering space to upload screen shots and the URL would assist.
- Q9 Screen shot of submission process – copy of the email or screen stating the complaint is being pursued.
- Q10 48 hours is acceptable
- Q11 Provided that each complete is reviewed it should be up to the eSafety Commissioner
- Q12 48 hours
- Q13 These are appropriate factors. Don't think any other factors need to be considered.
- Q14 Cause harm to any child
- Q15 48 hours
- Q16 not sure here

- Q17 yes if they are the same as the New Zealand ones
- Q18 Believe it is appropriate
- Q19 not part of the industry so don't feel I can comment
- Q20 no
- Q21 provided the child's age is taken into account
- Q22 yes – children don't need their lives ruined with a criminal record for an offence like cyber-bullying. Repeat offenders may need further rehabilitation.
- Q23 there is merit
- Q24 Penalties should be such that a child is able to take responsibility not the parent (i.e. \$1000 is unpayable by a child so this fine becomes the responsibility of the parent)

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute
Kind Regards
Julie-Anne Angell