

Concerned Citizen Submission for Amendments to Proposed Online Safety Bill.

Class 1 and 2 Content

There is an extremely poor distinction between class 1 and class 2. The language used in the content is extremely vague and carries broad moralistic and puritanical connotations that are subject to individual bias. The absolute opinion on one discerning what is allowed and not allowed on the internet, will potentially lead to the threat of censorship and the authoritarian control of how Australian's use the internet. Social media has become an integral component of how people in our communities engage with their lives in our western civilisation, and the internet is a core man-made technology in that social rapport.

The proposed classification of class 1 content will carry the consequence of causing abusive content and adult content to become indistinguishable. This means that class 1 or RC classified content will merge and distort consensual kink and fetish porn with things such as child porn, revenge porn or nonconsensual sexual content. This way of classifying erases consent, and it also erases the context of these different types of content and classes them together inappropriately. This is a dangerous precedent and has already been enacted in the US with the SESTA/FOSTA bill. This bill was passed in 2017 and has a documented body count from the violence and problems that it has caused by not distinguishing between consensual and non-consensual sexual content.

A class 2 classification for all sexual content or even content relating to nudity and sex will be classified as 18+. This is a major issue. The design of this bill incentives platforms to remove all content that could be flagged to avoid fines. This means that once this bill is passed companies will delete or censor all sexual/nude content to not receive classification. This will have far reaching social and economic consequences. This could mean that many forms of art and photography are censored from the internet. It will mean sexual educators cannot freely share their content online and provide important harm reduction information, consent training and sexuality discussions. The removal of these resources will lead to an increase in STIs, sexual violence and a disempowered generation of young people.

Restricted Access System

Having an unelected official appointed as the e-commissioner is dangerous, and extremely worrying for the public. This person will have an incredible amount of power to decide what is 'offensive.' The terms and language in this bill are so broad and vague that the e-commissioner will have a subjective interpretation of the guidelines, which is seemingly quite authoritarian. There is potential for reports to the commissioner to be weaponised against women or small businesses, and all independent creative practitioners.

Sexually explicit material that is reported could be removed within 24 hours. This will impact sex workers the most. If a malicious client or even an 'offended' stranger were to report sex worker content for nudity and it were removed this could cost the worker income, job security and safety. This could lead to people in desperate financial situations having less options to screen and advertise and consequently accepting bookings with dangerous people. This could very well directly cause the death of a vulnerable sex worker. There are already parental control systems in place that can be activated on all devices that caregivers can use to control what kind of content a child has access to. This bill will not create any new avenues for protection that do not already exist but it will cause harm and violence to minority communities, independent artists and business', to sex workers and to women.

Importation of old classification system

The definitions of class 1 and 2 material are derived from the existing framework under the Commonwealth Classification Act 1995 and National Classification Code 2005. These

classification are designed for old media and do not accurately reflect the diversity of digital media. They are also imbued with value judgements that are outdated and no longer reflect the values of the majority of Australians. As an independent artist, who works with nudity, it is extremely worrying to my welfare and livelihood. I believe this bill wholly misunderstands how the internet, algorithms, platforms, and new media function. There needs to be a re-evaluation of what is lawful and unlawful in the digital age that levels with the contextual peak of technological advancement. This bill, comparatively to the US, SESTA/FOSTA bill of 2017, has great potential to create countless unintended consequences, due to its outdated use of language and prehistorically existing frameworks.

Conflation of 18+ and Harmful Content

As it is currently defined, X18+ is the only classification category to include no violence. There is no reason why it should be considered harmful online content at all. At present, X18+ content, R18+ content and RC content are lumped in together with no other information about what makes such content 'harmful.'

Offensiveness

The Bill sets out criteria for when the Commissioner should consider material to be 'offensive'. This includes consideration of the standards of morality, decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adults, and whether the content has literary artistic or educational merit or medical, legal or scientific character. Offensiveness is an individual and subjective experience and should not be the criteria for determining whether online content is harmful.

Abuse and Harassment

The Bill opens up sex workers for vexatious, frivolous and malicious complaints. Sex workers and sexually explicit media are already subject to a high level of malicious complaints. The legislation emboldens users to complain by providing extremely broad grounds. A complaint can be made about any Class 2 content that is not subject to a restricted access system, even where there is nothing harmful about the content.

The Bill permits the Commissioner to create restricted access systems. The Commissioner has the power to specify a particular access-control system that must be used as a 'restricted access system'. This means that, for example, the Commissioner may determine that all Class 2 material ought to be subject to an age-verification system. Both the Australian and United Kingdom governments have considered age-verification processes to limit minors' access to adult material. This was dismissed by the UK government because of major issues relating to privacy and feasibility. This bill gives the commissioner too much power without any real accountability for their decisions. This is both autocratic and dangerous.

The Commissioner has extremely wide discretion to make decisions about all sexual content. The Commissioner has enormous power under this Bill to make decisions about what kind of content Australian residents can access. They can decide whether or not to instigate investigations and issue removal notices as they see fit. The Commissioner is appointed rather than elected, they can delegate their authority to other bureaucrats, and they have no obligation to give reasons for their decisions. There is no transparency or accountability for decisions made under the Bill. Just as the Commissioner is not required to give reasons for their decision, there is no requirement for the E-Safety Commission to publish publicly-available data on their enforcement and compliance patterns. This means that the public will not know how many complaints have been made against sex workers, how frequently sex workers' content has been removed, or why some content was subject to removal notices while others were not. Users will not be able to edit their content

accordingly to comply with the framework if there is no criteria for what content is 'harmful' and warrants removal. The Bill has the potential to shut down sex workers' businesses and undermine our right to choose how and where we work. Pivots to online work allowed many sex workers to survive the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic that effectively shut down in-person sex work in Australia for many sex workers. While many of the platforms we use to sell content, do cam work, or other forms of digital sex work have a paywall or other method of restricting user access, without clear guidelines for what that system will be, made in consultation with affected communities, this provision is very likely to cause undue damage to sex worker livelihoods. There is a risk under this Bill that advertising content could be removed with little to no notice, which could have a disastrous impact on sex workers' income. Restrictions on advertising and / or mode of work are a form of criminalisation of sex work. Sex workers must be able to advertise their services online without unnecessary restrictions or vulnerability to malicious complaints. Losing access to advertising and revenue streams is an immediate threat to sex worker safety and autonomy.

Sharing of non-consensual images

Sex workers need equitable access to non bias reviews.

For sex workers, this part of the Bill could open better access to redress if a client stealthily takes images or video in a session, intro or other interaction and posts it online. It is important for us to advocate for sex workers to have equitable access to reporting. Because the E-Safety Commissioner holds power over investigations and issuing of notices, we are demanding oversight and accountability to ensure that all complainants are handled equitably, regardless of the Commissioner's personal beliefs or stigmas.

Existing section does not recognise withdrawal of consent or limits on consent

Non-consensual intimate images are images where the person depicted did not consent to the posting of the image. In some scenarios, sex workers may have consented to the posting of the image for certain purposes (e.g. advertising on a particular escorting website), but not consented to the posting of the image for other purposes or on other platforms (e.g. continued use of image after leaving the agency, or the pirating or distribution of the image across other platforms). The Bill needs amendment to recognise that a person should be able to withdraw their consent to the posting of intimate images and place limits on their consent by specifying how, where, and for how long the image can be posted

The Bill gives incentives for platforms to remove all sexual content

The Basic Online Safety Expectations mean that services and providers will have to take active steps to ensure that minors cannot access Class 2 content. This provides an incentive for platforms, hosts, providers and services to either instigate age verification mechanisms, which have a wide range of privacy and feasibility issues, or, where this is too onerous, simply to create policies that remove sexual content altogether, resulting in the sanitisation of online space and a mass de-platforming of sex workers. The effects of the US, FOSTA-SESTA legislation is an example of this type of 'chilling effect', and virtually all sex workers who use the internet for work in Australia have been deeply impacted by this legislation. This is a great opportunity to discuss the damage of such legislation on your business and community. Sex workers rely on online platforms in order to advertise, screen clients and employ other safety measures, and connect with peers to get essential health and safety information. Not only does this send sex positive education in the dark, but enables a morbid misunderstanding of consent and non-consensual, appropriate activity and misconduct due to the gross mis-categorisation.

Other businesses are able to use social media and online platforms to advertise. There should not be exceptionalities with Sexual material, treated extremely disproportionately to other kinds

of media. Sex work is a largely lawful industry and should not be subject to discriminatory regulations. Consensual sexually explicit material should not be considered equivalent to violent, harmful or abhorrent content. There needs to be a line drawn, a border around consensual activity, that differentiates between dangerous, and harmful acts, in the virtual realm that the majority of Australians have the freedom to engage with.