

COPA Commissioners Questionnaire Responses

Common Resources and Parental Education

1. Online information resources

Collection of information regarding technologies and methods that can protect children and publication of such information on an open web page, with links to additional pertinent materials.

The Commission rated each technology/method in light of both its current effectiveness and near-term potential effectiveness, relative to other technologies and methods, in reducing access by children to harmful to minor's materials (when used along with other related technologies and methods).

(note special features of "one click away" approach)

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (5)
Bastian (1)
Berman (5)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (5)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (2)
Parker (2)
Schmidt (2)
Schrader (8)
Shapiro (6)
Srinivasan (7)
Talbert (1)
Telage (4)
Vradenburg (5)

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (5)
Bastian (7)
Berman (8)
DeRosier (6)
Flores (3)
Ganier (4)
Hughes (5)
Parker (6)
Schmidt (10)
Schrader (9)
Shapiro (9)
Srinivasan (8)
Talbert (5)
Telage (6)

DRAFT-10/24/00

Vradenburg (9)

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (2)** – The costs get passed on.
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (2)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA, (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (3)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (3)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (1)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**

Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (1)
Vradenburg (0)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (1)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (0)
Schrader (1)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (1)
Vradenburg (0)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (0)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (NA)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (+)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (0)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (1)
Vradenburg (0)

2. Parent Education Programs

Active outreach to educate families about both opportunities and dangers of the internet, as well as the tools and practices that can optimize a child's experience online -- with a goal of encouraging parents' involvement with their children's online experience and wider adoption of common sense practices.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (2)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (5)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (4)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (4)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (7)**
- Bastian (7)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (6)**
- Parker (4)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (9)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (4)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (4)**
- Vradenburg (4)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (0)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Berman (1)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (6)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (2)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (1)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (3)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (+)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

Filtering/Blocking

3. Server-side filtering using URL lists

Voluntary use by Internet Service Providers and Online Services of server software that denies access to particular content sources (identified by uniform resource locators) that have been selected for blocking. The selection of the blocked list can rely upon automated processes, human review, and user options. The list of blocked URLs may or may not be disclosed. The list is regularly updated at the server.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (7)**
- Bastian (6)**
- Berman (7)**
- DeRosier (7)**
- Flores (9)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (9)**
- Parker (9)**
- Schmidt (6)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (7)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (7)**
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (7)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (7)**
- Bastian (7)**
- Berman (2)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (7)**
- Ganier (school 7, home 3)**
- Hughes (8)**
- Parker (6)**
- Schmidt (9)**
- Schrader (8)** – Server-side filtering is obviously easier to use than client-side systems.
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (5)** – Fairly easy to find but implementation and use varies with different types of technologies. Some services are incompatible or difficult to implement with some software/hardware configurations and most require the user to have basic skills that some parents may lack in trying to load a program.
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (9)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (5)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (6)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (5)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (4)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (2)**

Srinivasan (2)
Talbert (3)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (2)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (4)
Bastian (5)
Berman (8)
DeRosier (5)
Flores (1)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (1)
Parker (3)
Schmidt (9)
Schrader (5)
Shapiro (4)
Srinivasan (3)
Talbert (1)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (3)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (0)
DeRosier (0)
Flores (0)
Ganier (0)
Hughes (+)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (0)

4. Client-side filtering using URL lists

Voluntary use by end users of software that causes the browser not to download content from specified content sources. The list of blocked sites may originate from both the software supplier and/or from decisions by the user. The list may be updated periodically by means of a download from the site of the software provider. The list may or may not be disclosed. A denial of access may be overridden with the use of a password controlled by a parent. The PC-based software may also filter out email or instant messaging from unapproved sources.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (6)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (8)**
- Ganier (5)**
- Hughes (7)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (6)**
- Schrader (9)**
- Shapiro (6)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (4)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (4)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (8)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (6)**
- Parker (6)**
- Schmidt (9)**
- Schrader (7)**
- Shapiro (7)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (8)**
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DRAFT-10/24/00

Balkam (3)
Bastian (5)
Berman (3)
DeRosier (3)
Flores (5)
Ganier (8)
Hughes (5)
Parker (6)
Schmidt (5)
Schrader (3)
Shapiro (4)
Srinivasan (5)
Talbert (3)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (3)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (0)
Ganier (0)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (0)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (2)
Berman (3)
DeRosier (0)
Flores (1)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (1)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (4)
Schrader (3)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (2)

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (4)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (3)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

5. Filtering (server- and client-side) using content analysis

Voluntary use of some combination of PC-based software and server software that conducts (when necessary) real time analysis of the content of a web site and filters out content sources that fit some algorithm. Such a system may be able to deal with pictures as well as words and may be able to analyze email and attachments. The end user may or may not be informed of the nature of the algorithm and may or may not have full information regarding what is being excluded.

The Commission limited discussion of this to systems using real time analysis of text. (picture analysis moved to other section)

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (5)
Bastian (7)
Berman (5)
DeRosier (5)
Flores – (7)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (10)
Parker (7)
Schmidt (Unknown)
Schrader (4)
Shapiro (2)
Srinivasan (8)
Talbert (7)
Telage (2)
Vradenburg (4)

DRAFT-10/24/00

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (2)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (7)**
- Schmidt (Unknown)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (5)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (7)**
- Schmidt (5)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (5)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (6)**
- Vradenburg (6)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (1)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (0)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (3)
Berman (4)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (2)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (3)
Shapiro (3)
Srinivasan (1)
Talbert (3)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (2)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (4)
Bastian (3)
Berman (4)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (2-3)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (2)
Parker (3)
Schmidt (8)
Schrader (4)
Shapiro (4)
Srinivasan (3)
Talbert (3)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (5)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (0)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (0)
Ganier (1)

Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (0)

Labeling and Rating Systems

6. First-party labeling/rating

Voluntary action by content sources to indicate that a site or particular content meets a particular standard or fits a particular category. The “label” can take the form of a metatag, or entry into a database listing, or display of a seal. The use of a label may be audited. For purposes of considering this technology, the Commission will assume that the voluntary labeling scheme would identify material that is “Harmful to Minors” and thereby allow others to filter or block such material.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor’s material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (7)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (5)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (4)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (4)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (3)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (4)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (4)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (4)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

DRAFT-10/24/00

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (1)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (6)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (5)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (7)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (6)**
- Srinivasan (4)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (2)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (3)**

Vradenburg (0)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (3)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

7. Third-party labeling/rating

Voluntary action by third parties to review content sources and to associate labels or ratings with such sources so as to enable filtering or blocking by others. The review may involve some automated parsing and some human judgment. For purposes of considering this technology, the Commission will assume that the labeling and related filtering may involve various “categories” established by private parties and that no affirmative action is required by a content source.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor’s material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (4)**
- Hughes (3)**
- Parker (4)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (4)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (3) (4)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (3)**
- Parker (4)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (4)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (1)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (1)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (1)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (7)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (3)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

Age Verification Systems

8. AVS based on credit cards

Use by a content source of a system to condition access to a web page (or pushed content) on the end user's ability to provide a credit card number. The number may or may not be verified as relating to a valid card (it may not be used for charging a fee) and may or may not be further analyzed to assure that the holder of the card is an adult.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (4)**
- DeRosier (7)**
- Flores (9)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (9+)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (7)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (7)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (4)**
- DeRosier (9)**
- Flores (8)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (8)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (8)**
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (4)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (6)**
- Schrader (8)** -- Being required to use a credit card to access HTM sites or specific HTM content is, at the very least, burdensome and discouraging to adults, and in many cases, an absolute bar to receiving lawful speech on the Internet (since a significant percentage of adults do not have credit cards).
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (1)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (2)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (6)**
- Berman (6)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (10)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (5)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (6)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (4)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (6)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (3)**
- Ganier (10)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (5)**
- Schmidt (6)**
- Schrader (10)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (2)**

Talbert (4)
Telage (8)
Vradenburg (5)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (5)
Bastian (3)
Berman (7)
DeRosier (2)
Flores (2)
Ganier (6)
Hughes (2)
Parker (2)
Schmidt (2)
Schrader (8)
Shapiro (8)
Srinivasan (2)
Talbert (2)
Telage (8)
Vradenburg (8)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (1)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (0)
Ganier (3)
Hughes (+)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (1)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (0)

9. AVS based on independently-issued ID

Use by a content source of a system to condition access to a web page (or pushed content) on the end user's use of a password protected identifier that is issued (by a third party) only to those who have presented some credentials indicating adult age.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (5)
Berman (3)
DeRosier (5)
Flores (9)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (9+)
Parker (8)
Schmidt (8)
Schrader (3)
Shapiro (8)
Srinivasan (8)
Talbert (3)
Telage (6)
Vradenburg (9)

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (2)
Bastian (1)
Berman (3)
DeRosier (5)
Flores (8)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (6)
Parker (2)
Schmidt (3)
Schrader (4)
Shapiro (3)
Srinivasan (5)
Talbert (2)
Telage (4)
Vradenburg (8)

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (6)
Bastian (3)
Berman (5)
DeRosier (2)

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (2)**
- Talbert (4)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (7)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (6)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (6)**
- Schmidt (3)**
- Schrader (7)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (7)**
- Talbert (8)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (6)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (10)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (5)**
- Schmidt (5)**
- Schrader (9)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

DRAFT-10/24/00

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (6)**
- Bastian (9)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (3)**
- Ganier (6)**
- Hughes (3+)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (3)**
- Schrader (9)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (9)**
- Vradenburg (9)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (1)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (+)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

New Top-Level Domain/Zoning

10. Establishment of a gTLD for HTM content

Creation for voluntary use of a new top level domain (e.g., .xxx or .adult) the use of which would be understood to signify that materials on web pages located in such domain (and email coming from such domain) are harmful to minors materials -- and the existence of which would make it easy for browsers or ISPs to filter out all material so located. In analyzing this technology and method, the Commission will assume that placement of material in such domain, to the exclusion of other domains, would constitute an affirmative defense to a COPA charge. (See recommendations).

(In analyzing this technology and method, the Commission will assume that placement of material in such domain, to the exclusion of other domains, will constitute an affirmative defense to a COPA charge. See recommendations).

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (2)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (3)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (5)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (7)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (9)**
- Flores (6)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (9)**
- Parker (5)**
- Schmidt (4)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (9)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (9)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

Telage (9)
Vradenburg (9)

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (1)
Berman (5)
DeRosier (3)
Flores (1)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (2)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (1)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (1)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (8)
Bastian (6)
Berman (6)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (1)
Ganier (4)
Hughes (2)
Parker (5)
Schmidt (7)
Schrader (6)
Shapiro (6)
Srinivasan (4)
Talbert (5)
Telage (6)
Vradenburg (7)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (2)
Bastian (0)
Berman (4)
DeRosier (3)
Flores (8)
Ganier (5)
Hughes (2)
Parker (0)

Schmidt (1)
Schrader (4)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (4)
Telage (4)
Vradenburg (1)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (7)
Bastian (2)
Berman (8)
DeRosier (4)
Flores (9)
Ganier (8)
Hughes (2)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (8)
Schrader (8)
Shapiro (7)
Srinivasan (8)
Talbert (0)
Telage (9)
Vradenburg (9)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (1)
Berman (8)
DeRosier (7)
Flores (9)
Ganier (0)
Hughes (+)
Parker (5)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (3)
Shapiro (2)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (3)
Telage (8)
Vradenburg (0)

11. Establishment of a gTLD for non-HTM content

Creation for voluntary use of a new top level domain (e.g., .kids) the use of which would be understood to signify that materials on web pages located in such domain (and email coming from such domain) would universally be considered suitable for minors of all ages -- and the existence of which would make it easy for browsers or ISPs to establish "green zone" features that point or accept only to such materials.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (7)**
- Bastian (7)**
- Berman (6)**
- DeRosier (8)**
- Flores (5)**
- Ganier (5)**
- Hughes (8)**
- Parker (7)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (7)**
- Talbert (8)**
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (7)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (9)**
- Parker (7)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (8)**
- Telage (9)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (1)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastain (5)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (5)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (4)**
- Schmidt (5)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (9)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (1)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier ((0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (3)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (1)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (2)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

12. Establishment of a “green zone” or “red light zone” by means of allocation of a new set of IP numbers

Creation for voluntary use of a set of IP numbers (in the new IP version 6 protocol, which has not yet been widely implemented) the use of which would be understood to signify that materials on web pages on servers with such IP numbers (or email coming from such servers) would be either non-HTM material or HTM material, respectively. Any material not in such an IP number zone would be considered to be in a “gray zone” and not necessarily either HTM or non-HTM.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor’s material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (2)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (5)**
- Schmidt (NA)**
- Schrader (1)**
- Shapiro (1)**
- Srinivasan (4)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (4)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (NA)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (NA)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (3)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (1)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (1-3)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (NA)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (1)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (3)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (7)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (NA)**
- Schrader (10)**
- Shapiro (9)**
- Srinivasan (7)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (9)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (4)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (NA)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (2)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (8)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (2)**
- Parker (2)**
- Schmidt (NA)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (4)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (9)**
- Vradenburg (9)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (+)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

13. Hotlines

Creation of facilities for easy reporting of problems to the parties who can address them (online and telephone). Assumes hotline would bring problems to attention of both relevant government authorities and private sector groups that can act in response. Assumes activity levels in aggregate and general nature of complaints would be made public.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (2)**
- Berman (6)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (4)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (2)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (4)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (5)**
- Parker (7)**
- Schmidt (5)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (1)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (4)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**

Flores (6)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (2)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (3)
Talbert (0)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (1)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (4)
Flores (0)
Ganier (3)
Hughes (1)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (5)
Schrader (1)
Shapiro (3)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (5)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (8)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (0)
Ganier (3)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (3)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (4)
Vradenburg (0)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (3)
Bastian (0)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (0)
Ganier (3)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (6)
Schrader (2)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (2)
Vradenburg (2)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (0)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (0)
Ganier (0)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (0)

Other Technologies and Methods

14. Greenspaces

The voluntary creation of lists of materials determined to be appropriate for children and provision, via a browser or an online service or server filters, of an environment that allows children to go to or receive only such materials.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (6)**
- Bastian (6)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (7)**
- Parker (5)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (9)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (8)**
- Telage (7)**
- Vradenburg (9)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (6)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (7)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (3)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (6)**
- Parker (6)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (8)**
- Shapiro (7)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (7)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (9)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (3)
Berman (3)
DeRosier (3)
Flores (3)
Ganier (4)
Hughes (1)
Parker (2)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (2)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (2)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (1)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (2)
Bastian (0)
Berman (4)
DeRosier (1)
Flores (2)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (5)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (5)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (1)
Vradenburg (0)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (1)
Bastian (4)
Berman (1)
DeRosier (2)
Flores (7)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0) (1)
Telage (1)
Vradenburg (0)

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (5)**
- Flores (7)**
- Ganier (4)**
- Hughes (4)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (1)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (3)**
- Telage (3)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (4) (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

15. Monitoring and time-limiting tools

Use (typically at the PC) of software that creates logs showing details of a child's online activities and, optionally, enforces rules regarding the amount of time that may be spent online. Such systems may track both web use and email and instant messaging activities. In analyzing this technology/method, the Commission will assume that the child is told that the monitoring is taking place and that only the parent has access to the resulting information.

(Assumes use by parents in home. Separate discussions of schools and libraries).

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (6)**
- DeRosier (7)**
- Flores (6)**
- Ganier (4)**
- Hughes (4+)**
- Parker (6)**
- Schmidt (4)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (6)**
- Srinivasan (8)**
- Talbert (5)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (8)**
- Ganier (3)**
- Hughes (7)**
- Parker (4)**
- Schmidt (7)**
- Schrader (7)**
- Shapiro (6)**
- Srinivasan (5)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (4)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DRAFT-10/24/00

- Balkam (4)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (3)**
- Flores (8)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (5)**
- Parker (7)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (3)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (5)**
- Talbert (2)**
- Telage (4)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (1)**
- Telage (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (7)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (1)**
- Flores (1)**
- Ganier (6)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (9)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (6)**

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (4)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (5)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (4)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (3)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

16. Acceptable use policies/family contracts

Establishment by a parent or an institution (school or library) of rules regarding the types of materials that may be accessed. Typically, such policies would be enforced by means of denial of further access in the event of a violation. Such policies may or may not be accompanied by monitoring that would allow the parent or institution to detect violations.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (2)**
- Bastian (2)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (2)**
- Hughes (1)**
- Parker (3)**
- Schmidt (5)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (4)**
- Telage (8)**
- Vradenburg (8)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (8)**
- DeRosier (6)**
- Flores (6)**
- Ganier (7)**
- Hughes (7)**
- Parker (4)**
- Schmidt (8)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (8)**
- Srinivasan (9)**
- Talbert (7)**
- Telage (4)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (6)**
- Bastian (1)**
- Berman (0)**

DeRosier (6)
Flores (9)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (2)
Parker (7)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (2)
Talbert (2)
Telage (6)
Vradenburg (1)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (0)
DeRosier (3)
Flores (0)
Ganier (2)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (0)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (0)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (6)
Bastian (0)
Berman (3)
DeRosier (5)
Flores (0)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (0)
Parker (2)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (1)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (0)

DRAFT-10/24/00

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (2)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (1)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (2)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (1)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (2)**
- Ganier (1)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (1)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (1)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

17. Increased prosecution

Governmental expenditure (at federal, state, and local levels) of more funds to investigate and prosecute online activities that are unlawful. While this “method” assumes a change in current governmental activity, the Commission will analyze its likely effectiveness (and potential adverse impacts) to provide a basis for its recommendations. The Commission will assume that US law could not practically be enforced against all content sources located in other countries with differing legal standards for content. The Commission will assume that the additional resources would not be used to prosecute lawful adult speech.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor’s material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (8)**
- Bastian (8)**
- Berman (3)**
- DeRosier (9)**
- Flores (8)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (9)**
- Parker (10)**
- Schmidt (6)**
- Schrader (2)**
- Shapiro (5)**
- Srinivasan (3)**
- Talbert (9)**
- Telage (3) (5)**
- Vradenburg (5)**

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (5)**
- Bastian (5)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (8)**
- Flores (9)**
- Ganier (8)**
- Hughes (8)**
- Parker (8)**
- Schmidt (4)**
- Schrader (6)**
- Shapiro (7)**
- Srinivasan (10)**
- Talbert (7)**
- Telage (4)**
- Vradenburg (1)**

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (0)
Bastian (0)
Berman (4)
DeRosier (2)
Flores (0)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (6)
Schrader (1)
Shapiro (1)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (3)
Vradenburg (0)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (6)
Bastian (6)
Berman (6)
DeRosier (2)
Flores (0)
Ganier (3)
Hughes (2)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (2)
Schrader (8)
Shapiro (7)
Srinivasan (3)
Talbert (0)
Telage (10)
Vradenburg (5)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (5)
Bastian (2)
Berman (5)
DeRosier (2)
Flores (2)
Ganier (5)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (1)
Schrader (7)
Shapiro (3)
Srinivasan (1)
Talbert (0)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (0)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (3)**
- Bastian (2)**
- Berman (5)**
- DeRosier (2)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (5)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (2)**
- Schrader (5)**
- Shapiro (3)**
- Srinivasan (2)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (5)**
- Vradenburg (4)**

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (0)**
- Bastian (0)**
- Berman (0)**
- DeRosier (0)**
- Flores (0)**
- Ganier (0)**
- Hughes (0)**
- Parker (0)**
- Schmidt (0)**
- Schrader (0)**
- Shapiro (0)**
- Srinivasan (0)**
- Talbert (0)**
- Telage (10) (0)**
- Vradenburg (0)**

18. Real time Content Monitoring/Blocking

Use of real time monitoring methods to detect and block HTM material sent via email, instant messaging, chat rooms and Usenet in addition to the web. Such monitoring assumes the ability to detect HTM materials in areas where filtering may apply.

a. How effective is this Technology/Method in preventing access by children to harmful to minor's material (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being ineffective and 10 being completely effective)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Balkam (NA)**
- Bastian (9)**
- Berman (4)**

DeRosier (NA)
Flores (6)
Ganier (6)
Hughes (7) (10)
Parker (7)
Schmidt (NA)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (4)
Srinivasan (2)
Talbert (6)
Telage (4)
Vradenburg (NA)

b. How accessible is this Technology/Method (easy to find, implement and use) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being totally inaccessible and 10 being totally accessible)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (5)
Berman (5)
DeRosier (NA)
Flores (4)
Ganier (5)
Hughes (4)
Parker (5)
Schmidt (NA)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (5)
Srinivasan (4)
Talbert (2)
Telage (5)
Vradenburg (NA)

c. How costly is this Technology/Method to users (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (2)
Berman (4)
DeRosier (NA)
Flores (5)
Ganier (6)
Hughes (2)
Parker (5)
Schmidt (NA)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (4)
Srinivasan (2)
Talbert (2)
Telage (4)
Vradenburg (NA)

d. How costly is this Technology/Method to sources of otherwise lawful adult content that would be deemed harmful to minors under COPA (considering direct and indirect costs) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 being free and 10 being very expensive)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (0)
Berman (2)
DeRosier (NA)
Flores (8)
Ganier (1)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (NA)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (10)
Srinivasan (10)
Talbert (0)
Telage (0)
Vradenburg (NA)

e. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on privacy (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (0)
Berman (7)
DeRosier (NA)
Flores (2)
Ganier (6)
Hughes (0)
Parker (2)
Schmidt (4)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (6)
Srinivasan (4)
Talbert (0)
Telage (6)
Vradenburg (NA)

f. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on first amendment values (protection of lawful adult speech) (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (1)
Berman (6)
DeRosier (NA)
Flores (2)
Ganier (5)
Hughes (1)
Parker (3) (2)
Schmidt (4)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (3)
Srinivasan (NA)
Talbert (1)

Telage (6)
Vradenburg (NA)

g. How extensive are the adverse impacts of this technology on law enforcement (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning no adverse impacts, and 10 meaning very substantial adverse impacts)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Balkam (NA)
Bastian (0)
Berman (1)
DeRosier (NA)
Flores (0)
Ganier (0)
Hughes (0)
Parker (0)
Schmidt (NA)
Schrader (NA)
Shapiro (0)
Srinivasan (0)
Talbert (0)
Telage (2)
Vradenburg (NA)