

In terms of protecting people from illegal harms, the Online Safety Act 2023 needs to put exemptions in for the following:

Standalone sites where it is not-for-profit

Standalone websites that are not part of any company - be it subsidiary etc.

Archival websites

I would argue that it is too much of a technical and financial burden for website owners.

Rednal Autos - itself an archive and a news site at <https://rednalautosnews18684.wordpress.com/> - is a standalone website that has archived vehicle material and does not rely on algorithms etc. and moderation is good.

I have a conflict of interest, for I am a manager/moderator/contributor there.

The website is not-for-profit and has been around in various iterations since 2002.

Similarly, websites like The Internet Archive Wayback Machine, AppKed (www.maced.com) which is a repository of MacOS downloads of software, or sites like Auto Trader, Autocar, Practical Caravan, Practical Motorhome, Out and about Live, Reddit, Digital Spy, and free web hosting companies should be exempt from the Act.

In terms of pseudonymity, it should be encouraged - there are multiple reasons people need to use a pseudonym - e.g. eBay sales, Depop, Mac-rumors.com forums - and if the option is not there, people who really need it cannot use it for privacy.

I was told in February 2007 "Use your own name online for the important things, pseudonyms for the less important things" etc. and this is a worthwhile thing to consider.

Yes, your article says "For example, while the evidence is contested, some studies suggest that pseudonymity and anonymity can embolden people to commit hate speech. At the same time, cases of harassment and stalking often involve perpetrators creating multiple fake userprofiles to contact individuals against their will and to circumvent blocking and moderation" - but I have spoken on the phone to a professor in California who argues that pseudonyms are a part of society that is time immemorial dating back to Roman times and we cannot really stop it. He also says that for the UK to do this puts it squarely in lockstep with Belarus, China and Russia and would be morally wrong.

I would propose this addition to the Act:


Any services or websites that deal in the following:

- Car sales, sales of goods/clothing, food and drink, archival of software, journalism, news reporting, product/consumer reviews, vehicle reviews or vehicle parts, park/holiday homes/touring caravans, motorhomes/campervans, software downloading, archival of photographs
- Used car sales and export/import
- Standalone websites that do not form part of any
- AI-generated images or text

are exempt from the Act by reason of their nature.

Any website hosted by a subdomain of a platform is at the moderation of the platform itself.

These platforms are exempt from the provisions of the Act:

- AppKed
- wordpress.com
- AutoTrader.co.uk
- ebay.com
- ebay.co.uk
- ebay.ie
- Freecycle
- Facebook Marketplace
- Wickedweasel.com
- malibustrings.com
- microminimus.com
- exchangeandmart.co.uk
- autotrader.ca
- autotrader.com
- jdpower.com
- outandaboutlive.co.uk
- gov.uk
- *.gov.uk local government subdomains
- publicmyth.ca
- zalando.
- 
- completocar.ie
- autocar.co.uk
- autocarindia.com
- protonmail.com
- autoexpress.co.uk
- whatcar.com
- reddit.com
- RAC
- AA
- BBC Bitesize
- www.radiotoday.co.uk
- www.decider.com
- www.variety.com
- www.capitalfm.com
- www.smoothradio.com
- www.heart.co.uk
- www.ford.co.uk
- www.volkswagen.co.uk
- www.vauxhall.co.uk
- www.elddis.co.uk

- www.swiftleisure.co.uk
- www.swiftgroup.co.uk

CSAM and Fraud detection should not be used on any website that fits into what has been discussed above or the list above.

I also propose that it should not be impossible for people to contact children who they have never spoken to before; my evidence is empirical.

Way back in July 2007, a 16-year-old female child, Alison (identity protected) near me in Leigh, Wigan, Greater Manchester was contacted by a 16-year-old female child, Sarah (identity protected) from Minnesota in the U.S. via a social media platform; no sexting or child abuse was involved but it was good for the child's GCSE geography and ended up being useful for their personal and social development. It was unsolicited but the child told their parents about it and the parents were very approving and a friendship would not have happened; it naturally ended in 2010 due to other circumstances in the U.S. beyond the girl in Leigh's control.

I would argue that it prevents people from being able to forge connections and we need a return to 2007's more permissive attitudes.

At the backend, it is hard to do in PHP-based systems to do a blocking system adequately if you know what you are doing for PHP/MySQL.

The truth of the matter is, with digital competency high, there is no reason to block this.

What should be obligatory is a green text at the bottom:

"This message was sent from someone you may not know - open at your own risk"
in a font like Arial or OpenSans in bold with a version of the "Pedestrians in road ahead" or "Pedestrian crossing" sign from Highway Code in PNG format next to it.

Also, sites like WordPress.com would consider it a major financial burden to have to impose more rules when their moderation is one of the toughest but friendliest and it works well.