

CI 1697 M Magin

First name: Matthew

Last name: Magin

Q1:

The ALRC should develop a new framework for classification. As it stands the existing framework is unable to cope with the constant influx of digital content from millions of different internet sources.

Q2:

The objective of a national classification scheme should be to give parents the information they require to make informed decisions about the content their children have access to.

Q3:

The technology and platform should be irrelevant. The form of distribution does not affect the content and it is only content that should be classified.

Q4:

Absolutely. There is far too much content to classify individually.

Q5:

Yes. It is pointless spending time classifying content if the vast majority of people will never be exposed to it. Yes, content designed for children should be classified across all media.

Q6:

Yes.

Q7:

No. Public exhibitions already provide warnings about content that may be deemed inappropriate for children.

Q8:

They should be classified. They should not be regulated.

Q9:

Yes. See questions 5 and 6 for justification.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Content should be classified if it has a high probability of reaching a large audience or if complaints have been made about a specific piece of media content.

Q12:

There is no effective method of controlling access to online content. The processing power required to effectively prevent access would be ludicrous and impractical, and would require constant improvement as people find more ways to get around it. URL blacklists are useless as it is trivial to create millions of different URLs for a single resource. Domain filtering is useless for the same reason, especially now that ICANN has opened up the TLD's for anybody to use. IP filtering would have far too many false positives due to the ubiquitous nature of virtual hosting. Deep Packet Inspection would require far too many resources to be practical. Encryption (SSL) makes DPI useless anyway. There is no technology that could adequately filter peer-to-peer content or any one of the

thousands of other data transfer protocols on the Internet. It is simply not possible to create an effective filter.

Q13:

Education programs to alert parents to the dangers of unsupervised Internet usage. This is the role of parents, not government.

Q14:

It can't. The existing controls are adequate. Penalties need to be enforced.

Q15:

If content is distributed in Australia it should have classification markings clearly visible before the content is acquired.

Q16:

There should be no regulation of content, only classification.

Q17:

Yes. There is no way the government can effectively classify all content.

Q18:

All content, with an advisory body available for consultation and an ombudsman to handle complaints.

Q19:

No.

Q20:

The MA15+ category is confusing. People don't understand the difference between M and MA.

Q21:

There is a definite need for an R18+ rating on games and the M and MA ratings should be merged. M should fall under PG.

Q22:

I think it's irrelevant as long as it's consistent across all media types.

Q23:

Absolutely.

Q24:

Child pornography should be prohibited.

Q25:

No. RC is far too restrictive. Examples are various computer games which have been refused classification as well as consensual sex acts between adults which are deemed "offensive". Detailed information about drug use is also important as education is the key to safe drug use however this is currently refused classification.

Q26:

Yes. If these laws aren't consistent across states it will be impossible for industry to properly classify and for consumers to understand what is legal and where.

Q27:

There should be a federal classification department with an advisory board and an ombudsman for complaints. There should also be an independent review process to prevent corruption.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

The amount of content that is refused classification in Australia is absurd. It has been developed on puritan values with little regard given to adults who wish to choose the content that they consume. Any future classification scheme should recognize that adults should be free to choose what content they view as long as everybody involved in the content creation is consenting. It is important to recognize the diversity of opinions and that the values of an advisory board are not necessarily representative of the values of every aspect of Australian society.

Other comments: