

CI 513 D Judge

First name: Daniel

Last name: Judge

Q1:

Improve the existing framework. While I think that eventually a whole new framework that better accounts for a more global, net connected and interactive media production & consumption environment that we now live in needs to be devised, for the purposes of this inquiry at this time the focus should be on improving the existing framework.

Q2:

To allow people to make an informed decision as to the general content 'level' of media before they purchase it (or allow their children to consume it). This should be standardised and practical and always (where classification is practical) related to the actual content itself without making value judgements or assumptions about the 'target' audience of the manner & medium in which it is consumed. It should also always err on the side of allowing adults to view and consume material that they, as adults, choose to consume, so long as viewing that material does not violate laws (most specifically in regard to child protection).

Q3:

The speed and ease at which content on the internet can be produced and changed makes case by case classification of individual content items largely impractical. However perhaps a scheme of voluntary classification could be derived where websites targeting an Australian market can brand their material/site with appropriate classifications so as to indicate their content 'level' to audiences. Enforcing Australian classifications upon overseas material is impractical and I feel the social good from a generally free exchange of ideas and information outweighs the potential negatives that could arise from enforcing a pre-approval process on all internet (or changeable, community driven) based content.

Q4:

Again, practical considerations mean that classifying some material, even if a complaint is received, is likely to be either unenforceable or be the equivalent of swatting a fly with a cricket bat (for example a does a single user comment on a blog end up causing the entire blog to be classified RC or R18+ ?)

Q5:

Content designed for children should be classified across all media where possible, yes.

Q6:

To an extent, yes. Again due to the practical limitations of classifying all content, priority should be given to classifying that content which is more likely to be more pervasive or widely viewed (ie mass media such as television etc)

Q7:

Places that physically exhibit artwork should be encouraged to provide consumer advice as to the nature of the material in the exhibit so that adults can make informed decisions about what they choose to view or expose their children to.

Q8:

Providing consumer advice as to the nature of content they can be expected to be exposed to by listening to the material should be enough. Classification perhaps, regulation no. Audio books should ideally be treated the same as books.

Q9:

As a matter of prioritising which content is classified then more widespread mass market material should undergo classification before smaller niche audience items.

Q10:

Ideally the nature of the content itself should be what affects it's classification rating, but any system should err on the side of allowing adults in their own homes to be the ultimate arbiters in deciding what to access, but where possible allow adults to make informed decisions on content aimed at children.

Q11:

The practicalities of implementing a classification system upon respective media. ie user generated content on various websites is next to impossible to police. The onus would be upon sites that wish to target specific audiences to try to keep their content within those limits. As such much online content classification would by necessity be voluntary advice to consumers. Any framework should possibly include a classification for "content viewed here is subject to change and may include adult content" or something that essentially flags a website or service as 'enter at own risk'. Also, the real danger to kids is NOT coming across some random accidental porn picture. The danger is peer based bullying, especially when that can become viral and go global and predators who may trick them or rely upon their immaturity to influence them into bad decisions. NONE of which is addressed in any way shape or form by filters or classification systems.

Q12:

For adults, really nothing unless it's opt-in type filters or walled gardens. In regard to kids. Education of parents. Parents need to not only be aware of what their kids are accessing online but also take steps to understand the technology and the online ecosystem. Any "filter" will be gotten around by more tech savvy kids. There is no easy answer to this despite the wishes of politicians and conservatives. The only answer is parents need to be educated and take an interest in their kids. Beyond that, giving parents the tools to assist in this, such as optional home/pc based filters.

Q13:

As said, Also, the real danger to kids is NOT coming across some random accidental porn picture or unclassified material. The danger is peer based bullying, especially when that can become viral and

go global and predators who may trick them or rely upon their immaturity to influence them into bad decisions. NONE of which is addressed in any way shape or form by filters or classification systems. This can only be combatted by education and awareness, so, also, as said above, Education of parents. Seriously. Ram it into the parent's skulls that they need to not only be aware of what their kids are accessing online but also take steps to understand the technology and the online ecosystem. Any "filter" will be gotten around by more tech savvy kids. There is no easy answer to this despite the wishes of politicians and conservatives. The only answer is parents need to be educated and take an interest in their kids. Beyond that, giving parents the tools to assist in this, such as optional home/pc based filters. Realistically, to restrict kids access to content, only a whitelist site only internet access or some other 'walled garden' type net environment where people/kids can only access specifically pre-approved content. Anything else is a false sense of security that pretends to protect kids online, but really does no such thing.

Q14:

Is this really a problem? It's all about point of sale.

Q15:

Places such as... When display of an item is in a public place. Prior to transmission of broadcast material. At point of sale. Advertising for said content. Primarily at point of purchase for items sold.

Q16:

Provide advice to content producers. Provide education to users and parents. Government agencies can set the ratings and determine what types of content fall within the respective ratings. Industry bodies should attempt to adhere to these, ie if they produce content of a certain nature, apply an appropriate classification. Users should be educated about taking responsibility for their own actions and where possible apply the ratings system to their content choices and those of their children

Q17:

Yes, perhaps. Respective industries could voluntarily self-classify their content. If content is self classified perhaps they'd be subject to periodic audits by government bodies. At point of sale it would be up to vendors to check for proof of age for R18+ or MA15+ material. This would include online purchases (although coming up with a way to do this properly would be fun).

Q18:

R18+ material and X rated material. Egregious gory violence. Possibly more, but that stuff should be damn obvious.

Q19:

Yes. Getting material classified shouldn't cost anything really, especially in regard to the independent/non-corporate nature of many content producers.

Q20:

Yes. Sometimes i think the RC and X classifications cause confusion. ie the often RC stuff is perfectly

fine and where X is allowed or not (ie what states etc) & the difference between X and R18 etc. MA+ MA M situation is a bit confusing also. Maybe change M to "Teen" or something.

Q21:

Get rid of RC, make a new classification to denote specifically Illegal sexual content. And also make a new classification for, "this could be perfectly fine but some tosser might submit a picture of hardcore porn which moderators may not remove in time to prevent you from seeing it so just be aware that by entering this content area you could inadvertently be exposed to something that you may not otherwise expect or desire" and/or maybe a simple "unregulated realm, enter at own risk, and don't let your kids in here unsupervised" (ie something for places like facebook, tumblr or imageboards etc)

Q22:

Just so long as there's a "user generated content" type classification ... otherwise, as far as look and feel of the branding, either keep it much the same as is, or try to implement a universal/global system (haha) Potentially items industry rated could be flagged (denoting they have been self rated and that the govt, classification board hasn't vetted it)

Q23:

I guess so. (?) ... or hey, Turn it into a wiki? ;-P

Q24:

Child Pornography.

Q25:

RC at this stage seems mostly meaningless. If it's illegal, declare it so and make it clear.

Q26:

Yes, but no idea how. (realistically, it should probably just be a federal issue)

Q27:

Give us an R18+ for video games for pete's sake! Get rid of the influence of State level Attorneys General. Ideally we should have a federal system for this.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Allow more public involvement without always to seemingly defer to the Christian lobby as arbiters of what Australians get to read, watch and play.

Factor in the increased flexibility for dynamic and changing and user generated content.

Other comments:

We should worry a whole lot less about trying to come up with meaningless "restrictions" upon access to content. Allow adults to make informed choices for themselves and their kids (ie an 18+ gaming

classification). And insofar as kids access to online content we should be worrying a whole lot more about issues like internet bullying, or things like an embarrassing/compromising photo/video going 'viral' and giving kids and parents the, knowledge, education, tools and skills to deal with such events. Also, worry less about unworkable filters, and instead target the producers of child porn or of abusive content. A dollar spent there will protect a lot more kids than a dollar spent on classifications restrictions or filters.

Any classification system, if attempted to be used as a means by which to prevent people & kids getting access to material, will always fail in the modern environment and act merely as a false sense of security for parents. Any classification based filter will only encourage parents into a more hands off "I don't understand all this new-fangled internet stuff" attitude, where realistically they need to be more informed and more hands on in actually taking an interest in their kids activities. Sometimes it seems that that is all 'too much hard work' for parents and they want the govt to legislate the boogeymen away. Alas it doesn't work that way. The best way forward is an informed and educated populace who are able to make informed and educated decisions about content. An R18+ rating on games goes a long way toward that, so too will ratings that can warn in regard to "user generated content"... So too will doing away with RC as a default classification for all sorts of things and instead give us a "THIS. IS. ILLEGAL" classification. And then if something about Euthanasia is stamped with a "THIS. IS. ILLEGAL" we can meaningfully discuss whether or not it should be classed as such.

In a free society we should always err on the side of allowing free and unfettered access to information and material. The exception to that is child porn. Anything else should be available but if unsuitable for kids, where practical, it should be marked in a manner that informs adults that that is the case. Keep it simple and stop coming up with ways that allows for people with religious agendas to try and sneak in their latest pet peeve, nanny tendencies, or bigotry into the system (they don't wanna look at certain stuff, they don't have to).

Child Porn = Bad. We can all agree on that.

Rate everything else in a unified system, where possible, on a scale.

R18+ (& X) Not suitable for kids.

G Suitable for kids.

And everything in between on a scale. (MA, M, PG, maybe change M to a basic TEEN)

Throw in a "changeable/user generated/unratable" flag for good measure/extra info.

Easy.

;-)