

CI 123 K Czajko

First name: Kamil

Last name: Czajko

Q1:

Develop a whole consistent system that is uniform across all media where realistically feasible or better yet work with existing frameworks such as pegi to create a globally constant standard preferably one that is industry regulated to reduce the burden on tax payers. In Either case the current system should be scrapped as it is ineffective, does not provide enough information to consumers and is inconsistent.

Q2:

Providing clear choices and information for consumers and parents without acting as censor or pushing agendas. Transparency and efficiency with a clear arbitration process. Classification not regulation. Focus on self regulation against a set of criteria to keep tax payer costs low.

Q3:

Only in the case of scope to determine if classification should be attempted. As has been demonstrated with the Trillions of pages indexed by google, and the thousands of hours uploaded to youtube everyday day it would be completely impractical to attempt to classify all that content.

Q4:

Yes this is probably the best way to classify internet content but the complaint should not sway the direction of the classification. I would also recommend a voluntary system where a site provider could submit for classification their site to get approved classification which could be used as part of dedicated services to bring this content together. Eg a Kids only search engine or a search engine that could have a rating set to exclude content above level XYZ

Q5:

Impact should be taken into account but should not be the single most important factor. Please see response to Q4 for more details.

Q6:

Media with the largest exposure benefits most from classification as it gives the largest number of people the ability to make an informed decision.

Q7:

Optional Classification but not regulated.

Q8:

Classified but not regulated.

Q9:

Media with the largest exposure benefits most from classification as it gives the largest number of people the ability to make an informed decision.

Q10:

Public content should get preference to classification to give more information

Q11:

There should be an easy way to view Classification for content where consumption may occur part

way through eg detailed classification messages as an option on free to air television which can be brought up while a show is running.

Q12:

Police illegal content, make better awareness campaigns and create safe portals parents can set their children's browsers to.

Q13:

Safe portals, perhaps even a special kids browser parents can install and set as default that only allows access to a group of while listed sites. Promotion of the XXX domain suffix to allow those who wish to block content be more able to do so.

Q14:

A code of conduct for news stands and age restrictions for explicit material, but beyond that there is little that can be done.

Q15:

Visible at time of purchase for static items or items that are started by the user such as movies or games. Any time access for broadcasts.

Q16:

Industry should be responsible for classification, government to police breaches and users should have the final decision in what content they view and what they deem appropriate to show their children.

Q17:

Yes. The ESRB has been shown to be highly effective in the USA and the voluntary code of conduct has been shown to keep more restricted content from children than similar government initiatives.

Q18:

Industry should classify all material.

Q19:

In the case of government classification, the fee should be free or minimal and special provisions for cheap content should be made. Expecting an app which may sell a few hundred copies in Australia at less than a dollar to pay the current fees is not a workable solution.

Q20:

They are highly inconsistent. Publishing categories and the lack of R18 for video games are two primary examples. It is doubtful many are aware of the levels for publishing. M and MA are probably confused more often than they should.

Q21:

The same classification categories should be required across the board. New classifications should be created to take into account changing content such as user generated content (eg profane racial hate speech appearing in the comments appearing under an unrelated video on youtube) I would recommend a renaming of the MA category to separate it further from M so there is a clearer line between the two. Also Pornography should have consistent rating AU wide as in WA there is no X rating and instead it is bundled in R. There should be a default category for content that has not been rated.

Q22:

The same standard should be applied across the board.

Q23:

Yes. It is ridiculous they are not currently.

Q24:

I am completely opposed to any filter maintained by the ACMA as there too much potential for abuse due to lack of transparency and over reaching goals. The definitions are too broad and it does not protect anyone. The government should be putting the money into taking child pornography sites off line and working with the international community to remove those sites. The current proposals are easy to by pass, do not prevent the worst material from being accessible by those that want it and only create a burden for all law abiding individuals. They are only there as an expensive feel good exercise. To recap: Nothing.

Q25:

No. The RC category is too broad and restrictive and when user generated content is taken into account this could easily wipe sites off the internet. Consider an active attack by a group such as anonymous placing ASCII art into forum posts, on various sites which would then have them blocked under fetish provisions and without a transparent system or appeals process keep them off the internet for life. Also what is labeled as RC today is far from what most Australians would class as abhorrent especially when considering performing those acts and/or possessing footage of same are completely legal. Examples are application of substances such as candle wax, golden showers, bondage, spanking etc which coincidentally are allowed to be depicted and published in magazines and I would strongly argue that anyone actively seeking X rated content would not be offended by any of those, contrary to what is listed as RC material.

Q26:

The same system should be Australia wide, with no state exceptions or changes as this breeds confusion and allows individuals to fall afoul of the law when they believe they are acting legally.

Q27:

Industry Self Regulation.

Q28:

Yes but I would only support this to allow for the scrapping of government regulation and moving towards Industry Self Regulation and not to allow a lock down on current content and/or to force through laws to allow the mandatory internet filter.

Q29:

Reduce the red tape, save tax payer money, Allow Self Regulation. Education here is key. Permit and promote services that give users the choice to lock down the content accessible if that is what they want.

Other comments:

The current system is a collection of odd legislation from last century. It is not suited to how information is consumed now or in the future. It doesn't fit with what most Australians would believe to be right or just. Current systems add confusion due to treating content differently depending on how it is defined. We do not want to be a nanny state. We do not want our civil liberties eroded so that politicians can claim they are thinking of the children while implementing policies that are completely ineffective and would cripple the \$50 Billion infrastructure being rolled out. We need a system that is Self Regulated, doesn't get in the way of honest people and gives adults the choice to access the

content they deem fit to. We need NOT to have an internet filter. We need education and systems that allow parents to choose what content is accessible in their homes but this should be optional and not forced on everyone else.