

CI 1511 R Pedley

First name: Richard

Last name: Pedley

Q1:

Improve on key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

To bring the classification scheme into line with the technological reality of the modern world. The way information is consumed, created, distributed and exchanged has changed drastically since the establishment of the current scheme. The major objective should be the right of the (adult) individual to decide what content they consume.

Q3:

No. Ignoring for a moment that this may present issues in future - technology has and will continue to evolve in ways that we cannot accurately predict - why should a person in essence be penalised or discriminated against simply due to the way they choose to access content? It becomes a question of what is being regulated, the content or the platform. It should most certainly be content focussed.

Q4:

It is simply impossible for all content to be classified, so yes.

Q5:

I take issue with the framing of this question - is it one question or is it two?

Whether content designed for children should be classified should be determined in the same manner as any other content.

As far as potential impact influencing whether there is a classification or not, classification should not be refused merely because of potential impact.

Q6:

Absolutely not. Content produced by an unnamed individual should be subject to the same standards as content produced by the world's largest corporation.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

Yes - the tests for classification should be clear and objective enough that they can apply to any medium.

Q9:

No. Content should be classified on its individual characteristics.

Q10:

No. Content should be classified on its individual characteristics.

Q11:

Q12:

I think there are no effective methods. People will access the content they want to access. Any efforts to curtail this are easily circumvented and really just make the consumer more determined to continue to consume the content.

The only realistic outcome is to foster the creation of other content that is more "desirable" to shift the incentives away from that which is deemed not desirable.

Q13:

Parental supervision. Ultimately what is fit for a child to consume is a matter for each parent to determine. Parents will not let children watch excessively violent or sexually explicit material on television. How do they make this judgment and enforce their rules? By monitoring their child's behaviour. It is not unreasonable to expect similar vigilance for online content.

Q14:

I'm not sure that it can or should be. It is difficult for minors to obtain and that is where it should end. Adults should be able to access this material if they so choose.

Q15:

When it is not suitable for children, contains violence or sexually explicit material.

Q16:

Simply one of providing classifications - a signposting role to inform the public of the nature of the content they are seeking to consume. Nothing more than that, and save where the content itself is illegal (i.e. child pornography) none of these participants should be seeking to prevent access to content by adults. Children of course must be more limited, however ultimately the responsibility rests with the parents to decide what content is suitable for their children.

Industry bodies have the same role as government agencies in this respect - one of signposting the nature of the content to be consumer by the user.

Q17:

Yes, to an extent. The industry has proven to be rather effective at self regulation - advertising being the example that comes to mind. This would be suitable for "traditional" media, provided the penalties for serious breaches of the code are properly structured.

For new and online media this model would obviously not work and there is a role for government agencies to classify online material where necessary or appropriate.

Q18:

Q19:

This depends on the model adopted. If the government insists on classifying the content then it should also bear at least a portion of the costs of doing so rather than potentially preventing content creators from being able to release artistic works. Perhaps a model based on the number of classifications that have been submitted for classification would be useful. For example, if the independent film is the only film submitted for classification in the preceding 12 months then it receives the maximum subsidy. The more material submitted for classification in that timeframe the lower subsidy received.

This has the result that the larger content creators will bear more or most of the cost.

Q20:

MA, RC. The distinction between M and MA is seen as arbitrary and meaningless. People do not realise the implications of an RC classification.

Q21:

It is quite simply absurd that there are different categories for different content types. That you can have an R rated movie but not an R rated video game beggars belief.

Q22:

See Q21.

Q23:

Yes - see Q21.

Q24:

ONLY illegal content. Child pornography, for example. Nothing else should be entirely prohibited, including pornography containing consenting adults of all types, what is termed as "excessive gore" etc. If people wish to consume such content then that is their right and choice.

Q25:

Absolutely not.

Q26:

It is important. It should be promoted by a national standard.

Q27:

Q28:

Very broad question. It would depend on the framework to be established. If the framework was one of censorship, filters and unpublished blacklists with little oversight then absolutely not. Such an Orwellian scheme is unacceptable and I would hope that the various States adopted their own more reasonable frameworks. There may then be scope for a sort of "forum shopping" whereby the State with the most reasonable laws sees more content creation and distribution.

Q29:

Transparency. If something is refused classification then the public deserves the right to know WHY. If something is added to some sort of filter or blacklist, the public must know WHY. It is not the role of government to dictate what people can and cannot view and where the public's rights are limited in this sense then the government must be accountable.

Other comments: