

CI 772 N Smyth

First name: Nicholas

Last name: Smyth

Q1:

It should be looking to develop a new framework that will work with digital environment in which we now live. The scheme should not seek to classify every portal for media (e.g. YouTube) But should focus on classifying material that would be accessible to minors without parental supervision. I.e. Cinema's and shops that sell boxed media. I think that monitoring all media available on the internet is impossible and that providing guidelines for parents would be an easier way to help prevent minors accessing disturbing media.

Q2:

I think that the primary objectives of the scheme should be to:

1. Allow adults to be free to consume whatever media they so choose to consume.
2. Minors should be protected from material that may be disturbing or harmful to them.
3. Illegal material, such as child pornography and bestiality should be refused classification.

Q3:

No. The content in question should be the only factor that comes into consideration.

Q4:

Yes. This makes perfect sense for something where sheer quantity is an insurmountable obstacle for classification.

Q5:

This seems too subjective to me. I am not sure how you would measure impact.

Q6:

I do not believe so.

Q7:

I will take the assumption that by Artworks you are referring to paintings and sculptures etc. This seems ridiculous. If Michelangelo's David were to be shown, would we throw a restriction on seeing it because of the nudity? I think self regulation and classification by complaint should suffice for Art Works.

Q8:

I think that sheer volume would make it hard to classify every book and musical piece. If we were to classify existing books I think it would be unlikely that collections from the Brothers Grimm (such as Snow White) would still be available for children.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

No Comments here.

Q12:

I think that software provided to parents to limit content available on the internet is possible the best method. Combine this with classifying content upon complaint. As there are a myriad of ways for those who wish to bypass any filter to access illegal material, it is probably better for law enforcement to get to the sources and stop the perpetrators of these illegal activities.

Q13:

Locally installed filtering software and parental guidance.

Q14:

Sealed packaging or available only over the counter.

Q15:

When it is available in a place where minors would frequent normally.

Q16:

Industries should self regulate where no other regulation is provided.

Q17:

This sounds like a great idea.

Q18:

Where the sheer amount of content makes it impossible for the government body to classify.

Q19:

If there are prohibitive costs involved for smaller content creators, then this sounds great. I would hate to be left with only the rich producing content.

Q20:

Some media such as video games do not have an R18+ classification, which makes it seem that most of the content available in stores is suitable for persons over 15 years of age. I do not agree with this, and I do not agree with some content being refused classification because it cannot be fit into a lower category.

Q21:

There should be a blanket approach to classification. This would make it easier to distinguish what is suitable for consumption by minors.

Q22:

See Q21.

Q23:

See Q21.

Q24:

Child Pornography, bestiality and other such universally condemned material. These, as I understand it are already illegal and unable to be accessed online in means which minors are able to access.

Q25:

I think other than Child Pornography, and bestiality, RC can be too broad in its approach and leave too much to the subjectivity of the reviewer.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

A national framework would make it easier to discern what content is suitable for who. Travel is too cheap and frequent between the states that it is confusing and counter productive for each state and territory to have different classification schemes.

Q29:

Other comments: