

CI 936 M Gillick

First name: Mark

Last name: Gillick

Q1:

Focus on improving the existing framework to standardise classification across all media

Q2:

To bring consistency across all media so people may make informed choices regarding the content to which they are exposed

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes. It would be extremely time-consuming, ridiculously costly, impractical and cumbersome to regulate all types of media information. Also, I would add that content that is subject to a complaint need only be reviewed for the necessity of classification, not subjected to mandatory classification.

Q5:

Yes.

With regard to practicality, yes.

Q6:

No

Q7:

No

Q8:

As long as the criteria for classification and regulation are not unreasonably restrictive or draconian, then yes, media should be classified uniformly, regardless of type.

Q9:

No

Q10:

As long as the decision to access the content is left in the hands of the end user (or, if applicable, their parent/guardian), then the venue should not affect the media's classification

Q11:

The target audience

Q12:

Individual responsibility and adequate parental/guardian supervision is the most effective way of controlling access to online content. It should not be the task of government to act as a parent. It's role in this area should be limited to that of an advisor.

Q13:

Via adequate parental supervision.

Q14:

Via adequate parental supervision and enforcement of point-of-sale restrictions

Q15:

At all times.

Q16:

The role of government in this area should be that of an advisor to the public.

Q17:

Industry should have an input into the regulatory process, but complete self-regulation is often abused. The government role should extend to the development a consistent framework (in partnership with relevant industry input), with oversight, of the regulation of content

Q18:

There should be governmental oversight of all content, with the regulatory authority only stepping in if there are numerous public complaints to the appropriateness of the classification assigned by the relevant industry. In this case, the government should act as an impartial third party to the disputed classification and review it.

Q19:

If the content is subject to classification, then that cost should be borne by the entity requiring the classification.

Q20:

Generally, the categories are understood. Any confusion is encountered where the levels of classification are not consistent across media.

Q21:

There is a clear need for a new 'R18+' category for computer media.

Q22:

The current system seems quite adequate to convey levels of classification, it just needs to be uniformly applied.

Q23:

Uniformity in classification criteria should be actively pursued.

Q24:

Blanket filtering of content is open to abuse (on the side of the regulator, perhaps under pressure from special interests or other governmental elements). I would advocate that it is the job of the police to investigate and if necessary, prosecute those involved in online criminal activity.

Q25:

With my (admittedly incomplete) understanding of content that would be refused classification, yes.

Q26:

Yes, there should be uniformity of classification laws across all states. The current system where any one dissenting Attorney General can effectively sabotage debate and stifle new classifications being enacted country-wide (as in the case of an 18+ category for computer media) needs to end. If there is dissent, the matter should be put to a vote with the majority view prevailing.

Q27:

A co-operative scheme for classification is to be desired, but not to the extent that a few dissenters can sabotage the classification process.

Q28:

With regard to the final authority on areas of contention, power should reside with the Commonwealth

Q29:

Uniformity of frameworks across media types

Other comments:

If nothing else comes from this review, an 'R18+' category should be introduced, with vaguely the same criteria of that which applies to movies. Computer media is not (nor has it ever really been) the preserve of children and, as adult consumers, Australians deserve to have the final say in what media they are exposed to.