

CI 1065 J Murray

First name: Jack

Last name: Murray

Q1:

Q2:

To provide accurate information that assists consumers in making an informed choice about the content they wish to consume.

Q3:

Yes, it should be considered. The more interactive the content delivery platform is, the more impact the content it delivers has (in my view). This should be taken into account when classifying content.

Q4:

No. All content should be classified before release. Complaints should be investigated, and content reclassified if necessary.

Q5:

Content designed for children should be classified, or at least information should be provided so parents/guardians can make informed choices about what their children consume.

Q6:

No, each piece of material/content classified should be judged on its own.

Q7:

Perhaps not 'classified' as movies and games are but the type of content to be shown in an exhibition should be advertised ahead of time so consumers can choose whether or not to view it, or whether or not to bring children along etc.

Q8:

Yes, they should display similar warnings and information to movies and games.

Q9:

The intended audience should be considered when classifying material, but it should be classified objectively as much as possible. The size of the audience shouldn't be taken into account.

Q10:

Content designed to be accessed at home should still be classified.

Q11:

Q12:

If people want to access online content, they will. In my view there is no effective way to 'control' people's access to online content, short of a China-style internet filter, which is incompatible with Australia's liberal-democratic society. The best way to control access for children is to provide education, information, and technology to parents to allow them to set restrictions on their children as they personally see fit.

Q13:

As above, by giving parents/guardians the information, education, and technology they need to guide and monitor their children's online habits. A top-down government-mandated approach is never going to be effective, because of the myriad of ways people can access content online.

Q14:

In a similar way to movies and alcohol: asking for and checking ID at point of sale. But if kids want to see sexually-explicit imagery today, they'll use the internet.

Q15:

When it has been judged that the content may not be appropriate for all people. It comes down to giving people the information they need to choose appropriately based on their personal convictions/morality.

Q16:

Government agencies should review content and classify it, and provide information to enable users to make informed choices about content. Industry bodies should assist the government by adopting standards in-line with government standards and classify their own materials accordingly, before they are reviewed by the government. Adult users should be allowed to view what they want, and should have enough information at hand to make an informed choice regarding what content they choose to show their children.

Q17:

Yes, but only if industry bodies can show that they can honestly and reliably classify their own content in-line with government standards. If government and industry are working from different reference points as to what is and is not appropriate for a particular level of classification then such a scheme would not work.

Q18:

'Safe' material for younger children (e.g. things that fall well within the 'G' band now). Material that is obviously for adults only (e.g. R/X rated material). It is the in-between bands that have to be classified more carefully, particularly material on the MA/R threshold.

Q19:

Where the producers of content meet some sort of 'means test' that shows they could not afford to have their material classified (such as independent films produced under a certain budget/by an organisation under a certain size etc.)

Q20:

I think the M and MA categories are the most confusing. G is obviously for children, R obviously for adults etc. But personally I think a lot of MA material could probably/should probably be rated R, whereas many people seem to think that MA material is closer to M.

Q21:

The MA category is the problematic one for me. Personally I think it should become MA 17+ rather than MA 15+. The R category should be anything that falls outside MA, and should be restricted to purchase/viewing by adults or those accompanied by adults. To be honest, children can be accompanied to MA movies and so on now, and a lot of the content in those is little more suitable for children than R content is/would be.

Q22:

Movies and games particularly should follow the same guidelines, with consideration given to the interactive nature of games. The same bands should apply across all media, barring perhaps art exhibitions.

Q23:

Yes. The more centralised a classification scheme is, the more consistent and helpful it can be.

Q24:

None. If adults want to access content online, they will. Instead people should be educated about the potential for 'damaging' content to be accessed inadvertently by children, and parents should be provided with tools to help them personally supervise and guide their childrens' online habits. Also, those resources that would be dedicated to trying to prevent people from accessing content should be redirected to catching those who access illegal content (e.g. child pornography).

Q25:

I don't believe there should be an RC category. The type of content that falls under RC is likely to be appealing to a very limited number of people. No type of online content should be 'prohibited' but resources should be dedicated to catching those who access illegal content

Q26:

Yes very important. It should be promoted by having each states' classification laws align as closely as possible, and having them displayed in a central location with differences between them highlighted. National classification laws would be best.

Q27:

A single, national legislative scheme that covers all states and territories.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: