

CI 1159 T Jachimczak

First name: Tom

Last name: Jachimczak

Q1:

Q2:

A national classification scheme must only have the goal of informing the population on the content contained. It cannot be used to censor or restrict content. Items which are currently deemed "Classification refused" cannot be legally sold, yet this creates a loophole to prohibit sales of these items without review. It is not the job of a classification board to decide what is savoury or unsavoury - it is their job to clearly label what the content is.

Q3:

Content that is physically distributed (Audio CDs, DVDs, Console and PC software) should be classified if it is being sold within Australia, however media that is distributed via downloads or the like simply cannot be kept track of. Attempting to do so will only prove futile.

Q4:

Q5:

Classifying ALL the content for children online on websites is simply not a feasible task. However, content physically sold on media such as CD, DVDs and the like should be classified - no matter what the audience.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No, doing so would open too many Orwellian possibilities.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No. The classification should provide an indication on whether it should be accessed/displayed in a public place.

Q11:

Q12:

For every method of restricting access, there are (often easy/simple) methods to circumvent the restriction. This has already been shown to be the case by the major communications providers.

Q13:

Through parents engaged in their children rather than through national schemes. Parents can purchase software to protect their children (such as NetNanny and many others). There was even a free version of this software that was offered to Australians. The incredibly poor uptake however, should clearly indicate that parents simply aren't that worried.

Q14:

It is currently well controlled.

Q15:

When it is being purchased.

Q16:

The government and industry should merely provide information to users, such as is currently provided on DVDs and music. It is the role of the users to ensure that we follow the guides shown to choose for ourselves what we want to view/purchase. For example, no-one should be complaining about foul language in a cinema if a classification shown at the start says MA - Frequent Strong Coarse Language. Better informed consumers are able to make a personal choice if they or their children should be viewing/purchasing content.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Yes, excellent idea.

Q20:

The classifications are understood (except why all media except computer games can be rated R) though most often these classifications are not strongly adhered to. This most strongly applies to content rated M and MA, where most Australians allow children well under the suggested age to view/access the content.

Q21:

There should only be one set of classification categories across all media, no matter what it is.

Q22:

All content should be classified to the same criteria and clearly marked across all physical media.

Q23:

Absolutely.

Q24:

Trying to prohibit content online will only result in the people wanting to access it finding ways around the system and an overall complacency in regulatory bodies.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Absolutely, there should be no reason for the same content holding different ratings in different states.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: