

CI 1286 M Kwan

First name: Matthew

Last name: Kwan

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

To inform consumers of the nature of the media before purchase.

Q3:

Yes, the technology or platform should affect whether content should be classified. It is a question of practicality. For some technologies, classification is simply not possible, for example live-streaming from a different country.

Q4:

No, the intent of classification is to inform the consumer. So either all content is classified, or none. Or classified voluntarily by the publisher.

Q5:

Yes, the potential impact of a medium should affect whether it is classified.

No, content designed for children should not be classified across all media, only media where everything is classified. Of course, publishers may choose to voluntarily classify their product, irrespective of media.

Q6:

No, unless the act of classification imposes substantial costs, in which case small producers will need special consideration to avoid being locked out of the market.

Q7:

There should be voluntary classification for the purposes of providing consumer advice. But never for restricting access.

Q8:

No, but voluntary classification is fine.

Q9:

No. It is not feasible to predict audience sizes in advance.

Q10:

No. You don't know in advance where it will be accessed, so there's no point making the distinction.

Q11:

Q12:

Remove the offending material at the source. If the government knows the IP address and/or URL of the offending material, have it deleted from the host machine and arrest the publisher. After all, child pornography is illegal in every jurisdiction on earth.

Q13:

Depends on the age of the child. Very young children need adult supervision. Teenagers should be left to their own devices - the internet is good training for the real world.

Q14:

By removing it at the source if it's illegal. For restricted content, unless you can come up with a foolproof way to check someone's age and current jurisdiction, control isn't possible.

Q15:

When it contains moving images (movies, DVDs, TV shows) and the provider is under Australian jurisdiction.

Q16:

Government agencies should ensure that media that require classification are classified. Government agencies should carry out classifications in a fair and transparent manner.

Q17:

Possibly, but I don't know the current arrangements well enough.

Q18:

"Obvious and straightforward" is irrelevant. If ACMA can do classification, so can private industry, using the same procedures. So long as classifications remain consistent, it doesn't matter who does them.

Q19:

Although I agree in principle, subsidised classification would be too expensive - there are too many short films made every day. Maybe small independent films should be allowed to self-classify, with penalties for serious misrepresentation.

Q20:

The existing classifications are fine.

Q21:

The existing classifications are fine.

Q22:

I don't think it's possible. Classifications that apply to movies are irrelevant when it comes to, say, ringtones.

Q23:

Yes. They both involve moving images and sound, so it makes sense to consolidate them.

Q24:

Access to child pornography, involving actual children, should be prohibited by removing it at the source.

Q25:

Yes, although it should be reduced in scope to only cover content that is illegal worldwide.

Q26:

Consistency is very important. If a product is legal in one state, it should automatically be legal in all of them.

Q27:

Use a scheme where the loosest state/territory regulation applies nationwide, so it requires a consensus to restrict anything. That reflects the current mail-order environment.

Q28:

Only if the Commonwealth agrees to consult the states, and not restrict anything against a state's wishes.

Q29:

As a matter of consumer choice, media content should be required to disclose any edits, modifications, and censorship that have occurred to the original product. For example, TV broadcasts should disclose "25 seconds of violence were removed to achieve an M rating", or "3 minutes were removed to fit it into this timeslot".

Other comments: