

CI 1305 M Yarrick

First name: Mason

Last name: Yarrick

Q1:

Q2:

To provide recommendations to parents as to the nature of the content of a piece of media to aid in making decisions regarding what their children will be exposed to. Also to inform consumers of media about the content of said media, so that they may make an informed decision about what to consume/not consume. It should NOT prohibit consenting adults from consuming any content that they wish to; that decision should be made at the discretion of that adult only.

Q3:

Yes. Classifying specific types of media such as television shows, movies and computer/video games is an easily regulated, standard procedure as there are well established channels/mediums for distribution of this content. The Internet is essentially impossible to regulate in this sense because of its scale and the ability for individuals to create and distribute content at any time. Moreover, one of the founding principles of the Internet is a free, open network that is not regulated by anyone. That principle is one of the factors that has allowed the Internet to grow into what it is today. We must embrace that approach (we certainly reap the benefits of it) and impose the responsibility of controlling access to minors to the parties that should already be doing this: parents.

Q4:

Q5:

Where possible, content designed for children should be classified. However, in cases where it cannot be, parents must take responsibility for what their own children are exposed to.

Q6:

No

Q7:

The definition of "artworks" is very broad. However, anything that is classified should provide consumer advice only and never restriction from content. Adults should have the right to decide what they do/don't expose themselves to.

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Access to online content should only be controlled for minors. As online content is accessible from literally millions of different locations across the country, by anyone, access to online content can only be controlled by parents. The idea that someone may make a decision about what content I may or may not access is, frankly, insulting. I am a consenting, mature adult and am more than capable of making that determination for myself. Classifying media is one thing; controlling access to it is entirely another. I especially object to the idea of a "blacklist" of sites when the list is inaccessible by members

of the public; that removes any transparency or objectivity from the process. As an IT professional I also understand the technical implications of imposing any kind of deep-inspection filtering process and object to anything that negatively impacts the already-outdated Internet service we receive in Australia.

Q13:

By educating parents and placing expectations/obligations onto them as to the content that children access online.

Q14:

I don't believe there's an issue with how they are controlled now.

Q15:

When that content has been classified and received a classification rating.

Q16:

Q17:

I think that this approach would be fine, however it may require some light governance activities by a government body to ensure that agreed standards are adhered to.

Q18:

Q19:

I can see a case for all classification activities to be subsidised by the government because any requirement for content to be classified would be imposed by the government in the first place.

Q20:

I personally understand the existing classification categories.

Q21:

There is a particular need in Australia for an R rating for games. There needs to be recognition that games are no longer intended for (or played by) children alone; in fact, the average age of a gamer is now 30. This would allow games that are currently refused classification to be sold legally in Australia to adults, as well as ensuring that some games currently rated down to MA in order to be allowed into Australia to be better classified to provide consumer advice to parents.

Q22:

I don't think this is required; anyone that is interested in a particular rating for a piece of media should have the capacity to find a rating label.

Q23:

Q24:

None. There is a case for prohibiting access to things such as child pornography (which has been the obvious catalyst/excuse for the concept of the internet filter), but surely the perpetrators of crimes such as that are to be pursued primarily? Not prohibiting access to content is NOT the same as condoning its existence; the Internet was created to be a free and open network and we should participate in that rather than making decisions on behalf of our citizens as to what is right/moral and what isn't. Furthermore, prohibiting access to anything online is not going to stop its distribution (we've seen that time and again with things like MP3s and movie downloads); it will only unfairly penalize ordinary individuals.

Q25:

No; I maintain that nothing should be refused classification online. As an adult, I expect the right to decide which media I consume, regardless of its content.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

At a minimum, introduce an R rating for games.

Other comments: