

CI 1308 N Grant

First name: Nathan

Last name: Grant

Q1:

Yes. The current framework does not accurately give the consumer the correct framework to base their purchases on and is inconsistent over different media formats.

Q2:

To keep classification consistent over media formats and to better allow adults to see and watch what they want.

Q3:

Yes. Since the internet is such a large format, with billions of documents and over a hundred million websites, it would be impractical to try and classify it all. Parental supervision and individual assessment would be the only viable way for content to be properly assessed by the consumer. Clearly, this does not relate to websites and content that is already deemed illegal due to current laws in media.

Q4:

Traditional media, such as television, cinema and video games should be classified whether a complaint has been lodged or not, to help the consumer. Internet websites should be addressed in a case by case basis. However, blocking websites to the public that have not been classified should not be a course of action.

Q5:

It depends on how "potential impact" is judged. Since the debate on how media directly affects children and even adults has definitely not been cleared up, basing potential risk is a very slippery slope. Content designed for children should be classified with the rest of consumed media, however with the internet and online websites being such a large area to cover, attempting to classify all websites, regardless of whether or not it was made for children, would be close to impossible. At the very least impractical, expensive and time consuming.

Q6:

No. However, with the current way that classification is done and the fees associated with classification, independent artists and game designers are currently being shafted and it is not viable for them to create games or release games in Australia. This needs to be addressed.

Q7:

If practical. However blocking or banning artworks from public view before they are classified would not be an optimum outcome. If complaints are raised over artworks, then classification could be implemented so that the consumer can be informed that the artwork or gallery may contain some offensive works.

Q8:

If practical. However the way that classification is run currently, it would be difficult for independent artists to raise money to classify their works. If the monetary fee for classification was scrapped and the classification process streamlined, then applying classification to sound recordings would not be

objectionable. Online distribution and content would be thoroughly difficult and impractical, if not impossible to classify though. So a case by case basis judged on complaints would be a viable way to classify objectionable content online.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No. Classification is meant to allow consumers to know what they are purchasing and viewing before they view it. However, forced classification for independent media works, school projects etc. would not be practical. Case by case judgement could be shown based on if a work has had complaints raised around it.

Q11:

Online content. The internet is such a large format and it would be impractical or impossible to classify. Judging and classifying online content in a case by case basis would be the only viable way to try and classify websites for the consumer.

Q12:

Since websites and content that is currently illegal in Australia has not (and to be frank can not) been eradicated, attempting to control online content past it near impossible. If websites are flagged by complaints, then a case by case review of the website to determine that websites legality would be effective. Giving out a public list of websites that have been reviewed and classified to ISP or computer application developers who make child protection programs could help the consumer become more aware of a websites classification and in the case of internet filter (voluntary) software could provide a way to block children from accessing restricted sites.

Q13:

One way to help parents stop their children from accessing inappropriate material would be to develop (voluntary) internet filter software that provides parents and consumers access to a list of websites that have been classified. The software can be updated online as the list is updated, and the parents have control over what their children see online.

Q14:

By rating magazines, like movies and dvds are rated, would help the consumer to make better choices. However, under the current system, it is not practical. Streamlining the current classification system and eradicating the monetary fee would help industries to adapt to a national classification scheme and also help independent magazines and publications to survive.

Q15:

If practical, always.

Q16:

Government agencies to help contain illegal media and content, and to help with the classification of media for the general public. Industry bodies to give adequate information of their products to help classify material for the public. A users role is to help the government and industries to define what the publics standards are with content in order to keep classifications updated and current.

Q17:

Yes. Since the government currently hasnt put the needed resources into classifying material in a streamlined, easy way, co-regulatory models would improve the system.

Q18:

Books.

Q19:

Yes. Most definitely. Independent artists, music artists, film makers and publishers should all be subsidised.

Q20:

For the most part yes. The video games industry is currently extremely confusing due to inconsistent classification models being applied to it. The absence of an R18+ classification for computer games is not up to standard with current attitudes and should be amended.

Q21:

Yes, in the video games industry. An R18+ classification should be introduced to the industry. An X-rated classification for Australian states should also be implemented.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Content that involves unconsensual participants in creation or distribution. Such as child pornography, bestiality and rape.

Q25:

No. Currently RC content surrounding sexually explicit material does not reflect the content that should be prohibited online. The mere appearance of a participant should not be taken into account when classifying this material. If all participants are over the age of consent, and have given consent, then the government should not be applying laws refusing this material classification.

Q26:

Being consistent between states and territories is very important. Because territories enjoy access to X-rated material, they are seen as sin cities or havens for the sexually perverse. However, if it were allowed in all states and territories, then the territories would cease to have this connotation attached to them.

Q27:

A national classification scheme.

Q28:

Yes. This will keep zealous state leaders from blocking nation wide changes and improvements to classification systems.

Q29:

By being honest about classification. Consenting adults should be able to see, watch and hear what other consenting adults produce. Classification is for the benefit of the consumer and general public, regulation and classifying media helps the consumer to make better judgements when buying media products. However, refusing to classify (and in essence banning) material because a minority, or even a majority, do not like its contents is not the way a free country should conduct itself. If media is produced by, and consumed by, consenting adults it should be legal in Australia.

Other comments: