

CI 1367 W Buggy

First name: William

Last name: Buggy

Q1:

Improve the current framework.

Q2:

Create one rating system that is consistent between all content types that can be classified, as well as making clear what types of objectionable content belong in which rating and which types of product should be classified before public access is allowed.

Q3:

Yes. For example, while retail products can be safely classified, products solely distributed online are nearly impossible to properly classify due to sheer amount as well as the rapidly changing nature of some sites, and as such no attempt should be made to classify at all except in special circumstances.

Q4:

Yes, but classification should only be considered when there are a very large amount of complaints.

Q5:

Potential impact does not need to be considered. Content designed for children should be classified, but only when it would normally be classified anyway.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No, although the groups hosting the artworks should be encouraged to provide consumer advice if there may be some objectionable content.

Q8:

Music seems to work well under its current voluntary rating system, however the rating categories should be changed to match other content types. Audio books should be classified as if they were books, which also require rating categories that match the film, TV and video game categories.

Q9:

No. Audience size and demographics should never be important for classification purposes.

Q10:

No. Due to various distribution systems, accessing at home and accessing in public may as well be the same thing.

Q11:

Not that I can think of.

Q12:

To put it simply, it's impossible. No matter how good you patrol content, no matter how complex a filter that is put up, the majority of restricted content will still remain accessible, and more will be made before it can be caught. Thinking otherwise is foolish.

Q13:

This should be the responsibility of the parents. Educate them in ways that they can control content and the importance of watching what children are doing online.

Q14:

It's already very well controlled.

Q15:

Assuming we are dealing with the packaging of a product, consumer advice and any warnings should always be displayed, preferably on the back of the product. A classification marking should only require to be prominently visible on the front of the product if the content is restricted in some way (i.e. MA15+ and up) or unclassified, however, there should probably be a small classification marking somewhere.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

The pornography industry. Everything in that industry that's legal to sell will end up being rated X18+, so having a group to rate such works seems redundant.

Q19:

Smaller companies should be subsidised.

Q20:

Usually fine, however, the practice of making video games that would be classified R18+ OK for sale by changing content to make it R18+ essentially mashes those two ratings together, causing confusion.

Q21:

We do not need any new categories.

Q22:

Have all types of content use the same categorization system. Naturally, some things won't apply to some content types, but treating all works as "a product" instead of "a product of content type Y" will save on a lot of confusion.

Q23:

Q24:

Content depicting actual criminal behaviour should be prohibited, however, as stated before, it is impossible to block access to this content.

Q25:

I agree with the people who say that 'much of the material deemed RC in Australia would not be refused classification in other Western democratic liberal countries'. Adjust it so that it is more in line with what other countries would ban.

Q26:

Classification laws should be consistent between all states and territories. To do this, the laws should be decided on a federal level, instead of letting the individual states decide.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments:

Mainly, I'm concerned about the R18+ rating for video games and internet censorship. The former is something we've needed for a very long time and the latter is something that is completely infeasible with the methods that the government wants to use and generally a bad idea.