

CI 1459 L Brown

First name: Lee

Last name: Brown

Q1:

The focus should be on classification rather than restriction. Any restricted content should have clear grounds for its status and a simple means for appeal for the status.

Q2:

The primary objectives of the national classification scheme should be to grade content based on clear criteria, and then leave the restriction of the content to the end-user

Q3:

To a degree. Physical content ( dvds, cds , video games discs etc) should be classified because they do not change once the product has been reviewed.

Intangible content ( internet sites, youtube, etc) should not be required to be classified by default.

Because it would amount to chasing your own tail. There are so many media files created and posted daily that you will never be able to keep up. Also a media file from the internet could be slightly modified and be reposted on a different site which would require it to be reclassified, this is a ridiculous concept and should be discarded completely.

Another concept to consider here is an approval stamp where a site could apply to be approved by the classification board. This would be a voluntary classification, but would work for child friendly sites.

Q4:

Absolutely. See my response to Q3. Intangible content ( internet sites etc) should not be required to be classified by default.

Q5:

No. No more than any other age group. The Idea of the classification should be to give meaningful grades to the content.

Q6:

No it should not.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

No.

Audio books definately not. If the book is not required to be classified why should a recording of the book.

Q9:

Yes. If a short film is produced for an event with a limited audience then it should not need to be classified.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

There are no effective methods to control access to online content.

Q13:

By their parents.

Q14:

It does not need to be better controlled. It is fine the way it is. They are already wrapped and obscured in the stores.

Q15:

When it is on sale. Allow the salepoint to restrict the sale to the correct age group.

Q16:

Government agencies should have as little input as possible in the regulation of content. The governments role should be to put the rules in place and to oversee any industry bodies to make sure that they are following them.

Users should be able to find out why content has been classified the way it has and to question the classification.

Q17:

yes.

Q18:

Adult content/Porn . This content is clearly not for children and if the industry marks it as such then should be classified that way.

Q19:

The government should subsidise the classification of all Australian content.

Q20:

I believe the existing categories are understood. The only categories that could be confusing is the difference between M and MA15+

Q21:

Yes there needs to be a category for unclassified material. maybe UC18+

Consider low-budget short and indie films. The existence of an unclassified category would allow these to be distributed without having to pay for a further classification.

Q22:

Yes. There needs to be equivalent 18+ ratings for video games. Video games are not just for children.. Look at the demographics of the gaming community. The majority of people that play games are > 18.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Here is the slippery slope.

We all agree that access to child-pornography should be prohibited.

But that should be the whole extent of the prohibition

Q25:

No. It is too broad. And has no oversight.

Q26:

Yes. All states and territories should have access to materials from G to X18+.

You wont need to promote it. It will promote itself ( Sex sells)

If instead you are asking how do you sugar coat it for the fundamentalist christians. Then the answer is Dont.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes. It should be a standard classification system that is consistent, and the only way to do that is to have the commonwealth involved.

Q29:

Allow unclassified content to be available to adults.

Other comments: