

CI 1483 J Curcuruto

First name: James

Last name: Curcuruto

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework should be the focus. There are a few glaring omissions and issues but once these are corrected

Q2:

To provide a fair, balanced and adult approach to content classification across all media without discriminating against specific technologies.

Q3:

No. The technology used to access content should never affect whether the content should be classified - the only basis to judge content classification upon should be the content itself.

Q4:

Yes.

Q5:

Political impact should have no bearing on classification. Psychological impact on the viewer of content should. Content for children should be classified across all media in order to ensure a balanced approach across the spectrum

Q6:

No. Firstly, because the market position of producers and distributors fluctuates over time, so what could have a small impact originally may dramatically change as the producer/distributor grows in size (the opposite is also true of course). Content should always be approached from a neutral standpoint and judged purely on the nature of the content itself.

This could lead to potential

Q7:

No. All artworks should be made available to the public - if artwork is considered to be unsuitable for children it is the parents responsibility to restrict their child's access, not the government.

Q8:

In my opinion the current music/audio scheme is sufficient.

Q9:

No. The potential size and composition of audiences is almost impossible to predict accurately and effectively.

Q10:

No. If content is unsuitable for children, parents are responsible for controlling access to it.

Q11:

Content should be classified based on what age group the content is suitable for.

Q12:

Assuming that access needs to be controlled so that minors are not exposed to inappropriate material, the most effective method is parental supervision.

Q13:

Education, for both parents and children. Parents should be shown how to restrict their child's access via the numerous methods available, and children should be educated on how to use the internet in a fun and safe way. Where this is not possible and access must be controlled, requiring proof of age such as credit card or drivers license details could potentially be used.

Q14:

Vendors must always see proof of age prior to selling such materials.

Q15:

When the content is deemed inappropriate for certain age groups.

Q16:

Continued education of parents, children and consumers in general. Clear, concise, simple regulations that allow the public to make informed choices and give industry a firm platform to market their content to the appropriate audience without confusion or fear of censorship.

Q17:

Impossible to answer this question effectively without knowing the details of such a code. Industry is relatively competent at classifying content. This should continue as long as this remains the case.

Q18:

Movies, TV shows and computer games.

Q19:

There should be a financial ceiling up to which point the government will subsidise classification. For example, any works that cost up to \$50,000 to create should have their classification subsidised.

Q20:

The lack of an R18+ classification for computer games is confusing, purely due to the fact that it does not exist.

Q21:

Yes. R18+ classification needs to be introduced for computer games urgently. A glaring omission in the developed world and one which does not allow Australian adults to make informed choices about which games they purchase (and potentially drives them to piracy/ the black market/ other illegal means to obtain this content). The lack of an R18+ rating for computer games is also a form of censorship, which should not be permitted in a free democracy such as Australia. Adults should be free to make adult choices about the content they consume.

Q22:

A standard logo / rating system should be agreed upon between industry and government so that the consumer is always provided with a clear indication of the content's classification.

Q23:

N/A

Q24:

Firstly, it is technologically impossible to entirely prohibit any content online. Prohibition only drives illegal/unwanted content underground and has major potential pitfalls such as impacting freedom of speech amongst other things. If content is deemed to be so unsuitable that accessing it is illegal, it is up to the police to detect and prosecute.

Q25:

In relation to computer games, the RC category refuses a large amount of content that is actually suitable for adults. This needs to be rectified ASAP by the introduction of an R18+ category.

Q26:

Yes. There should be a consistent and fair classification law applied federally in order to ensure consumers in each state have an equal and balanced idea of what content is suitable for which age group.

Q27:

Anything that provides a consistent and balanced approach to classification catering to ALL age groups

Q28:

Yes, as long as the new framework is appropriate for the modern world.

Q29:

Other comments:

I believe the formatting of the above submission form has prevented a large amount of respondents from replying, due to some questions being vague and inconcise. Also a lack of general media coverage will have contributed to the small number of responses.

That said, in my opinion the only real glaring oversight in the current classification system is the lack of an R18+ rating for video games. Correct this issue and Australia will finally be on a level playing field with the rest of the world (and cease being ridiculed by the international community for a ridiculous censorship regime).