

CI 1499 D Stevens

First name: Dominic

Last name: Stevens

Q1:

The existing classification scheme should be able to be made current, it seems only deficient with regards to more modern forms of content.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to update the scheme so that it is able to make a judgement where particular piece of content sits without being so rigid that content is excluded simply because the scheme does not already possess a method by which to evaluate it.

Any classification scheme should concern itself only with ensuring that the content it is classifying is made available or restricted depending on the laws regarding the content, not pass moral judgement.

Q3:

The technology should not be a factor, it is conceivable that a new medium of content creation might exist next year that is significantly different to any current mediums as to render a platform specific classification scheme ineffective.

Q4:

A classification scheme is helpful even if only to allow a consumer to choose what they experience. A properly transparent classification scheme could pass the responsibility to the content creator, allowing them to declare that they have met a particular classification. A formal review would then be necessary only in the event of a complaint.

Q5:

Potential impact could only be assessed if the content was already under review so in that sense, the content would already have been the subject of classification for the question to even arise. Content for children should definitely be classified across all media.

Q6:

The size or market position of content producers affects the impact their content will have, and so yes larger producers should have to classify their content.

Q7:

Only to provide consumer advice.

Q8:

Only to provide consumer advice.

Q9:

Yes, it should be a consideration.

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

Access to online content should not be restricted. If content is unlawful, action could be taken against the producers or hosting services.

Q13:

The responsibility lies with the parent spending time with their children, not having their access controlled.

Q14:

There is no need to change this.

Q15:

When it is available in a place where those it is unsuitable for have easy access to it.

Q16:

The only regulation that should take place is police action if content is unlawful, any other content should be merely classified so that the consumer can decide for themselves what they access.

Q17:

Yes, this would allow industry to understand exactly what was expected of it from the outset and reduce the uncertainty involved in submitting content for classification. This would also reduce administrative efforts as the classification filter would be present through every step of the content creation.

Q18:

The classification scheme should be straightforward enough to allow industry to classify all of their content. If the classification was any more complex, it is already too inefficient to be effective.

Q19:

A classification scheme that is transparent enough and communicated properly would not impact industry enough to warrant a subsidy.

Q20:

Q21:

There needs to be an R18 rating for digital content including computer games.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes, the more transparent the classification scheme, the easier it will be to follow for content producers, and it will produce more predictable results.

Q24:

The only content that should be prohibited is content that is not considered lawful.

Q25:

No, currently the RC category reflects the schemes inability to correctly process content.

Q26:

Consistency is definitely important, any difference of classification between states would increase costs of compliance, complexity of distribution and allow opportunity for loopholes. All of these would be bad for consumers as content creators, particularly small ones, might see such a system as too complex to want to get involved with.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: