

CI 1539 D Cheai

First name: Dan

Last name: Cheail

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework, such as discretionary classification of interactive media, voluntary self-classification schemes for Australian internet content and a broadening of acceptable content guidelines.

Q2:

The sole objective of a national classification scheme should be to provide a framework for ensuring that the Australian public are INFORMED about the nature and content of the media they are purchasing / viewing. The classification scheme should not dictate or restrict the availability of media—such restrictions should be left in the hands of retailers and parents.

Q3:

Yes—mandatory classification efforts (by OFLC) should only be undertaken where the media in question is to be made available in physical form through public place where parental oversight cannot be reasonably assumed: public cinemas, retail and rental outlets.

Internet-based content should not be subject to mandatory classification, but self-classification guidelines should be made available to Australian content producers to allow for voluntary self-classification

Q4:

Only if the content in question is already subject to OFLC classification, or if there is significant complaint about self-classified content by a publisher subject to Australian judicial jurisdiction.

Q5:

If the content is to be made available via the media described in Q3, yes—all content should be classified, regardless of potential impact.

A directory of self-classified content with G and PG ratings should be compiled and reviewed and offered to the public as a "safe" repository of websites.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

On a voluntary, self-assessed basis, yes—but only for the purpose of providing consumer advice. Restriction of access should be at the discretion of the exhibitor.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

This is quite a loaded question with many subtleties.

From an awareness perspective, education for parents about supervision, safe browsing practices and monitoring their child's online activity are the most effective methods of preventing access by children to unsuitable (yet legal) online content.

From an enforcement perspective, there is no easy way to control access to illegal content—it should be the role of law enforcement agencies to continue enforcing the laws governing child pornography, etc.

Q13:

It can't. Again, it should be the responsibility of the parent to monitor their own child's behavior.

Q14:

Treat the sale of restricted offline content the same as the sale of tobacco and alcohol—require ID and fine vendors for non-compliance.

Q15:

In the situations described in my answer to Q3, it should be mandatory. For all other situations, it should be voluntary, but preferable.

Q16:

None. The only regulation of content should be by users—the government and industry bodies should provide guidance and information, nothing more.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Adult content and any game, book, movie or TV show which would get an MA15+ rating.

Q19:

Government grants to media should be increased to help subsidise classification.

Q20:

Generally, I think our current classification categories work. Differentiation between M and MA could be improved, however.

Q21:

Q22:

I think the current classification markings are excellent.

Q23:

Yes. There should be a single, simple guide for the classification of media.

Q24:

None.

Q25:

No content should be prohibited online.

Q26:

Very—classification should be regulated at the federal level, not state.

Q27:

A unified federal legislation.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: