

CI 1541 S Dowideit

First name: Sven

Last name: Dowideit

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework - its impossible to accurately quantify results if the entire framework is thrown out, and the risks of creating a completely new failure far outweigh the issues in the existing framework.

Its simplistic and disruptive to suggest that censorship is relevant - media access controls are nothing more than a smokescreen imagined by the ignorant.

its also unrealistic to think that a government agency can keep up with the amount of media that classification would be helpful for - so the role should change to aggregate consumer classifications, publisher and creator classifications and formalised reviews and analysis.

Q2:

accurate and relevant information (consumer advise) to allow individuals and parent to make choices that are suited to their life preferences.

Q3:

not really - consistency is more useful to allow media consumers to make choices.

Q4:

no. classification should be mandatory - and not a burden on the content creator / distributor.

Classification should be a service provided by the government to enable residents to make choices that reduce the user's chance of being exposed to challenging content that they choose not to be confronted or affected by.

crowdsourcing should be able to be leveraged to help pinpoint areas where formal government agency review is needed, and content domains where pre-emptive government classification evaluations and information may help ensure the usefulness and consistency of published information.

Q5:

potential impact should be a decision made by the potential consumer - classifications need to be content specific, not lazily based on 'age'

all media with potentially challenging (to any particular user group) content should be classified with consumer advice - such as 'sex scenes', 'rape scene', 'graphic medical scenes', 'denigrating to religious beliefs' etc.

government should work on aggregating and disseminating crowdsourced, content creator and provider advice based on the formalized classifications schemes - ie a webscale scalable online

democracy system, with more formalised reviews by government agencies when there are disparities between the commercial interests and media consumers.

given that carer choices for children are the most complicated, it would be helpful for some focus to be made to increase the coverage of classification for the under 18 groups (irrespective of delivery media).

Q6:

no.

Q7:

it would be interesting to apply a classification to an exhibition - its reasonable to expect that once a consumer has entered an exhibition, that they will walk around all of it...

but this is something to consider, if there isn't enough classification work to keep you busy.

Government agencies might be involved if there is a lack of consumer sourced classification feedback to compare to the publisher advice.

Q8:

yes.

Q9:

Classification 'should' be the responsibility of a gov so that taxpayers can make choices on what legal content to consume in any medium.

Given that its impossible for a government agency to classify all content on all media forms, instead government should focus on creating enabling technologies to crowdsource the information, and to check a balance between publisher and consumer views.

Q10:

no.

Q11:

none, all content 'should' be classified. Reality suggests that this means government can only aggregate, communicate and validate.

Q12:

there are no effective methods of controlling access - a classification scheme should inform consumers of the content, so that consumers can make a choice.

Q13:

by improving support for relevant metadata in the appropriate protocol standards so that consumers can make choices in browser setup to choose what content they see.

Q14:

by improving support for relevant metadata in the appropriate protocol standards so that consumers can make choices in browser setup to choose what content they see.

ie, not through censorship, but rather by allowing and accepting challenging (ie legal) content, while

formalising classification metadata protocols that can be used on servers and clients to allow users to choose what content types are delivered.

Q15:

always. there should be classifications for 'overt advertising', 'product placement', etc for all media types - if the government does their job right, they will be involved in the metadata protocol standards development and browser development projects to implement displays of consumer advice.

Q16:

government agencies should set evaluation criterion help consumers, publishers and creators apply them to media (including do evaluations to speed up the process) and then aggregate and publish this information.

industry bodies should classify based on the criterion

users should then use the classification&advice to decide what content they are willing to consume and where. and can also use the gov provided systems to add their interpretation of the criterion
gov agencies should then evaluate any mismatches between publishers and consumers, and to validate and adjust the system

Q17:

no. it should be co-regulatory between government and consumers _and_ industry.

for example, the online pornography industry _is_ interested in adding metadata to allow this kind of consumer choice.

Q18:

government should be creating aggregation and communication systems to facilitate all content to be classified by all 3 parties in the scheme.

Q19:

crowdsourced, and content creator and distributor classification frameworks should be created by government to allow timely advise in a scalable way.

Q20:

(G, PG, M, MA15+, R18+) are simplistic and need to be augmented with content based advice (ie more of what we already have).

There needs to be more granularity in the classification, as what an average 5year old is able to cope with different viewing from a 12 year old, and then 13, and similarly 18+

For all consumers, the main rating 'value' is a touchstone to signal to them if they need to find out more (ie, reviews, external sources and consumer advice), or if they can just watch without 'event'.

Q21:

whatever causes different consumer groups distress should be a classification/advice category - that way that group and choose not to consume it.

Q22:

by making them the same? What kind of incompetence would allow there to be inconsistency?

Q23:

yes.

Q24:

Illegal content should be prosecuted using the appropriate laws. Legal content cannot be prohibited based on delivery mechanism.

Q25:

no. 'refused classification' is not a helpful, relevant or useful category for consumers. If its legal, there are no enforceable ways to 'prohibit' - users can just ask a facebook friend to mail them a dvd from wherever the content is accessible.

Thus, as legal content cannot be prohibited, it also is not useful to 'refuse to classify' - ie 'refuse to provide relevant consumer advice'

Q26:

Inconsistent classification is useless to consumers.

Q27:

A consistent, relevant and informative scheme.

Q28:

yes.

Q29:

By remembering that the primary use of classification is to enable consumers of media to choose appropriately to their personal preferences.

By creating a 2005 era web service to aggregate, evaluate and disseminate classification 'opinions' of publishers, ratings agencies (government or special interest) and consumers, statistical and personal bias faceted advice can be aggregated to allow more scalable, timely and societally aware information both for consumers, and for refining of the classification scheme itself.

Prohibition should be the domain of other laws and agencies, allowing classification to be useful to consumers.

similarly, confusing information with prohibition has lead to inconsistent and illogical restriction of unsimulated sex - it seems somewhat pointless (and wasteful of taxpayer moneys) to prohibit the dissemination of media representations of acts that are legal to perform.

refocusing on providing information should also allow the classification system to reduce the problems caused by publishers trying to manipulate their ratings downwards for marketing or merchandising - especially when 360 degree evaluation and validation techniques can be used to correct ratings over time. (the ratings for a 10 year old film are just as important as those for one to be released tomorrow)

Other comments: