

CI 1550 N Fowlie

First name: Nathon

Last name: Fowlie

Q1:

The focus should be on amending the existing classification system to recognise mature adults are interested in & that there is a large market for content that is suitable only for persons over 18.

Q2:

Cover existing gaps in the classification system that results in the outright banning of content that is suitable for viewing/use by persons over 18, but not suitable for persons under 18. The current system meets all the classification requirements for content appropriate to persons from 0 - 18 years old, but lacks classifications for material that should NOT be viewed/used by those under 18 but is appropriate for mature persons.

Q3:

The root issue is who has access to material that may contain high amounts of violence, excessive drug use, encourage criminal activity or contain sexually explicit material. The technology or delivery platform used to access this content has zero bearing on how appropriate/inappropriate the content is. Additionally due to the rapid rate that technology and delivery platforms evolve, in order to be consistent and remain applicable to any technologies/platforms that are developed in the future, the classification system needs to focus purely on content, not how/where/when it is accessed.

Q4:

No. With the exception of extremely explicit material, all content should require classification.

Q5:

Yes. The classification system needs to be consistent across ALL platforms/media. Whether the media is a tv show, magazine, movie, book or computer game, the classification criteria should be the same. This consistency would make it easier for parents, religious people etc to determine whether a type of media is suitable for viewing by themselves or their children as there would be very clearly drawn lines as to what "G", "PG", "M" and "R" mean.

Q6:

No. As stated in the previous questions, the system needs to be consistent across ALL platforms/technology/media. Any "special condition" rules only serve to muddy the waters and make it more difficult to both allocate an appropriate classification to media, and for a member of the public to evaluate whether media would be suitable for viewing by themselves or their children. A "keep it simple" philosophy should be taken to developing/amending the classificatoin system.

Q7:

Yes. Consistency is the key here... if a movie is classified M to prevent children from seeing frontal nudity, then the same should also apply to any photography or artwork containing frontal nudity (as an example).

Q8:

Yes. Some music contains themes that younger people who are easily influenced may mis-interpret, resulting in them doing things they may not have otherwise done. This is not to say that a song talking

about murdering your parents will make a teenager murder their parents, but a teenager that is already having violent thoughts or is otherwise mentally unstable may take it upon themselves to decide that the song was "written for them" and is "telling them" to follow through with their violent thoughts. The song itself doesn't cause them to commit murder, they merely use it as an excuse/justification for their actions.

Q9:

No. It doesn't matter if the audience contains 2 people or 2 million, some content is simply not suitable for certain age groups (or not suitable for anyone aka child exploitation etc).

Q10:

Definitely not. If the classification system is designed properly and classifications are applied consistently, then obviously a rated M show would not be shown in a public area that contains children (but could be shown in a public area that doesn't contain children - drive-in theatres for example).

Q11:

The only time content should not be classified is when it contains content that breaks local/state/federal law, contains child exploitation (child porn, not documentaries on illegal child trafficking) or promotes criminal activity ("snuff" films, anything that glorifies murder, theft, rape etc. An instructional video on the dangers/uses of drugs would not be "banned".)

Q12:

Technology develops at a rate orders of magnitude faster than policies. There is not such thing as an "effective" method of controlling access to content when the internet has been designed in a way that allows traffic to be re-routed around damaged/censored areas. People will always find a way to access things they shouldn't. It should however be mandatory for all ISPs to offer content filtering software that parents can install on their children's machines. There are already online content classification systems in existence that are used extensively by hardware/software firewalls. These systems should be made more accessible to the general public. The ISP should NEVER have opt-out/mandatory filtering.

Q13:

In short, it can't. The only way children's access to inappropriate content can be controlled is through proper parenting. Unless properly supervised, enquiring minds will always find a way to work around any content filtering systems put in place. It is not and should NEVER be the government's job to do the parents' job.

Q14:

Higher penalties for businesses that knowingly sell such content to minors along with random "secret shopper" spot-checks to catch and charge those that are providing the material to minors.

Q15:

All classified content should contain classification markings, warnings and consumer advice. Under no circumstance should (non-banned) content not display classification information.

Q16:

It is the role of agencies and industry bodies to classify content according to strict, well defined classification criteria (no "grey-areas"). The classification criteria need to be publically accessible with FULL transparency and consistency. It is the role of users to use those consistent classifications to

determine if content is suitable for them or their children to view. The government/industry bodies should never perform or partially perform the role of parents (which is to decide what environment their children are raised in. What they see, do, hear etc).

Q17:

This all depends on how the government/industry comes to its decisions. Regardless of whether the industry or government is responsible for classifying content, the classifications should NEVER be influenced by lobby groups, religion or any single politician. The classifications need to be completely unbiased, based on measurable metrics, not merely opinion. If controlled by the government, the classification system needs to be opened up to the general public on a regular basis to allow adaptation to changing social attitudes towards sex, violence, drug use etc.

Q18:

Childrens shows with no nudity, violence, drugs or criminal activity should be classified as "G" as it is obvious they would not offend any of the general public. The same applies to documentaries.

Q19:

The government should not subsidise any parties. If the classification system is to be completely unbiased and consistent, then the same rules need to apply to everyone. This includes the costs of classification.

Q20:

The existing categories are well understood by the public and clear as to their intention.

Q21:

G, PG - Do not make any changes to these classifications.

M - Under 18 only (and this MUST be enforced).

R - Over 18 only (and this MUST be enforced). Proof of ID should be required before anyone can access rated R content.

Q22:

Standardised logos, colour coded text or text background (blue for G, red for R, yellow for M etc) in a standard font, with ratings located on the front, back and side of the package that the media comes in. For electronic media, the classification information should be located close to the media title or after the media description.

Q23:

Yes. "Keep It Simple Stupid". Consistency promotes understanding and reduces confusion

Q24:

Child exploitation (child porn/slavery..not including educational material on these topics) and "snuff" films. Drug use instructional videos while distasteful for some people should still be accessible for curious minds, and also drug users that would like to know the best way of avoiding medical problems which server only to place a burden on the health system.

Q25:

Definitely not. Some RC content is desirable for mature persons (18+) but under the current system is refused classification. Things such as explicit pornography & violent video games can be viewed by those over 18 and should not be restricted.

Q26:

Yes, it is VERY important to ensure that regardless of state/territory, the classifications system is consistent. The system needs to be ammendable by the public as social attitudes change, and it needs to be implemented at a federal level. If it is left to each indiviudal state/territory to establish their own systems it will only lead to extensive confusion, "illegal trade" of content banned in one state but not another and make it impossible to maintain consistency across australia.... put a hundred people in a room and tell them to decide on the best movie of all time and they will all die of old age before they 100% agree with each other. But a hundred people in a room, ask them to vote on the best movie of all time and announce the movie with the highest amount of votes as the best of all time, and people will be more likely to "tow the party line".

Q27:

One single commonwealth classification scheme that is voted upon by the entirety of the australian public.

Q28:

yes

Q29:

Other comments: