CI 1553 M Saunders

First name: Michael
Last name: Saunders

Q1:
Improve the existing framework, but including acknowledgement that some content delivery platforms will be impossible to regulate effectively (such as the internet).
Q2:
Allowing the public to make informed choices as to what content they wish to consume for themselves or their children.
Q3:
Yes. Some content delivery platforms (specifcally the internet in this case) contain such a massive amount of content which is also so easy to access that it would be impossible for an organisation to classify all of it.

Attempting to do so would be costly and barely ever account for a fraction of a percent of all content. Attempting to automate or have site owners self-classify would also cause too many problems as much content would be mis-classified, not to mention the impossibility of forcing overseas website administrators to comply with local classification rules.
Q4:
No. Why have different rules for content that receives a complaint? Classification rules should always be consistent. What offends one person may not always offend the other. If classification rules are clearly defined this shouldn't be an issue. It will also have the upshot of making it easier for the classification board to defend their decisions.
Q5:
No, content should always be classified in the same way. Content designed for children should always be classified to assist parents in making an informed correct choice.
Q6:
No. Classification rules should apply equally. If you are implying that some content avoids classification due to the sheer amount of content out there, then perhaps there is a need to identify content that has most market reach and ensure it is classified properly. Otherwise keep the rules the same for all content.
Q7:
Some artwork should be classified for the purpose of providing consumer advice.
Q8:
Yes, classify this content the same way.
Q9:
No, except for the case of content specifically aimed at children, this should be classified as mentioned above.
Q10:
No.

Q11:

Feasibility of classification. In reference to attempting to classify online media - the sheer amount of content would make this impossible to do effectively.

Q12:

Government control of online content is not feasible. The most effective method to "control" access to online content is to educate the public about the internet so they are aware what they may be bringing into their home when they have internet connected systems.

Putting in a Government controlled content filter to control access to online content would have the following effects:

* Occasional blacklisting or misclassification of sites would occur
* Those that this aims to protect may be curious as to what content they are being sheltered from, and seek access to it (the age old anti-censorship argument).
* Cost a rediculous amount of money to implement and maintain
* Would be absolutely easy to circumvent and this would become public knowledge very quickly (Proxying, encryption, VPN, tunnelling, using protocols that aren't covered by the filter etc).

Q13:

Better parenting is the only solution. Parents should always be aware of what their children are doing on the internet. The Government could potentially assist and consider a similar scheme as before with the 'Net Nanny' software that was made available to end-users, but this time make sure all ISPs advise their customers that this software is available for them if they wish to use it to help guide their children's internet use. However, all content filtering software is flawed and can be circumvented and parents should understand this and NEVER believe that this software will "protect" their kids online, they would still need to provide supervision of their kids' internet usage.

Q14:

ID checks, and penalties for non-compliance by business.

Q15:

Just before the content is viewed by the consumer.

Q16:

Government agencies and industry bodies should only educate end users about content, with the goal to provide effective guidelines that allow people to make their own informed decision.

The Government should also impose restrictions on importing content that gets an RC rating, though what fits into the RC classification should be reviewed (especially for games, but in some cases also for other content) as it is too broad.

Q17:

This could work so long as a very clearly defined set of rules are defined over how content is classified.

Q18:

Adult entertainment industry could likely be given the ability to classify their own content as 18+, as it seems obvious.

Q19:

Don't know enough about this to answer it. If small, local business finds it difficult to afford classifying content then I believe something should be done to make it easier on them.

Q20:

Personally I haven't come across any uses of the publications classifications. Having just looked them up, I would not know the difference between Category 1 & Category 2 as it applies to publications. I believe this should be made more clear.

Missing an R18+ rating for computer games is obviously also confusing to the general public. Film & games are becoming closer in content to each other and the classification ratings as it is for film should also apply to games.

Q21:

R18+ rating for computer games is definitely needed. As stated above I believe that the content between games & film is becoming more similar each day and the classification categories for films should also apply for games. If a game is refused classification and banned within Australia, people will instead go online and either pirate the game, or find a way to import it into the country. This also can make pirating software a more acceptable crime in the eyes of the person committing the act.

Q22:

The same classification markings and categories should be applied to all media.

Q23:

Yes, as stated above.

Q24:

The nature of the internet means that if someone is seeking access to particular content, they will find a way to get it. Attempting to censor/filter particular content online will therefore only be a costly, useless exercise and a complete waste of resources. Highly illegal content such as rape, child pornography, snuff films etc should be prohibited, but should be enforced by the AFP and overseas policing entities to catch those distributing the content in the first place.

Q25:

No. The RC category seems too broad and vague (what is a definition of a reasonable adult?), and is especially so for computer games without an R18+ rating.

Q26:

Yes, the laws between each state and territory should be the same.

Q27:

Unsure, however a single state AG should not have the power to stop a new classification category from being introduced.

Q28:

I believe this would be the best way to get a consistent outcome across Australia. However I'd hope that if this was done that it wouldn't end up becoming a more draconian system that gets enforced in the end.

Q29:

Other comments:

I believe some lobby groups have too much power in influencing classification laws.