

CI 1610 R Buxton

First name: Roger

Last name: Buxton

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework

Q2:

To inform people of the content of games/movies/etc. to allow an informed decision as to whether a child is mature enough to be exposed to it

Q3:

No; games, movies, music all can contain themes and imagery that would impact on a young mind so all should be treated equally

Q4:

No, once it has been released to the general public, recalling it after a complaint would be too difficult. Everything should be classified before release

Q5:

Any material which is deemed to have a higher impact should be subject to more stringent classification requirement. Content designed for children must be held to a high standard across all media.

Q6:

No, any media released in Australia should be subject to the exact same guidelines of classification.

Q7:

Yes, but only to provide consumer advice. The parents/guardians should be allowed to make the decisions about what their children can/can't see.

Q8:

Yes, music can have an impact on people, so it should be held to the same standard.

Q9:

Yes, it would be a waste of resources to classify every piece of media that is only intended for a small audience

Q10:

No, content should be classified, even if just for information purposes wherever it is viewed.

Q11:

In general most media should be classified, if the content producers would like it to not be classified, the burden of proof rests on them to make a case to be exempt

Q12:

There are ways around any filter, but marking content as 'safe' usually works better than trying to block content that is not suitable

Q13:

A database of websites that have been classified as suitable for children would allow for children to access a 'safe zone' of the internet without the risk of encountering adult content

Q14:

Age verification at the point of sale, children will always have older brothers etc. to get around any restriction you place

Q15:

when it is marketed to the general public

Q16:

Industry bodies should classify the products of their industry, the government should oversee this, and the users should make informed decisions based on the classification information

Q17:

yes

Q18:

All content

Q19:

If it's only going to be displayed at a film festival or similar, the distribution would be low enough that it wouldn't need classification, otherwise the government shouldn't be subsidizing the classification

Q20:

I believe the existing classification categories are well understood

Q21:

Over 18 category for video games

Q22:

Just have simple classification categories: e.g. violence, nudity etc. classify all media into these categories, and include an age rating to indicate the severity

Q23:

Yes, a single code will be easier to interpret and abide by

Q24:

None, people will find a way to reach any blocked content and establishing blocks will only inhibit technologically inept people who may have a legitimate reason to wish to view the content

Q25:

No, the scope of the Refused Classification is too broad to prohibit all access

Q26:

Consistency is not important, states should be allowed to set their own guidelines

Q27:

The current scheme should not be replaced

Q28:

No, this is not an issue that needs to be dealt with at the Commonwealth level

Q29:

Overall I think the framework is good

Other comments:

What we all want to achieve is to protect children from imagery and messages that will have a negative impact on their developing psyche, ultimately the parents of these children will have the best idea of the child's development and know what they are and aren't ready for, so we need to give parents the information they need to make that decision.