

CI 1631 D Woodman

First name: Danny

Last name: Woodman

Q1:

Given that both societal standards and technologies have changed, it would be easier to implement something new with generic principals that encapsulate new technologies (for example) rather than having to update many different parts of the code (film, game) or add new sections to encapsulate new mediums for content and/or new forms of content.

Q2:

To clearly identify what is impermissible (rather than permissible) for content. To have uniform labelling of content that can be used by both the audience and any form of broadcaster. Methinks that the role of classification is not to ban per se but to label material which legislation and/or codes (acma) allows or makes illegal.

Q3:

Absolutely not. Classification should be viewed as a tool that allows considered consumer choice (e.g. don't want to buy something with content that is considered inappropriate) or for law/codes (e.g. acma) for enforcement purposes which can then clearly be used to prosecute breaches - for example broadcasting of certain classifications not permissible or restricted to certain hours, or for security laws that ban content of given classification (e.g. how to construct drugs or bombs from kitchen ingredients).

Q4:

No

All public content should be labelled to allow considered consumer choice, if self regulated it ought not be onerous to comply. A mechanism ought to be in place to allow for complaints, this ought to include a nuisance clause.

Q5:

All content should be classified uniformly (as per q4). It is too easy to pick up a CD and have inappropriate content playing for an audience including children or for a book containing graphic art. A designed for children classification would be useful as it is a different thing to not having varying levels of restricted content, though this would have to include considerations of restricted content (though that would vary, what is inappropriate for a 2 year may be different for a 16 year old)

Q6:

No. If this is an issue, it reflects on how classification is done, how time consuming and how costly and indicates that the classification process itself needs change. If it were simple and expedient then size ought not matter (e.g. self classification). Again, I would envisage self-regulation with optional 3rd party reviews (e.g. as a paid for service by the classification board)

Q7:

No. For consumer choice as well as for law/codes reasons, all content, not some content, irrespective of media used that is being broadcast/exhibited/sold requires classification so that people have

choice. It is nonsense if we were to stipulate that a film on tv ought not be accessible to children but they can see the same content in a gallery without some warning for the parents.

Q8:

All content requires uniform handling, some pigs are not more equal than others. I am a songwriter, I can understand that there is content that some people find inappropriate even if it is lawful.

Q9:

All public content ought to be classified.

Q10:

More to the point, it's about if it were publicly accessible than where it was accessed. All publicly accessible content should be classified.

Q11:

Privately made content for a private audience that has not been sold/traded for should be the only exemption. If content is illegal (e.g. child pornography), that is already covered by various statutes.

Q12:

Content held outside of Australia, is impossible to impose classification on. However, there are alternative laws/mechanisms that deal with prohibited content, it is a matter for customs/police to determine how they best use their resources.

Q13:

Parental supervision. Children can easily find inappropriate material by browsing the adult section of the local library... Ultimately, there is a market for this and there are commercial solutions available which will increasingly get better.

Q14:

As long as it's classified, there are policing and customs departments to resolve illegal trade (control). For people that find material objectionable, provided classification is there, it is enough. They don't have to purchase it, equally they have to put up with it's existence. I object to religious books, nonetheless they oughtn't be restricted from retail outlets as the content is legal.

Q15:

Always and for all public content.

Q16:

Classification board administers classification labels, but not actively prohibit (that is for legislation and for police enforcement). Classification board offers a paid classification service. Content creators actively classify their works or get a 3rd party to do so. Government creates and enforces laws. Users responsible for making informed choice as to what they access, with a dispute mechanism for inappropriately classified material.

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

It should be straightforward period. Consumers need to know what they are accessing, if classification is simple for consumers then it will be straightforward for industry. So, all industry - and if it isn't straightforward for consumers then it highlights that classification labels and laws need to change.

Q19:

No pigs are more equal than others. They ought to self classify and optionally get a 3rd party review, obviously if they've self classified there is no need for subsidy.

Q20:

The confusion is that standards are arbitrary and don't necessarily reflect community standards in part or more broadly.

Q21:

Keep it rational and meaningful and it can better encapsulate new media and evolving community standards. So, no media specific differences because if it suggests sexual violence (as an example) then it does so irrespective of if it is film/book/music or interactive game. There can be as many categories as required as long as it is simple.

e.g. Category such as violence, they type (as what is acceptable differs) also have an associated level - e.g suggestive/depicted/actual

Example classifications

category:type:level

Sex:Oral:Depicted

Sex:Oral:Actual

The current system of PG/MA/R/X doesn't really give the consumer enough information as to content as I could find something rated MA with violence acceptable in circumstances and distressing in others due to (for example) thinking it's okay for boxers to hit each other, but for a documentary to show someone having their head cut off in Iraq as two very different types of violence.

The labels themselves would be enough to upset some people, but a simple but comprehensive system would allow for better choice. Clearly knowing that something is classified as containing actual sex would make it easy for a gallery to restrict visitors appropriately (e.g. see an id card) or for a tv producer/radio station to schedule accordingly. It also means that a consumer has clear guidelines that enable them to avoid material that is legal but would upset them, it also makes it easy for them to report legal breaches (e.g. broadcast suggested violence at 4pm).

I think the pg/ma/r/x stays but it's a guideline of appropriateness but with the more descriptive classification suggested.

Q22:

Put the broad classification (e.g. pg/ma/r/x) on the top left, how things print - be it rendered on a printer or computer screen, things are often rendered top left to bottom right. For an explicit warning - .eg the warning given on tv for a film, it needs to be center as display differences may have this offscreen.

Q23:

There should only be one uniform set of classification, media used does not matter. Legislation may then be used for example to dictate that sexual violence in an interactive media is prohibited.

Q24:

This should not be left to the classification board. Let the classification board ensure clear guidelines for labeling, let politicians set the laws. To more directly answer this question though, either the content is legal or illegal irrespective of medium.

Q25:

No. Classify it. If it has a classification that is illegal and people know the code (e.g. actual sexual violence is prohibited) then people can react accordingly (avoid it, report it)

Q26:

This is an area where it makes sense for states/territories to surrender their rights to classify as a uniform classification is desirable. They should be able to make laws and enforce restrictions on types of classification.

Q27:

One commonwealth scheme that is responsible for classification - but as labelling (as it were) and not for banning. Normal legislation, police and court are reasonable and fair for determining and enforcing prohibited/legal content.

Q28:

One uniform classification scheme is desirable.

Q29:

Other comments:

I am coming to suspect that you've made this submission process boringly long for ulterior and sinister motives.