

CI 1707 L Woollard

First name: Luke

Last name: Woollard

Q1:

Developing a new framework for classification

Q2:

The primary objective should be to provide ratings so people can make an informed decision about the material they purchase.

Q3:

The technology and platform should affect whether content should be classified.

Content classification should be about assisting informed choices for specific literature.

Classification should be an option available to content providers, not a necessity.

Q4:

Content should only be classified with the content providers consent.

This gives people a choice to limit their exposure to classified material.

This would also encourage industries developing classification standards suitable to their target audiences.

Q5:

The potential impact of content should not impact whether it should be classified.

Content designed for children should be subject to the same classification as other media.

Q6:

The size or market position of particular content producers and distributors, or the potential mass market reach of the material, should have no impact on the classification.

Q7:

No artworks be required to be classified before exhibition for the purpose of restricting access or providing consumer advice

Q8:

Music and other sound recordings should be classified only on the creators asking.

Q9:

The potential size and composition of the audience should not affect whether content be classified.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

None

Q12:

Providing content providers who subject their content to classification a certificate of classification.

Q13:

Working with the community to develop certification guidelines similar to WCAG for online material.

Also educating parents about the internet and online content distribution mechanisms.

Q14:

Q15:

Classification markings, warnings and consumer advice should only be present when the content consumer is under the impression that the content has undergone classification.

Q16:

The role of government agencies should be to contribute to community classification guidelines and encourage industry bodies to meet classification certifications.

The role of industry bodies should be to educate industry about classification options and assist industry in adopting classification certifications. They should also be involved in the development of classification certifications.

Q17:

Yes.

Even more effective and practical would be to encourage the development of community certification guidelines for classification similar to WCAG certification.

Q18:

Any content they believe meets community standards.

As community standards would differ dependent on their target audience they should be required to make known their target audience.

Q19:

The government should subsidise the development of community classification guidelines, and the costs to industry to become certified.

The government should not subsidise the classification of individual projects such as small films as these are commercial projects which do not encourage or assist classification for other projects.

Q20:

No they are not, in particular the role served by classifying material as restricted is poorly understood by a majority of Australians

Q21:

No.

Q22:

Classification should be about informing the content consumer.

As the most effective manner of doing this will vary significantly, an emphasis should be put on educating people about what classifications mean, and how to access classified material.

Q23:

This question is not understandable by the average Australian and should be asked in a more obvious manner in a future form.

Q24:

A system similar to the one adopted by New Zealand should be implemented.

See below for key point about the system as outlined by Steve O'Brien the National Manager of the Censorship Compliance Unit at the New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs

Q "It's a voluntary system and there's no legislation"

A Yes, the system we are introducing in New Zealand is a voluntary system. We have approached the problem with the idea that we should partner with the service providers rather than seek legislation to force them to participate.

Q the website filtering system prevents access to known websites containing images of child sexual abuse (Instead of "Refused Classification" material)

A Yes, the system only prevents access to websites offering or supplying child sexual abuse material as defined

in the films, videos and publications classification act 1993.

Additionally we have taken steps to further enhance this by establishing the no "grey" areas procedure thereby requiring that the items that are included in the list are children between the ages of 0-12 being sexually abused.

Q Is there a mechanism whereby the filter list is scrutinized by an independent body.

A Yes, we have established a Independent Review Group (IRG) whose purpose is to review the details of the items on the list and review any new policy or procedures to do with the running of the system

Q For websites which have had offending material uploaded to them in breach of T.O.S, are they notified and will they be removed from the blacklist when the material has been removed.

A Yes and No, We do not actively notify the network or provider hosting the material for the sole reason that as we are an enforcement unit we will be contacting our international partners to attempt the removal of the site or assist them in investigating the site for possible prosecution or if it is a local site it we will contact the local provider for its immediate removal. and or prosecute of the owner of the site pending an investigation.

One requirement established early in our testing of the system was the need to review the list periodically (currently monthly) to ascertain if any of the material had changed or been removed. If a site upon reaching the monthly review is found to not contain material it is removed immediately from the list

Q And will the whole domain be blocked, or will it only be the offending url?

A Only the offending URL will be added to the list however the whole domain will be investigated to ensure there are no additional areas to prevent access to.

Q25:

No, the current scope of the Refused Classification (RC) is outdated, and no longer in line with community expectations or wishes.

As it stand the RC category should not be used as a guideline for restricting content online.

The RC category should also be updated to meet modern community expectations.

Q26:

No.

Q27:

The development of community classification guideline schemes similar to WCAG where content providers can voluntarily meet classification certification.

Q28:

No

Q29:

By discussion with the community about what role the government has in classifying material.

Other comments: