

CI 1744 S McDonald

First name: Shane

Last name: McDonnell

Q1:

I think the inquiry should develop a new classification. When the original classification was adopted digital media/streaming/internet was probably in it's infancy and trying to fit it to the old classification would probably cause more problems than it appeared to fix.

Q2:

The scheme should try to protect consumers (adults/children) against being subjected to material they may find offensive, whilst at the same time giving consumers the right, if they wish to do so, of watching a violent movie, assuming they meet the minimum requirement for watching the aforementioned item.

Q3:

No. Technology in of itself is neither good or bad. It is how that technology/hardware is used by the people in control of said technology. So regardless if a movie is streamed live or watched on a mobile device later, the classification should be the same if it has been classified.

Q4:

No. The internet already has a form of classification based on user input. A video on videosift that is labelled NSFW (Not suitable for work) gives an inherent warning that content may be dubious or offensive. This label was attached by users, not an overseeing power and so some content is self classifying.

Q5:

No. This is an ambiguous question. What one person classifies as the potential impact of content depends entirely on the individual who watches/sees and interprets the content. So to assume that all people will react a certain way based on a few peoples input could potentially restrict content that to others would be classified as informative or escapism. i.e. watching a violent sci-fi movie or a documentary on the holocaust.

Q6:

No. All items should be classified based on it's own merits. By taking into account other factors you may inherently skew the classification because of the size, big or small. Using offensive language, sexual scenes to classify without taking into account the other factors puts all items on the same playing field.

Q7:

No. Artwork is designed to give an insight to ourselves, the artist , or to populous as it was when the art was created. By restricting access you reduce the fundamental right of a person to learn/understand/appreciate art.

Q8:

No. Again the music industry already has their own "Parental Advisory Lyrics" logo which is a guide to the nature of music. Also audiobooks generally have a synopsis to inform you of content, and a title like "Amanda's Seduction" is probably a bit of a giveaway as to content.

Q9:

No. One 70 yr olds idea of offensive is not the same as another. So to assume certain compositions will be offended or not is a massive generalization.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Self classification of content should help legislators determine if content needs extra classification. Other than that. Offensive language, sexual content, violence, reality of the aforementioned items.

Q12:

There are none. Online content is viewable by all, if they want to view it. I do not look for items involving people and animals online because I find that offensive. But to filter content is against what the internet was designed for. It was designed for open and transparent communication and dissemination of information and knowledge. Restricted content could be tracked i.e sites that disseminate illegal content, child pornography etc, could be tracked and the destination IP address contacted regarding the incident. That way those partaking in illegal activities do not censor the web just censor the people.

Q13:

This should be the responsibility of the parents. Devices and services already exists that can be used to restrict content, access time, etc to the internet. Some of these are already built in to some broadband/cable routers. Software can be setup on the PC to help filter content.

A device that runs Smoothwall (www.smoothwall.net) or Astaro (www.astaro.com) can be setup. The industry or government could supply lists of inappropriate sites (blacklists) that are compatible for upload to routers/software solutions

The telco supplier could offer a blocking service, but this should be opt in rather than opt out. So when signing up for a connection you would be asked if you wish for content filtering or not, and have the option of changing this if necessary.

Q14:

Require them to be put on child inaccessible shelves in obscuring wrappers or an opaque shelf where only the magazine title is shown.

Q15:

In general content is already self censored thanks to other laws overseas i.e. the requirement of pornography site hosted out of the USA to show a "This site is for 18 and over". To require content to be classified is an almost impossible task and in general is already self censoring.

Q16:

Governments should enact the laws on what is lawful content. Industry bodies should offer services that allow content regulation but it is opt in rather than opt out and educate users on what is available for content filtering. Users should protect those in their care (minors) and educate peers in safe use of the internet and mobile devices.

Q17:

I think trying to get the industry to classify content is a losing battle. Content is constantly being uploaded and to have to try to classify it even with the best guidelines in the world is nothing short of impossible. Focus on education of users and offers services that create safe environments for users to experience the internet without filtering the whole internet.

Q18:

None. content is already being self censored and it is pretty much impossible to classify all content, even something that should be easy to classify, like pornography.

Q19:

Rather than subsidise independent film lower the overall cost for classification and enable DVD release, assuming no special edition edits etc, to ride on the back of a cinema film classification. This should reduce the barrier for independent companies and hopefully create more incentive to submit content for classification and the cost reduction could be recognised with an increase in the number of classifications

Q20:

I think the current classifications are understood but in some instances may need more granularity. The BBFC classification for films became more granular when the 12/12A classification was brought in. Until that classification I would not have been allowed to watch one of the Batman movies as it was going to be classified 15. However, it was one of the first films to be classified 12A which allowed me to see it with consent from my parents.

Q21:

Yes. Times have change significantly since the introduction of the original classification, and during this review process it would be prudent to review the current classification and any improvements that can be made.

Q22:

If content is rated then it should use the same markings as is familiar with a DVD/movie at the cinema. To have more than one set of markings will only lead to confusion.

Q23:

Yes. Consolidation will lead to a more consistent user experience and enable users/consumers to be more aware of the content. Greater granularity may be required to encompass the variety of media/content, but this can only be a good thing as it enables better screening for users/consumers and more consistency.

Q24:

None. By restricting content you are inherently breaking the precepts of what the internet was designed for. You punish the masses for the sake of a few illegal activities. Use tools mentioned earlier, tracking, education, blacklists to enable users to self censor.

You don't ban all V8 cars because of the few hoons. You catch the hoons and teach them a lesson.

Q25:

No, see comment Q24

Q26:

Yes. Classification should be consistent nationally, not state or territory controlled. Consistency leads to understanding, and understanding to acceptance. Different classification from one state to another

will cause miscommunication, errors and confusion in both the classifiers and consumers and undermine confidence in the classification system.

Q27:

A single national law should govern all classification schemes for the reasons already mentioned in Q26.

Q28:

Yes. National consistency should be enacted. Regardless of where you are the law should be same.

Q29:

Consistency in law and classification through all territories and states via national mandate. Greater granularity of classification. Education of consumers and users in the meaning of the classifications. Cooperation of telco companies on educating and offering filtering services for consumers.

Other comments:

Trying to classify all content on the internet IS impossible. New content is created hourly and uploaded. Dubious sites change domain names when they are "taken down" so are back up within hours. Filtering the internet of inappropriate content is impossible. However, tracking those who view/use illegal content is not impossible, hard, but not impossible. Penalize the few who are breaking the law and allow honest users the knowledge that the internet is free from restriction. Educate users and provide tools/services that allow filtering of content, but allow opt in/opt out of those services. By educating users in the use of these products we promote better computer literacy and understanding. The internet is mostly self censoring, in some cases because of the law in the origin of the hosting server. In other cases from user input.