CI 1781 E Barker

First name: Elliot
Last name: Barker

Q1:
Developing a new framework based on the previous framework that is consistent across all media.
Q2:
Provide a system to classify content into age based categories
Q3:
No, the focus should be on the content itself not the method of delivery. Separate criteria based on the method of delivery needless complicates the system for no real benefit. If the method of delivery does affect the consequences of the content, then make that assessment as part of the content analysis instead.
Q4:
With the proliferation of the internet and ease of access to new content that is constantly being generated the resources of the review board would be stretched trying to classify everything. Perhaps a system allowing for self classification according to set of public guidelines which would then be subject to review if a complaint is lodged.
Q5:
Yes the potential impact should cautiously be taken into consideration. The potential impact should created from guidelines developed by child psychologists. In this manner if the impacts of the content are measured the rules should be the same across all media based on what is presented not how it is presented.
Q6:
Maybe. The potential size or reach of content could be a good measure of how to dedicate the resources of the classification board.
Q7:
Depending on where they are presented yes. If they are presented in an area of 18+ restricted access then there is no reason for classification to be required beforehand.
Q8:
Yes, all content should be regulated according to the same guidelines.
Q9:
Maybe. The potential size or reach of content could be a good measure of how to dedicate the resources of the classification board.
Q10:
Yes.
Public access to content could be limited by the classification system, but privately content classification should be used as a guideline by the parties involved. In this way public content should be classified as there is a potential need for this, classifying privately consumed content on the other hand might not be used by anyone.
Q11:

Is it reasonable/possibly to try to classify the content?

Is classifying the content going to be of use?

Q12:

Provide a series of tools that can be used to both classify content as well as optionally restrict access to content. Additionally information about how to use these tools as well as other information should be available. Using this method people with children in their care can be informed as well as make personal decisions about if restrictions are needed and their personal level of monitoring

Q13:

Through education of care givers as well as children combined with optional tools to restrict access on computers based on preference. As the internet is completely agnostic to the person accessing it, flexible restriction methods available to care givers would help to fix this and allow a tailored solution based on circumstances/opinions of those involved. Attempts to force restrictions onto children/teenagers will not be well received and ineffective (due to the ease of bypassing), better to bring them into the discussion and involve their care givers.

Q14:

Depending on the particular industry sector, if a deficit is shown in the ease of access to those unsuitable for the content or a lack of easily accessible classification information then:

1) making the industry aware of this and trying to rectify the situation and create new guidelines/methods for that sector

and if that continues to prove unsuccessful:

2) Forceful introduction of new guidelines that the particular industry sector is to follow

Q15:

When the content is displayed for sale to allow informed buying decisions.

Q16:

Government agencies should be determining and reviewing the guidelines by which content is classified and monitoring to ensure that classification information is easily available.

Industry bodies has the responsibility to try to work with the government agencies and ensure ease of access to classification of content, as well as making it easier to classify such content or following a code and classifying content itself.

Both industry bodies and the classification board have a responsibility to work through any complaints lodged.

Users are responsible for ensuring that content consumed fits with the classification and if not then should be registering complaints outlining why they think it doesn't fit.

Q17:

They could be. Assuming the code is not to difficult to follow, then allowing industry to classify content could prove much faster. This would allow for content to reach its audience quicker, the size of the classification board wouldn't need to scale up in size anywhere near as quickly as content generating industry. There could be a problem for content that is on the border between classifications, so an option for independent review should always be available.

A system for review, complaints handling as well as consequences for companies found breaking the code would have to be established.

Q18:

If the content is obviously going to be only for adults, or the company in question is happy to classify it that way then there should be no problems. If the contents size/scope is small enough then classification should be easy.

Q19:

A co-regulatory model means the government doesn't have to worry about subsidising the classification of content, only companies with complaints lodged would need to be concerned. The government could offer subsidies for classification under funding under existing allocations to arts projects to help with local content creation.

Q20:

I don't understand why the method of delivery of content affects how it is rated, it adds extra complication into what trying to discover what the classification mean.

Q21:

Not that I'm aware of.

Q22:

Either by:

By rewriting all the guidelines based upon the previous ones, but constant across all media

Or by changing any inconsistencies between media formats so the same guidelines can be presented publicly and applied across all media

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Access to content determined to be illegal should be illegal online, but it shouldn't be prohibited as the scope for what is illegal/legal is often murky (especially in unchallenged legislation)

Q25:

No, just because something doesn't fit within the classification guidelines currently doesn't mean that it should be prohibited.

Q26:

Yes, just as the guidelines should be consistent across media platforms, they should be consistent across state lines. To have it any other way is to add needless complexity to the system.

Q27:

The scheme introduced should be:

Constant across all media platforms

Have guidelines driven by both community expectations as well as expert opinions on the effects of content

Introduce room for industry based as well as independent classification

Q28:

Yes, any differing legislation between states only adds unnecessary complexity and cost to doing business across Australia.

Q29:

If common guidelines are adopted, a simple fact sheet available wherever guidelines are used as well as on the internet

Other comments: