CI 1786a Endless Technology Pty Ltd

Organisation: Endless Technology Pty Ltd

Q1:
Improve key elements. I doubt society and classification systems have changed enough to justify the time and expense of a complete rewrite which would include developing a new framework. The framework should take into account new media and content on the internet as an additional different type.
Q2:
To segregate media into categories that enable parents to appropriately decide what levels of adult themed speech and sex, drugs and violent content, are suitable for their children. To further provide a blacklist of media that is unquestionably contradictory to Australian values and therefore prohibited.
Q3:
No, under no circumstances should the platform or technology affect whether something is classified or what the classification is. Minor violence, or minor sexual themes, extreme violence, or extreme sexual themes, or drug use content is inherently damaging to children and this must be objectively rated and tagged in a way that allows for platform or technology independence.
Q4:
There is too much content produced and made available to Australians to be able to classify it. Any person who claims it should all be classified first is naive or lacking a broad understanding of the amount of media available through new content channels through the internet. Rather, resources must be directed towards enabling a simple 'request for rating' to be made and the number and nature of the request should dictate what is required to be classified and tagged locally.
Q5:
No, there is far too much media and content available on the internet that could be easily be demonstrated as having a high potential impact. It is essential that the public (including academics and religious groups) be able to nominate what is concerning to them, and assessments should only be made to that which is highly concerning or that which is frequently flagged as of potential concern. This way resources are most effectively used to rate media and content of extreme nature or high popularity. Likewise, is simply impossible to classify all media available to children, especially as children have internet access. It is again necessary to restrict the classification to material that is flagged by the public, and to direct resources to making the process of flagging and public rating or evaluation of content and media simple.
Q6:
No. The content classification system must be independent of political systems and processes that would otherwise use it as another potential weapon against political opponents and their related organizations. The public must decide what is designated as 'mass market' and this can only be done by enabling a simple reporting process for internet content. A cross platform / cross browser reporting toolbar or application may be the solution. Other content is of lesser concern as it is of a far simpler nature to regulate it.
Q7:

No. Even artistic material of extreme concern (such as material involving children in obviously sexual situations, or material depicting gratuitous violence) can't be expected to be regulated to the level that would allow for pre-exhibition classification. Instead, galleries and venues or promoters of artistic content could be required to display information for the public on how to report objectionable content. This could be in the form of a government produced brochure that could be handed to people, or in the form of a sign stating that the exhibitor welcomes the public to submit a rating if the material is objectionable.

Q8:

As an audio book or music can contain subversive material, illegal pornographic material, or extremely violent material, it is essential that the same simple reporting process be preserved and enabled for that content, allowing it to be rated upon the public flagging it. To reduce the chance for a music or book release to be halted due to a classification becoming necessary, publishers should be encouraged to pre-submit their content for 'a request for classification' - otherwise - they might find their existing stock of produced media and content becomes illegal to be sold as it is lacking the required classification warnings.

Q9:

No. Internet content (the most difficult and potentially concerning media and content available) is able to become popular or fade in popularity within days, depending on which channels it is promoted in. This cannot be predicted, and any attempt to do so (predict what size or composition of audience exists) is foolish and a waste of critically valuable resources.

Q10:

No. The independent standards used for classification review apply equally. Dangerous or concerning content is dangerous or concerning whether accessed privately and individually or accessed as a public group, even though there are subtle differences in the way individual psychology results in it being assessed.

Q11:

Whether the target market is children is of no bearing and should never be used as a consideration during classification. It must be assumed that children will become the target, and that adults will become the target, regardless of any obvious intentional direction towards a particular market.

Q12:

Government provided block list at the IP level being made available to toolbar manufacturers, for voluntary use. Default DNS servers using interpol blacklists are brilliant and an excellent compliment to a toolbar that enables items to be flagged as objectionable or requiring a rating. Ignore the fact that shared hosts may contain thousands of websites or millions of content items. If a host contains extremely objectionable or dangerous material that isn't or can't be rated the entire host should be blocked. Eg. The Pirate Bay contains persistent child pornography material (clothed or non-nude but obviously sexual). This is of extreme concern as it may result in a substantially higher portion of people becoming accustomed towards sexualizing children. The entire host (The pirate bay websites and associated IP addresses) should be blocked until they make efforts to remove this content instead of allowing it to be persistent (as it is of potentially low objectionable rating to some people). It is not necessary to completely block it - to block it at a simple level is sufficient for the majority of people to benefit from a classification system designed to improve society and protect our values.

Q13:

It can't be. There are too many ways children can and will access inappropriate material. Making available a simple 'request for rating' system or 'flag for classification' system in the form of browser extensions or voluntary toolbars, combined with a simple mandatory IP level blocking system, is the only way to reduce the number of children exposed to material of a dangerous or inappropriate nature.

Q14:

Existing systems of password access are sufficient. To reduce the number of websites or sexually explicit material available without a password you need to implement an IP level blocking system that is based upon reporting provided by the public in the form of a 'flag for classification' option as a browser extension or toolbar, as previously described.

Q15:

As per movies, all content that has been classified should be required to display the classification at the beginning, start, or in the header, or in the form of audio notifications, or signs.

Q16:

Government agencies should design the systems, browser extensions or toolbars. Industry bodies should be consulted with by the government to ensure the least amount of interference in daily trade is created. The public should rate the content, with the government collecting and publishing the ratings - so industry bodies can assess and access the ratings for help with their consultation.

Q17:

I am unaware of the current arrangements. I suggest the code be decided upon and implemented by the government with industry bodies forming a system of consultants to this cause. The industry groups can't be relied upon for classifying content as they are by their very nature beholden to their constituents - commercial enterprises with vested interests. The public must do the classification, and the government must aggregate and clarify this information for publication.

Q18:

I am unaware of any content of this nature. All media and content can be interpreted by the public in ways that are not immediately obvious. This can only be detected after it is made available to the public, and they have developed a group feel or consensus - even if this is of a polarizing nature.

Q19:

The cost of classification should be carried by the government, with the public deciding what must be classified, after they have begun to become aware of it.

Q20:

Yes. The existing categories (for movies and magazines) are generally simple and clear.

Q21:

Insufficient information on the existing variety of classification categories for the various types of media exists. EG. Presently, what categories are applicable to internet content of a child non-nude sexual nature? I expect a review of existing classifications may need to be done to include the greater diversity and nature of internet content (eg. extremely short video clips, or text segments. Comedy of extreme nature that is nontheless generally harmless. Beheadings and extremely violent war related web clips that are of true events, that shouldn't be blocked altogether due to their factual nature as a accurate reflection of important true events.

Q22:

Existing video markings can be made available to publishers. Criteria and guidelines can be expanded where the public need becomes obvious - as a result of feedback from the public on suggested ratings and classifications. This can be made available as a dynamic yet simple list.

Q23:

Unknown. I haven't read the publication.

Q24:

No content should be completely prohibited unless this contravenes our values. Presently, I suggest - considering the practical focus of Australians in general - this be restricted to child pornography, non nude pictures of children in obviously sexual poses, and materials inciting and promoting hate or violence towards either the majority or minorities. Media and content materials of fact or of political dissent should be encouraged as this makes our society stronger and allows us to appreciate and work with positive elements of society by preventing crime and corruption, especially at the political or government level.

Q25:

Unknown.

Q26:

Yes, but variation in public opinion should be allowed to be published to encourage diversity and enable more accurate assessments of political position with regard to classification to be made. EG. The public in Queensland, Canberra and the NT likely have different opinions on what is considered of concerning sexual nature and political hate. While it is crucial a single country-wide classification system be used, the public position on classification can be published in a form that allows regional differences of opinion to be discerned.

Q27:

Unknown.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Unknown.

Other comments:

Thank you to Slashdot for bringing this to my attention.