

CI 1822 A Varis

First name: Andrew

Last name: Varis

Q1:

Key aspects of the current classification framework should be improved. Namely in the form of the full existing framework being standardised across all forms of locally distributed content.

Q2:

To advise parents and retailers of content that may be unsuitable for viewing/use by minors and to ensure that material only be restricted if it is morally reprehensible (MR). This is the case in videos showing child pornography, bestiality, extreme torture, and/or rape.

Q3:

Yes, there exists two possible technological access methods that would apply. The first being local content (i.e. videos, games, art) and the second being internet content. The first is relatively easy to classify and enforce using the current G-R18+ ratings as they rely on proof of age and physical media. Enforcement of classification on the internet should not go beyond the removal of content that is MR (see Q2) as the age of the person accessing cannot be reliably confirmed. This responsibility should lie on the parents.

Q4:

Yes, but only in the instance of internet content due to the sheer amount of content available. In this instance, only MR content should be removed from access after input from Interpol, government, and a representative body of citizens. All local content in the form of videos and games should be classified on application for sale in Australia.

Q5:

Potential impact of content should not be taken into account during classification as there can be no reliable judge as to the weighting of this impact or whether any exists at all. A standardised classification based on themes and levels of violence should be implemented across all local content. All content designed for children should be classified to ensure that it is in fact suitable for children.

Q6:

All content submitted for retail sale in Australia should be classified.

Q7:

No classification should be applied to art, excepting where there is a breach of criminal law. A recommendation might be made that artists provide consumer advice where their installations may be viewed as controversial, and required for installations in a public place.

Q8:

Yes, a standardised classification should be applied.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No, content is content and despite where it is viewed, it should be classified. How can you even ensure that something will be viewed purely at home?

Q11:

Q12:

It is unlikely that any methods other than filtering at an isp level will prove effective.

Q13:

Controlling access to content online remains the responsibility of the legal guardian. Educating legal guardians would be the best and most effective approach.

Q14:

The current methods of proof of age and non-display of illicit material is adequate in restricting access to this content.

Q15:

when it has been classified and approved for retail sale in Australia.

Q16:

To provide a standardised classification system, and prevent the sale of morally reprehensible content. Industry bodies should ensure that all content in their area comply with the classification scheme prior to sale in Australia. In the case of internet content regulation, a body of users should provide oversight as to what is refused classification. Users should be responsible for ensuring that goods do not fall into the hands of minors where content has been classified as unsuitable for consumption at their age.

Q17:

The current system works well presently, however a co-regulatory model may be appropriate at the least sensitive classification ranges.

Q18:

industry should have some input into the classification of local content that lies between the G and PG level and the M and MA levels only.

Q19:

The government should provide some subsidised funding for the classification of small independent films.

Q20:

The only issue where there is true confusion is with video game content. An R18+ rating is required to allow for a greater separation for games that now tend to all fall solely into the MA15+ category and to permit the freedom of choice for adult gamers (whom tend to be an increasing majority nowadays).

Q21:

R18+ for video games

Q22:

standardise the classification schema across all local content types, the current markings are more than satisfactory.

Q23:

In order to provide for a standardised classification system across all local content types, yes.

Q24:

films which include child pornography, bestiality, rape, torture

Q25:

no, it is far too vague in its definitions to be applied to online content. Online content should only be restricted where the content described as MR is found and judged by Interpol, a government body and an independent body of citizens to be unsuitable.

Q26:

A standardised classification system would be preferable, as it would provide a single barrier to entry for content into Australia.

Q27:

one with standardised classification rules which apply to all states. One which does not require the attorney general's input on classification.

Q28:

A standardised cooperative scheme at the state level may be preferable to one implemented at a national level.

Q29:

Allow more easily accessible feedback from the population (perhaps in the form of a web survey with fewer obfuscatory questions). Also less input should be allowed from lobbyist groups with agendas which do not represent the majority of the populace.

Other comments: