

CI 1861 J Barber

First name: Jedidiah

Last name: Barber

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

- Enabling the public to make informed choices about media based on its content
- Ensuring that adults are always allowed to make their own decisions about what they do and don't

view

Restricting minors from accessing inappropriate material (except with parental consent), while a reasonable objective, should not be a primary aim. A national classification scheme should never result in censorship.

Q3:

No. However, it should be kept in mind that the ideal classification scheme should involve an "unrated" classification, treated as equivalent to R18+. Also, enumerating and classifying all content on some platforms may be exceedingly impractical.

Q4:

No. However, complaints may be sufficient basis for changing an already given classification.

Q5:

No.

...and...

No. Some types of media (such as books) currently have few/no problems with minimal/no classification.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Whether or not it is practical to enforce classification without compromising democracy, without introducing censorship, and with minimal economic impact.

Q12:

No online content should be restricted. A National Classification Scheme should not result in censorship. Parental restriction of content accessible to children is acceptable, but in the case of the

internet this should take the form of optional classification.

If a person wishes to censor their own internet connection, downloadable open source software, or a simple lockable hardware device, to be applied to their own (and only their own) computer systems would be most effective.

Q13:

Online classification should be optional. This means that the vast majority of content would be unrated, but any website or other content could apply to be classified as suitable for children. Restriction of access to only children-suitable content should be the responsibility of parents/guardians. Software/hardware should be available as per Q12, but should be strictly optional.

Q14:

I see no reason for tighter control of such content. As it is physical media sold at shops, restricting sale to minors without parental consent is sufficient. Containing such magazines in mostly opaque wrapping, as is done now, is also sufficient to ensure any minors present do not view the material unless a parent/guardian purchases it for them.

Q15:

For physical media, on the packaging. For broadcast media, just prior to broadcast. Much the same as is done now.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide a classification service to guarantee that certain content contains certain things. This service should be optional, and all content not submitted for classification should be regarded as unrated - equivalent to R18+. However, in the case of content platforms where it would be impractical to classify all content (eg the internet), unrated content should not be legally restricted.

Industry bodies should assist the classification process by providing information about what kind of content is contained within something submitted for classification.

Users should have the sole responsibility of deciding what they do and do not watch. For children, that responsibility should rest with their parents/guardians.

Q17:

I do not have enough information available to me to state one way or the other. Care should be taken that the industry does not engage in excessive self-censorship (eg where major retailers of a particular kind of media refuse to stock content above a certain classification level).

Q18:

Depends entirely on the answer to Q17.

Q19:

As the national classification scheme should include a cost-free "unrated" classification equivalent to R18+, this is mostly unnecessary.

Q20:

As far as I know, but I do not have enough information to state one way or the other.

...and...

None to my knowledge.

Q21:

There is a great need for an "unrated" category, considered as equivalent to R18+ for legal purposes, for physical/broadcast media. This category should not require any review of the content, just packaging/broadcast requirements to display the classification. This would save money, and help us move towards a model of adults being always allowed to choose what they view.

...and...

More thought should be put into emphasising the content in the rating. Also, there should be no criteria for R18+ aside from not being illegal and not being suitable for other classification levels. Similarly for X18+, the only criteria should be containing explicit sexual content and not being illegal.

Q22:

By bringing ratings for videogames into equivalence with ratings for movies.

Q23:

Yes. Consistent, concise law is always a plus.

Q24:

None. In fact, I resent this and Q25 as being extremely suggestive of censorship.

Q25:

No. The only content that should be refused classification is that which contains evidence of a crime (the oft-mentioned child abuse material fits here). The only restrictions that should be in place on RC content are 18+ only and no purchasing/selling. Restricting access to content outright undermines the very principles of democracy and a fair trial.

Q26:

Yes. Unless border controls between states are set up, having different classifications in different states is unenforceable.

Q27:

No comment.

Q28:

No comment.

Q29:

As mentioned in Q25, Refused Classification content desperately needs reform. The only content that should be RC is that containing evidence of a crime, and the only restrictions should be 18+ and no purchasing/selling. Nothing should be outright censored. To do otherwise undermines democracy, and can distract from the real solution of arresting people who produce illegal content.

Other comments: