

CI 1934 D Wyley

First name: Duncan

Last name: Wyley

Q1:

The basic concepts of the classification system have some validity, but the manner in which they are defined and administered could use a dramatic rethink.

Q2:

A national classification scheme should be an educational resource and guide to levels of acceptable content within clear given guidelines. It should also serve as a mediator and assistant in arbitrage should someone complain about a breach of those guidelines.

Content should be classified by the creator of that content. There should be incentive for Australian content providers to choose appropriate classification for their content, and content distribution channels.

The administrative body should only be involved should there be a dispute as to the accuracy of that self-accreditation.

In the case of disputes, the creator of the content should be approached for first comment, rather than the content being removed from circulation. A dispute resolution procedure should be even-handedly administered by the agency, with the ultimate aim being to see the classification error fixed, rather than the content removed.

In any case of illegal material, law enforcement must be involved.

Do not attempt to censor the internet. It won't work and the Streisand effect is real.

Q3:

If you have to set a list of classifications, just do it. Set the lines. The technology shouldn't hinder that. People access content too many ways to have different rules for each model of iPhone.

If parents do not want their children accessing information of a certain type, they should carefully consider the appliances they allow their children to access and what software, filtering or otherwise, they choose to install, if any.

Q4:

This is the only time that content classification of a given unit of content should be determined, providing that content falls within the boundaries and laws of Australia. If someone complains about content on a server in Australia, perhaps a word with the webmaster might be in order, but don't expect other countries to be as obliging.

If you want all Australian websites to have a content rating then encourage the content providers to rate themselves, or to specify a rating (or ratings range) for their distribution channel, or parts thereof. Complaints should be raised if a piece of content is stated to be of a given level but observed to be otherwise, for example, a G-rated show containing M-rated material, or an MA-rated commercial airing during a PG-rated time-slot.

Q5:

Define potential impact, and on whom. A content creator would presumably be aware of the impact their work has. Many films have had major impact in millions of lives, Bambi being one of them, and

(spoiler!) its got a death in it. Star Wars rocked, and it was fairly thin on raunch.

I would think that the developers of childrens' content would be all-too-happy to classify their content as suitable for the kiddies. This attracts an audience who like reliable content provision for their children. Build trust and you build your audience.

Parents should be monitoring their children's access to content and encouraging their education.

Learning together is a Good Thing. Parents need to understand the acceleration of the technology of content delivery and its effects on curious youngsters exploring their world.

If someone is found to have classified their content inaccurately, a dispute could be raised. Deal with it fairly and politely and reclassify the content into a more appropriate bracket. If it's illegal, call the police and let them handle it.

Q6:

Content is information. You can't attempt to microscopically deal with the plethora of information being produced each day. Only intervene if a complaint is raised, and reclassify disparate material if necessary.

It is in the best interest of content producers to classify their work in order to inform their audiences.

There should be no hinderance to any adult to access any content they choose.

If illegal content is found, there are people who can deal with it in place already.

Q7:

See Question 6.

Q8:

See Question 6.

Q9:

See Question 6.

Q10:

See Question 6.

Q11:

See Question 6.

Q12:

This should not be done.

If parents wish to control their children's access to information, they already have the tools to do so.

Teach them how to use them appropriately. Make a reality show: How Secure is My LAN? or something. Encourage them to care for their kids' education.

But don't block attempt to block access. It won't achieve the goals you're attempting to achieve.

Q13:

That's a job for parents, not for the government. You cannot suggest that the whole world of content or yet-to-be-created has to be child-safe, but you can help parents educate their children in appropriate information choices.

Q14:

That's a job for storekeepers and the police, not the government. If content is mis-labelled, a dispute can be raised. If a crime has been committed, involve the authorities.

Q15:

You may rule that content created within Australia should fall under the guidelines, but the reality of classifying everything everyday is unrealistic. If content is classified, administer it within the guidelines. If someone complains about unclassified material, consider the context of the content and the complaint. Resolve the dispute. Classify the material if it falls with Australian auspices (hosted on an Australian server, perhaps).

Do not attempt to classify material that is not within Australian legal borders unless it is distributed through a content delivery channel that has advertised itself as subject to classification (such as a television channel restricting itself as a whole to a level of classification, or certain sub-channels or time brackets being G, PG, MA, etc) and only then act if a dispute is raised.

Q16:

The agency should deal with the resolution of disputes based on centralised guidelines.

Industry bodies, by which I guess you mean the advisory boards and lobbying user groups and technical experts - people who know what they're doing, I hope - should be advising and they should probably be listened to. They should, in turn, listen to the people they're representing and help educate both sides.

Users access content. If they're offended by content, let them consider whether they thought they had fair warning prior to that exposure, and open a dispute if they need to. They might like to complain to the creator of the content first, who might point them to the FAQ. If there's an issue, they can ask the agency to intervene, perhaps with input from the industry bodies if its needed.

You missed out the creators of content. That's everyone in a forum or facebook or posting to Twitter or whatever they do on those sports sites. If you want everyone to classify each of their updates on livejournal or tumblr or whatever they post on ebay.com.au then you face a challenge. People should have a choice to classify their material. If a site or content delivery method states that content delivered therefrom must be of a certain classification then content creators availing themselves of that facility should respect those guidelines, lest, heaven forbid, a dispute is raised.

Q17:

The industry should not be classifying content. Content creators should be encouraged to choose to classify their material, and users encouraged to adhere by content guidelines when within the boundaries of a restricted content area.

Guidelines should be written with the guidance of all parties, under the auspice of the government and with influence from the various content industry bodies. Public opinion must be heard and considered.

Q18:

Industry should assist in the education of the users and content creators, helping them to choose appropriate classifications for their creations and their content exposure. They should not be classifying material themselves.

Q19:

Classification must be freely done by the creators of content. This should not be administrated. If you are going to charge for classification of all the content in Australia, you will be dealing with millions of micro-payments every day, or annual licenses for content distribution from guinea-pig fancier associations and gaming tribes alike. This nightmare is avoidable.

If there is a dispute raised, the cost of the dispute should be handled by the government. Judgement may include reasonable costs to be distributed amongst the parties.

Criminal matters must be dealt with by the legal system. Fines issued through that system should assist in funding the disputes of others.

Q20:

I understand them, but then I've taken the time to learn about them. There is a general awareness of them in the public through ongoing exposure. The difference between the various "Mature" and "Adult" categories seems murky, as does the need for a "Parental Guidance" category. Parents should constantly guide.

Q21:

A graduated set of guidelines with clear expectations and boundaries should be set. Each should be unique and distinct. Allowances for overlap should be at the choice of the informed content viewer/parent as appropriate, not at the discretion of the government.

Q22:

One simple graduated system with clear (colour-coded if necessary) symbolism, easily recognised by readers and non-readers alike.

Q23:

Content is information. One set of rules across the board, self-accreditation and intervention only in the case of dispute should satisfy this project. You cannot control content and information; you can only ask for the cooperation of content providers and the accedence of the content consumers to a trust in that cooperation.

Q24:

Illegal content should be removed, not blocked. Providers of illegal content should be dealt with the law. Those who accidentally access illegal content should be encouraged to report it. Those who deliberately access illegal content should be dealt with by the law.

Q25:

No. Content should either be illegal or accessible. If you can't classify the content for some reason, it probably counts as Mature Adult. Be mature about it.

Q26:

Given the nature of content spread and the acceleration of information exposure, you cannot expect a piece-meal system to work. You cannot block content, you can only inform people about how to avoid content that they may wish to avoid. A movie on youtube is just as available in WA as it is in NSW and you can't try to change that.

If you want to appeal to the whole country, find advertising that works, is informative and entertaining, and will appeal to as wide an audience as possible, without making them feel scared or like idiots.

Invite parents to education nights at schools and talk realistically about the content revolution currently underway. Show them how they can educate their children and learn at the same time.

Family values include growing as a unity, and this is a new facet of everyday life that can be shared beneficially.

Q27:

An agreement on content guidelines and a standard of arbitration for content disputes should they arise.

Q28:

If individual states or territories or libraries want to have stricter rules than the guidelines arbitered by the agency, then let them. They can deal with disputes within their own areas with their own coin.

Q29:

Scrap it. Change it. Rethink the way you think.

Content is not what it used to be, and information is everywhere, accessible in many forms at all times. Teach the people how to choose their channels of content and indicate appropriate content per the guidelines established. Teach parents how to guide their children in this new world.

Do not tell adults that they cannot view something they want to view. If they are able to choose to fight for their country, vote for their leadership, drink for their health or breed for their gene pool, they can choose whether to click on a porn link or watch A Current Affair and deal with the mental repercussions of that decision.

If someone breaks the law, use law enforcement. The government is not the police.

Other comments: