

CI 1964 J Downey

First name: Joshua

Last name: Downey

Q1:

A new framework for classification is needed. Given how increasingly obvious it is becoming that our current system is inadequate to today's media landscape, making tweaks to the existing system would be a band-aid at best.

Q2:

To provide a framework for the the public to be advised on the contents of particular media in as concise and consistent a manner as possible so that individuals may make informed decisions about what content they consume NOT to make that decision for them through overt government censorship.

Q3:

In principle, no.

Q4:

Given the volume of content available, this makes sense. Alternative options include a classification bureaucracy larger and more sprawling than the entire public service as it stands today or cutting Australia off from communication from the rest of the world.

Q5:

No. "Designed for children" is too broadly open to interpretation and a system that includes caveats such as this is open to abuse.

Q6:

Should the size or market position of particular content producers and distributors, or the potential mass market reach of the material, affect whether content should be classified?

No.

Q7:

Not by a government body, no.

Q8:

Should music and other sound recordings (such as audio books) be classified or regulated in the same way as other content?

In principle, yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

This would be impossible to determine and enforce.

Q11:

In addition to the factors considered above, what other factors should influence whether content should be classified?

Classification by government bodies as a matter of course should not remain part of the system. A

small body should exist to impartially deal with complaints regarding specific content, but anything more is a waste of public resources and too open to abuse by political interests.

Q12:

"Controlling access to online content" should, in the vast, vast majority of cases, NOT be something a government body should even be CONSIDERING implementing in a centralised manner. Providing tools and education to the public to better navigate content is preferable.

Q13:

How can children's access to potentially inappropriate content be better controlled online?

Parental involvement in children's online activities.

Q14:

Requires definitions of "control" and "better" in this context and for whom this access should be restricted.

Q15:

When should content be required to display classification markings, warnings or consumer advice?  
When content has been deemed (preferably without direct government involvement) to include content that a reasonable person may consider offensive or inappropriate for themselves or their family.

Q16:

Government agencies should exist only to provide oversight and deal with specific complaints. Wherever possible, regulation is better left to industry bodies who are better equipped to handle such things without becoming enormous drains on public resources.

Q17:

Would co-regulatory models under which industry itself is responsible for classifying content, and government works with industry on a suitable code, be more effective and practical than current arrangements?

Q18:

This should be the preferred arrangement for all content. Classification is nearly ALWAYS obvious and straightforward for reasonable people. People are not idiots.

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

In principle, only content that required illegal acts in it's creation and where the consumption of which can be shown to encourage or perpetuate those acts. Child pornography falls into this category.

Q25:

No. It is entirely too broad and draconian.

Q26:

Yes, laws and regulations should preferably be harmonised.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

There needs to be consistency across all forms of media. Practical concerns in today's world, especially of online content, makes the loosening of government grip in this area absolutely necessary to achieve this goal.

Other comments:

At the very least we need an R18 rating for video games. Currently the entire debate is being continuing to be hijacked by small, conservative special interest groups who have no place dictating policy that will affect so many Australians. The debate has gone on long enough and the public have shown themselves overwhelmingly in favour of instituting such a rating for video games. Please guys, it's time to get off your butts and make this, if nothing else, happen. Adults are treated like adults (capable of making their own decisions about content they wish to consume) and parents will be better informed about what content may be inappropriate for their children. It's win-win and it's time to stop pandering to small, unrepresentative lobby groups and get this done.