

CI 2047 M Jacques

First name: Matthew

Last name: Jacques

Q1:

The government should focus on improving key elements of the existing framework

Q2:

To provide a framework under which individuals can be reasonably informed of the major themes and concepts behind content.

Q3:

Yes - digital distribution platforms (such as Apple's app store, Android Market and so on) currently classify content themselves. Classifying this content a second time would add an unnecessary extra level of complexity to these systems.

Q4:

It depends on where the complaint comes from. In recent years it has been shown that the overwhelming number of complaints regarding television and film come from "interest groups", small groups of individuals who launch campaigns regarding an imagined offence and reflect only a tiny subsection of the community. Complaints should be more closely investigated before being acted upon.

If a complaint is found to have merit, the classification process should be launched. Refusal of classification should happen rarely, if ev

Q5:

Refusal of classification should happen rarely, if ever. At present, Australia's classification laws are positively draconian compared to most first-world countries. The "potential impact of content" is a very broad, easily interpreted phrase, and this needs to be redefined.

Parents are capable of determining what their children can and cannot watch, and I believe they may be the best judge of this. Some media may be incapable of classification (eg, internet) and should not be classified.

Q6:

No. This would create an uneven playing field for larger distributors. All content to be classified should be classified under the same set of rules.

Q7:

No. Art should not be classified. It is up to the Gallery to decide whether to exhibit an artwork, and individuals to determine whether they wish to view it.

Q8:

No. Music should not be classified. This is a waste of government time and resources. Audiobooks should not be classified.

Q9:

no. This is irrelevant.

Q10:

no. This is irrelevant.

Q11:

Undue weight is given to personal sensibilities - even if one individual finds a piece of content objectionable, the next person may have no issue with it. Religion and Politics should have no part in the classification of a piece of content. Any classification should also be independently verified by other individuals.

Q12:

Online content should not be classified. Australian sites with possibly objectionably content should have an age verification system, but there is no other way to control online content.

If an individual wishes to control access, they can do so via a personal system (netNanny or something of the sort). Organisations already control the content their staff have access to. This is not the responsibility of the government, nor should it be.

Q13:

See Q12. This should never be controlled by the government - individuals wishing to control their children's access to possibly objectionable online content already have the option to purchase software to do this. If the government wishes, it could offer a subsidy to families for a suitable application.

Q14:

I see no need to modify the current system for magazines.

Q15:

If the content contains strong themes (violence, sexual activity).

Q16:

Government agencies should ultimately classify all content that does not have a single distribution channel (such as apps). Industry bodies should play no part, other than to provide a synopsis of particular media if required. Users should be able to contest the classification of content (either

lowering or increasing the classification level), but should provide valid, concrete reasons for their suggestions.

Q17:

No. Greater involvement with industry would only relax the standards for which the industry is responsible for classifying. A single government body with capable, educated and secular individuals should be sufficient.

Q18:

None. As stated previously, industry may provide suggestions only.

Q19:

Absolutely. If the cost is substantial, subsidies should be provided for smaller content creators. The creators should apply for these subsidies, but the implementation of a classification system should not prevent an individual from being able to create content.

Q20:

M and MA are superfluous. I see no difference between the two ratings.

Q21:

Games should be able to have an adult (R) rating, given that the major consumer audience for games are adult males. The Film and Video ratings scale would be sufficient for games.

Q22:

Consistency. Use the standard film rating scale, drop MA, and include the type of content on the rating for all classified media

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

none. Objectionable content should be taken down via a cease and desist / DMCA request to the content creator or provider.

Q25:

no. see Q24

Q26:

Yes. There is no reason that media should be refused classification in one state if it is allowed in another.

Q27:

Q28:

yes.

Q29:

Refusal of classification should almost never be used. MA or M should be dropped as a rating. Government censorship of online content is a terrible idea. A brief description of possible themes leading to the rating should be displayed on every piece of media that is classified.

Other comments: