

CI 2077 | McGregor

First name:

Ian

Last name:

McGregor

Q1:

Improve on key elements of the existing framework to better suit all forms of media entertainment.

Q2:

The primary objectives should be how to improve on the existing system, and to account for the wider variety of media entertainment currently available, and for prospective types of media entertainment, and making them available for their chosen demographics rather than refusing classification to them outright - with the exception of illegal content (child pornography, etc.).

Q3:

Yes. Content accessed from PC's and via the internet should not be classified to the same standard as other technologies/platforms, as the content is user driven and not controlled by a third party.

Anyone wishing additional classification on PC and via the internet has control to not view something they find inappropriate, or to censor the content themselves, or to have it censored for them with 3rd party software.

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Content designed for children should be classified across all media - so as to help inform parents of any potential conflict in their individual family values. The potential impact of content for adults should not affect classification.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes, but only if the artwork is deemed inappropriate by a majority board of average australians from different cultural, religious, and societal backgrounds.

Q8:

No, because the user is in control of their experience and can choose to end their experience of that content at any moment.

Q9:

No, as long as the audience is legally of adult status, then it should have no bearing on whether the content should or should not be classified.

Q10:

Yes. Content that is accessed in public (outside of privately owned property), should be classified. However, content that is accessed by a consenting adult on their own property should not require classification, as the viewer can choose to end their experience at any time.

Q11:

Content should only be classified if it is displayed in a public setting. Any content accessed and viewed in a private setting should not have classification, as it is the individuals decision to when to end their experience with the content.

Q12:

By educating parents about their options for parental controls and censorship, rather than implementing censorship to the entire population or userbase. Parents should be looking at classifications on media they purchase or allow their children to view, they should also be implementing censorship as to their own family values via third party options and programs in an online environment.

Q13:

By educating parents about their options for parental controls and censorship, rather than implementing censorship to the entire population or userbase. Parents should be looking at classifications on media they purchase or allow their children to view, they should also be implementing censorship as to their own family values via third party options and programs in an online environment.

Q14:

The restricted access to offline content seems adequate at its current standards.

Q15:

Content should always be required to display a broad classification marking, as to warn the consumer of the demographic it is made for or themes it contains.

Q16:

Government agencies should only regulate the classification of content in very extreme circumstances, and the rest should be left up to the users and industry to self regulate.

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Do not entirely understand question.

Q19:

Government should subsidise the classification of content on approval to submitted form to request the subsidy.

Q20:

Yes, the existing classification categories are understood. If there has been any confusion to the current classification categories, it is because they haven't bothered to learn what each category represents, or that another organisation (ACL) has led a campaign of confusion as to what each category represents.

Q21:

There is a need for a Restricted (R18+) rating for video games. All other classification categories are adequate.

Q22:

No opinion.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Child Pornography, and any other content that is prohibited by law due to its abusive and exploitive nature.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes, consistency is important. It should be promoted: Available for One Australian, Available for All Australians.

Q27:

Any legislative scheme, as long as it has nothing to do with state government. State government couldn't find its rear end if it sat on its hands. The federal government are generally reliable to make sane decisions, I'd be happy with any federally supported scheme.

Q28:

I guess so, yes. These questions are worded really terribly, and are not easily understood. It's no wonder its hard to trust the government and its processes.

Q29:

It could be improved by limiting the impact any intervention outside groups hold over the classification system. The ACL, for example, has had too much power to intervene in the classification process. Classification should be decided by a panel of average australian's from all sorts of different backgrounds, religions, etc.

Other comments:

In future, have surveys with more clearly worded questions so its easy to understand the question that is being asked.

Also provide links to documention when documentation is referred to.