

CI 2093 J Vu

First name:

Joseph

Last name:

Vu

Q1:

Given the wide disparities between the classification systems for print, visual and electronic media, it is perhaps an appropriate time to consider unifying these systems so that comparisons can be made between different media as to the potential impact on the consumer. In addition, the concept of classification needs to move away from the concept of censorship in that classification should be used as a scheme to inform, not to restrict. Obviously, there remains the need to restrict items that are *actually* illegal (for example, child pornography), but there is no need to restrict items that depict illegality but are not illegal in itself. They merely should be classified in such a way that it is clear to the viewer such that they can make an informed decision whether or not to consume said media.

Q2:

To provide a framework wherein consumers are able to make an informed decision whether the consumption of products will be suitable for them (or for the person(s) for whom the consumer is acting on the behalf of).

Q3:

Treating classification as a means of informing consumers, there is no need to differentiate between platforms. Classification ought to merely warn the consumer as to the potential impact of consuming the media.

Q4:

Ideally, any product that potentially may have user impacts should be classified as an advisory to anyone who may be affected by the content (note the differentiation between classification and censorship).

Q5:

See Q4.

Q6:

See Q4

Q7:

As per the previous responses, classification should be used only as an advisory tool. With that being said, people of inappropriate ages should not be able to gain access to classified anything without parental consent.

Q8:

Yes, but as an advisory tool only (as per previous responses)

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

It should essentially be irrelevant what the media is or what the expected audience it, standards should be applied in the same manner.

Q12:

Given the dynamic and geographic nature of the online world, it is impossible to restrict access to anything. The best that can be done is to mandate that Australian hosts of classified content know their customers (there are a number of techniques for this, including the use of credit card checks or a full blown 100 point check). With that being said, however, classification should not be used as a tool to restrict content from adults.

Q13:

Through parental education in the use of endpoint filtering software and/or techniques on staying safe online. It is not the government's role to play the role of parent to children.

Q14:

The system works as it is.

Q15:

When there are potential impacts to any potential audience / consumer.

Q16:

The government should provide a framework in which content can be classified based on potential impact. Ideally, the industry can self-regulate the issuance of classifications but it is acceptable that the government can play a role in this. The government also defines, through legislation, what is actually illegal (note the differentiation between something actually illegal and depicting illegality).

The responsibility of users is to, based on the advice provided through the classification scheme, to make informed decisions on whether they (or their children) should consume the content.

Q17:

These sorts of systems (such as the ESRB in the US) appear to function better in the electronic entertainment industry than the system currently in Australia - in this case, it is an exclusively industry-only model. There is potential for such a co-regulatory model to work. Industry are more in tune with their target audience and are in a better position to gauge what impact their content may make. The government may play a role in ensuring that the industry is not producing something that is actually illegal.

Q18:

As per Q17, industry should provide the leadership in classifying their content.

Q19:

The government should use the co-regulatory model as an opportunity to reduce the cost of classifying materials. Should assistance be needed, the government may play a role.

Q20:

It is probably the different standards for each media that causes confusion. Unifying this will alleviate this problem.

Q21:

The single-most disjoint classification scheme is for gaming where it lacks an R18+ rating. Quite a number of games within the MA15+ rating should really be moved into this category and a number of RC games moved in as well.

Q22:

Ensuring that how classifications are determined is based on a prescriptive and objective method, rather than subjective methods.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None, other than content that is illegal in its own right (child pornography, for example).

Q25:

The RC category should be abolished as classification should not be used as a means to restrict content. Illegal content is, implicitly, RC by its nature and should new types of content cause feelings that it should be restricted, legislation can outlaw it.

Q26:

It should be disbanded in favour of a national model.

Q27:

There should be a unified and national classification system at the Commonwealth to avoid confusion between states (as some sad tales of people being found guilty of possessing materials that they thought were legal, based on Commonwealth advice).

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

As pointed out in a number of previous responses, classification should be seen as a means to provide information, not as a means to restrict. Restriction is and should be age based, but parents are the ultimate responsibility for children and the classification scheme should reflect this.

The only thing that should be restricted for consenting adults are things that are actually illegal in their own right..

Other comments: