

CI 2269 E Cheng

First name: Eric

Last name: Cheng

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework, more consistency between different media channels (including digital software such as video games).

Q2:

Consistency between different forms of media. Ease of understanding. Education of the different classifications. Accountability on those who choose not to adhere classifications.

Q3:

No. With a standardised classification system, all content will naturally fall into a classification in accordance to the criteria. How the content was accessed should be irrelevant.

Q4:

No. Objective here is to be [clear] and [consistent] as to minimise disruption and extra effort once content can be accessed.

Q5:

No. Potential impact is subjective and difficult to gauge, defeating the point of standardised classifications. All content should be classified, regardless of target audience.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

User discretion is really the only effective way to controlling online content. The internet is too large to be effectively controlled and restricted by a government scheme, not to mention costly and potentially detrimental with regards to user backlash. What one user finds inappropriate may not be so for another. The purpose of a classification scheme is to inform consumers as to the nature of the content that is available in Australia and allow the consumer themselves to make a decision for themselves and assume responsibility for their decision. Online, content from anywhere across the world can be accessed. From here, it really is up to the individual user's discretion.

Q13:

See Q12. Parents need to assume the responsibility of their role and act as guardians, teachers and monitors for their children. Government should instead educate parents who are not as computer

literate on the various dangers of the internet and different methods on safeguarding their children from these dangers (whether they be parental controls or sites/internet jargon to be aware of).

Q14:

Sealed bags which already exist for many magazines?

Q15:

Isn't the point of a classification system to inform consumers as to the nature of the content? As such, markings should always be shown if it has been classified. At the same time though, such markings and warnings should not detract from the product. Black text on white labels should suffice as done in other regions such as the US, EU and Japan.

Q16:

Government: Setting of guidelines and criteria of the classifications that regulates content. Act as an ombudsman to address content that may be incorrectly classified and take appropriate action to offenders (first warning then financial penalty for repeats, etc). Does not do the actual classification of content. Industry bodies: As they know their own content the best, should be the body that classifies material in accordance to the guidelines and criteria set by government, and be able to provide reasoning to government for a specific content's rating if it comes into question. Consumers/users: Assume responsibility for the content they purchase, whether if be for themselves or others. Inform government bodies if they believe content is genuinely incorrectly classified.

Q17:

Yes, as given by simplified example in Q17. Given justified penalties for not classifying content appropriately, a self regulation model would work much more efficiently than current arrangements. Firstly, industry bodies are more familiar with their respective content than a government body and given a clear and consistent set of guidelines and criteria for classifications, are able to classify content faster than government. Secondly, with the onus of classifying content shifted to industry, government can concentrate on improving guidelines and criteria as to how content is classified and act as a ombudsmen during complaints.

Q18:

Q19:

Yes, small independent companies (films, music, video games) should have their classification subsidised.

Q20:

M15+ and MA15+ I believe are redundant and have little distinction, especially with regards to the "guardian supervision" component, which creates too much of a grey area for who a guardian is.

Q21:

An R18+ category needs to be extended to video game content. No category needs to be removed, but the distinction between M15+ and MA15+ needs to be much more clearly defined. Maybe MA15+ could be turned into MA17+ which would restrict access by those under 17 unless under parental supervision?

Q22:

Current criteria of "level of violence", "frequency of offensive language", "level of nudity" seem to be working, with exception between M15+ and MA15+. Guidelines only need to be clarified between these two categories, while the classifications extended to all media formats.

Q23:

In order to create a consistent set of guidelines, I believe so.

Q24:

Q25:

Q26:

Yes. Otherwise it creates areas of friction amongst the national community and undermines a consistent set of guidelines.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: