

CI 2283 F Stark

First name: Frederick

Last name: Stark

Q1:

The focus should be on improving key elements of the existing framework, as there are a few key problems.

Q2:

To protect minors from unsuitable content whilst protecting the rights and freedom of adults. (protecting minors should take precedence) Classification should also give advice to adults and parents to enable informed decision making.

Q3:

Ideally there should be no difference in classification across platforms. For practical reasons, certain platforms/technologies should not have the same restrictions placed on them as it would not be feasible and/or effective.

Q4:

Complaints based classification should only be considered for easily accessible, extreme content so as to not overburden the Classification Board.

Q5:

Yes, impact should be considered. Content for children should be industry regulated or quasi-regulated, so that parents have content advice and can make choices based on these, and that the classification board can use its time more effectively.

Q6:

Yes, as that would be the most successful and cost effective method of ensuring the majority of content is classified, whilst not overburdening smaller companies and the Classification Board.

Q7:

Only artworks that are presented in open public spaces (ie, shopping centres, street malls, etc) should be considered for classification. Art galleries and museums should remain exempt.

Q8:

I believe that the current methods of classifying audio content is sufficient. Although audio content should be included in classification legislation with other content, the lower potential impact of audio media should be taken into account when classifying content.

Q9:

Yes, this information can be used to prevent overburdening the Classification Board. Events targeting small audiences should be somewhat exempt as children are unlikely to accidentally encounter this content, thus still meeting the requirement to protect minors.

Q10:

Yes, as media displayed in public spaces are more likely to attract very large audiences.

Q11:

Yes, potential burdens on the Classification board and potential burdens on industry.

Q12:

The only effective way of controlling access to international content online is by asking media distribution websites to comply with our classification scheme. An ISP level national filter would be detrimental to business and would open the door to malicious manipulations, both political and otherwise.

Q13:

With optional parental filters and parental education.

Q14:

Offline content is best controlled through ID checks and separation; as video rental stores used to have a separate section for adult material.

Q15:

Classification markings and consumer advice should always be displayed wherever it is practical to do so.

Q16:

Regulation should use a mixture of regulatory models, as it does now, to ensure the effective and practical regulation of content. Online content in particular is best regulated by the industry, with support/encouragement from the government. For user created content such as youtube, community regulation is already highly effective, and providers of user created content should endeavour to filter content flagged by the community to young australians.

Q17:

The co-regulatory model would certainly be more practical and, based on the classification quality in the USA, would also be effective. The Classification Board would then review material on a complaints and possibly random audit basis to ensure compliance with government guidelines.

Q18:

All industries are aware of their particular nuances and can make sensible judgements on the classification of their media. Therefore all content would benefit from industry classification.

Q19:

If classification of small films, art, independent theatre, etc. is required, it should be subsidised to a fair degree by the government. Classification of user content on websites, if required, would require compensation due to the immense scale such an undertaking would require.

Q20:

Personally, when I was a young teenager (approx 12-16) I had confusion between M and MA categories. The distinction between them and the age requirement confused me and others around me. There may also be a large amount of confusion about what content each category allows and which factors cause content from being put into a particular categories.

Q21:

The addition of an R18+ for games would be a great benefit, and the guidelines for M/MA should be slightly tightened. Currently, many video games barely scrape into the MA15+ category, but should probably be placed in an 18+ category.

An R18+ category would also bring video games in line with the civil liberties afforded to other forms of media.

Q22:

By having a government created universal guideline document.

Q23:

Yes, one consolidated and unified document would prevent confusion.

Q24:

Child sex content.

Q25:

No, it is too broad.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Yes, the classification of content should be managed universally by the federal government.

Q29:

Other comments: