

CI 2316 A Fraser

First name: Andrew

Last name: Fraser

Q1:

The framework should be completely re written, as it no longer applies to the modern media landscape. It was conceived back before we had the current media revolution, and amending it to fit the new landscape is just not feasible

Q2:

To come up with a clear, concise, transparent, evidence based system for the classification. There should be clear guidelines and the removal of such ambiguous terms as " offend a reasonable person" A "reasonable person" is a completely subjective term and has not been legally defined anywhere in Australian law

Q3:

No. The method for accessing content should have no bearing on the rating system. A media accessed by a mobile device is the same as media accessed by a PC or TV. By its very definition is the content that should be rated, not the means by which it is accessed.

Q4:

Correct. Content such as games on mobile devices should only be rated if there is a specific complaint. The mandatory content rating system for games and application developers in Australia is a barrier to entry in an already struggling industry.

Q5:

Content for children, should be classified as such by default unless there is a specific complaint. Upon receiving the complain, it should be reviewed

Q6:

No. All content should be rated according to a clear and well defined set of guidelines. Allowing the size of companies to dictate the rating system will open it up to abuse. This is already the case in the USA, where the MPAA uses it's power to give independent studios much harsher ratings as a means of keeping them out of the market. Big studios are allowed to have graphic content rated lower, simply because they have the market power to do so.

Q7:

No. Artistic works should not be censored or subjected to rating. This would see some artworks banned because under the current scheme they would be "refused rating" under the current scheme.

Q8:

No. Audio books are no different to written books. The content is the same as the written book, just accessed by a different method. Music should carry a warning, but it should be up the individual purchaser to make the final decision

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No. In today's modern world, content can be accessed literally anywhere, so the differentiation between public and home spaces is meaningless.

Q11:

Q12:

The most effective method will be to leave the decision up to individual users of the content. There are enough software packages available to allow people to control access in their own home.

Potentially the govt could publish a central "black list" that people could chose to subscribe to, if they wished.

Q13:

By parents taking an interest in what their child is doing.

Q14:

Better enforcement of current rules. Spot checks that vendors are not breaking the rules about sale and display, and greater penalties for infringement.

Q15:

When it is aimed at adults, and contains concepts, or images that may disturb younger people.

Q16:

Government should have no role in determining what people can and can not view online. They should provide tools and eduction to help people make their own informed decisions. Industry bodies should have a clearly defined code of conduct, that is legally enforceable with penalties for breaking it. Users should have a means to which the can seek information about managing their own rules for acceptable content.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Any content that is clearly for children or a general audience.

Q19:

If the content creators are required to classify all content, then they should be subsidized for it if they can prove the burden of doing so will provide significant financial hardship to the company .

Q20:

No

Q21:

Yes. There needs to be an Adult X category implemented across the country, rather than the patchwork grey area we have now.

Q22:

Q23:

The whole thing should be consolidated and re written to reflect modern community standards.

Q24:

None. The government censors should not be the deciders of what is prohibited. In the example of illegal content such a child pornography, blocking serves no purpose, it simply hides the problem. It's like closing your blinds because you don't like the view. A better approach would be to have a reporting mechanism for such content, and get law enforcement to remove it if it is deemed to have

violated the criminal code. Content that is hosted outside Australia that violates the criminal code, should be blocked with a clear block page as to why.

Q25:

No, the RC category is too restrictive, and does not reflect current community standards. Australians are huge consumers of pornographic material, but under the current standards, anything more than vanilla non kinky sex is banned. This standard was created in the 50's and does not reflect Australia's more modern attitudes.

Q26:

Yes, because they are completely in-consistent. There needs to be a federal framework, that states can implement with clear guidelines.

Q27:

It should be replaced with a federal framework. States can implement restrictions based on the criteria defined in the federal act.

Q28:

Yes they should.

Q29:

There should be clear and well defined guidelines. Remove the "reasonable person" wording from the act. Set out criteria for each classification. It could be done with a points based system. There could also be a online searchable database / website that the public could access, which lists the rating for the media, and exactly why it was rated that way.

Other comments: