

CI 433 L Nunns

First name: Liam

Last name: Nunns

Q1:

Design an entirely new framework for classification, the current one is out of date and out of touch with society.

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to ensure that inappropriate material is not accessed by children, however adult material is legally accessible by adults. The graduated scheme currently in action needs to be enforced properly ie. MA15+ etc and an R18+ rating needs to be introduced for video games,

Q3:

Only to a degree, I don't believe that games and film should have any different emphasis on classification as a healthy adult I'm capable of determining right from wrong when playing a game as well as viewing a film. A child should be gradually introduced to these concepts as they develop mentally.

The internet should not be filtered, the current filter proposals are a joke in terms of their effectiveness, currently bypassable by a 12 year old who can follow basic instructions. and the more advanced IP filtering suggested won't affect the people seriously attempting to access illegal materials.

Q4:

I don't believe a statistically insignificant amount of complaints should have any real effect on the classification of content especially if they're the work of lobby groups. If material is deemed potentially objectionable by complaints an investigation should occur, not a knee jerk reaction.

Q5:

Content can have an impact on children, and the classification system should support parents decision in giving their children access to the content. It should not be the single point of decision making for a parent but a tool in their belt, as whats deemed offensive by one parent may not be by another.

content specifically designed for children should follow the current classification system which as I understand it is a simple G/PG/M rating. all media should be similar in terms of classification for children.

Q6:

Essentially if an item is mass marketed you can generally be re-assured that it's an item thats considered socially acceptable, however that shouldn't prevent smaller developers from having the same consideration as the larger producers and distributors. in the case of a significant consumer

backlash, such as that which occurred with Mortal Kombat you can be fairly re-assured that current society expects access to that content.

Q7:

Only if it breaches major laws such as child pornography, etc. Transparency should be encouraged in for example a gallery, however art-work itself should be fairly immune from classification except in extreme examples.

Q8:

music and sound classification would be a fairly futile exercise in control to attempt to classify, the MA15+ rating on a CD will often make it more desirable to a sub-section of today's youth than less. The nature of music is it's nearly impossible to police, and to try beyond the current system would be un-desirable.

Q9:

No, it should have no real bearing on whether material is classified or not. if a mass consumer backlash occurs it should obviously be investigated, but so should the smaller content providers.

Q10:

Unless the material is being broadcasted in a way that is completely public then it should be classified as the same, obviously pornography should remain an in home activity. However the current approach to this issue appears to work.

Q11:

the only point I suggest making content illegal is if the making of it hurts another person without their consent at the time of production.

In terms of classification preventing children from accessing material is effectively as a guide to support parents in making their decisions.

Q12:

There is currently no proposed way to control access to online content that isn't easily by-passable, filtering should be applied by parents at the home level. If illegal content is discovered on the internet then it should be dealt with at the source where the real damage is being done, if its legal content it should remain legal. If a user is potentially under-age then it's the parents responsibility to monitor that usage, plenty of software and strategies are currently in place for motivated parents to do so. The internet is not a magic intangible network, all content on it is hosted in a physical location uploaded by a physical person.

Q13:

At the individual level, a free pamphlet handed out with internet connections with clear easy instructions in how to install software that prevents inappropriate content access by children. Vigilance by parents is the single most effective internet filter.

Q14:

It is effectively controlled with current methods, at most put explicit magazines behind a counter.

Q15:

if it's potentially harmful or deemed potentially harmful have a warning and explanation on the item.

Q16:

to facilitate parents in their choice to prevent their children from accessing content they deem inappropriate, and pursuing people both local and overseas who host/create content which mentally or physically portrays the harm of another person.

Q17:

collaboration with the industry needs to occur in order to accurately define content, with the way technology is rapidly advancing the industry will need to have input to keep government bodies in touch with the content

Q18:

pornography should be fairly easily classified, as well as children's films. the grey area around M - MA15+ should have some consultation with industry. I don't see anything wrong with the classification boards decisions, they're just limited by an archaic system.

Q19:

Classification should be free, or similar to a HELP debt for university. if the content ends up making a significant amount of money then the debt can be repaid (a reasonable debt no greater than a certain % of revenue) otherwise the debts forgiven.

Q20:

the M-MA15+ and lack of R rating in the games industry causes a lot of confusion, content isn't classified appropriately in those fields.

Q21:

an R18 rating needs to be introduced to the games industry so adults can legally play content they choose to play. greater transparency about the MA15+ and potential R rating needs to occur as this was introduced.

Banning a game has the same effect on children and adults as putting an MA15+ sticker on music does for children.

Q22:

Effectively simple questions should be asked when grading content, in regards to levels of violence. levels of sex/sexual connotations, language etc. the content should classify itself. Different media formats shouldn't have much of an effect on how its classified.

Q23:

consolidated? or re-written is more apt. 1995 was a very long time ago in regards to technology, 15 years in the industry is a life-time. it needs significant revision to be applicable.

Q24:

Content that depicts the "significant" physical or emotional harm of another person. however introducing a "filter" is next to impossible. contact with the point of hosting is the only solution.

Q25:

the internet is a whole different environment, by its very nature attempting to restrict it will just make it harder to restrict and less transparent.

The RC category is only applicable at this point and it only should be applied by the individual or parent. A filter simply won't currently work, unless you want children to learn how to be subversive quite early (it's that easy to bypass) then it needs to be done by parents and law enforcement officials in the case of child pornography.

Q26:

If an individual Governor General or state body decides to roadblock consensus effectively across the board then do it without their consent.

Q27:

A scheme up to date with technology, and acknowledging a new strategy to classification

Q28:

new framework for classification of media will not have consensus however it desperately requires reform, you may not get complete agreement in how it should be enacted. but it has to be enacted soon or in-action will just cripple the industry (specifically the game industry).

Q29:

Introduce an R18+ rating for games. simplify classification criteria.

Other comments:

The internet cannot be filtered effectively, stop trying and start focusing on the criminals creating the content.

An R18 rating should of been introduced 5 years ago for games, why hasn't it? the ACL deserve a say, but not the amount they're getting.