

CI 450 J White

First name: Jonathan

Last name: White

Q1:

Given the developments in technology and media in the last twenty years, a new framework for classification that takes account of these developments would make the most sense.

Q2:

Providing advice to the consumer so that they can make an informed choice rather than banning content.

Q3:

No. Classification should be determined solely on content as the technology or platform is immaterial. This also allows for future proofing of the classification scheme against new technology developments.

Q4:

Yes. There is far too much new content being delivered via the internet for an effective classification scheme to review all of it prior to release. Any attempt to classify content that is delivered via the internet would be far too resource intensive and expensive.

Q5:

Potential impact of content should only be considered if there is substantial proof that the content would be harmful or could reasonably be expected to be harmful.

Q6:

The size or potential market reach of the producer of content should be immaterial to its classification. Classification should be dependent solely on the content.

Q7:

Classification for the purpose of providing consumer advice is acceptable, but restriction of access to art is an unacceptable impingement on freedom of expression.

Q8:

Yes, but for the purposes of providing consumer advice, not to restrict access.

Q9:

Potential size of the audience should be immaterial, but the composition of the audience should be taken into consideration as different demographic sections of the population have different views on the standards of acceptable content.

Q10:

Yes. Content accessed in public areas carries a far greater risk of being viewed by persons for whom

it would not be acceptable than that accessed in the privacy of a home.

Q11:

The onus for classification should be on providing advice so that parents can exercise their responsibility to properly supervise their children, rather than abrogating that responsibility.

Q12:

There is no effective method of controlling access to online content. Any attempt to filter certain domains or websites is ineffective as it is not only purely reactive, but can not control all other means of accessing illegal content such as through peer to peer networks, virtual private networks, through the use of proxies based overseas or via anonymous networks. Further, evidence has shown that the vast amount of illegal content is shared via email amongst private groups and is NOT accessible to the open internet.

Q13:

Proper parental responsibility in supervising their children's online activities and the subsidizing of quality and effective PC based filtering software is the most effective method. The onus should be on parents to properly supervise their children.

Q14:

As the internet continues to expand, the market for sexually explicit magazines will dwindle until they are no longer commercially viable. In the interim, current practice of sealing the magazines in a plastic cover, along with regime requiring the production of identification in a similar way to alcohol sales should be sufficient.

Q15:

For the purposes of providing consumer advice, any content not suitable for persons under a certain age should be clearly marked. e.g MA15+ and R18 classifications in the current scheme.

Q16:

There is far too much content for a government agency to reasonably be expected to classify before release. Industry bodies should establish a code of conduct for their members to classify their own products. Any complaints or disputes of the classification by users can then be arbitrated by a government agency.

Q17:

Yes, it would streamline the system and reduce the workload and demand on the government bodies.

Q18:

All content if the its classification is obvious and straightforward.

Q19:

No. The onus should be on producers to properly classify their content in line with a suitable code.

Q20:

There is a general understanding of the different age restrictions of the classification categories, but confusion regarding how the categories are applied to different formats. For example, material that would result in a movie being classified R18 is available in video games as MA15, due to the lack of an R18 category for games.

Q21:

Yes. An R18 classification for computer and video games is urgently required. Australia is currently the only country in the western world lacking such a category and urgent action is required to bring our industry and market in line with world standards.

Q22:

The establishment of a consistent code based solely on the content of the media, regardless of its actual format.

Q23:

Streamlining of classification criteria would assist in removing confusion, particularly the introduction of an R18 classification for games.

Q24:

There is no feasible way to properly prohibit access to any sort of content online. Only a very small percentage of illegal content is available via websites. The vast majority is traded privately between individuals. There is no feasible way to prevent this.

Q25:

No. Not only is there no feasible way to properly prohibit access to such content online, but the current scope of RC material is far too broad.

Q26:

Yes. Australia is an open country and a patchwork of classification laws would only create confusion. Promotion of a single classification law should be promoted by the States surrendering their powers in this area to the Commonwealth.

Q27:

A single commonwealth based regulative framework that allows industry bodies to classify their own work with a government department overseeing the scheme and arbitrating complaints.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Introduction of an R18 classification for games. Recognition of the infeasibility and futility of attempting to filter the internet.

Other comments:

Any classification scheme should emphasize the responsibility of parents to properly supervise their children, rather than impinge on the freedom of adults to access content. As stated previously, attempting to filter the internet is not only futile and technically infeasible, as demonstrated by the ease at which previous attempts have been bypassed, but doing so based on a secret black list is completely anathema to Australia's democratic culture. Current laws prohibiting the possession of certain materials such as child pornography or terrorism related materials have proven to be sufficient.