

CI 454 J Chilcott

First name: Jason

Last name: Chilcott

Q1:

Improve existing frame work, use the same standard across all types of media.

Q2:

To advise adults about the content of media in order to help them make informed decisions about their consumption.

Q3:

No, with the exception of user generated content. It would be impractical to classify user generated content.

Q4:

No, the content should be classified based on the content, not on a complaint.

Q5:

1) No. The content should be classified based on the content itself, not on what may or may not be.
2) If the content needs to be classified it should be classified regardless of who it is designed for or what media it is on.

Q6:

Professional content producers who produce content for a living should have their content classified. Potential mass market reach of any material is huge due to the ease of distribution and promotion across the internet, anything can become an instant hit. The potential should not impact the classification.

Q7:

Classification should be to provide consumer advice, not to restrict access.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No. The content should be classified based on the content alone. It should not be classified based on what may or may not be.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

The only content that should be RC should be that which is criminal in nature (eg. child porn.) Illegal content like that should be dealt with online in the same way it is dealt with offline, with the police. There is no effective method of controlling access to online content. Any type of filter or block is easily bypassed with the use of a VPN or proxy. Even the seizure of domain names has been proven ineffective by the USA's Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement division with their seizures of many domain names over the last year. This can be seen with the fact that many of the sites that had their domain name seized had their site running under a different domain name within days if not hours. The general public does not even need to know the new domain name of these web sites if they use a simple browser add on like Mafiaafire (<http://www.mafiaafire.com/>) that will automatically redirect a seized domain name to its new address. Any attempt to control access to online content will be a waste of time, money, and resources that would be better spent on bringing criminals to justice rather than hiding them under a blanket and pretending they are not there. It is also known that many intelligence agencies around the world are against any form of access control or filter on the internet because of the increase in encrypted communications online making their work at tracking down criminals much more difficult than it already is.

Q13:

By educating parents. If a parent is not willing to let their children roam free and unattended in the slums and dark alleys of a big city then they should also take control of their children's access to online content. Local child safe filters installed on a child's PC should be all that is needed if the parent chooses to use one.

Q14:

I was unaware that the current controls in place are insufficient. They worked well when I was a child.

Q15:

Whenever a parent needs to make a decision about their children viewing the content or if the content contains material that may be considered distressing to an adult.

Q16:

gov: guidelines

Industry: application

Users: notification of breaches of regulation.

Q17:

Yes. With some kind of penalty for industry if found willfully abusing or misusing the classification.

Q18:

So long as the code of classification is obvious and straightforward I see no reason why industry can't classify their own content with a gov agency available to assist and perform random checks.

Q19:

No comment.

Q20:

Yes, with the exception of RC. No one I have talked to understands why the government would refuse classification to content that is not illegal.

Q21:

No, so long as classification categories are the same across all types of media. If the categories are not made the same across all types of media then there needs to be a category for adult video games so that adult gamers like myself can purchase adult video games in Australia instead of sending all our money overseas.

Q22:

By using only one set of markings, criteria and guidelines regardless of the type of media the content uses.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

None. Content online should be treated the same as content offline. If content is illegal such as child porn then the police should be called in to deal with it as we have seen time and time again with co-operation across law enforcement agencies around the world shutting down these criminal groups and bringing them to justice. It should not be dealt with by filtering the internet.

Q25:

The current scope of RC is a joke. It is common sense to have things like child porn and extreme violence rated RC. It is NOT common sense to have adult video games classed RC, nor is it common sense to have a secret government list that has no oversight nor any form of defense or appeal if someone believes their material has been classed RC incorrectly, nor is it common sense to have a Government choose what it wants to class RC simply because it doesn't like it.

Q26:

Yes, make classification laws federal and make the states and territories follow the federal laws.

Q27:

No comment

Q28:

Yes, so long as the Commonwealth steers clear of censorship and internet filtering.

Q29:

No comment.

Other comments:

Regardless of what else comes out of this there are two things I would like to see.

1) The addition of an adult classification in video games. (Stop treating us like children, lets us make our own decisions as the educated adults that we are.)

2)No internet filter. It won't hinder anyone who wants to access the material that is on the filter list [link redacted]. It will constantly lag behind the availability of, or completely miss, the content it is designed to filter [link redacted]. It will affect innocent sites [link redacted]