

CI 459 D Scott

First name: Dougal

Last name: Scott

Q1:

I believe the current framework is too broken due to lack of coherent policy and poor definition. Therefore a new framework should be developed that ideally parallels common international frameworks. This will minimise cross border issues and make the final framework more effective.

Q2:

Advising consumers of the content to enable them to make informed decisions on suitability of content for themselves and those they are responsible for.

Q3:

Due to the volume of content in some technologies it is impossible to classify it all content on those distribution channels. The classification system must address this issue.

Q4:

This is the obvious way to deal with the inability to classify the world. Allow creators to classify, and only involve external classification when there is a complaint. To prevent vexatious and nuisance complaints and deceit by creators there should be a cost to the losing side of the complaint.

Q5:

There is no way to determine or define what content is "designed for children" or "not designed for children". Children and adults will make their own choices as to what they want to see and hear, and it will in many cases not agree with marketing, legislative or authority assessment. No one can predict fads.

Q6:

Again, it is impossible to predict interest in any new content. As I stated in my answer to question 4, the purpose of classification should be to enable informed choice. Blanket classification will significantly lessen the accuracy of the classification because it will not be based on the actual content, leading to under and over classification and making classification worthless.

Q7:

Again, self classify, and if there is a complaint that is adjudicated. Simple procedures to facilitate rapid assessment, and clear and unambiguous guidelines to allow self assessment to be correct. Include facility to obtain authoritative assessment in advance when the self assessment is borderline.

Q8:

All content should be classified in accordance with the same principles. Classification should enable informed consumers decisions. This equally applies to all media.

Q9:

In a self classification system there is no reason for any exemptions.

Q10:

In a self classification system there is no reason for any exemptions.

Q11:

In a self classification system there is no reason for any exemptions.

Q12:

No information should be restricted under the National Classification Scheme. If the content is illegal under the various criminal codes (not associated with classification) then the content provider should be prosecuted under the appropriate law and jurisdiction. If the content is not illegal under the jurisdiction where it is created/hosted, then viewing or hearing the content should not be illegal and should not be restricted, anymore than other jurisdictions should restrict access to legal Australian content such as leje majeste of the Thai king.

Q13:

By parental supervision and use of client level content filters, many good free and commercial versions are available.

Q14:

For children by parental supervision as it has since cavemen started drawing naked figures on cave walls. For adults by providing them the means to make informed decisions whether they want to access it or not - which is what the National Classification Scheme should be doing.

Q15:

Whenever the content is self assessed as above the level that parents should know about to restrict their children - equivalent to MA now.

Q16:

Government agencies should only provide the definitions and framework to facilitate informed choice. Classification should largely be between the producer and the consumer.

Q17:

The current arrangements are hopelessly broken, mainly because classification has been deformed into censorship.

Q18:

All content should be classified by the creator owner.

Q19:

Never. The only time classification should have a cost is when there is a complaint and then either the complainant or the content producer should pay the cost, or when a content producer wants to get an authoritative assessment because they believe it is borderline, in which case the content producer should be responsible for the cost.

Q20:

Content should be classified by its content eg violence, nudity, language and extreme levels of same. Arbitrary age ranges are meaningless because it is assessment of the content that is required to make an accurate informed decision. It is like classifying food as not suitable for under 15 year old people. Classifications have to be descriptive to be meaningful.

Q21:

All age categories should be abolished. Categories should only address content. A related but separate consideration then is what categories should be age restricted. But age restriction itself should not be a category, because it fails to inform why the content is restricted, and doesn't allow informed choice.

Q22:

Industry probably has the best answer to that, except that the labels should be simple and consistent and easy to distinguish. A simple but effective system would be 3 tiers of each of the violence, nudity and language eg extreme violence with some nudity would be NVVV or N3V. Level one of each would be not offensive to anyone and is suitable for everyone, level 2 is anything not criminally illegal in public, and level 3 is the rest.

Q23:

It should be scrapped because it is meaningless in providing tools for people to make informed decisions on what appropriate.

Q24:

None. Actions are illegal, not informing yourself of those facts or opinions.

Q25:

Refused classification is tautological - it has been classified, how can it possible be refused classification. A "not classified" category for everything that is not classified may be required, but not to ban it, just to inform the consumer that they have to exercise caution because it has not been classified and it may upset or offend them, and may not be suitable for their children.

Q26:

Classification guidelines should be consistent throughout the nation. The states should make their own decision on criminal code.

Q27:

Federal legislation should address consistency of guidelines and management of classification. State legislation should address legality of content display in various regimes from private viewing, though public viewing, to public display for profit, and sale and distribution.

Q28:

Classification only should be federated to ensure consistency of classification and improve understanding by consumers of what classification mean. Legality should be tranferred to state control.

Q29:

Stop using classification as a means of censoring society and imposing specific morals and ideals on the whole population. Government stay out of personal morals and ideals - that is for individuals and their religion if any.

Other comments: