

CI 478 J Krautz

First name: Johann

Last name: Krautz

Q1:

A new framework of classification is needed.

Q2:

To provide accurate advisory information about the media content so that consumers can make informed decisions.

Q3:

Yes. It is impossible to create a classification system that could even approach the task of applying Australian classification standards to websites and software that is distributed via the web; for example, appstores and free software repositories. Self-classification may prove useful in these situations, or classification in response to popularity.

Q4:

No. If the content fails to meet the criteria for being processed by the classification system, then a complaint shouldn't make a difference.

Q5:

This is two questions. For the first, yes, a classification system should respond proportionally. The second question has been partially answered previously. It is impractical to apply classification standards across all media. Classification should be primarily focused on broadcast media, where an individual might consume the media without intending to, such as radio and television, and other media where the consumer has no choice in what is presented to them. Unicast media should be classified based on popularity and potential impact. Unicast media includes web content, games and books, where a consumer makes a decision about what they wish to view.

A consumer of broadcast media needs to be warned, whereas a consumer of unicast media merely needs to be informed.

Q6:

Yes, as above in Q5, the system should respond proportionally.

Q7:

What is art? Perhaps a better question would be: Should works displayed in museums and galleries be classified for the purpose of restricting access or providing consumer advice? My response is no to restricting access, yes to advice. A consumer is capable of restricting their own access, provided they are advised suitably.

Q8:

Sure, why not?

Q9:

Yes, as in Q5 above.

Q10:

Yes. As above, this is related to the distinction between broadcast media and unicast media.

Q11:

Q12:

Content restriction must not be involuntarily forced on a consumer. The role of the NCS must be advisory, otherwise the rights of a consumer to choose are infringed. Also because there is no effective way of controlling a consumer's access to online content short of turning off the Internet. The creators of illegal content should be prosecuted and their hosting removed, but controlling access to them is impractical. But if online content is not illegal, no action is justifiable against it.

Q13:

Education of both the parents on children. There are only two places to intercede to stop a child accessing material that is not appropriate for them. One is at the child, and the other is at the content. To restrict at the content interferes with every other consumer who wishes to view it. To restrict at the child is not only the most effective, but the most fair.

Q14:

Is it not well-enough controlled as it is?

Q15:

When it is deemed potentially harmful to some viewers. After all, some people will take offense at anything, so guessing if something will be offensive to someone somewhere is a terribly criteria to judge by.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide a framework for classification and a process for review. Industry bodies should hold primary responsibility for following that framework and proposing classification for their content. Users must make the choice to heed that advice or not.

Q17:

Yes, a system where the industry proposes self-classifications and the government reviews and approves would be more efficient.

Q18:

Most content should be self-classified.

Q19:

Any media that already receives subsidy for other reasons should probably have allowance in the

subsidy made for classification. Classification should not discourage creativity.

Q20:

The categories are fairly well understood.

Q21:

no need for more.

Q22:

They can be applied consistently. A basic example is to allow an 18+ or AO category for video games. If the framework isn't consistent, or if it means different things when applied to different media, then it becomes useless as a means of providing advice to consumers, and may in fact become misleading, such as when a very violent game is shoe-horned into an MA rating rather than the 18+ it deserves.

Q23:

Sure, why not?

Q24:

The publishers of illegal content should be persecuted and hosting removed, but trying to restrict access would be nigh impossible. Blocked content could be swiftly moved to a new host at very low cost. An effective method of pursuing law-breakers would prove more efficient in prohibiting online content that's deemed too ghastly for human eyes.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yeah, consistency is of the utmost importance. I've got no idea how to promote it though, that seems like a matter of logistics. Aren't there already federal guidelines in place?

Q27:

Well, a federal scheme, obviously.

Q28:

Yes, I suppose so. If that makes it easier. It doesn't matter who does it, though, provided it's done right and is consistent.

Q29:

Regular reviews.

Other comments: