

CI 535 A O'Donnell

First name: Ashley

Last name: O'Donnell

Q1:

A New framework should be developed.

Q2:

The main objective should be to create a system that classifies its content appropriately and fairly, the current system, and the current framework for that matter does not do this, and there have been many examples in all categories of content and regardless of what platform it is delivered on.

We need a streamline system that makes classification easy to understand and easy enough for content to be classified appropriately. An easy system makes it easier for parents to understand what they are allowing their children to watch, while being informative and classifying content appropriately as to not offend between age/sex/race etc.

Q3:

No, simply because any platform can be easily accessed regardless of age, therefore should not be subject to being treated differently.

Q4:

No, all content should be classified. This is an extremely big task, but there has been development of computerised system that can appropriately rate content according to the publisher.

Q5:

No, this is answered above.

Q6:

No, again this is answered above, but just because a minority uses this content, doesn't mean it shouldn't be classified appropriately. This would just end up causing the same problems we have with the current system.

Q7:

Yes, it is still content that some people may find offensive, and therefore should be classified and if so restricted access to the appropriate groups.

Q8:

Yes, if music is classified than so should audio books/podcasts (at least those produced from reputable companies) etc

Q9:

No, see my answer to question 4 and 6.

Q10:

Content delivered through the internet is rather hard to classify and in such cases it comes down to adults being reasonable enough to decide for themselves whether it is something they want to interact with, and it also comes down to the parents to provide guidance for their children, the government cannot protect them from this without making inroads into the freedom we take for granted. Eg. the national broadband internet filter, a failed idea because it imposed on our freedom on the internet and failed to have any impact on preventing what it was trying to prevent.

Q11:

Adults need to be given more freedom to choose what they want to interact with, and be able to decide for themselves if it is appropriate to interact with, not just for themselves but for their own children (not someone else's children). Stop babying the Australian public with archaic views, especially those based on religion, especially when the vast majority are not interested.

Q12:

The ISP filter was a failed idea, and should never be considered again, the content would just have to be classified as best as it could be, with major internet sites be given a classification for their appropriate use. Minor sites would just have to be neglected due to a minority that use them. Ultimately the adults should be able to classify content on those websites for them and their children.

Q13:

Parents. That is all that needs to be done, they need to control their children, not cry about it because the government doesn't have an effective system to deal with it.

Q14:

It comes down to being responsible adults, the current system is ok for the classification of such content, although the system does need some tweaking to be brought into line with the 21st century.

Q15:

All content should be required, otherwise there is limited chance for parents to understand what they are allowing their children to interact with before it is too late.

Q16:

There needs to be a considerable approach to how this is handled, the idea is to make a process that is fast and effective, not drawn out and compartmentalised along the way.

Q17:

Yes, definitely, people who work in that industry know and understand the content they are delivering and therefore know their target audience and can therefore give a more reliable classification, as well as the classification process being relatively quick, especially compared to the current system.

Q18:

Classification of content that is designed for families and younger age groups, as well as content that is sexually explicit (such as pornography). There are probably other types of content that can be self classified, however the content that needs to be addressed are the content that is perhaps morally ambiguous or where a more delicate approach is needed to give a clearer indication of appropriate classification.

Q19:

Yes, there needs to be a way to make content more easily accessible, and that starts firstly with distribution.

Q20:

I don't think so, there are so many example of content that cause confusion. For example, the recent release of Duke Nukem, a video game that has high amounts of violence, as well as nudity and coarse language, but is only rated MA15+, whereas it is rated at R18+ in other countries. As well as the fact that other games have been banned for similar activity, but due to not being as well known they are Refused Classification, for example, the video game Risen.

Q21:

Perhaps, there definitely needs to be more meaning behind each classification, as some categories appear to overlap in duties, such the M and MA rating's as well as the G and PG ratings.

Q22:

On set of criteria, not multiple for each media format. This will allow greater understanding of that criteria and what each classification rating means in respect to the content contained in that rating.

Q23:

Yes, as I stated earlier, there needs to be one system for the classification of content, that will bring the content in line. There does need to be some consideration when using the system to classify words compared to images however.

Q24:

None, people have a right to freedom on the internet, the proposed ISP filter is a joke and should be considered as such.

Q25:

No, the RC category is just a way for the current system to remove content from the system because it is too hard to classify, or perhaps the there is a lack of understanding with that content.

Q26:

Yes, why should it be different in another state/territory, these guidelines are for people to use to understand what they are interacting with, not to have changed because an AG doesn't fully agree with it for their chosen state/territory. Whats the point of having a classification system if it is going to be different within the same country, that won't help protect or communicate with the general public.

Q27:

A scheme that allows power to the federal government rather than the attorney generals.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

No further suggestions

Other comments: