

CI 576 M Coats

First name: Michael

Last name: Coats

Q1:

Improving elements in the existing framework

Q2:

To provide information to users of material to evaluate the suitability of the material for themselves and others (mainly their kids) before viewing/using it.

Q3:

No. The only real issue is does interactivity increase the impact of material. While interactivity can make the material have a higher impact through active participation, at the same time it also gives the user choice as to whether or not to participate - which balances it out. If there is no choice, it isn't really interactive - and can be handled like any static media.

Q4:

Ideally no - everything relevant should be classified equally, but if market forces dictate that the choice is between classification after complaints or no classification at all, then some classification is better than none at all.

Q5:

No. Just because a content producer aims to target children does not automatically mean that they will be successful in the implementation. Everything should be checked equally.

Q6:

No. All content should be classified equally. If there are increased economic problems for small producers, these should be addressed separately without compromising classification.

Q7:

Yes. blanket classification of galleries/exhibitions rather than individual pieces may be more appropriate, but 'art' is not inherently better than any other media format - and should be classified to the same level.

Q8:

Yes. Music or sound recordings are not inherently better than any other media format - and should be classified to the same level.

Q9:

No. All content should be classified equally. If there are increased economic problems for small producers, these should be addressed separately without compromising classification.

Q10:

No. There is no reason to evaluate either to a different standard.

Q11:

There are no factors. Everything should be classified to the same level. Any economic impacts should be dealt with separately.

Q12:

There are too many ways to bypass any method of control to online content. The focus should be on education of users that there is no real control and they need to be aware that they could inadvertently access content of any classification level. Possibly an opt-in platform to provide informative content classification can be provided for web content with multi-tier classification (rather than just safe/unsafe for kids which commercial platforms provide) where users can post classifications for unrated material (The rating could be based on the average of x reviews, with mixed rating material receiving classification review so not everything on the web has to be actively reviewed) - with an associated education campaign to advertise the platform.

Q13:

Education of Parents is the only appropriate method - as they realistically control childrens access to online material and they need to take responsibility of this fact. Without effective access control methods, parents need to step in and provide active oversight themselves - and restrict access to all content if/when they cant.

Q14:

Enforce restricted classification ratings at the point of purchase, and fine sellers who don't comply.

Q15:

Always - whats the point of classifying something and then leaving the information off the product.

Q16:

Gov't needs to overall control classification. Industry bodies and users can provide information, however this will usually be biased (industry will act in the interests of their profits, and you tend to only hear from unhappy users and not the silent happy majority) - and this needs to be taken into account before final classification is made by the Gov't which 'should' be independent.

Q17:

The government needs to have final say. As above, industry will act in the interests of their own profits at the end of the day - and they will only be reliable for the instances where profitability and user protection coincide.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

This issue should be tackled separately, by considering "should government subsidise independent artwork/media" - classification cost is just another cost among many for independent producers and shouldnt be considered separately.

Q20:

No. M15+ and MA cause a huge amount of confusion. One should be removed or at least renamed with an appropriate education campaign.

Q21:

As above, either M15 or MA should be renamed/removed purely to reduce confusion. The existing classifications fully span the media and more would just confuse matters further.

Q22:

Use the same classification categories, and the same labelling.

Q23:

Q24:

Anything which breaks Australian Law, or falls under RC categories of classification.

Q25:

I believe so.

Q26:

Yes. All states should have identical classification. Separate classification in different states is unneeded (no state is small enough to encapsulate one demographic only, and there isnt any real cultural differences between states overall to warrant any different classification systems. Having separate systems is just a waste of time/money.

Q27:

Something controlled by the Commonwealth only, and applicable uniformly across the whole country.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

The influence of extreme minority groups should be reduced in regards to classification. Too many decisions are being made based on noise made by the vocal minority with agenda's that are contrary to what the bulk of the population desire. Just because you only hear from the people with complaints does not mean that everyone is complaining. The current system covers most things, and works pretty well. It just needs to be applied more consistently - all media are inherently the same and should be treated as such with a uniform system across all formats.

Other comments: