

CI 580 B Letcher

First name: Bryce

Last name: Letcher

Q1:

The existing frame work is a good basis to begin, but it can certainly do with some updating. One of the fundamental concepts I believe is important is to follow is that classification should track the general public's view of what is acceptable and what is not acceptable as it changes over time.

Q2:

To provide as little restriction as possible while still maintaining an alignment or consensus with the views of the general public (rather than noisey minorities).

Q3:

NO. However, content restrictions where policing of the rules is not possible is just stupid. In other words, trying to restrict access to websites, news groups, peer to peer networks etc. is stupid because technology provides easy ways around controls such as Senator Conroy proposes for a Government mandated filter. Only make rules that can be enforced.

Q4:

Absolutely, and not just one or ten complaints either but when the community in general would find something unacceptable, then it should be restricted.

Q5:

In principle yes, however I refer you to my answer to Q3 above.

Q6:

No, the source of material should not affect its classification status.

Q7:

I see artworks as just another media and as such the content should be treated the same. IE: Paintings of naked teenagers is no different to photos of them, movies of them, or stage performances by them and all should have the same classification system applied.

Q8:

Yes. Why should it be any different. Does it matter if a swear word is uttered by a radio announcer or the singer of a song played by the radio station? I don't see any difference, if it is acceptable in a song then the announcer can say it, or vice versa.

Q9:

No. These days the potential size of an audience is not limited to the venue or the physical attendees of an event. Nor should the access to an event be an influencing factor, it does not matter if it is a private or public event, experience has shown that private things rapidly become public where there is a will.

Q10:

Please see my answer to Q9 above.

Q11:

Acceptability to the general public (not minority groups) should be the dominant influence, followed by common sense as to the ability of a Government body to police that classification. IE, broadcast TV can be regulated, but IPTV cannot for technical reasons.

Q12:

Unfortunately there are no effective methods of controlling access to online content on a national scale. It can be done on a computer by computer basis, but only if the owner is cooperative. For this reason I see classification of online items as senseless.

Q13:

This can ONLY be effectively done by close parental supervision. Providing education to parents in the methods of supervision would greatly assist, but only if the parents are going to be responsible for their own children. Providing free "approved" filter programs for individual computers (read tablets, mobile phones, or any other connected device) would also assist, but these do have significant limitations and are not useful by themselves. They become useful as a tool when used in conjunction to parental supervision.

Q14:

This can only be done up to the point of sale. Once the item leaves the sales venue the new owner has total control.

Q15:

When ever there is a classification restriction AND it is technically feasible. IE, Websites and online games would not be considered technically feasible because the hosting can be located off shore, web filters can be by passed with trivial effort, etc.

Q16:

I believe that Government agencies should provide the tools and education required for parents to be able to supervise their children, but in the end it is up to the users or parents of the users to follow the recommendations of classification

Q17:

No. Sorry but I do not believe in self regulation. That is simply an attempt on the part of Government to pass the buck, or skip the work load.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

No. But classification should be cheap and fast to obtain for any organization.

Q20:

Most actually. Make it easy but classify directly by age for the lower levels and by a number system for adult materials. IE, for something mildly offensive to an adult, rate it 1, for something very offensive rate it 5.

Q21:

See Q20 above. I would suggest ratings for children to be up to 8 years, up to 12 years, up to 15 years and up to 18 years.

Q22:

No comment

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

It's not technically possible to restrict online access or to display a classification warning, so any prohibition must have some method of policing, other than filters etc.

if this is kept in mind, then there is nothing special or different about online content and it should not be treated any differently to say printed media.

Q25:

Please see my answer to Q24

Q26:

yes, it is a Federal matter, nothing to do with State.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

Transparency of the systems and methods is important, as is provision of an appeal system or review for items which have been classified.