

CI 759 K Robertson

First name: Kai

Last name: Robertson

Q1:

Improving key elements. The basis behind the current framework is correct, but simply needs to be expanded to be consistent across all media and platforms. Better clarification and explanation of exceptionally broad parts of the framework, such as Refused Classification, would also be a large improvement.

Q2:

To inform consumers of the content and potential impacts of the media they are considering consuming so that they can make an informed choice as to whether it is suitable for the purposes they wish to fulfill.

Q3:

No. The argument for this is that some differing elements of media platforms and technologies (such as interactivity) allow for different psychological effects on the consumers, particularly children. There is no conclusive evidence that different technologies or platforms demonstrate these differing effects, as numerous studies disagree with one another, although meta-analysis of studies finds that the majority find no causal link - this was also the decision that the Supreme Court of the US came to in *Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association*. Most authors of studies that find psychological effects caused by one form of media often also find these same effects on other media.

Q4:

Yes. With the increasing volume of end-user produced media that typically skirts classification law, any attempt to cover it would need to be dealt with on a complaints-received basis for the sake of both consistency and financial reasons. Not only would employing the amount of staff required to deal with such an enormous volume of media be expensive but consistency in rating would become problematic, potentially resulting in more complaints and an increased workload.

Q5:

To an extent, yes. The potential impact of, say, violence in a form of media should be determined and then used to determine a classification rating and the information presented with it. If the consumer then processes the information and allows another party which the classification does not believe is suitable to consume this, that is their choice. The purpose of the classification framework should be to allow such informed decisions to be made, rather than force the consumers to make a certain decision.

Q6:

No. The content should be classified purely on the basis of the content, for the sake of consistency and so that consumers can trust in the classification system to inform them correctly.

Q7:

No. Providing restrictions on this could both hamper creative expression and the display of potentially risqué artworks by exhibitions due to potential expense involved (unless paid for by the classification

board, as is currently not the case). If complaints are received or the exhibition itself believes their to be a potential risk, then classification could be performed.

Q8:

Yes. A form of media is a form of media. Consumers should still be informed as to the content of the media regardless of platform or delivery method.

Q9:

No. The content should be classified purely on the basis of the content, for the sake of consistency and so that consumers can trust in the classification system to inform them correctly. The classification rating and the description of the content should determine what an appropriate audience is - that is the purpose of the classification system, so that consumers can determine this and then make a decision to consume based on this information.

Q10:

No. Classification law should simply inform, it should be the role of other laws to determine the legality of accessing specific content in public places compared to private places. If classification changes depending on where it is typically accessed, then those that access it differently could be unfairly disadvantaged and the classification framework itself could be subject to public mistrust.

Q11:

None. The media should be classified based on its content alone so that consumers can be correctly informed and make informed decisions.

Q12:

Barring changes to the law, content that is refused classification and is thus restricted (assuming it is not covered under other laws, such as those that cover child abuse content) is still legal to possess and thus private access should not need to be restricted online. Assuming that it does need to be, provides no known effective methods of controlling access. Attempts to block access to websites are expensive, prone to mistakes (such as blocking access to non-restricted websites) and ineffective against those who wish to access said content. The most effective method against that content which is truly illegal and needs to be properly restricted (such as child abuse content) is to provide police and foreign affairs resources to deal with the source.

Q13:

Inform the parents of the risks in a non-alarmist manner, and provide them with the technology to take action to control this and the information that enables them to determine what they feel is inappropriate and how they might discuss it with their children.

Q14:

Inform the public as to the true legal status of such content and provide police resources to deal with it. An informed public is more likely to make complaints than an uninformed public, as they will know for certain that such content is illegal or restricted.

Q15:

All content should be required to display classification markings, including a list of what specifics the content includes. Nothing more should be required.

Q16:

Users should be informed of the regulations and make complaints when they feel there are mistakes or problems. Industry bodies should be required to form and administer a framework for such

regulation amongst the industry. Government agencies should handle complaints, inform the public and industry bodies, classify and regulate, and forward breaches onto the respective authorities so that it can be dealt with.

Q17:

To some extent. The industry could be responsible for making its own determination of the classification and the government could review it and make changes based on both complaints and perceived differences. Government overview would be necessary for consistency and so that consumers are correctly informed.

Q18:

Children's entertainment and music, as they are the least likely to have differences. Penalties would need to be applied for those intentionally misrepresenting their content in these categories.

Q19:

Any content that is believed to earn under a certain projection (the exact amount would need to be determined through study and consultation). If the content goes over the projection later, a fee could be asked for retrospectively.

Q20:

Largely, yes. The only classification category misunderstood is the Refused Classification rating (RC). The difference between M and M15+ can also be unclear. RC is often misunderstood to be the category for illegal content, when only some of the content is truly illegal and others are merely restricted in how they can be displayed and distributed.

Q21:

Changing M and M15+ to make the differences between the two more readily apparent would be a good idea. Separating RC content into two categories - the truly illegal and that which is merely restricted in distribution and display.

Q22:

The current system works well if it used consistently across all types of content.

Q23:

Yes. Having a single reference point would make referring to the legal documentation earlier and reduce any vagueness or contradictions that might be evident.

Q24:

Child abuse content. Bestiality. 'Snuff' content. Content that involves the severe violation (murder, abuse) of a living being's rights (human or animal, providing they are real) and does not have scientific, literary, artistic or political value.

Q25:

No. The RC category is currently too broad. RC includes content that is still legal to possess (outside of WA) but not to distribute as well as truly illegal content.

Q26:

Yes. Having a single scheme means that people can move between states and territories and still trust in the classification information provided. In the case of a single state or territory refusing improved classification laws, it might be better to provide the laws without that state or territory. It should be promoted through negotiations between the states, territories and the federal government.

Q27:

A single Commonwealth scheme that regulates all content. Most content is introduced country-wide rather than in individual states, so this reduces duplication and wasted resources.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

None that come to mind.

Other comments: