

CI 782 B Davies

First name: Ben

Last name: Davies

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing.

Q2:

To provide information to consumers so they can make informed decisions about what material they wish to watch/use/listen/play/etc. The classification scheme must NOT implement any mechanism for restricting access to any material.

Q3:

Yes. Resources should not be wasted in a futile effort to classify and/or restrict online content.

Traditional media publication (video, CD, magazine, cinema, etc) should stay as it is.

Q4:

Yes.

Q5:

No, it's not possible to assess what "potential impact" means, it is VERY subjective.

Q6:

Yes. Anything with a wider potential audience should be giving priority when deciding what content should be classified.

Q7:

Yes. In the same way as messages are displayed before a movie ("this movie may contain images which may offend some viewers", "this exhibition contains images of deceased animals", etc) it is feasible and reasonable to provide a classification.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Yes. Refer Q6.

Q10:

Yes. Content which can be accessed directly at home (i.e. online content) should NOT be classified. It is a futile effort and one for which there are no benefits. Any person who wishes to filter their own content can do so using existing software tools.

Q11:

Anything relating to sexual preference should ALWAYS be exempt from classification. Anything which depicts a family different from the traditional atomic mum+dad+children family should be EXEMPT.

Anything which provides medical information (including safe sexual practices, etc) should be EXEMPT.

It's fair to ignore anything the australia christian lobby wants classified; not all of us want to live in 1950.

Q12:

There are no effective methods, everything can be circumvented. There must be NO filtering of online content, it is an expensive exercise in futility.

Q13:

Education of parents in ways to filter content on their own PC and in ways to better supervise and monitor their child's online activity. This relates especially to social sites (sms, instant messaging, facebook, etc).

Q14:

It's classified and it can't be sold to minors, there's nothing else to be done. Any person who wants to access this material (any boy in high school) has already done so online.

Q15:

On the back cover of print and other media (back of CD case, computer game case, etc), before a presentation. Similar to the current scheme.

Q16:

Users (and guardians of those users) have the primary responsibility for regulating content. It is the government's responsibility to classify where appropriate (NOT online content) and educate users on how to make informed decisions. It is NOT the government's responsibility to act as nanny; we are adults and can make informed decisions about the material we choose to consume and choose to let our children consume.

Q17:

If a clear set of guidelines are written then an industry can self-classify, assuming there is an easy way for consumers to flag content which has been mis-classified.

Q18:

All content.

Q19:

They should be self-classified and if that film is flagged as being mis-classified then the government should cover all costs involved in establishing an official rating.

Q20:

Yes, they are clear.

Q21:

The Refused Classification (RC) rating should be remove/merged with R 18+. Any rating should be accompanied by a message which indicates the type of content ("sexually explicit material", etc) [as it currently is].

Q22:

They are clear to me.

Q23:

Consolidation at the federal level.

Q24:

Anything which is currently illegal (child pornography, bestiality, etc). There should be no attempt at filtering this content, it is the job of federal law enforcement to curtail illegal content.

Q25:

No. This category should not exist. There should only be "R 18+". Only illegal content should be prohibited online.

Q26:

Yes. There should only be one federal classification system.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

There must never be a government scheme to filter the internet, even for prohibited material. I will not support any government who accepts filtering as a viable solution, and nor will any of my family, friends, or peers. It isn't technically viable, it isn't cheap, and it isn't effective. The only solution is EDUCATION. The government must not let itself be bullied by the australia christian cult lobby whose minority but well-funded opinions don't represent those of the (sadly apathetic and uninformed) wider community.