

CI 786 S Caldwell

First name: Stewart

Last name: Caldwell

Q1:

I believe the Existing classification structur for films works quite well in terms of identifiers however how they are applied is very inconsistent therefore a new framework may be required.

Q2:

Consistence any application to other medias. I think the nature of classification should be reviewed (for example why is endless violence acceptable in most levels of classification but sex seen as generally unacceptable? A very outdated approach) and how this is applied consistently to other medias (including computer games)

Q3:

Yes. Content created to entertain should be deemed different to that which informs. Is is typically difficult to do however information sources on the internet are different to movies or computer games created for consumption.

Q4:

No

Q5:

I don't think any system can legislate what is appropriate for children in all cases. The definition would be to broad to b useful.

Q6:

This feels like a loaded question. Any system should not restrict the ability for small producers to have their content distributed or hamper the development of independent arts.

Q7:

No. I dont art produced for demonstration is the same as media produced for commercial distribution.

Q8:

Yes. But refer to comments for Q7

Q9:

Refer Q6

Q10:

Yes to a degree. Again refer to Q7.

Q11:

-

Q12:

Optional parental filters I guess. But there is no effective means of controlling access. Best options are opting for adult domain names And of course education of users in using the Internet.

Q13:

Educate parents on using the Internet. Ensure parents can educate children on using the Internet.

Q14:

It's a pointless exercise trying to control content on the Internet as it goes against the nature of how the Internet functions. Education of users is the key.

Q15:

If consumers are paying for it.

Q16:

Govt bodies should set classification ratings (ie R, MA) industry bodies and users should be used to help inform what those classifications relate to.

Q17:

It may lead to faster classification but the concern would be inconsistency in classification application. Refer to Q16. If industry and user bodies consulted with govt perhaps inconsistency could be reduced.

Q18:

Unsure. This question seems too broad.

Q19:

Unsure what would be subsidized. Are there significant costs associated with classification?

Q20:

I think the 'codes' are clear but the application seems inconsistent. Refer Q2

Q21:

Perhaps a classification for public works informing the public to use necessary discretion

Q22:

Consistency in graphic design is most important.

Q23:

Unsure

Q24:

If content breaks Australian law. But this still seems impossible as shown many times recently.

Education is most important.

Q25:

Unsure.

Q26:

Yes but this doesn't necessarily mean the 'dilution' of Laws in areas who currently permit material banned in other states.

Q27:

Unsure. Not a very good question and would be difficult for most contributors to answer.

Q28:

Yes. Assuming this system still allows for localized flexibility.

Q29:

Simply provide Clear information on what content contains that may concern consumers to ensure consumers can make educated choices.

Other comments: