

CI 798 S Krebs

First name: Shannon

Last name: Krebs

Q1:

Elements of the current framework should be improved, but a completely new framework is not required.

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be about ensuring there is no surprises when viewing content. The role of the classification system should not be about censorship or prohibiting access for adults, but providing information for people to make informed choices about content.

Q3:

Yes. In theory all content should have a classification available, but as more content is accessed over the Internet from internationally hosted sites, it will not be feasible to apply an Australian classification scheme to all content.

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Yes, No

Q6:

Yes, this greatly depends on the cost involved in classification. If there is plain language guidelines and the classification rating can be applied by the producer/distributor it would be easier for more content to be classified. If the classification has to be applied by a central government agency then it would not be cost effective to apply classification to content for anything other than mass market broadcast content.

Q7:

In the principle of no surprises, artwork should be classified to provide consumer advice. Restricting access should not be the purpose of the classification system.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

Yes

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

No content should be restricted under the classification scheme.

Q13:

It is a parents responsibility to guard against inappropriate content for their children. There is already software that can be installed locally to provide some filtering of content. If there is a demand for this

type of software the market and the available solutions will grow. The Government, in the guise of the classification scheme should not be involved in restricting access to online content.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Government agencies should provide the classification framework outlining the national classification levels. Government should not be involved in the actual classification of content unless complaints about content (above a threshold) are received. Users may report content that is clearly misclassified.

Q17:

Yes, if the range of content that is classified in the future is expanded it will not be cost effective for a central government agency to control all aspects of the classification process.

Q18:

All content should be industry classified initially. If there are obvious breaches of the classification framework, the Government body should step in to appropriately reclassify the content in question. If there is repeated breaches from a specific content producer or industry sector their ability to self classify would need to be reviewed.

Q19:

As previously stated, industry should be responsible for classifying content so no direct subsidies should be provided. The best way the Government could help would be to provide clear plain english guidelines so the classification process is straightforward.

Q20:

The classification categories are understood.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

The fact there is not an adult category for computer games is an embarrassment for Australia. It is a reasonable goal that all content types should share the same classification scheme.

Q24:

None. It is not desirable from a free speech point of view to prohibit access to any content online, it is also not feasible from a technical point of view.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Q27:

Classification should be handled by a body that is independent from the Government of the day to prevent pandering to special interest groups that want specific content to be banned or classified at a different level than it normally would be.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments:

