

CI 859 D White

First name: Daniel

Last name: White

Q1:

Development of a new framework would be preferential, this way more changes can be made and it becomes clear change is occurring.

Q2:

Consistency across the many platforms under classification (for example, video games are currently subject to harsher and more limiting regulations than other, similar media - specifically the lack of R18+ Ratings). I also believe the focus of a national classification scheme should be to inform the public of content then allow them to decide for themselves.

Q3:

No. This approach led to the current issue with R18+ Ratings on video games, and would only lead to further issues in the future.

Q4:

No. Complaints should only cause a review on the original classification decision. Special Interest groups could bring the review system to a standstill if content was only classified after complaints.

Q5:

Potential impact is not impact, classifying content based on potentials and possibilities serves only to increase the restrictiveness of this system. I strongly believe this framework should serve only to classify and inform of content present. This carries over to content designed for children. No extra classification should be required to focus on children targeted content, this only increases the scope and restrictiveness and redirects any new classification scheme in the wrong direction. Sheltering children rather than classification and informing the public.

Q6:

No. Content should be classified purely on the content. If the content is suitable only for an MA15+ market, it should be classified as such. This should apply to both niche and popular markets.

Q7:

No. Art is art. It should not be classified nor should it be restricted. Access restrictions are in the hands of Artists and Exhibitioners, as is consumer advice. The only role any classification scheme should play in terms of artworks is to aid in informing the public of what content it contains.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No. Only the content itself should determine classification

Q10:

No. Only the content itself should determine classification.

Q11:

The complexity of a work should influence its classification.

Q12:

Education and information. In no circumstances should online content suffer restrictions. This is not for the National Classification Scheme, but for the Police. Any restrictions applying to online content would only fail at a technological standpoint. In this instance the National Classification Scheme cannot and should not interfere.

Q13:

Through Parental intervention either through direct methods (watching their child) or indirect methods (private net-nanny software and home filtering systems built with children in mind). This is the only way.

Q14:

It is my belief that this is currently being controlled sufficiently.

Q15:

In advertisement and presentation (packaging, tickets, etc). Consumer advice in the form of warnings and reasons for classification should be available from an easy to use website.

Q16:

Government agencies should focus only on illegal content, through agencies such as the Police or ASIS.

Industry bodies should focus on fully informing consumers/users of content.

Users should directly control regulation. Restriction should only apply to minors and should come in the form of consent from a Parent/Guardian.

Q17:

Definitely, with the National Classification Scheme advising the government on this code.

Q18:

Pornographic content. A blanket R18+ would suffice.

Q19:

Yes (on small independent films). Any grant based publication should have subsidized classification.

Q20:

The restrictive classifications are the least understood at the moment. MA15+ and R18+ are not equally applied across all platforms and this causes confusion in video games as content is frequently labelled as MA15+ when it is much closer to R18+.

Q21:

Current classification categories, when applied consistently across all platforms are sufficient and cover important stages in maturity.

Q22:

Classification markings should be applied consistently across all content classified. This would create a sense of convergence.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Illegal content. This is and can be prohibited through ISP intervention and Police Action, so no action by the National Classification Scheme is needed.

Q25:

No. Refused Classification has a "Everything Else" approach to classification. Content prohibited online should be limited to content already illegal to view/own/distribute by the public.

Q26:

Yes. In the current cultural climate, consistency should aim at meeting a global level.

Q27:

A revised and less restrictive but more informative scheme.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

A shift in focus from restrictions to information would greatly improve classification of Media in Australia.

Other comments: