

CI 892 A Shaw

First name: Alexis

Last name: Shaw

Q1:

I think that a new framework for classification is needed. Many elements in the classification system make it hard for innovation in the arts to occur in Australia.

Q2:

To inform consumers about the content of books, movies, games etc. Without putting undue pressure on small or private content producers procedurally or financially.

Q3:

Yes and no. It is unquestionable that large producers of content such as big budget films or AAA games should be treated by the system than films or games that may be viewed by only 100 or 1000 people. The cost of formal classification in this case is too great and may make the prospect of making such a work untenable. There are some examples of this occurring.

Q4:

This seems like a good idea.

Q5:

I do not see why a formal classification should be required if wide distribution of such content is not expected. However there should be at least a complaint mechanism in place if content that targets children misrepresents its self

Q6:

Absolutely see above.

Q7:

All artwork where no laws were broken in its production (or would've broken if produced in Australia) should in my opinion be allowed to be shown to an audience made up of adults that are informed of what may be in the content.

Q8:

No music and sound recordings should have minimal or no classification due to their limited impact on audiences. Parental discretion should be advised however on some titles.

Q9:

Absolutely see above if there is a limited audience or potential size of distribution overwhelming classification burdens stifle creativity.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

What vetting has and is being applied before the content is allowed to market. See the Apple app stores separate classification system.

Q12:

There is no effective method of removing content that would be restricted under the national classification scheme without in some way breaking the internet. For example the system that is being implemented by Optus and Telstra is both ineffective in the simplicity that it may be circumvented and

in the way that it is incompatible with DNS-SEC a new system that is aimed at providing security and reliability in the DNS thus allowing one to avoid malicious web sites.

Q13:

Only by having parental supervision of children's online viewing habits. Any other method will not be effective.

Q14:

I cannot comment here.

Q15:

Content that should not be viewed by children. Or that intended for children should be marked as such.

Q16:

Users should be in control of their viewing habits and should be informed by the content industry. Government involvement should be only in the amount required to ensure industry honesty.

Q17:

Yes in all cases.

Q18:

All content. Especially content with a limited market or limited impact. Also content that is marked for adult consumption only should not need government intervention.

Q19:

If classification is to remain the sole purview of government then if the classification costs are likely to be greater than 10% of gross revenue then classification should be subsidized by the government significantly or wholly.

Q20:

The difference between PG and M are misunderstood or the guidelines do not effectively define how content is actually viewed and as such are ignored as they are not relevant.

Q21:

The classification categories that are in existence are enough however they are not correctly calibrated for a modern audience.

Q22:

I think that this is adequate.

Q23:

No the current separation is sufficient.

Q24:

Only the most vile content such as child pornography or videos of actual rape should be prohibited. However even in this prohibition content filtering should not be employed as it is at most a false security.

Q25:

No. It is far too broad.

Q26:

Yes states and territories should have consistent classification laws.

Q27:

It should be replaced by a more permissive and less legislated system. This has been showed to work efficiently in the USA and Europe.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

By allowing for portability of descisions made by other countries or industry bodies descisions to be used in classification.

Other comments: