

CI 954 D Keaton

First name: Danny

Last name: Keaton

Q1:

A new framework should be the focus of this inquiry.

Q2:

The primary objectives of a national classification scheme should be to bring Australian inline with international classification schemes, to make sure that access to content intended for adults is not impeded and to take into account (or make recommendations for) parental classification controls, which are now commonly found in most consumer electronics used to access classified content.

Q3:

Modern platforms used to access content contain parental safeguards, for example all home video game consoles contain controls of what sort of content can be run by those who use it. Services like Netflix streaming, Telstra T Box and others also contain these controls which can be set by parents.

Q4:

Yes. The cost of classifying and the time spent classifying would be burdensome to the content creators, distributors and users if all content needed classification by default. Any system that prevents users from accessing content, or prevents content from being released in Australia because of fees or waiting times to access the content would be harmful to the consumer, not beneficial. iPhone games, YouTube content, music, and others would be impossible to classify every release because of the sheer number of releases. Some content should certainly be considered for classification only when it has been the subject of a complaint.

Q5:

Q6:

It makes practical sense to classify content that will reach the highest number of consumers, if I am understanding this question correctly.

Q7:

Yes, if the only purpose of that classification was to inform.

Q8:

Audio books should be treated the same way as the books they are being read from.

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

The most effective method would be to simply leave it unclassified and design a free optional "net nanny" software for parents to use, meaning the only expense needed in response to the vast amounts of unclassified content online would be the expense of maintaining and updating the optional software for parents. Money spent this way would be far more effective than any other option when attempting to deal with unclassified content online.

Q13:

Free and optional net nanny software should be provided for download from an official government website, and a browser app with the net nanny software built in released for other platforms such as iPods, for parents who wish to use the software on other gadgets as well.

Q14:

Q15:

In the same location for all products of it type, such as bottom left hand corner, bottom of spine, start of program, when software is first loaded etc. Consumers and parents should be able to count on seeing these markings in a regular location, without having to "scan" for them, if the content is classified.

Q16:

The role of the government agencies should be in making sure that access to content is not limited in any way, or consumer inconvenienced and for the convenience of parents instantly knowing and controlling what is in the content their children access. Industry bodies should ease the speed that content to consumers by fostering industry standards to make the job of classification easier and cheaper.

Q17:

Yes. Classification should be efficient, by which I mean fast and as non burdensome as possible for the government in terms of time and money spent. A co-regulatory model where the industry largely regulates itself in-line with government guidelines makes the most sense.

Q18:

Q19:

Non profit softwarr, apps, videos etc. Educational non profit content, content which can be proven to not be viable for release without subsidies (such as classic films, video games, content of historical or cultural value which cannot be released because of the cost of entering a market as small as Australia.

Q20:

Q21:

An 18 years and older category is needed for software and video games. The Australian classification system should be inline with the international system to reflect a growing global content system classification where content can be efficiently compared to existing ratings systems. The goal of a ratings system should not be to restrict content to consumers, but to help parents restrict access of certain content to their own children. Also the M rating should perhaps be renamed to avoid confusion with the MA15+ rating, perhaps a more unique lettering system, such as T for Teen. Or making the classifications a green G, a blue M to help distinguish it from an orange MA and red R.

Q22:

A coloured system to work with the current marking system, such as green lettering for children, blue for mature audiences, orange for MA15+ and red for R18, and information leaflets or clickable links to an official webpage which explains the ratings and the colour coding system.

Q23:

Q24:

No content should be entirely prohibited online. Australians accessing content, such as sexual abuse of children, should be left to the police to track and prosecute and for international police to track and

stop at its source. The promoting or linking to of material of such a nature should be up to the police to take care of and remove. Material such as this goes beyond classifying and to try and prevent its access would be impossible and would only impede access to the internet for the majority of legal users.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Bringing it in-line with international standards, where large discrepancies exist.

Other comments:

Above all else, I believe Australians have the right to access the same content that is released in the United States and Europe, with the right of the consumer to access material always being the goal of any classification scheme. Anything that limits the rights of adult consumers, where compared to a precedent has been set in similar Western markets, should be reconsidered. Classifications should first and foremost help adults control what their children have access to, not limit what adults themselves have access to. In the case of internet restrictions of "filtering", I believe such schemes would be completely inefficient and wasteful. Resources would be better spent in educating children and adults on safe internet use with their children. Education would have long term benefits, limiting the internet itself would inconvenience the vast majority of legal users and seems contrary to the open access of the internet, which is enjoyed by billions of people world over, including Australians.

Encouraging device manufacturers to include "safe" browsing options modes for children would be far more effective and would not infringe on the rights of adult Australians.