

CI 996 C Morris

First name: Colin

Last name: Morris

Q1:

New framework.

Q2:

Providing information on content to citizens for those citizens to make a informed opinions on content prior to interaction.

Q3:

It should not affect a classification rating being attached to the content. Content is content.

Q4:

A complaint should trigger a re-evaluation of the content, with regards to accuracy of the attached classification. If the complaint is viewed as justified, the classification should be altered. This does not affect anything other than the classification attached.

Q5:

Content should be classified. It is not the responsibility of the classifications board to restrict content.

Content designed for children should be classified as designed for children, no matter what the medium.

Q6:

All content should be classified. Classification does not entail restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access.

Content for a specific audience with specific values/ ideas of standards make their decisions on viewing with advise from classification. Content for a specific audience should have less restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access - which is out of scope of classification.

Q7:

All content should be classified. Classification does not entail restrictions or other curtailments of access. Michelangelo's David is a work of art and should be classified as indicated for a statue of a naked man.

Content as artwork speaks to specific values/ ideas of standards make their decisions on viewing with advise from classification. Content as artwork should have less restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access - which is out of scope of classification.

Q8:

All content should be classified. Classification does NOT include regulation. Classification denotes pigeon-holing into broad categories. Classification is not a fit methodology for regulation.

Q9:

All content should be classified. Classification does not entail restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access.

Content for a specific audience with specific values/ ideas of standards make their decisions on viewing with advise from classification. Content for a specific audience should have less restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access - which is out of scope of classification.

Q10:

All content should be classified. Classification does not entail restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access.

Content in the home has less of an impact - classification remains as consumer advise. Content at home should have less restrictions, regulations or other curtailment of access - which is out of scope of classification.

Q11:

All content should be classified.

All the above have reasons for adjusting restrictions/ regulations or other curtailment of access.

Citizens should be able to make up their own mind with advise from classification bureaus.

Q12:

No content should be restricted.

Education of controllers of the consumer-side of the internet is the only way of controlling access to online content. Consistently, it has been proven any national censorship strategy will be bypassed by those who want to; and is only a barrier to those who want to do things simply. See also the DVD discussions: <http://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2009/04/doctorows-law> and the discussions on the Australian Censorship first attempt: <http://blog.futurestreetconsulting.com/2006/03/25/understanding-gilmores-law/>

Q13:

Don't allow children on the internet.

Have a children-only internet that has sites added to it, rather than an internet that has specific sites blocked from it. Allow end users to switch between them at will.

Q14:

They cannot. People will always find a way.

Q15:

Whenever users want to know more about an item of content before interacting with it. Labels on physical items, the ability to look up a Classification site for online items (e.g. websites).

Q16:

None. Hands off the content. They should be able to classify it, but trying to regulate it is a waste of time and money. There are more important things for government agencies, industry bodies and users to put their time and money into.

Q17:

Co-regulation would works if the self-classification is obviously different than a government-sponsored classification system. There should be one code, not multiple. But self-classification should be visually

distinct than an independent rating body. This is useful as the independent rating body will not be able to rate everything as soon as it is available.

Q18:

Everything has variations. If we accept that no classification is perfect and that complaints are a perfectly reasonable method for content to be reclassified:

Children's content

Animated content (distinct from Children's content)

Contains smoking/ drug-use/ alcohol use

Q19:

Government pays for the independent classification bureau. It must classify everything.

If content can be self-classified without requiring costs, there's nothing to subsidise.

If content cannot be self-classified without requiring costs, there should be a subsidy for Australian producers of 'content' for them to be rated by the 'self-classification' bureau appropriate to their media.

Q20:

No.

The difference between G, PG, PG15, M, MA15 etc. is ludicrous. Age is not a determination of maturity. It's the content that must be classified, not pigeonholed into imaginary age ranges.

Q21:

Yes.

Classifications must be based on content.

Q22:

Visual distinct designs.

A web site containing the master list of content that can be looked up by ISBN/ Title/ Q-code/ etc.

Q23:

A new classification system is required.

Q24:

Attempts to prohibit content online are pointless. Money should be used responsibly.

Q25:

See Q24

Q26:

Yes. It should be promoted once it is consistent.

Q27:

Tiers of classification:

Classification via self-classification.

Classification via Media-representative groups.

Classification via government-funded independent classification body.

Q28:

States need to make their own decisions; as states are self-contained groups similar to Q6/Q9. See the recent R18 Video Game issues to see why Commonwealth control is inadequate.

Q29:

Transparency - so we know how decisions on content classification are made; so we can see what complaints have been raised; so we can see complaints have been addressed, how they've been addressed, and what further steps can be taken.

Other comments: