

CI 1716 A Alpert

First name: Alan

Last name: Alpert

Q1:

Improving the consistency of application of the existing framework across various forms of media.

Q2:

To inform consumers as to the content of media, so that they can make informed choices about the media they wish to partake of (or allow others access to).

Q3:

No, because any such restrictions will lead to consumer confusion for that platform.

Q4:

Ideally no, but in practice this is a much better alternative than not classifying a category of content at all. So it would be a valid approach for exceedingly large content categories (like all web pages).

Q5:

Potential impact of content can affect the classification given, but consumers require a classification across all media in order to be informed of the potential impact of the content.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

All artworks being exhibited should have some form of classification to provide a minimum level of consumer advice.

Q8:

All content should be regulated in the same way for consistency. This will facilitate both the classification process and the ability of consumers to understand classification results.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

All content should be classified, to avoid creating types of content which consumers have no guidance for. Such a situation is bad for everyone, as many distributors will not risk distribution and consumers will have great difficulty in making informed choices.

Q12:

For restricting access to content not deemed suitable for the general public, content owners have a responsibility to perform reasonable control measures. While not perfect, online registration processes are quite effective - as effective as the imperfect methods used to control access to offline content at least.

For preventing access to banned content: IP address blocking (a bit too effective though, as it will often block unrelated content) and government take down orders. A good combination would be to

send takedown orders for content hosted in Australia or cooperating nations, and IP address blocking for servers in locations which cannot be reached by the Australian Legal system.

Q13:

Education for parents on how to configure their network properly. This would allow parents to control the types of online content accessible by their children.

Q14:

Q15:

When the content has a classification assigned to it.

Q16:

Government agencies should help establish, regulate and police a framework like the current classification scheme, in cooperation with industry bodies. Industry bodies can then use the framework consistently so as to easily provide the information to users. Users then can make a more informed choice with their content access decisions.

Q17:

Yes, industry bodies have much to gain from appropriate content classification and are the content providers. They have a considerable interest in making an effective and practical solution. By working with them, the government can police the industry actions so as to ensure they are always to the benefit of the consumer.

Q18:

None. All content should be classified by an independent third-party (most likely government backed, though it could also be supported by industry as a whole).

Q19:

In cases where the classification of content is particularly expensive, the government should provide subsidies as a short term measure while the classification process is streamlined. Per work, classification should not have a major cost in order to scale to all content that enters the nation.

Q20:

The MA15+ category for video games creates great confusion, because it means something different to the MA15+ categories of other media. Because there is no R18+ rating for games, games that arguably should have had a harsher rating get lumped into MA15+. It is therefore unclear whether MA15+ is suitable for the 15-18 bracket.

Q21:

Video games should have an R18+ category like the rest of media types. The existing classification categories are reasonable, but need to be applied consistently across all media. If that cannot be done, there is a need for new classification categories for media types that do not fit in, to avoid consumer confusion.

Q22:

By being consistently applied, and by having the same criteria, markings, guidelines and categories for all different types of content.

Q23:

Q24:

The same kind of content as would be entirely prohibited for offline access.

Q25:

No. That category contains content which would not be prohibited offline. If scope of RC is reduced, so that the same standard is applied to electronic and offline content (currently content that would get RC in a video game would not get RC in a video for example), then perhaps it would be.

Q26:

It is important.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

R18+ rating for video games. We're the laughing stock of the world in this category right now.

Other comments: