

CI 1776 S Poole

First name: Stephen

Last name: Poole

Q1:

Ideally I'd like to see the ALRC focus on developing a new framework for classification. Using the existing framework, to me it seems more logical to identify the problems arising from it and applying to a new framework than attempting to amend the existing framework.

Q2:

To inform Australians of the likely content of video & audio entertainment, through the use of classification. To correctly determine, on a regular basis, and through a broad cross section of people (age, religion, sex, etc) the appropriate processes by which particular forms of media should be classified. Finally, to ensure that

Q3:

Yes. For example, tighter classification standards should apply to a movie screened at a cinema (where, in a group of people watching a movie, the consensus on whether the correct classification was applied will differ more from person to person) or free to air TV channel than a DVD movie purchased or rented (where it is less likely that a smaller group will have differing consensus on the correct classification). Websites, games, books, art, tv and also potentially so-called 'augmented reality' games will all require vastly different classification schemes.

Q4:

Yes. For content where the sheer amount would overwhelm any committee in attempting to classify all of it, it may be helpful to allow content creators to 'self classify' their work in order to reduce the workload of those tasked with classifying content. Publishing strict guidelines on appropriate content & requirements for each classification, as well as consequences for not meeting those requirements (fines, banning, confiscation etc) all help.

Q5:

Yes and no. On one side, potential impact can be extremely subjective. Every person will receive a different impact from certain media. On the other hand, some subjects & events will generally always have a potential impact, regardless of the person. Potential impact should -only- be taken into account where the potential impact is proven (ie news items about suicide) or is an extraordinary event (ie releasing documentary/news at an extremely sensitive time). It should remain a factor in judgement, but a marginal factor in deciding classification. Should content designed for children be classified across all media? I would say no - unless the content has been designed to be delivered over several different types of media. Each particular type of content should be classified within its type (tv, games, movies, books etc).

Q6:

I think this concept is similar to that of potential impact. It should be a factor in deciding classification, however it should be a marginal factor in that all other factors should be considered first. Then if it is apparent that the size or market position of the content producer will affect public acceptance of the content, that can be considered as well.

Q7:

Absolutely, but not for the purpose of restricting access, merely to provide consumer advice. Consumers will always vote with their feet when it comes artwork.

Q8:

Absolutely not. A different medium means a different classification scheme. I would say the current scheme works reasonably well, though needs to take into account (or work with) online music distribution methods eg. Bigpond Music, iTunes Music Store Australia, Amazon Music, as well as internet radio stations.

Q9:

As I think it is easy to misjudge the size & composition of audiences, I think this should NOT affect whether content should be classified.

Q10:

Yes. As I've mentioned previously, for example, a movie in a theater will have more people watching it, and a wider variety of opinions will always come from this. In this case, yes it should affect whether it is classified.

Q11:

Q12:

I would say the most effective that comes to mind would be to provide businesses, small & large, and individuals/families pre-configured filtering software, operated & updated by the government (NOT a private company). A nation-wide internet filter for online content as proposed already is simply too easy to circumvent, provides no way to check/add/remove a website from a blacklist, and has no independent oversight.

Q13:

By providing pre-configured filtering software to families & businesses, and actively promoting it. ISP's would readily assist government with this if required, in pushing the software out to families & businesses. It would be essential that the software be operated & updated by the government, not a private company. In this way government would be able to centrally control the list of filtered sites, and allow those to opt-out whom would be unlikely to be affected (have no children or children would never use to access the internet).

Q14:

I believe current restrictions work well and do not require more control than we have already.

Q15:

For TV: before it is aired (as it is currently). For CD's, at all times on the front or side or both of the CD case. For movies, at all times: in a cinema, before viewing, on a DVD/BD, on the front of the case or side or both. For games, at all times on the front or side of the case. For books, on the spine of the book if it is necessary. For magazines, on the front or spine if it has one, and only if the content is sexually explicit. For all similar content online, classification advice should be displayed or noted before purchasing/downloading of the item (be it music, sound recordings, movies, games etc).

Q16:

Q17:

Yes. In particular for websites or for any sort of media in which there is a very large amount, that would otherwise take a government agency too long to classify individually. This could also apply to

small, short-term play games such as those found on popular smartphones (there would be too many to go through - self-classification, with complaints on those that do not comply/fines/banning/etc)

Q18:

Websites, magazines & small games on smartphone platforms (iphone/android/etc). Please note advertising should NOT be self-classified.

Q19:

The same could be said for small, independant games. Perhaps when a certain form of media is required to be submitted for classification, if the producers of the content can prove they would find it difficult to fund classification, and the content cost under a certain amount to produce, then the govt could subsidise it.

Q20:

I think categories for magazines, books, tv & art are well understood in the community. The free to air TV channels (no experience with pay tv) are well aware of their regulations. Movies are generally understood within the community; however occasionally there is some confusion in the judgement of MA and R rated movies. Content that may be thought of as R rated sometimes gets into MA rated movies. Also, because there is no R classification with respect to computer games, this also happens quite often - games that should rightly be classified as R, and sales restricted to adults only, are instead classified as MA and sold to children.

Q21:

I would say with respect to Movies & Games: MA & M should be merged, or remove M completely. There is a need for an R classification for games. This would give all consumers firstly greater choice, but better information with regard to the content of games purchased for their children.

Q22:

Where formats will use a similar classification style, including a small box with "GAMES" or "MOVIE" etc next to the classification marking would be helpful. With similar criteria & guidelines, I would be more interested in consistent punishments for breaking classification.

Q23:

Q24:

Limiting access to anything online - legally - is folly.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: