

CI 124 L D

First name: L

Last name: D

Q1:

The present framework for classification is sound in principle and need not change. The concept of evaluating the suitability of media to a young audience and considering how offensive it may be perceived by a general audience, to be used in order to advise or limit distribution if necessary on a nation wide scale, is a reasonable and sound ideal.

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to standardise and modernise the existing framework. The new scheme should be based upon the realisation that the nature of media has evolved, and along with it has the attitudes and normalities of society across all ages.

Q3:

The platform upon which content is delivered should affect classification, as the nature of how media is viewed can alter its influence on its audience. This can be divided into two key aspects - the publicity of the media and the interactivity of the media. For example, a billboard is a public form of media that should be classified more strictly, as the general population may be unable to avoid viewing this media; whilst a video game need only be viewed by the person(s) who chose to purchase the media and can be classified more loosely. However, it should be considered that computer games require mental interaction that could be more influential on children in comparison to the "static" billboard.

Q4:

Provided content can be classified within the bounds of a reasonable time and cost, media should always be classified. (An example of a situation falling outside these bounds may be a promotional trailer for a movie, where the trailer has been composed intentionally for general viewing and is not the primary media being evaluated.) A complaint should instead give way to the reclassification of media by an independent reviewer, using the same process as was done to first classify the media, but taking into consideration both the nature of the complaint and that complaint's criticisms by third parties.

Q5:

It is fundamental that content be classified based upon an objective evaluation of its likelihood to offend or negatively influence the general population and particularly influence children. The so called "potential impact" is a subjective analysis of media and should therefore be removed from any classification process, unless clear and scientific data can be presented demonstrating such a negative influence.

Q6:

The size or market position of media should not be considered a valid reason to apply differing classification standards upon media. I would consider it a valid exception, however, to alter a classification depending upon its classification by other international bodies. For example, a video game rated R but rated as for mature audiences in the United States and United Kingdom may be allowed to lower its rating to MA in order to ensure Australian citizens are not unfairly restricted by classification standards. Similarly, a video game rated MA in Australia but rated for adults only in the United States and United Kingdom should be reviewed and if necessary reclassified as R.

Q7:

Q8:

No, music should not be classified using the same standards as visual content such as movies and computer games. It should instead use a simpler classification system that seeks to simply advise listeners whether or not it contains any explicit content, and voluntarily what this is (profanity, sexual references, etc).

Q9:

Similar to Question 6, the potential size and composition of the audience should not affect the classification process or criteria. The audience (or their parents/guardians) should determine which classification is of suitable viewing to them - not the classification agency moderating its decisions based upon their perceived needs and wishes.

Q10:

All media should be classified to determine whether it is suitable for either public viewing or the consumers' private viewing. This should be done using the same objective classification process, giving the consumer the right to determine which media is suitable for them and the government the right to determine or limit which media is suitable for display in a public space as recommended by the general population.

Q11:

Q12:

I do not believe the government should be controlling access to online content. This responsibility or liability should fall upon the consumer to make the appropriate decision regarding which media is suitable to them, or in the case of minors, their parents to determine their child's mental capacity and maturity for viewing classified media.

Q13:

Children's access to potentially inappropriate content can be better controlled online through the education of parents. This education should enforce a realistic approach to media - where children are allowed to participate in widely accessed and socially normal or acceptable media (such as video games like "Call of Duty" where violence is presented in a fantasy context) yet protected from harmful real-world influences (such as videos promoting substance abuse or real world violence). This

balanced approach will ensure a generation of technically experienced minors comply with set controls, rather than seeking to avoid and undermine such controls.

Q14:

Q15:

All content should be required to display classification markings before viewing. For example, a movie should have its classification made available before buying cinema tickets and a DVD or video game should have its classification on the packaging.

Q16:

Government agencies and industry bodies should be seeking to classify content in a fair and consistent manner, whilst ensuring age restricted content (MA, R and X) is appropriately blocked from under age person(s).

Q17:

Both government and industry should share the responsibility of classification, striking a balance that ensures the system remains functional, practical and in the interests of the public at all times.

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

I believe the current classifications are understood by the majority of the community, however the present subjectivity in classifying content can make individual media's classification confusing or misleading. The present subjectivity of analysis, coupled with "exceptions" such as the size, scope and 'potential impact' of media allows for any individual submission to be easily misclassified (usually over-) according to what the population may expect. Allowing the population to determine what they personally find suitable, rather than changing a classification to suit what the board determines to be suitable for them, will result in a more widely understood system.

Q21:

I believe the classification system should remain, however there should be more distinct age recommendations for content evaluated to be for "mature audiences". Specifically, M (mature audiences) should be advised [not restricted] as a secondary school student, which is usually twelve or above years of age. MA (mature adults) should be renamed inline with its age recommendation, which should be lifted from fifteen to sixteen years of age.

Q22:

I cannot stress enough the importance of extending the R classification to all media, primarily video games. This will prevent the under classification of media to prevent a RC non-classification, and ensure adults are not unfairly disadvantaged by our systems implemented to protect children.

Q23:

Yes, a consolidated version should be released for general reading.

Q24:

Internet censorship should only occur on an individual site-by-site basis, and only if it is determined and its administrators convicted of an Australian or International breach of law. Apart from this clear and strictly limited exception, no content should be censored online.

Q25:

No. Not allowing for an R rating in certain types of media has forced the scope of Refused Classification to become excessively broad.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: