

CI 1117 R Tuten

First name: Rodney

Last name: Tuten

Q1:

I believe they should just adjust the key element of the existing framework specifically by allowing the use of an R18 rating for games. The reason for this is I feel that generally people understand the rating system in place eg G, PG, M and M15+ if a new framework was developed I suspect that it would be very difficult to educate the general population (ie parents) on what this new framework is especially as the existing framework has been around for so long.

Q2:

Consistency across classification throughout the country, clearly listing what is present in the product be it a book, movie, game, music track, live performance, web site or anything else I may have missed. However there really should be almost no restriction on what an adult can access just clear labelling on what is contained within product. (the only restriction I would agree to is limiting access where the material would contain people/victims that are not consenting adults).

Q3:

No I believe trying to limit classifications to specific technologies or platform would be ineffective costly and would not achieve any possible desired result.

Q4:

I tend to agree that some products should be exempt or subject to a honesty system with in reason. For example I believe trying to force small developers to classify all their applications/games would be costly and prevent innovation however telling them to classify the application/game themselves based on guidelines is reasonable. Then if complaints are received review the application/game and re-classify if required. Also if a company/developer repeatedly gives a rating too low then consider penalties for them but these should never be applied to once off incidents where it could be believed the developer just made a mistake in their interpretation but if they continuously make mistakes then the penalties should be applied.

Q5:

All content on all media should be subject to classifications however the cost of classification needs to be minimised.

Q6:

It should not effect whether they get classified but the size and market position of content producers and distributors should effect whether they should be allowed to self classify the products.

Q7:

Art work I actually believe should be classified but not restricted. i.e something that may be rated say M15+ or even R should still not be restricted from view by children just as long as it is clearly labeled so that the parent can give their consent. The reason I believe this to be reasonable is that a lot of objectional artwork still has a lot of value from an educational and cultural perspective and therefore should still be available for that purpose.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

no

Q10:

no

Q11:

Q12:

To be honest from a technical perspective the only people that can limit this is the parents themselves as I do not believe that any online restrictions would work. They even if it could be argued that only some of the more skilled kids could by pass the system all it would take is one to figure it out and that kid will tell their friends and then even the unskilled kids will have access to the content. Any system to filter or restrict would just be a bottle neck and annoying for accessing legitimate content.

Q13:

I would be tempted to suggest the government create or sponsor the development of a "Safe" search tool and rating for web sites. E.G partner with Google for example to develop a kid's portal which will only display web pages that have been rated as suitable for that kid's age. This would restrict the access as any page that has not been rated should not be shown in search results however this would give some level of trust that what they do find would be legitimate. This could be deployed as a downloadable and installable search bar on a computer.

Q14:

it can't regardless of how you try to filter it there will always be a way around it.

Q15:

I would say any rating M or higher. However any page with dynamic content would be very difficult to deal with.

Q16:

Q17:

I would tend to agree the co-regulatory models would work better as they can be developed in a way that would allow them to be applied effectively

Q18:

I think most could be done by the industry as long as they are reviewed to insure that their ratings are fairly consistent and realistic.

Q19:

I agree that any cost should be subsidised for small independent films and developers as the cost of classification should not cause a product or film to not be developed or released.

Q20:

Generally yes however I believe some people get confused between M and MA15+

Q21:

probably not but if so maybe just to make sure there is a listing of what the rating is for.

Q22:

Just make sure that the ratings are identical across them eg if for example nudity or extreme language would give a movie an M rating then the same level should give a game an M rating as well

Q23:

any thing to simplify the understanding should be done.

Q24:

anything that could be considered by the general Australian population as objectional and it involves anyone or any creature that would not be considered a consenting adult.

Q25:

no

Q26:

no it should be consistent across the country

Q27:

It should be controlled from the commonwealth level however feedback from states should still be important however no one state or territory should be able to veto a decision.

Q28:

yes

Q29:

Other comments: