

## CI 1126 A McDarmont

First name: Alex

Last name: McDarmont

Q1:

Improving key elements. The existing frameworks have good consistency with other classification systems; this consistency being key for a wider user base to usefully understand and utilise classifications.

Q2:

To allow consumers to make an informed choice as to content. Whether this is parents vetting content for their children or adults being aware of graphic content, the classifications should be informing and not controlling choices.

Q3:

No it should not. This goes to the consistency of the classifications themselves. Especially with new platforms continually emerging, some users of classifications schemes may only be familiar with standards as applied to earlier media; their knowledge should be transferrable.

Q4:

Yes. Spending scarce resources rating content that a publisher can clearly verify is extremely low risk (such as produced for children) is of little benefit. Conversely, high risk or graphic content should probably always be externally rated. There may be an area of uncertainty between the two positions whereby ratings could be on demand or if complaints are fielded.

Q5:

No. However, the threshold for rating of more immersive content such as games should be attuned to the interactive and engaging nature of this media, as opposed to the passive consumption of (but say) film or television content.

Q6:

No, although this may affect the view of veracity of declarations around content suitability per my response to question 4.

Q7:

There may be scope for requiring artists and/or galleries to provide guidance as to suitability of artworks however actual classification seems overly intrusive and difficult to achieve.

Q8:

Yes, however fewer classification bands are likely to be required as the degree of immersion in this content is likely less, it being only one sense (hearing) and more passively engaged with.

Q9:

No - content is either suitable according to some measure or not. Size and composition of audience may affect the desirability that the classification is correct so may contraindicate self-rating content intended for expected larger or more varied audiences.

Q10:

No. Ratings should remain available for individuals to make informed choices. There may be a case made that unrated content, of a type normally rated, be not displayed or promoted in public but I believe this to be the case today.

Q11:

Q12:

Any solution devised would soon be circumvented; adult supervision is the only practical and ongoing method.

Q13:

Through empowerment of parents and availability of opt-in tools or software. A "clean feed" may be a point of competitive advantage for an ISP to offer as a product for those who are unable to exercise full supervision or deploy appropriate tools.

Q14:

Existing controls seem effective. As for system-wide tools to control online content, once this content is in circulation, only appropriate supervision exists as a defence to inappropriate access.

Q15:

If rated, the rating should be displayed. Self ratings should be identified as such.

Q16:

Government agencies should focus on high risk or extreme content. Industry bodies should be self regulating, recognising that (a) they will be intimately familiar with the content they produce and (b) it's in their best interests to have informed consumer support. Users should be able to influence standards through feedback mechanisms.

Q17:

Yes, although consistent with earlier answers, there may be a role for government to classify or rate high risk or extreme content.

Q18:

Any content that is either clearly low-risk e.g. content for children or high risk e.g. violent or sexual content.

Q19:

Given a largely self-rated regime, the necessity to subsidise may abate. Subsidy seems appropriate if there is a demonstrated need.

Q20:

I believe they are well understood.

Q21:

Yes. Consistent with film/video media, there should be R and X ratings available for all content e.g. computer games.

Q22:

Establish the one, consistent set of markings - the current film markings seem appropriate - and use only these.

Q23:

Yes. The greater the degree of consistency, the more viable and useful the ratings become, particularly with emergent media types.

Q24:

See response to question 25.

Q25:

No. I see no issue in accessing content showing actual sexual activity. Other existing RC scope elements seem appropriate.

Q26:

A critical mass is necessary. Classification should not be a state or territory function.

Q27:

Commonwealth legislation.

Q28:

Yes - again, would promote broader user base and consistency of ratings nationwide.

Q29:

Create system sensitivity to minority groups that may try and "game" classification systems for political or religious ends.

Other comments: