

CI 1891 T Ebringer

First name: Tim

Last name: Ebringer

Q1:

ALRC should first align the games rating system with the rest of the system. That would be a simple first step. The classification system for film does not appear to be particularly deficient.

Q2:

To standardise ratings nationally, and across media types.

Q3:

No, the content is what is being classified. Content where it is not technologically and logistically reasonable to classify should not be classified. People may wish to opt-out of unclassified content. The criminal justice system is there for illegal content.

Q4:

No. What point would there be in trying to classify a YouTube video which one person complained about. It may have been uploaded by someone in one country, hosted in another, adored by people in many others, and complained about by a person in Australia. It is not reasonable to attempt to classify such content, and such content should be left outside a classification system. If the content is illegal, the police may liaise with the police in the country where the material is hosted, and it is not a classification matter.

Q5:

No and no. It is technologically very difficult to classify content across "all" possible media. Content should be classified based on Australian revenue. If Australians, collectively, will pay more than a threshold amount to consume the content, then the content provider must also pay to have their content classified for Australian audiences.

Q6:

Yes, if Australians pay beyond a threshold to consume the content, they must also pay to have it classified. Any system must be simple.

Q7:

As a general rule, classification should be about providing consumer advice more than about restricting access. Artworks do not appear to regularly attract significant consumer outrage.

Q8:

Either they should be classified in the same way, or not at all.

Q9:

Perhaps, but revenue would be an easier way to do it.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

The only semi-effective methods, such as the firewall employed in China, tend to be quite draconian. Consumers can opt-out of content that is not classified.

Q13:

Parents must take responsibility for limiting access. Modern commercial operating systems already provide the means, but parents must turn it on.

Q14:

Do people still buy magazines?

Q15:

Up front, on the packaging, and/or embedded in a digital stream, if classification is required.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Yes, if classification is mandated for some content, then there must be support to have such content classified at subsidised rates, or the audience for that content will be severely and artificially limited.

Q20:

They are well understood.

Q21:

The categories are fine.

Q22:

Simply create the same categories across media types, then develop appropriate guidelines for choosing the correct category for different media types.

Q23:

Definitely!

Q24:

It would be good if material such as child pornography could be prohibited, but it is quite difficult to effectively do this with a classification scheme. People do not "stumble" across child pornography whilst browsing online content, and any technological filter can be circumvented. Better to leave a classification scheme as consumer advice, and leave the horrible stuff to criminal law and the police.

Q25:

No, especially not for games, since there is no R18+ or X rating.

Q26:

Yes. Costs must be controlled. Would a media company wanting to sell content into Australia want to negotiate a minefield of differing state requirements for a relatively small audience? It would only result in less legitimate content coming to Australian audiences and more content piracy.

Q27:

Changes to the classification system should not require unanimous support of all states. This system is clearly inflexible and broken.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: