

CI 28 A Roma

First name: Andrew

Last name: Roma

Q1: It depends on whether the scope of classifiable material is to be significantly increased. If so then a new framework may need to be adopted to accommodate additional mediums. Otherwise minor enhancements to the existing framework would suffice.

Q2: A clear advisory of types of content with age appropriate guides, without censorship.

Q3: Absolutely. Context is important, as is location. I would expect an online movie or game that streams from an overseas service to be classified according to the country of origin, with no classification necessary provided here. If it is available for purchase or view here then either the individual item or the entire service / event / exhibition should have a rating.

Q4: Yes, in fact I think a self classify system would be a fantastic idea, with complaints requiring a formal classification. For example a Game Developer could self rate a game as Unclassified PG with low level violence and infrequent coarse language. If the product was found to exceed the classification then it would be heavily penalised and a forced classification applied. Or the developer could go through the standard classification system and cost up front for a Classified PG rating.

Q5: I don't believe that any particular media has a greater impact than any other (I know this is under debate), so if the content was identical across all media types a single classification could be applied.

Q6: No, if we design a classification system that allows small or individual content producers to self rate or have a very affordable system then the size or market position becomes irrelevant.

Q7: Again - a self rating system would easily overcome this, because an exhibition could apply an advisory based on content. This would only need to be formally reviewed in the event of a complaint. So an outdoor film festival could rate the whole event based on the highest classification needed.

Q8: Yes it is isn't just the visuals that are potential harmful or unwanted. The language and themes in audio material could still be classified.

Q9: Possibly. An event occurring in a licenced club where the entry age is 18 shouldn't need to classify an exhibition or screening, but may choose to for the benefit of the patrons. However I believe the type of content is more important than any arbitrary age guides when informing an audience.

Q10: Yes, content that is never available publicly should never need classification.

Q11:

Q12: Parents and Guardians. Any other system will fail to achieve both objectives. We can't classify content coming from overseas servers and we

can't wholesale block it either. Possibly an opt in filtering system at home or ISP level would work in this regard.

Q13: Better education. Possibly clean streams to particular computers or homes from the ISP.

Q14: Behind the counter sales or in adult only establishments (bars, clubs etc).

Q15: I believe it is helpful for consumers to have all media identify any potential objectional content upfront.

Q16:

Self regulation within industries - Industry bodies aiding content producers. Government should be restricted to complaints, overruling and forced classifications.

Severe penalties for breaches couple with a very cost effective and simple system to implement.

Q17: Definitely.

Q18: All content. A guidebook listing the requirements for each classification and clearly defined rules for each possible objectional area. Above all it needs to be simple to implement and simple to understand.

Q19: No - but there should be self classification according to the guidebook with severe penalties for underestimating content.

Q20: Partly. The basic G, PG, M and R ratings are ok but the MA15+ is widely misunderstood. The number of parents I have seen believe little Johnny can play an MA15+ game because 13 is almost 15 astounds me.

Q21: M and MA15+ should be merged and remove the need for regulation of it. Possibly converting it to a Teen rating. Anything that needs to be regulated could move up to R. But more than that the content should better be described.

Q22: Extending the basic rating to include the type of content and the level of that content.

Q23: Absolutely.

Q24: No content should be prohibited. Of course accessing certain materials should still be covered by existing laws. Because online material crosses international boundaries, no system of prohibition can work effectively without side effects and consequences worse than the problem.

Q25: No it is way too restrictive, especially because the materials are not on public display.

Q26: State and Territory classification should be replaced by a Federal (or wider) system. There is not enough difference in the culture and society of each state today to justify the difference.

Q27: A federal advisory and self-classification system of all media publicly on display and severe penalties for breaches.

Q28: Absolutely.

Q29: Basically the classification system should work in some ways like the nutritional or ingredient list on foodstuffs for sale. If it is available to Australians in a retail environment or for public display then it should carry the new markings.

Other comments: A clearer (and much simpler) understanding of the types of content needs to be defined. A basic graduated scale for each type of content. None, Low, High. (Green Orange Red). This should apply to coarse language (frequency over type), Violence, Gore, Drug Use, Nudity, Sexual References, Sexual Acts etc... Where a particular type does not apply the None / Green icon is optional.