

CI 1124a Double Loop

Name of organisation: Double Loop

Q1:

Developing a new framework for classification, including the introduction of an R-rated classification for all multimedia content, including games.

Q2:

To bring the classification for games in line with other forms of media (print, film and TV, Internet, etc).

Q3:

No. The technology and platform are irrelevant from the content itself. One should have ZERO bearing or weight on the other. Platforms and technologies should not be evaluated at all, unless they are a stand-alone way of accessing particular content (eg. hardware / software gateway for content)

Q4:

No. Individual complaints should have no bearing on the role of a censor or classifier. That is, if there are processes in place that have been followed, then complaints should be directed to that process itself, and not toward a particular item of content.

Q5:

Content should be subject only to classification guidelines. The "target audience" is irrelevant.

Decisions relating to "content designed for children" should be the responsibility of the parent or legal guardian of a child. This has ZERO bearing on classification. Target audience should not be assumed by the classifier.

Q6:

No. As above, content should be assessed due to the guidelines at all times. Audience is irrelevant.

Q7:

Yes, all content should be subject to classification. But this should not have any bearing on the content. Classification does not mean censorship. It is up to the audience to decide whether they wish to view content on advice from the classification.

Q8:

Yes. See above. All content should be brought in line.

Q9:

No. As already stated, audience is irrelevant. Separation between classification and audience should exist for any independent system to exist.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

All content should be able to be subject to classification, as long as there is no censorship.

Censorship is the result of a poor system of classification.

Q12:

There should be no restricted access to online content. Online content cannot be completely enforced or policed. Parents, should take responsibility for their child's online presence. Adults, should be able

to control their own access to online content. Internet filtering is NOT an option, as censorship is not the answer to controlling content.

Q13:

Parents taking responsibility for their children's online presence. And perhaps installing a 3rd party (or government) SOFTWARE LEVEL (ie. on their local machine) internet filtering program. This can be set for individual needs, and will not affect other users.

Q14:

I don't think there is a problem with the way offline content is currently controlled. It is the same way access to alcohol and cigarettes are controlled.

Q15:

There are too many situations where this may be appropriate and inappropriate to discuss here.

Q16:

All classification should be done by an independent body. An advisory board, made up of government, industry, and an avenue for public comment, should all help influence the actions of the independent body. But they must always remain independent.

Q17:

Possibly. It does not work for all media at the moment.

Q18:

No content should be obvious or straight forward to classify. Content is always varied. But that does not mean industry should not be able to classify content if processes are in place.

Q19:

The government should fund an independent classification board, whose job is to classify content, enforce guidelines and update these guidelines if necessary. Small films would submit their work to this board for classification, that is comprised of many people that are experts in certain fields of content (eg. film, multimedia etc)

Q20:

There are not enough classification categories, as there is still censorship being undertaken. There is no reason for this, because if something falls outside of a category, a new category needs to be created to accommodate it. eg. R-rating for video games

Q21:

An R-rating for video games should be created.

Q22:

There should be individual classification guidelines for different media. The same markings could be used though, but the controls will be different and contextual.

Q23:

It should be reviewed.

Q24:

None. Illegal content (eg. child pornography, etc) should be removed and enforced. But there should be no prohibition of LEGAL content.

Q25:

No. More categories need to exist if something falls into the realm of RC. And this should also have no bearing on access to content regardless. Legal content should not be banned.

Q26:

It should be the same. Promotion, is not my strong suit however.

Q27:

I am not a classification expert.

Q28:

Yes, this needs to be a Commonwealth initiative.

Q29:

By comparing our classification framework to other countries, and also listening to the voices of the Australian people. No citizen would vote for censorship of content.

Other comments:

I am optimistic that there will be a change to this framework. I hope it happens.