

CI 1359 J Dansberry

First name: Joe

Last name: Dansberry

Q1:

I think that it is important to both update and improve upon Australia's antiquated system when it comes to classification. Especially when held up against most of what we would call civilized society. You don't necessarily need to throw out the baby with the bath water, but at the very least be open and willing to address the issues and have some adaptability built into the system so that in the future, be it 5 years or 25 years the country is not once again facing an outdated system and such an uphill battle to make logical and sensible changes to that system.

Q2:

I believe that the most important objectives should be those of informing parents so they are better able to understand what their own children are playing, and the recognition that adults are capable to decide for themselves what is and is not something they wish to view/play/hear.

Q3:

Yes. Only products sold locally in Australian 'brick and mortar' stores should be readily classified, it is unreasonable to attempt to classify every single video/game/piece of music that comes out on the internet. To do so would be a fool's gambit and an unattainable goal. Instead limit it to items sold locally in local retail shops.

Q4:

No, I do not believe that classification is a great evil that should be avoided unless brought to the attention of some outside entity. I believe instead that the classification is there to help inform and educate both retailers and consumers about the product they are purchasing. Is the game for families? Children? Young adults? Adults? These issues should matter to both ends of the consumer chain, stores and shoppers. Educating parents about what each rating means is also a vital and important part of the system.

Q5:

I think content should be classified logically and systematically, not using talking point words like 'impact' and 'children'. The classification should be simply based on a scale depending on content. Is it violent? How violent? Is there foul language? How much foul language? Is there adult situations/sexual connotations? If so how much? The answers to these questions should then be compounded, formulated and a simple sliding scale applied. If it's a low score, all ages, if it's a high score, adults. And so on. It doesn't really matter who the game is targeted to that should impact its rating. The rating should come based off of concrete things. And the organization needs to be able to adapt as the things they are rating change and society changes.

Q6:

No. But once again, this ties in tightly to Q3. I do not believe every single piece of content that is created needs to be classified, instead just those things that wish to be sold locally in Australian retail outlets.

Q7:

No. However, I do not believe that it is wrong for the place doing the exhibition to warn people of violent/sexual or otherwise possibly offensive displays. It should be left up to the gallery or other location to do so. And while perhaps not mandatory, strongly advised or encouraged on extremely sensitive exhibits.

Q8:

Only if they wish to be sold locally within Australia.

Q9:

No. Once again, I feel the audience isn't what is relevant. It's the content. The rating of a product should be based off content. Not how many people are going to bother looking at or playing that content.

Q10:

No. Violence/sex/etc. are what they are no matter where they are viewed. Giving things a rating is simply a warning. "Beware, this content may have something in it you find upsetting or do not wish your children to see. We are not telling you what to watch, or what not to watch. Simply telling you that this content is violent or sexually charged or may be deemed offensive to some." That's what a good rating system should do. Not limit, but instead inform.

Q11:

I believe I've been quite clear. Products that wish to be sold locally within Australia should be classified based on content of said product and rated accordingly.

Q12:

I do not believe it is necessary to control access to online content. I believe it is both a waste of time and effort to try to stop the internet. Instead that time and effort should be spent informing and educating parents on how to help children and if the parents wish it, to set up local filters for private use.

Q13:

It can not be better controlled by putting up a wall. People that wish to see content, will see the content. If parents wish to better protect their children they should spend time teaching and guiding those children, and perhaps use local filter devices that the parents have control over. Not an unseen, unchecked entity.

Q14:

I believe they are already fairly controlled. I see such magazines in milk bars and they are always in black plastic bags covering the cover from the typical passer by. Once again it comes down to enforcing regulation on the people selling such products and parents guiding children.

Q15:

When sold locally within Australian outlets. Parental advisory and education is the most important tool we have. I also believe retail outlets should openly display what the rankings mean and perhaps offer pamphlets on enabling parental controls on things such as consoles for playing video games. Parent's can do so already, but many may not know how to do so. Or that it's a very simple process.

Q16:

I believe that all 3 are vital. The industry should work closely with the government agency to set up the guidelines. Perhaps have members of the industry sit in on the classification board in addition to other public and government workers, so that it is an educated and diverse board. From the user

perspective, it is important that we take responsibility for our own actions and use the classification system for what it is, an early education system.

Q17:

As long as there is an option for government overseeing, I believe it can be possible. But the government should have the ability to step in if they feel the industry is not conducting itself within the limits and guidelines set forth.

Q18:

Once again, I feel items should be classified purely on content and in my experience things are almost never obvious or straightforward.

Q19:

I personally don't believe that items sold locally should be forced to pay for a classification at all. If the government wishes things classified, that's fine. But don't punish publishers, creators, and developers for that.

Q20:

I do not believe the categories are plainly enough understood. I believe steps can be made to make the various classifications more obvious in retail outlets that specialize in selling movies/games/etc. I believe the biggest current problem is the lack of an adult classification in the games industry and the frequent clumping of adult content into an MA 15+ category. There is a far gap between 15 and 18, both emotionally and maturity level.

Q21:

Yes, as I said above there needs to be a step above 15+ for the games industry. Similar to the film industry.

Q22:

I believe there should be a single system used for everything. Music/movies/games. The markings should be clear. Concise and obvious to the consumers and retailers both.

Q23:

If that question is asking should those forms of media have the same classification system? Then yes. As I said in Q22.

Q24:

There is no true way to 'prohibit' content online. Parents should be able to decide for themselves what content is allowed within their house, and be given simple tools to enact their wishes. Greater steps should also be made by local authorities to find and punish people who publish and distribute child pornography or other forms of illegal material online

Q25:

No. The current RC category is too wide. It is impossible to rate or classify things online. Keep classification to products sold locally. Stay out of the internet. The internet should be policed by one thing, the local family. Let them decide. Provide them education and tools to do so. That is all a government agency should attempt to do.

Q26:

The classification system should not change from state to state. It should be a country wide system.

Q27:

As long as the system is unified across all states within the country and is based purely off content and focused primarily on content released and sold locally in Australia, and made clear and obvious for consumers and retailers both... then I believe it will be a system that is in vast superiority to what we have now.

Q28:

As stated above, I believe the system should be country wide. Not individual from state to state

Q29:

Stop attempting to place the internet. It's security theatre and I find it offensive. If you truly wish to assist children, help teach parents how to protect them themselves, provide them the tools and knowledge to do so. In addition, realise that adults are able to make decisions for themselves on what is and is not appropriate. Law enforcement organizations need to be able to protect and enforce things published and distributed online that are illegal more aggressively

Other comments:

I think this is one of the most important issues that is the least spoken about facing Australia at the moment. It has the capability to either make us better more educated country or a laughing stock to the rest of the world that involves itself in technology and common sense. Thank you for your time.