

CI 1425 R Musgrave

First name: Ryan

Last name: Musgrave

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework, specifically having consistent classification for video games.

Q2:

Consistent classification and transparency, as well as a complaints and appeals process.

Q3:

Yes. Any broadcast media or physical media should be classified. Any communication media cannot be classified.

Subsections of communication media can be counted as broadcast media and can be classified if jurisdictionally possible.

Q4:

No, a medium should be consistently classified.

Q5:

Two answers for the two questions:

- A medium should be consistently classified.
- Only broadcast and physical media should be classified.

Q6:

This question is hinting at the subject of cost - should small content producers and distributors have to pay for classification of their content, especially if the expected profit is low relative to the cost of classification.

Perhaps the best way is to subsidise the classification process under a certain revenue level. I would prefer the decision on this to be based upon numbers and statistics rather than 'gut feel'.

Q7:

The definition of art is qualitative and differs between two people and as such should not be given any special privilege.

Q8:

Audio books should have the same classification rules as paper books.

Broadcast and physical media should be classified.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Consistency of classification rules for a medium, and between media.

Q12:

The internet is a communication medium and should not be restricted under the National Classification Scheme.

Subsections of the internet can be classified as a broadcast medium (for example, Foxtel or ABC iView). These services may be required to display classification information.

Q13:

Parental controls on a PC or LAN is the most effective method. This requires education of parents to give them both the social and technological tools to manage this. This does not help with the 'lazy parents' problem but it is not a government's responsibility nor the responsibility of a classification scheme to ensure that children are not exposed to inappropriate content.

Q14:

These are effectively controlled already. Sexually explicit magazines are either behind a counter or wrapped in plastic to prevent 'store reading'. DVDs and video games require identification for purchase.

Q15:

The current system works fine for this.

Q16:

I have no problem with the current arrangement - it allows for consistent application of the regulation.

Q17:

I do not have any data for how expensive the current classification is or how overworked the classification board is so I cannot make a comment here. If industry can do it more efficiently to at least the same level of competency than I see no reason why this approach cannot work. The ESRB in America appears to be a good example of this.

Q18:

There is no content that is guaranteed to be obvious and straightforward. With a good complaints/appeals process, it can feasibly be possible for industry to state their expected classification and flag that it is 'obvious and straightforward' to expedite the classification process.

Q19:

The decision to do this should be based on figures rather than upon my gut feeling, so I shall abstain from this question.

Q20:

Yes.

Q21:

Yes, there needs to be an R18+ rating for video games. This should be consistent with other media (e.g. Movie, TV)

Q22:

Apply the rules consistently across media. A good example of this is the interactivity argument in video games - this tends to cause video games to rank higher than an equivalent movie due to the argument that 'the player is actually doing those things and is therefore more likely to do them in real life'.

Q23:

Yes, but the name of the new, consolidated classification document should be at least as long as this question.

Q24:

None. It is better to focus on preventing the creation of illegal content than preventing access to illegal content.

Attempting to prevent access to illegal content is infeasible as it is quite simple to work around all technological access prevention mechanisms. If it will not work then there is no point spending money on it!

Q25:

No, nothing should be prohibited online.

Q26:

Yes. The current system on broadcast media and physical media has consistent laws so no promotion is needed.

Q27:

Any one that is functionally equivalent as what we have now, except with an R18+ rating for video games, and no mandatory internet filter.

Q28:

As long as the rules are consistent and very little (if any) content is banned outright then there is no reason why a national system legislated by the Commonwealth will cause any harm.

Q29:

There should be no outright ban on materials such as terrorist instructions etc. It is important that we are permissive in our framework as what is appropriate for one adult may be inappropriate for another. It is also important that we do not affect free political speech.

Other comments:

The two main things I want to see out of this new classification system are:

1. An R18+ rating for video games, including the re-review of some controversially MA15+ rated games already released under the current system.
2. A clear lack of support for a mandatory, ISP-level internet filter that will be expensive, inefficient and pointless.