

CI 1537 A Delosa

First name: Anthony

Last name: Delosa

Q1:

In light of the Internet and the content it makes available from sources outside of the control of the Australian Government, it makes all types of mandatory classification schemes futile. A framework based on this fact would make sense rather than the underlying assumption that the Government can regulate content in the future. For regulated channels like mass media and physical goods, the current framework serves us well - except in the case of video game classification who's rules are not aligned with other video content.

Q2:

Despite the advent of the internet, I believe that ratings as applied to current media should continue as they do today, or streamlined to be consistent across the media types rather than the current multiple processes. Not too fussed about if this is an industry or government regulated activity. The internet is an uncontrolled space. There is no point in trying to classify the content and if done, there is no way of making the media producer show the rating or restrict the availability of the source without effectively restricting the internet like China. Control needs to be at the end point at the user discretion. There are already a number of services available to people to put this in place if they don't want to come across offensive material.

Q3:

Yes - The internet can't be restricted.

Q4:

Yes, comfortable with this approach for some materials.

Q5:

Happy with current classification system in regards to childrens material.

Q6:

Yes - the higher the reach, the more focus that should be made.

Q7:

If the exhibitors believe that the exhibition may offend and wish to classify, or a complaint is made then a classification for the purpose of providing consumer advice seems reasonable.

Q8:

Industry self regulation with a complaints process seems to be working, so don't want to see a change in this space.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Yes

Q11:

No comment

Q12:

A DNS service could be established by the government that would only provide access to classified sites (whitelist) or restrict access to RC sites. Enforcement of this would not be possible, but for those concerned about stumbling across RC material, this would be an effective measure. There is NO technical way of restricting access to material.

Q13:

Parents can install filter software on their computer or use a filtered DNS service like OpenDNS (Opendns.com)

Q14:

Cannot be controlled so futile trying. I understand this is the law, but any attempt will be a waste of taxpayers money in fighting something that anyone with a small amount of technical ability or the ability to do a google search will be able to circumnavigate.

Q15:

If the content has required classification, then it should show the classification.

Q16:

For traditional mass media and physical media, current practices are adequate. For online, an education and assistance approach should be taken.

Q17:

Generally comfortable with this approach, including for Film.

Q18:

No comment

Q19:

A self classification scheme should be adopted which would avoid costs. If government deems classification is necessary (complaint), then it should bear the full cost of the classification if accusation was false, or the maker pays if proven.

Q20:

Video game classification does not align with other types of media. The average age of a computer game player is 36, yet the classifications do not provide for a R rating.

Q21:

R for video games.

Q22:

R for video games

Q23:

Yes - a single code would be good.

Q24:

The current rules for RC material should be prohibited, but technically this is impossible

Q25:

The scope of the RC should be brought into line with other liberal countries. In some ways our classification system can be erring on the side of big brother, particularly in relation to the depiction of the use of drugs

Q26:

No comment

Q27:

No comment

Q28:

No comment

Q29:

No comment

Other comments: