

CI 1617 J Keppel

First name: James

Last name: Keppel

Q1:

A new framework based on informing, not censoring.

Q2:

Allow R18 video games, and reducing non-classification of material based on moral grounds. To provide a rating system to allow Adults to make informed decisions. Censorship should not be a goal.

Q3:

Yes. Different platforms create content at different rates. There are on average over 300 new iPhone apps every day. <http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2009/09/22/apple-approved-1394-apps-on-friday/> As an example limiting access until individual approval results in classification hindering industry. In these cases classification should be exempt, based on the understanding that these vendors take due process to remove content that does not meet a majority of Australian Classification standards. This should allow online content creators and vendors such as the iPhone store and Android store to operate, as both do actively remove or refuse to approve content that is deemed inappropriate by international standards (Child abuse material etc..)

Published books that do not contain images, should be exempt from any classification.

Q4:

For content where the sheer volume makes individual classification possible, for example iPhone apps (average of 300 a day, sometimes more) <http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2009/09/22/apple-approved-1394-apps-on-friday/>, where individual approval would hinder industry, then this is a viable option. However, these decisions would need to be made with an avenue of appeal to eliminate frivolous, anti-competitive, or vindictive complaints.

Q5:

The potential impact is far too subjective. How a medium impacts someone can be debated, and counter-debated, and takes away from the point of classification, allowing adults to make informed choices. Classification needs to focus on the content, and the individual then applies their perceptions of how that relates to the medium to create an informed decision. As new media is created, having to measure the "impact" of that new media detracts from the goals of classification.

Q6:

No. Classification

Q7:

Only in terms of consumer advice. Should it be deemed necessary, provide a rating system so Adults can make informed decisions. Access to artwork by Adults should never be restricted.

In relations to highly controversial artworks & access to minors, adult supervision should be

suggested, but not enforced, or access limited. Display can be limited to galleries, and not open public areas so classification rating can be properly advised prior to viewing.

Q8:

Audio books of published books are exempt from classification.

Q9:

In examples where

Q10:

Only content that can be purchased in physical stores, or displayed in Australian venues. Internet content is not to be classified (For example it is not practical to classify the 140+ millions videos on youtube)

Q11:

The internet should not be classified. Opt in filters applied by adults are an option.

Q12:

An opt-in filtering system. Blacklists and Involuntary blocking are technologies unfeasible, and do nothing to stop the trade of illegal material through unmonitored channels (peer to peer networking, email, direct file transfers)

Q13:

Thought opt in filters applied to computers children have access to by their parents.

Q14:

Requiring Identification, which is to be requested if the vendor believes the person to be under 25.

Online purchase via credit card only.

Q15:

M15+ & R18 only.

Q16:

Government is to inform, industry bodies are to display information, users are to make decisions based on the information provided.

Q17:

Yes. As the goal is to inform, not restrict, a code that industry follows would result in more effective classification scheme that is more suited to the large amount of content created across current, new and emerging media markets.

Q18:

Mobile Phone software. (I.E. iPhone Apps), Online Computer Game Stores (Steam, Origin, Direct 2 Drive, etc..)

Q19:

All independent film makers, independent computer game publishers,

Q20:

The lack of R18+ rating for video games causes confusion.

Q21:

No, they are well known and serve the purpose of informing the public.

Q22:

Add R18+ to video games.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None should be prohibited as it cannot be correctly enforced. However, material deemed illegal such as child abuse material should still result in prosecution. Classifications are to inform, enforcing laws relating to illegal material is up to local and federal police

Q25:

No. Due to a lack of R18+ rating for games, Content that is less offensive than similar content that was classified in movies (themse such as excessive violence, and sex) have been refused classification. As a result there is large amount of RC content that should be able to adults who make an informed decision to view it.

Q26:

Elimination of the system that requires a consensus amongst State Attorney Generals, where one state can hold the process of national classification guidelines hostage.

Q27:

A Federal system, focused on information, not restriction.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Add R18+ Rating for Video Games.

Focus on informing, not restricting or censoring.

Do not allow or recommend involuntary internet filtering.

Other comments:

See attached petition for R18 Game Rating in Australia

File 1:

[bdo_audit - game_palgn_petition_count.pdf](#)