Organisation: The Herb Cottage Partners

Q1:

Develop a new framework. Too much has changed (examples include massively multiplayer games where the participants are a mix of children and adults (de facto if not always de jure, for example Secondlife, where the only guarantee you're over 13 is that you checked a checkbox saying so).

Q2:

1. Allow people to know what kinds of content to expect in an entertainment product.

Outdated, simplistic classification by age or by a single scale (G - X18) is unhelpful. Inform the consumer what kinds of content, and how extreme/common each is. Food allergy information is a helpful model in that the purpose is similar; people are reading the list because they hope to avoid specific ingredients.

2. Make it simple for untrained retail staff to avoid providing products to a consumer for whom it's inappropriate (e.g. a violent game to someone too young, a strobing shoot-em-up to an epileptic etc).

Q3:

No.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

Yes - warnings of violence and disturbing images are helpful to consumers trying to make informed decisions.

Q6:

Yes. The classification decision should take into account, for example, content unlikely to be shown outside of art galleries/shows, where the audience is self-selecting. These classifications should be allowed to be conditional - i.e. subject to review in the event that (for example) the content "goes viral" and becomes more widely/easily available.

Q7:

Yes. But ONLY for the purpose of providing consumer advice. Never for restricting access.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Yes. The classification decision should take into account, for example, where the audience is small and self-selecting. These classifications should be allowed to be conditional - i.e. subject to review in the event that (for example) the content "goes viral" and becomes more widely/easily available.

Q10:

There should never be restriction of access for content accessed at home - only advisory classification.

Q11:

Q12:

Advisory warnings. There should be no restriction.

The most effective tool would be for the relevant authorities to develop an approval/star-rating scheme for third-party providers of internet-blocking software, allowing people to choose to use an approved product if they wanted to block certain content. Providers like Net-Nanny could opt in to such a scheme, or it could act independently.

Q13:

See the answer to Q12 - if there were a national approval and rating scheme for internet blocking software, it would be simple to run awareness and education campaigns aimed at educating and informing parents about the sort of content their children might be exposed to online, and advising them that if they want to shield their children from exposure they should select an approved product and install it on the devices (computers, smartphones etc) that their children use.

Q14:

current systems work well.

Q15:

Primarily, violent content and exploitative content.

Politically extreme content (e.g. incitement to violence or hate crimes).

Q16:

Government Agencies:

Creating the ratings system.

Rating content.

Policing the consistent use of the ratings system by industry.

Listening to consumer input about the system, and adjusting it accordingly.

Never banning/censoring content other than actually exploitative content (snuff movies, child porn etc).

Industry Bodies:

Compliance with the warning requirements of the rating system

Consumers:

Using the rating system to shield children and others from inappropriate content

Q17:

No.

The code and the classification should remain outside of industry hands. The public must be able to trust that commercial interests play no part in classification decisions.

Q18:

Training videos ("how to use word processing package X")

Nature Documentaries

Q19:

Pay the same % as is australian owned. So for a videogame produced 100% in-house by an Aussie game development company, pay 100% of costs, for a hollywood movie or imported french arthouse movie, do not subsidise at all.

Is it possible to work towards bilateral treaties in this regard? Might the government, and that of the

UK for example, agree to at least recognise each others' "G" rating, allowing for free trade in content so classified, without the need for boards here and in the UK to go to the expense of reclassifying?

Q20:

No one I know is confused.

Q21:

Instead of ages, it would be more helpful to classify by content types, and how extreme/common each is (analogy: Allergy list on a food product).

Q22:

Use the same graphics, colours, and position on packaging/onscreen (e.g. always top left, or always bottom right).

Q23:

Yes. Convergence is only going to speed up. Already books available in both print and eBook editions sometimes feature animated video episodes in the eBook edition, so distinctions are now meaningless.

Q24:

None.

This is not China or Saudi Arabia. If people are accessing child porn, prosecute them and put them in jail if it is for unsavoury purposes.

Q25:

No.

RC reflects what should not be on display in any shop.

In their own homes, there should be no restrictions on what adults choose to access online.

Q26:

Yes.

Q27:

A fully federal system of classification, with the explicit aim of not censoring, but providing the maximum possible information for the consumer about the content.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: