CI 1703 A Dickson

First name: Andrew
Last name: Dickson

Q1:
Improving the existing frameworks ability to manage online and computer/video game classification.

Q2:
To allow consumers to make informed decisions about what types of content are suitable for them and/or their children.

Q3:
Technology and platform convergence means that this question becomes more meaningless every day. Content can increasingly be accessed in whichever way the consumer sees fit. Therefore, the platform should be irrelevant.

Q4:
The sheer volume of content being produced means that a pure "white list" approach is not feasible. Therefore, this should be one method used to target reviews where required. Unfortunately, this may mean that content is then recalled and re-released with an appropriate classification, which is certainly not ideal.

Q5:
Certainly, as long as it is recognised that many computer/video games are not produced for children!

Q6:
Content that is considered to be a "major" or "mass market" release should receive preference due to the large exposure it will receive. It would also be more difficult to classify after release. Content producers that are known to consistently produce objectionable material should be targeted.

Q7:
In the case where people cannot be "inadvertently" exposed to the material (e.g. would need to physically visit the gallery for instance), individuals should be responsible for themselves and their children. No classification should be required.

Q8:
Music, yes. In the case of audio books, generally it should be sufficient to classify only the base material. e.g. The written work.

Q9:
For audience size, see question 6. For audience composition, it would seem more important to classify content aimed at children and teenagers than obviously adult content. However, it is important that the actual target demographics are well understood, not just assumed from the medium. South Park is a cartoon, yet it is certainly not aimed at children. Grand Theft Auto is a computer game, yet it should not be played by children.

Q10:
No, especially where children are concerned. Where the content is accessed is irrelevant, as long as the viewer (or guardian) can be aware of its potential impact.

Q11:

Q12:

There are no truly effective methods. It is generally futile to attempt censorship, even if it were desirable. Education for parents and clear classifications allow consumers to make their own decisions.

Q13:

Specifically for the protection of children, it would be feasible to create an optional online filter application at the individual machine level that can be controlled by the machine owner. It is misguided to create national infrastructure (eg. national firewall) or force the ISP (industry) to perform this role.

Changes to classifications and updates to the software could be released through an update manager which could be set to automatic when the software was installed (may be more difficult on some platforms than others). Certainly the software may still be defeated with determined effort, but it places control in the hands of parents without the major investment required for other solutions that are no more effective.

Q14:

I believe that this is well enough controlled already. I imagine that any such content is actually far easier to access online anyway.

Q15:

Certainly this should be required when the content is available from an Australian distributor, retailer or website. For online international sources, in many cases this will be difficult or impossible to enforce. Industry/trade ties should be used to influence content providers in this case to attempt to visibly classify and/or restrict content where suitable.

Q16:

Q17:

The amount of content being produced will, to some degree, make this type of arrangement necessary. If there is effective oversight, it will be a much more efficient method of gaining classification coverage than relying solely on government departments.

Q18:

Perhaps children's daytime television aimed at toddlers. Adult and children's content covers too broad a spectrum to classify without review.

Q19:

For public service or independent films or publications, the industry should assist where possible to do much of the groundwork for the classification. This will reduce costs and increase efficiency from the government's perspective. The remaining cost could be subsidised up to a limit per applicant.

Q20:

No confusion.

Q21:

Q22:

There must be adult classifications for computer/video games, consistent with those currently used for film. There is no intrinsic reason why the same classification terms cannot be used for both forms of content.

Q23:

Yes, there should be a single document/guideline that considers this content. This will make it easier to apply the legislation consistently and without bias for the medium.

Q24:

Q25:

There should be no specific treatment specified for computer/video games, online or otherwise, that would lead to them being classed as RC when a film with similar content would not be.

Q26:

The fundamental features of the classification laws must be agreed at federal and state level, otherwise there is the risk of masses of content being re-classified at state level. This leads to unnecessary duplication of effort for authorities and confusion and possible interstate legal concerns for consumers.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: