

CI 1780 B Dibley

First name: Bice

Last name: Dibley

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework. The familiarity people have with the existing classification scheme is a crucial factor in the role classification plays in informing consumer choice.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to ensure material deemed inappropriate for minors be clearly labeled as such, that this objective does not interfere with the rights of adults to view whatever material they deem fit, and that material in the discretionary zone be labeled in such a way that parents can make informed decisions.

Q3:

The technology or platform should not affect whether it should be classified, but it does by its nature affect the manner in which should be classified. For example, if a game has a series of small downloadable additions created, it may be appropriate for the publisher to provide some sort of guarantee that the new content conforms to the classification of the original product.

Q4:

I think this is a bad idea, as it gives too much power to complaint. Several games in the past (Marc Ecko's Getting Up, Blitz: The League, GTA San Andreas) have suffered from high profile complaints which it appears the classifiers have been unwilling to ignore despite the fact the content in question has already undergone a classification. I feel there would be a sense of obligation to make a decision in favour of censorship if the only form of classification for a medium was complaint-based, especially if the complaint was made in a high publicity forum.

Q5:

If content is to be specifically marketed to children or advertised for children (a classification more specific than G) then it should always be classified. If a media producer is going to the effort of explicitly targeting children, then the media should be reviewed.

Q6:

I would like to say no, but it's hard to argue a band playing in a pub selling their home-recorded album for \$10 should have to go through the same classification process as the album sitting at the top of the ARIA charts. Whether this is a sliding scale or a threshold depends on the cost of classification

Q7:

Artwork should be classified for the purpose of providing consumer advice

Q8:

I would assume audio books should be regarded as identical to the original text for purposes of classification. Music should be classified, but remembering to take into account the difference between allusion and depiction that is in the existing guidelines.

Q9:

The composition of the audience for any media should realistically be assumed to include all ages groups. If this means that all content should be classified because it may be viewed by minors, it

should also mean that all content be classified on the scale of whether an adult should be allowed to view it.

Q10:

If public means unavoidably public (billboards, train ads, etc) then all content should definitely be classified. If public means museums and galleries, then there should be no difference between public and at home classification requirements.

Q11:

Q12:

Online content access is probably best controlled client side, which is to say on the computer of the consumer rather than the ISP. Blacklisting content at a transport level is unfeasible.

Q13:

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Certainly for high traffic, high churn content, like that found online (be it video, text or games) industry regulation is likely to be more effective. Some level of buy-in and sense of responsibility from the media creators combined with the threat of government enforcement should be at least as effective as the current system.

Q18:

There is a variety of music which would fall into this category such as instrumental music, and instructional books and videos. Certainly industry could be in the position to classify the obviously inoffensive and defer anything even slightly questionable to the regulatory body.

Q19:

I think it would make more sense to scale the fee based on the size of the release rather than subsidising. For example, films could have their classification fee based on the number of screens the movie is planned to be opened on. Large movies can then subsidise the cost of smaller movies automatically.

Q20:

I believe there is cause for confusion between M and MA, as they both have the same age restriction and cover a similar type of content.

Q21:

I think it is better to keep the number of classification smaller rather than larger. The more different classifications, the more room there is for confusion.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes. The less number of places classification information and regulation is defined, the more likely the final system is to be consistent.

Q24:

Q25:

No, it does not. The RC category includes a number of criteria that are enforced so poorly and inconsistently offline that trying to enforce them online would be fruitless.

Q26:

Yes it is important, especially if a wider variety of material is being classified as it is unreasonable to expect content producers to get their material classified by six different states and two territories. Furthermore, while it may be true that different states have different requirements in some government services, the state in which you live should not inform the media which you are allowed to consume. Providing all states follow the same classification guidelines, I don't see that there is any requirement to promote consistency, as it will be the only option.

Q27:

The classification scheme should be federally run and regulated.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

It would be good if there was more transparency about how media was being classified and by whom. The current method of classifying computer games for example, destroys the context in which objectionable material occurs, and I don't get the feeling it is being done by people who are familiar with the medium. This is not to say that material should be more or less acceptable in video games, but rather that the impact should be judged by people who are literate in the mechanics and devices of the medium.

Other comments: