

CI 1809 C Boulton

First name: Callum

Last name: Boulton

Q1:

Either would be nice, as long as there's some progress in the area of classification.

My personal preference leans towards allowing the industry to self-regulate, if only due to the sheer number of things the classification board would need to classify (How many apps are there on Apple's App Store? how about the Android market? The various kinds of downloadable content? Would all of YouTube need to be classified?)

Q2:

A national classification scheme should keep "An adult should be able to make their own choices about what they watch/hear/view/play" at it's forefront, with appropriate classifications for media so that all citizens can make informed choices.

Q3:

No, content is content. If you're rating some of it, you should be rating all of it, otherwise content accessed through certain portals will be unrated. However that breeds problems, such as the sheer number of materials requiring classification. (see my answer to Q1)

Also, I understand that the classification process has an attached fee for submission, which may kill some independant developers, who's budget of 'slim to nil' cannot afford such a fee (leading them to either not release in Australia if they're international, or outright prevent an Australian developer from investing in a small application)

Q4:

That'd be a good way of dealing with filtering the sheer amount of content that needs to be classified into just the ones people definitely need to be informed about before purchasing.

Q5:

A special 'Suitable for Children' label would be nice, although this would be easily accomplished by a self regulating industry, as no doubt such a label would advertise to parents this product is definitely designed for children. (and then any parent could complain should the content be something they believe is not 'Suitable for Children' and then the Classification board could step in and make an accurate classification of the content.

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

There are NONE. Any attempt to restrict online content will fail. Short of building a Great Firewall of Australia, following in glorious footsteps of countries such as China, Iran and North Korea, there is no effective way of controlling access to online content. Don't even go there. It's not practical. Again,

does the classification board really want to review /every/ single YouTube video? There are 48 hours of video uploaded to Youtube every single minute. The Classification board does not have the resources, even if they did decide to go that route.

Q13:

The most effective method would involve parents taking responsibility for their children. Education and parental supervision would be far more effective and beneficial than any ham-fisted attempt by government.

Q14:

The same way it has been for years? I don't see any way we can improve upon the current system without serious consequences.

Q15:

This question is ambiguous. Do you mean 'under what circumstances' or 'at what point in the purchasing process'?

Q16:

It should be up to the user to regulate the content they consume for themselves, using the information given by ratings which the Industry provides based on what it feels is accurate for said content, while the government can challenge the given rating if it receives a complaint, or otherwise feels the industry given rating is inaccurate.

Q17:

Yes. This would solve some of the 'sheer volume' problem. If a suitable code could be agreed upon, which included wide enough classifications that would allow the industry to sell the vast majority of its wares in Australia. (rather than being unable to sell products in Australia because they do not fit into the code)

Q18:

Movies are the clearest choice, as everyone viewing the movie will see the same things.

Q19:

For any piece of content is produced for minimal or no cost, places a monetary disincentive for that content to be released for Australian audiences, simply because they're less able to afford the classification fee than a work that is backed by a large producer.

Q20:

<MA15+> I believe is the category most likely to cause confusion. Particularly with regard to video-games. Parents may think '12 or 13' is close enough to 15, where the same game may be rated R18+ in other Western countries. (simply because we lack the R18 rating)

This confusion would be solved by having the aforementioned R18+ rating, which would advertise to parents 'DEFINITELY NOT FOR CHILDREN'

Q21:

There is a dire need for an R18+ for games. Australians have been campaigning for it for over 10 years now, yet any game deemed unsuitable for a 15 year old is deemed unsuitable for all Australians, even those who're old enough to legally make their own choices.

I would personally like to keep the current MA15 rating, unlike some. I feel that there are definitely some games which are too mature for 15 year olds, but by the same token, not all games that are

above an M are automatically for 18+. Movies have separate M and M15+ ratings, and so games, which are at least as diverse as movies, should receive at least as many classification categories.

Q22:

By making them more standard and uniform? looks like that question answers itself :P

Q23:

Consolidation is good, provided the Act that replaces it has classifications which allow the ratings to be accurate.

Q24:

I'm sure this box will be filled with 'EVIL CHILD PORN!' since that's what Senator Conroy was using to drum up enough blind fear to get people to support Labour's internet filter. But last time I heard, Child Porn was already illegal and you can go to jail for it. Which would make 'prohibiting' it sort of redundant.

Content may be illegal to view, but should not be prohibited. If it's illegal, it should be passed on to the police. Prohibition solves nothing and creates only problems. (Particularly so with the internet, when even a child can learn to bypass all by the strictest of firewalls. Labour's plan to filter the internet was not popular when they announced it, and any similar plan will be equally unpopular)

Q25:

Any attempt to prohibit things online only shows naivety about the way the internet works, and makes those attempting to prohibit it look dictatorial.

"The Internet treats censorship as a malfunction and routes around it." -- John Perry Barlow

(I would atleast hope that the government speaks with and heeds those in the tech community before saying 'block it all!' and sticking their collective fingers in their ears about how and why it will never work. You don't let the plumber fly the plane, so you shouldn't let a politician run the internet)

Q26:

Yes, consistency is important. Ideally, the classification laws would be uniform across the country. It should be promoted by

Q27:

Q28:

Yes, if the Commonwealth insists upon requiring a unanimous vote of the Attorney's General in order for there to be any change to the classification system, then the Commonwealth should absolutely have the power to step in, preventing the situation we've had for the past several years where a minority of 1 Attorney General has the power to block classification revisions for the whole of Australia.

Q29:

Joint government and Industry created classification framework, a full range of ratings from G up to X for ALL media content, which the Industry itself would apply to the content, with the government being able to call the industry out on any content it feels is breaching the applied classification.

Other comments: