CI 1865 A Attwood

First name: Anthony
Last name: Attwood

Q1:
Improving certain elements of the existing framework..
Q2:
Ensuring that consumers are aware of the likely impact of content so that appropriate decisions can be made depending on the audience (for instance, choosing content for ones own entertainment, or choosing content to entertain children). The focus should be on consumer awareness as a priority, not restriction.
The purposes and principles outlined in paragraphs 50 and 52 of the issues paper are still appropriate and do not require any substantial modification.
Q3:
If content is classified on one platform (such a movie intended for theatrical release), then the same content should carry its classification over to other platforms (such as a DVD release of the same movie, or online release). However that should not imply that all movies released online would necessarily be classified.
Q4:
Yes. Content such as books that is generally both low-impact, and, where high impact instances exist, is not targeted at a large audience, only need to be classified when it is subject to a complaint.

I believe the current system is a quite adequate in this regard.
Q5:
Q6:
Q7:
As with books, I believe classification of artworks should only be necessary where particularly high-impact or offensive artwork is being displayed. I do not believe there should be cause to ban any artwork outright (ie, to refuse classification), provided suitable warning and advice is given to consumers, and that consumers must make a conscious decision to view the artworks, ie, such art should not be exhibited in generally accessible spaces, but should require the consumer to enter a restricted exhibition hall.
Q8:
Q9:
Q10:
In general no. Content with high impact will have the same impact when viewed at home (such as on TV) as when viewed in public (such as in the cinema).
Q11:
The anticipated audience: when content is intended for a large audience or a wide demographic, then clear and correct advice regarding the themes and impact of the content is important. On the other

hand, when content is intended for a small, relatively homogeneous audience, then classification may not be as important.
Q12:
Q13:
Education of parents and guardians, and possibly the availability of opt-in internet filters that the internet subscriber can choose to have placed on their internet account.

Any other solution would remove the ability of adults to make their own choices and decisions.
Q14:
I don't believe it needs to be. I believe the controls currently in place strike a reasonable balance between protecting those that need protecting, and allowing adults to make their own choices and decisions.
Q15:
Whenever classified content it is available for purchase or viewing. Content that is not required to be classified obviously would not need classification markings.
Q16:
Q17:
Yes, for certain classes of content for which there is a large amount of content available that it would simply not be cost-effective to be classified by a government body. See response to question 18.
Q18:
Following on from response to question 17:
For instance, the large number of computer games produced by small independent game developers, usually known as 'indie' games, that are usually only available online. These games are typically smaller in scale and scope than big-name releases from major developers, and do not attract such large audiences either. The likely classification for games like this is typically very straightforward due to the low or no impact nature of the game. Further, they are usually distributed through online services like Steam, Playstation Network, or Xbox Live Arcade that already do a good job at prohibiting the sale of offensive content.
Q19:
Yes. One of the aims of any government program relating to the content industry should be promoting creative talent and, where reasonable, reducing the barrier to entry for smaller content producers.
Q20:
In general, yes. I believe RC is generally misunderstood, however consumers generally do not come into contact with RC content, so this is a relatively minor issue.
Q21:
Aside from the anomalous lack of R18+ rating for games, no. I believe the existing classification categories are adequate and suitable.
Q22:
I don't know, I only know that they should be made as consistent as reasonably possible.

Perhaps content that has been classified by industry should receive slightly different classification markings than content classified by the Classification Board or Classification Review Board (as is

currently done for music) to indicate that the industry classification is subject to change by the CB or CRB should complaints be received.

With reference to paragraph 112 of the issues paper, I don't believe that any particular form of content has intrinsically greater or lesser impact than any other. I believe that consumers reasonably expect that, for instance, an M15+ rating for a movie entails similar impact or themes as an M15+ rating for a computer game or any other form of content. I do not believe that there is justification for different classification criteria for different types of content.

Q23:

Yes. As in my response to question 22, I don't believe any kind of content deserves different classification criteria to any other. Hence, classification criteria should be consistent across all content types. A particular classification rating should mean the same thing regardless of the content it is applied to.

Q24:

Only content currently that is currently illegal in most (perhaps all?) international jurisdictions - child pornography, snuff films, etc.

Q25:

No. The only content I believe should be entirely prohibited online is content that is already prohibited offline and is subject to other laws and treaties. I believe free-speech issues outweigh the benefits of any possible mechanism for prohibiting content online.

Q26:

Yes. With the strong system of federal government in Australia, there is no reason that classification of content in one state or territory jurisdiction should be different to any other.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

The issues surrounding the introduction of an R18+ classification for computer games in 2010 demonstrated that it is unreasonable to require a unanimous decision by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General when considering changes to the National Classification Scheme. I believe a 2/3 majority (or some other substantial majority) should be required, not a unanimous decision.