

CI 1890 G Gower

First name: Graham

Last name: Gower

Q1:

A new framework. However, I have concerns that any new framework would become more restrictive than the last.

Q2:

Consider consumers to be represented with a bell curve type scale. E.g. C0 -> C10, where a few C0 consumers are offended by all material and few C10 consumers are not offended by any material. Most consumers are somewhere in the middle at C4, C5, C6. Content can be represented likewise (material that offends no one at C0 and material that offends everyone at C10).

Consumers implicitly know where on the bell curve they lie. The classification scheme should allow a consumer to make an educated decision regarding what material is appropriate for themselves, and their children until those children are considered mature enough to make their own decisions regarding content.

Consumers can choose to restrict their consumption to materials which have been classified in the lower range(s). Alternately, consumers should be free to consume all material along the spectrum, regardless of whether it has been classified or not. Not classifying material should indicate to the consumer that they are responsible for determining if it is appropriate for themselves. Consumers who don't wish to take this responsibility are free to choose material which has been classified with the range C0->C5, or whichever range is felt to be appropriate.

Consumers with a high tolerance for potentially offensive material are generally comfortable disregarding classifications and a classification scheme should consider this as reasonable, while targeting those with a lower tolerance. Material which is not (yet) classified should not be illegal! (are 1 trillion currently unclassified web sites illegal?)

Q3:

No. The classification scheme should not attempt to predict future content delivery mechanisms.

Q4:

Yes. Attempting to classify all content is impractical.

Q5:

Maybe. Content designed for children should be classified; without the classification, parents must make uneducated guesses about which material is intended for children. While this is generally not difficult, it does simplify content distribution along a potentially complex chain between content creators and content consumers.

Q6:

If it is easy for material to be consumed accidentally, then content guidelines become more important.

Q7:

This content should only be classified if it has been the subject of a complaint. Industry regulation may be appropriate here. Given the relatively few complaints by consumers, the current system appears to be practical. So far, complaints tend to come from those who are not consumers.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

If it is easy for material to be consumed accidentally, then content guidelines become more important.

Q10:

It is appropriate for classification guidelines to be more prevalent for content intended to be accessed in public. Especially with regards to advertising this material. Content accessed in the home should have no requirement for classification, as it is reasonable to assume this content consumption is not accidental.

Q11:

It is in the best interest of content creators to have their material classified if they wish their material to be consumed by those with low tolerance for offensive material (e.g. children, ACL members). Thus, more offensive material should be considered a lower priority for being classified as its consumers are more likely to disregard the classifications and are unlikely to use the classifications to find said material.

Q12:

For the majority of consumers, access to content online need not be controlled. For those that do seek to avoid certain content, free filtering software is readily available. The burden for controlling content access online should be largely placed upon the consumer.

Q13:

Greater parental supervision. Free filtering software is readily available for those who don't wish to provide constant supervision.

Q14:

Current point of sale controls are adequate. Restrict sale/consumption to minors for material which is classified inappropriately or not classified at all.

Q15:

Classification markings and consumer advice makes the most sense if it is given prior to consumption. E.g. on advertising material, prior to film screenings, physical packaging. Content should not be *required* to display classifications and consumers should be educated to assume offensive material in this case.

Q16:

Industry bodies should provide more regulation than government agencies, simply due to the sheer wealth of content and available resources.

Q17:

Absolutely. Government intervention in the cases where co-regulation falls down sounds practical.

Q18:

Most content. This should apply to content at any part of the spectrum from inoffensive to offensive.

Q19:

If classification is a requirement before the material may be sold/consumed then yes. Ideally small/independent content creators should be given the choice to distribute material which is not classified, under the assumption that adult consumers do not need advisory guidelines unless they are concerned about being offended. Small/independent content creators targeting children should have classification and classification reviews subsidised.

Q20:

Category 1 and Category 2 are not particularly self describing. I had never heard of them before reading the issues paper. M/MA15+ are treated the same by consumers, what is the intended difference? R18+/X18+ are treated the same by consumers, what is the intended difference?

RC (Refused Classification) is a huge source of confusion. Different states/territories treat it differently in law.

If the content is legal to possess, it should be legal to obtain/distribute. If the content is legal to possess, restrictions to accessing it make no sense (e.g. mandatory filtering of non illegal content).

Q21:

The obvious one is an R18+ or equivalent for games. Games with similar content to many graphic movies should be salable to the same audiences.

Q22:

Current markings for film/tv are widely recognised. These markings could be adopted where other formats vary.

Q23:

Yes!

Q24:

None. This is outside the scope of content classification.

If content is illegal, law enforcement should be responsible for removing it and prosecuting the content creators/distributors.

Q25:

No. If RC is not illegal, access should not be restricted in this (or any other) way.

Q26:

Yes. Content creators/distributors should not have to deal with different content laws. Nor should consumers need to consider differing laws when consuming portable content across state/territory boundaries.

Q27:

Lack of familiarity with possible legislative schemes prevents me from contributing a useful answer to this question.

Q28:

Assuming there are not increased restrictions on consumers and content providers/distributors, yes.

Q29:

Any framework should be designed with the goal of informing consumers regarding choice of content, not restricting consumers to content deemed inoffensive by a vocal conservative minority.

Other comments:

Please consider that adults want to be treated as such.