CI 1911 A Sweet

First name: Anthony
Last name: Sweet

Q1:
Developing a new framework from the ground up would require a significant investment in time and resources. When the basis of the current framework is largely workable, it would make more sense then to improve the contentious elements in the current framework.

Q2:
A national classification scheme should provide Australian consumers fair warning of potentially objectionable content in the media they and their families will consume. It is NOT the objective of any governing body to censor content; the moral relativity of any media should at the end of the day be the responsibility of the consumer.

Q3:
The cost of regulating content across all platforms is pragmatically unfeasible. The distribution and modulation of online content - especially international content - close to impossible, short of a complete censored filter of the internet. Even a moderately tech-savvy junior can easily find blacklist workarounds within a minute of a simple Google search, thus rendering the Herculean effort of moderating the entire internet completely moot with a single search effort.

Many platforms have already successfully adopted self-regulated classifications, e.g. the Apple App store. Industry has an inherent economical interest in maintaining healthy classification schemes so that consumers feel empowered to buy what they want safely. Businesses understand that they will not make money if their user base is not well informed of what the business is offering.

Given these two arguments, I would then answer that yes, technology and platform should be considered before classification of content, especially if a self-regulating model for the distribution channel already exists and performs adequately at the intended objective of a classification scheme, i.e., informing the consumer of the content of the media.

Q4:

Q5:
Approaching the classification of children's content as a whitelist seems like a significantly easier and more effective method than blacklisting all media. Giving content creators the option to register their work as "children friendly" puts an onus on the developer, with vested financial interest, to go through the regulating body to prove their work is safe.

This then allows parents to make fair judgement calls on the content for their children. If a child asks for a game that has not been stamped as classified "child friendly", they can still use their own judgement based on the currently standing classification scheme if this game is suitable for their child or not.

Q6:
No. Size and market position of the creator should potentially affect the outcomes and mechanics of the classification, but it should not affect wholly whether a product is classified or not.

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

The content of the media is not altered by virtue of being broadcast publicly or privately. In it's role as an advisory aid, classification of content should not be altered due to it's distribution channel.

Q11:

Q12:

Educating the persons who should have control of access to online content, i.e., parents and educators. Restricting access to content should be the objective of a child's guardian or educator, not a regulating government body.

This is both a social and a pragmatic argument. As noted in the discussion paper, the sheer quantity of content online is staggering. There is no possible way for any percentage of that content to be efficiently regulated in a manner that could not be easily bypassed.

Q13:

Provide parents and educators the knowledge and tools to regulate access to online content.

Technological ignorance in the modern day is no excuse - if an adult serves as a guardian or an educator for a child, they must be versed well enough in the media channels accessible to children to safely guide their charges. Educate adults in parental controls and best practices for game consoles, television and web browsers.

Q14:

As above.

Q15:

Q16:

Government agencies should be responsible for the guidance of industry and users in content classification. Industry bodies should be encouraged to engage the classifying agencies to develop and promote either self-classification, or further the work of the base classification scheme. Users alone should be responsible for the regulation and restriction of media consumption within their own homes or businesses.

Q17:

Yes. Industry has every interest in making sure that their content reaches the right audience. Media content is targeted consumption, not consumption by necessity. Good business practitioners know they have nothing to gain in the long-term by selling their product to an audience that is offended and not receptive by their content.

Sustainable industry comes from targeted product development, and that is hampered when the industry does not have any practical means of advising their consumers of their content.

Self-regulation coupled with an effective complaints mechanic would be an effective and cost-efficient solution to creating guides for consumers and industry that is informative and economical.

Q18:

Q19:

Administration of classification should be subsidised when a content creator has shown they have taken all necessary steps to manage classification of their content and have the intent of the

classification guidelines in mind when engaging the body or consumers, or when the content is distributed through a channel that has a self-regulation scheme in place.

Q20:

The MA15+ (and lack of R18) classification for video games has been a highly contentious issue in the general community. Unfortunately the topic gets washed over with political agendas from both sides, leaving parents less informed and disempowered to act in their children's best interests. Anecdotally, many parents I have talked to have been confused or frustrated at their children having access to clearly adult content and themes in an MA15+ game that should have easily fallen into the R18 category. The parents have no moral qualms with the content existing - and in some cases even enjoyed the content themselves - but they were frustrated at the misinformation provided by the current classification.

Q21:

R18 for video games. Please see above answer for further notes.

Q22:

Have a clear objective for classifications. The granularity of the actual classification scheme should not matter, as long as there is consistency in the broader objectives.

Q23:

Q24:

Although there is content I personally find morally abhorrent available online, it should not be the objective of a governing body to restrict access to any content, unless it poses a sufficient threat to the physical safety or well-being of an individual.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: