

CI 1919 G Go

First name: Grant

Last name: Go

Q1:

Due to the vast range of available contents and media ALRC should focus on designing a new classification framework that simplifies the process and outcome. It should produce a clear guideline for content creators for self-classification which could then be submitted to Classification Board or ACMA for certification purpose (if the content is aimed for children). This will ease the regulatory burden on both sides and ensures higher rate of participation and compliance.

Q2:

Inform and warn consumers about the (in)appropriateness of the content so they can make their choice accordingly.

Q3:

No, classification should not discriminate based on the delivery technology (whether it's delivered by Australia Post or by download). However, due to practicality and privacy reason it is not possible to disseminate and classify every materials from different sources. Therefore, classification should not be mandatory and web access to the ratings of all classified materials should be available to empower consumer to make their choice. Due to the advent of smartphones and wireless internet access, consumer should be able to access the classification rating by manual search or by scanning the barcode (or any other available machine readable code).

For example. the book "Raw" should have the same classification as paperback and as PDF file. It makes more sense to provide consumer with one central source to check for the current classification rating of the book. Then if a film, or an animation, or a play, or a game is created based on that book then the website could be easily updated to provide rating for the new media.

Q4:

Assuming that classification is now optional and act as an advisory rather than a censorship framework, when a content is subject to a number of complaints then the classification board may review the material, upgrade the rating accordingly, publish the classification on the website and advise the content creator accordingly that they need to provide that information to consumer directly or by providing link to Classification Board website.

Q5:

I'm assuming children are of the age between 0 - 12. If the content is specifically packaged and designed for children then a stricter classification rule should apply. Potential impact such as inducing children to buy certain product will need to be considered especially with current advertising practice during children programming time on TV.

As I have answered on Q3 classification should not discriminate media with the same principal to keep in mind that the purpose is to inform consumers (in this case parents) of what material is they providing the children with. So it would be the parents responsibility to check the classification rating

is and if not available should go through the material to ensure that the material is safe for their own children to consume. If they find any questionable content within the material then they should raise the issue with Classification Board and make a formal complaint if necessary.

Q6:

No it should not.

Q7:

It would be recommended but not required for artworks to be classified prior to exhibition. Since artworks will be displayed as a collective on exhibition it would not be practical to classify every individual art. It should be classified as a whole/package/unit adopting the most questionable/offensive artwork as the final classification.

Q8:

Yes, material could still be offensive even on other media so a classification may be applied accordingly.

Q9:

No, classification is recommended but not required.

Q10:

No, classification is recommended but not required.

Q11:

Q12:

It is not appropriate to apply National scheme to an International jurisdiction. However, if a site is found to be hosting restricted online content then the Classification Board could inform the site owner/host to remove the offending material or provide an explicit warning to visitors.

Q13:

Parents need to educate children of what they can and can't do online before allowing them to access internet at home or from mobile device. Online access at home or from mobile device should be treated as a privilege since children can go to local/school library to perform online research. At home, depending on how much control is required there are software tools widely and freely available that parents can use to monitor or control children's access from home network.

If the Government is aiming to provide more proactive solution then on the website they should publish some free guidance and free tools on how to control home network to empower parents.

Q14:

Place the materials together on a particular area only that is easily monitored by either electronically or by staff member to ensure that nobody can steal the material. A barrier may also be required to only allow people of certain age with certifiable ID access to the area.

Q15:

Any of the following:

- content is certified by Classification Board for children consumption, or
- content was subject to a substantial complaint (100+ accountable and verifiable individuals)

Q16:

- Government agencies: assist content producers in providing correct classification, certify or endorse and enforce classification

- Industry body: encourages and assists content producers to apply classification rating and to a certain extent assist in certifying content
- Users (content producers): apply classification rating whenever possible to help the consumer
- Consumers: Use the classification scheme and content regulation to make informed decisions

Q17:

On paper it sounds great however it might not work in practice and open to a number of abuse. A more transparent process where the content creator is given a form to openly declare the content and the Government automatically generate an appropriate classification would work better.

Q18:

Adult content, horror, violence, gore, medical procedure, drug use, nudity, sexual references, racial vilification.

Q19:

Government should provide clear policy and guideline instead of subsidy. If subsidy is needed then there is a serious underlying issue with the policy and guideline, that will need to be fixed first. The cost of classification and compliance should be as minimal as possible to allow level playing ground for all media.

Q20:

Most of them are well understood, I have problems understanding M and MA15. I ignore R or RC classifications because most of the time they are irrelevant to the actual content.

Q21:

I believe further simplification of classification categories are possible. It should be divided and sub-divided as following:

- Children: G (0-12) and PG (12-15)
- Adult: M (mature, violence, horror) and O (offensive material, eg. extreme violence, strong racial theme, strong sexual violence, extreme drug use)

Q22:

Adopt a simpler, broader classification and apply for each individual content. For example, a Harry Potter movie is G but the fact that there is an M rated iPhone game based on that movie should not change the rating of the movie.

Q23:

Yes, to simplify the process and provide a clearer guideline to both content producer and consumer. The criteria should be objective based rather than subjective to be effective for all media.

Q24:

My personal information.

Q25:

No, that classification is dysfunctional and not relevant.

Q26:

Yes, it should be a National/Federal/Commonwealth level law.

Q27:

The Federal legislation should aim to simplify the classification scheme and reduce the bureaucracy (therefore reducing the high compliance cost) required.

Q28:

Yes, that would streamline the classification scheme and reduce burden for all parties involved.

Q29:

Improving transparency and allowing consumers (end-users) contribute to the classification rating.

Other comments: