

First name:

John

Last name:

Lawton

Q1:

This question is too broad without having an extensive understanding of the existing framework; I find it difficult to answer this question. The framework is considerably old, and dates back to a time where the internet & computer games did not exist or had little impact. The remaining questions appear to suggest that a new framework is the intention, I can only make the statement that the classification for online content and computer games need to be further detailed; whether this requires a new framework or not is a decision I do not believe I can answer factually.

Q2:

1. A stronger focus on providing consumer advice rather than restrictive measures.
2. The online element in media should be taken in consideration in classification.
3. Ratings for computer games should be created to be on par with the movie industry.

Q3:

Ideally all content should be classified, not restricted; regardless of technology to allow informed decisions. However, this is not always practical, refer to answer 12.

Q4:

No, people in Australia are multi-cultural and follow many different faiths. It is quite hard to create media which would not be a source of complaint from people in this country. Also, this option may lead to abuse by extremists.

Q5:

Refer to answer 3. Content designed for children should be classified across all media.

Q6:

No, refer answer 3.

Q7:

Artwork is a form of expression and should only be classified for providing consumer advice. Restricting access would be considered excessive and borders upon censorship.

Q8:

Music is a form of expression and should only be classified for providing consumer advice. Restricting access would be considered excessive and borders upon censorship.

Q9:

No, refer answer 3.

Q10:

No, refer answer 3.

Q11:

Q12:

Controlling access to online content is impractical, impossible and dangerous; the nature of the internet is to defy control. Any attempt to control access nationally will be too costly, a waste of resources and will gain the attention of the hacking community who will subvert any nation control. As demonstrated in recent times hackers enjoy a challenge and often can wreck some mayhem in the process.

The most effective method in controlling access to online content is not on a national scale. It is better to supply/recommend a filter to those who request it, ie. make it voluntary. An Australian filter is not in the best interest of Australia, a better alternative would be to pursue filters already commercially or freely available. It is likely that the very persons who are encouraging a national filter for their household are unaware that these filters already exist. A household filter is fine, a national filter is a disaster. These household filters in turn could be reviewed and receive approval by the Classification Board and encourage Australians to use these filters. In so doing the filters become another form of classification to adhere to another form of media; the net.

Q13:

Parental knowledge of computer access, parental supervision and access to commercial filters. Refer answer 12.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

To inform viewers with the themes of the content in front of them and provide options.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

An R rating for computer games. A new distinction should be made for the MA15+ rating, MA15+ is currently being made available by parents to 10 year olds, particularly in the computer game media. Parents just are too unaware with this media.

Any parent who believes a 12 year old should be allowed to play a computer game such as World of Warcraft unsupervised, clearly has no idea what they are exposing their child too. In my own personal experience I have encountered many 12 years olds playing this game, the youngest I've met was an 8 year old boy, who is interacting with complete strangers over the age of 20!

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Online content can not be prohibited online by the classification board, the board is simply not strong enough to contain the vast information that is on the internet. The type of information that "should" be prohibited is content already illegal under Australian law, as such it is hidden within chat forums and underground torrents which are not readily accessible to the general public. In other words, wepages are found on the front lawn in clear view while illegal material is found in house, down in a

locked basement, hidden behind the old bookcase within a safe. Only a safecracker is going to find it.

I don't believe prohibiting the information will achieve any worthwhile result, refer answer to question 12. Any other content that is legal under Australian law but deemed by certain public groups as "objectionable" should be permitted.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

Currently Australia is experiencing many problems with the current classification schemes due in part to the emergence of newer technologies. But this has occurred on a global scale and each country has attempted to solve it in their own way. UK implemented a voluntary internet filter, while the US has an R rating for computer games. Hopefully other country's solutions are reviewed before we implement our own.

Finally I would like to add that Australia & the people who live here are increasingly being labelled as "technologically backwards" by the rest of the world, particularly online and fortunately in most respects we are. This has made Australia a large target for spammers and IM'ers (Internet Marketers). I hope the new classifications scheme will be a step in the right directory rather than a step backwards towards technological ignorance.