CI 2137 T Graham

First name:
Thomas
Last name:
Graham

Q1:
Using the existing framework maintains consistency with what consumers already are familiar with. Extending that will provide an easier transition for most consumers rather than creating a new system.
Q2:
To allow the public to make informed decisions about the content they choose to consume or that they choose to allow their children to consume. The classification scheme should aim to make this an easier and obvious process, without pandering to vocal moralistic minorities by limitin what adults may choose to their own moral standards.
Q3:
Some technologies and platforms should be self-classifying rather than by the Australian Government. Things such as the Internet cannot be "completely" classified. Instead existing laws and the opportunity for parents to use Government provided filtering software to protect their children (or ISP level opt-in filtering) are a far better solution.
Q4:
This approach seems far more logical for many types of modern technology such as smartphone applications and smartphone games.
Q5:
Impact should be taken into account particular with classifications for children, but it should not have an effect on whether or not certain technologies should be classified as per the above questions.
Q6:
If content has a larger market then it makes sense for it to have a higher priority for classification purposes.
Q7:
This sort of content would benefit more from a self-censoring or classification advisory method.
Q8:
Yes.
Q9:
See Q6.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
Q12:
There are no effective methods of controlling access to online content. There are a multitude of ways to get through any possible "control" methods that can be used. The only method that would work would be to completely isolate Australian internet connections from the rest of the world (essentially

creating a private Australian Internet and blocking Australians from accessing the rest of the internet) or to implement costly filtering solutions whilst also outlawing SSL (secure) internet traffic (such as what is used in business or for accessing bank websites).

The Government should instead focus its efforts on providing resources for adults to better protect their children using ISP and Home level filtering software and better education on these matters.

Q13:

Better education for both parents and children as well as opt-in filtering at the home and ISP level would be a good first step (very few people know about the free software made available by the government).

Q14:

I thought this sort of content was already tightly controlled.

Q15:

Any classified content should be required to display it in some form.

Q16:

Government Agencies and Industry Bodies should be responsible for the actual classification of content. Government Agencies in particular should be involved in creation the classification guidelines with input from Industry Bodies and the general populace.

In creating these guidelines the Government needs to be careful not to submit to moralistic outrage from a minority and be aware that adults should have the right to consume content that others might have moral objections to. Obviously there are limits to this; but the current restrictions in some of the more adult oriented classifications appear backwards.

Q17:

This sounds like a solid approach. The video games industry in America uses this method (the ESRB) and it seems to be fairly effective and fair overall.

Q18:

As long as the guidelines for classification are clear and understandable (instead of wrapped in unintelligible legalese) then a broad range of content could be classified in this way as long as appropriate complaint methods are made available.

Q19:

The cost of classification in Australia is quite high for content that will only be targeted at a small audience (for example if smartphone games needed to be classified). Using industry classification or having Government subsidies would help alleviate these problems.

Q20:

The M and MA classifications appear to cause quite some confusion given that they're both targeted at a 15 years and above age group but have quite different meanings. This also causes confusion in other ratings by introducing the concept (as per M15+) that something is targeted at a certain age group but acceptable for younger people. It is not unlikely that people might assume that R18+ means "recommended for 18+" and think that there is a similar RA18+ intended for restricting consumers to 18+.

Q21:

The confusion among M and MA needs be addressed (as per Q20) and the video games (interactive entertainment) industry in particular desperately needs an R+ (and has the potential for an AO) rating.

Q22:

Using a single set of colours and markings as per the existing film and game system allows for this.

Q23:

Have a single source of truth is always a big help for everyone involved, from the people doing the classifications to consumers.

Q24:

Clearly illegal content (such as child abuse content) should be prohibited by law.

Q25:

I feel there are serious problems with some parts of the RC category that should be relaxed. But overall prohibited content should be based on this scope.

Q26:

See Q23. A consistent set of laws should be a priority.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Electronic entertainment absolutely needs an adult appropriate rating.

Other comments:

I would hope that any future changes to Australia's classification schemes takes into account the range of differences in opinions among the Australian public and assures that no single group of adults (small or large) should be capable of dictating what another group of adults may consume based on conservative moral grounds.