

CI 2142 G Lockwood

First name:

Grant

Last name:

Lockwood

Q1:

The existing framework is well constructed in terms of clearly identifying the content and recommended ages to consumers. As this should be the primary role of the OFLC, the existing framework serves consumers well.

Q2:

To assist potential consumers of the content to make an informed choice regarding the content they view, as well as to assist parents to make age-appropriate decisions on behalf of their children.

Q3:

For advisory purposes, not at all. A single movie should not be treated any differently whether it is delivered via physical disc, IPTV, internet or mobile platform; the content remains the same. As technological boundaries blur further (e.g. internet over TV & vice-versa) any enforcement of different regulatory regimes across different platforms will be very difficult.

Q4:

If it's on a store shelf, it requires classification. If it's on the internet, it doesn't. Having the OFLC become the internet police is way outside its scope of authority, not to mention feasibility. The internet has a huge amount of constantly changing user-generated content, and sites that host user-generated content (e.g. Youtube) have their own complaints mechanism.

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

In terms of an advisory capacity, a listing of classified content on the OFLC website with recommendations as to potential audiences and impacts allows people to make informed choices. In terms of a restrictive capacity, none.

Q13:

Parenting. Any parent that allows their child to use the internet without supervision or oversight is derelict in their duty. Parents have many tools at their disposal (e.g. web filters, account restrictions) to provide this monitoring, even when not physically present.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

R18+ for games. The average age of a video game consumer in Australia is 30. Not having an adult classification for a medium with an average user age of 30 defies all logic.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

None. For all its ubiquity, the internet is woefully understood. The internet is primarily a communications platform, not a content distribution platform. The idea that content being transferred on the internet from one point to another should be inspected is akin to the idea of inspecting all content sent through Australia Post, just in case that content may be objectionable to someone.

Q25:

As above, no content should be actively prohibited online. If anything, an advisory capacity would be sufficient.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Always err on the side of freedom of speech. Freedom of expression is one of the single-most important advances in human society in the last 400 years, and should not be restricted lightly. Merely being offensive to someone is not sufficient grounds to restrict this right.

Other comments: