

CI 2172 T Holland

First name:

Trevor

Last name:

Holland

Q1:

Focus should be on improving the current systems, however additional framework needs to be put into place to deal with the wider variety of content and delivery methods now available.

Q2:

To accurately identify appropriateness of content for set age groups with clear definitions consistent across all forms of media.

Q3:

Content should be classified consistently across all platforms, however the method by which it is classified can vary, for example - Literature and television by government, movies and computer games by an independent industry body. While it is a well meaning goal classification and restriction of the internet is ultimately pointless due to rapidly evolving technology and readily available knowledge of how to bypass restrictions and access content, eg IP Spoofing, VPN etc

Q4:

In the case of industry rated movies and computer games complaints about inappropriately rated content should be investigated by the classifications review board and the cost of the review paid for by industry.

Q5:

Australian government studies have shown that there is no conclusive evidence that various forms of media have additional impact despite what is often put forward for arguments to restrict, or even ban, particular forms of media. The best approach is to have consistent guidelines to accurately classify all forms of media.

Q6:

Again, type of content, form of media and even market saturation makes no difference. To apply different classification rules to different content only confuses the matter and makes it harder to understand what a particular ratings means. Consistency is vitally important.

Q7:

All forms of media must be consistently rated so there is no doubt of appropriateness of content, including art.

Q8:

As above.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

As long as classification is consistent across all forms of media made available in Australia then classification is appropriate.

Q12:

Online content can not be restricted as it is very easy to bypass and the worst content will never be affected. Pushing illegal material further underground will only hamper efforts of law enforcement agencies.

Q13:

Parents need to supervise and educate their children as to the appropriateness and use of online content.

Q14:

No additional control is necessary. It is the responsibility of the person selling the material to ensure the buyer is legally allowed to purchase it.

Q15:

Material should continued to be labelled with the appropriate ratings, as long as the ratings are consistent and clear then no additional labeling should be necessary.

Q16:

The government agencies set and police the guidelines, industry bodies can set the ratings and the users make the decision as to whether the content is suitable for themselves or the person they are obtaining the content for.

Q17:

Absolutely.

Q18:

Industry should classify movies and computer games, and provide recommendations of ratings for other content.

Q19:

If industry is classifying content then there is no cost to the government. Should a complaint be received that any material has been incorrectly classified then the industry pays for the investigation.

Q20:

There is confusion due to additional levels and inconsistency across forms of media. In particular the PG rating covers a very wide range group with much of the content not suitable for the younger end of the spectrum, and the combination of M and MA15+, particular with the different rules applied to video games is also a cause for concern.

Q21:

The scope of the ratings needs to have defined limits. For example M and MA15+ need to be more clearly labeled and the age range for PG reduced with a T for Teen rating implemented for the upper end of the range. I would suggest G to be up to 7 years old, PG for 8 to 12, T for 13 to 15, M for 15 to 17, R for 18+ and X remaining for explicit material both sexual and violent.

Q22:

A clear label and consistent guidelines should make it abundantly clear what is appropriate for what age group.

Q23:

Absolutely, given that movies and games both cater for young to mature audiences consistency is vital.

Q24:

It is pointless to try to prohibit content online. Additionally discovery sites like Google and Yahoo will never include the worst content in their search results. Filtering of online content can never be fully effective and is too easily bypassed. The cost of attempting to restrict content online would be better spent on additional resources to apprehend producers of illegal content.

Q25:

Refused classification, and any other rating, is pointless when dealing with online content. Additionally as not all RC content is illegal attempting to prohibit it online will simply encourage more adults to investigate how to bypass any filters or restrictions.

Q26:

Consistency is the most important part of any classification, and it should be clear that this is a National Classification Scheme. There is a history of State Attorney Generals making classification decisions based on their personal view points rather than considering the people they represent so an important step would be to remove the requirement of agreement between all states and make classification a purely federal government responsibility.

Q27:

Classification should be the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Clear and consistent classification of all forms of media is the most important improvement required.

Other comments: