

CI 2186 B Droste

First name:

Benjamin

Last name:

Droste

Q1:

Given that the existing framework was developed in a vastly different media landscape - before youtube, before iPhones, before streaming media services on devices such as Xbox and Playstation, before the boom in web games, before the advanced visuals of modern games, before motion control such as Wii and Xbox Kinect, before international online game and movie stores (eg Steam and Netflix), and a greater ease of access to import services - it seems inconceivable that the existing framework could simply be adapted to suit.

Q2:

To provide a guide for adults, to aid them in making informed decisions as to what they allow their children to watch.

NOT to censor media, unless it is to restrict content to minors.

Under no circumstances should a national classification scheme censor media for adults, unless the content itself is illegal (i.e child porn, snuff films). Whether something is 'too violent' or 'too extreme' for audiences is not for the government to decide, it is up to the individual to decide with the aid of information provided by the classification board.

Q3:

In practice, classifying all media regardless of platform is an impossible task. When millions of new videos are uploaded to Youtube every day, when anyone can make a film in their backyard and host it on their own website, when anyone with a computer can make an iPhone game and upload it to the Apple iStore, it is foolish to think that all of this could, or even should, be classified.

Example:

iPhone games are developed on budgets ranging from millions of dollars to no budget at all. Indeed many are developed for less than the cost of submitting a game for classification. Forcing all developers to pay this fee before they could sell their product in Australia would effectively kill small bedroom developers and drastically reduce the number of cheap and free apps available on the Australian store.

Q4:

If content has not been classified then it is likely because it is impractical to do so, such as web videos and mobile phone games. It is difficult to see how classifying a few number of these after a complain would have any practical effect. Keep in mind also that many of the largest sites and services self-regulate and will act on complaints far faster than any government process ever could.

Q5:

No, the potential impact of content is something considered in classification, not a determination of what should be classified.

Q6:

Would this result in some iPhone games being classified (due to the size of their production) while others, due to being developed on a budget are not?

Potential reach of the material is a difficult concept to identify also. Youtube and mobile videos often go viral - meaning they spread quickly all over the web - and are seen or played by millions of people. The top selling iPhone game Angry Birds is an example of a game that took off beyond all expectations.

A downloadable product's mass reach potential is as large as the user base of it's target platform. In the case of mobiles and PCs, that's enormous.

Q7:

Artwork displayed in a public place could be one instance where something could be classified after a complaint. However it is probably more effective to have the exhibitor self regulate, and where possible (such as in a gallery) provide consumer advice before entering or even place more extreme artwork in it's own separate area.

Q8:

A book is not the paper it is printed on, it is the content contained therein. In that respect there is no difference between a printed book and an audio book.

The content and the message is what is important, not the delivery. Different forms of media, by virtue of how they engage our senses may be more or less effective at getting a particular message across than others. The media format should be considered only when it impacts the effectiveness (positively or negatively) of delivering the message.

Q9:

No, see answer to question 6

Q10:

In public, yes, where practical.

Q11:

Content should be classified when it is practical to do so. Major cinema releases and free-to-air TV are practical cases. The more impractical the classification, the more self-regulation should be encouraged. Unclassified material should not be restricted.

Q12:

Industry self regulation and parental control. Keeping the home PC in the living room under the watchful eye of parents will stop children access adult content more effectively than any restrictions or filters ever will.

Adults that want to access content will do so regardless of restrictions.

Short answer: you can't, stop pretending you can.

Q13:

Parental supervision and education.

PC based filters installed by the parents, or ISP based filters requested by the parents.

Pressuring large distributors to self regulate (much like Apple already does on the iStore)

Q14:

Sales restrictions to minors, just as with alcohol.

Q15:

On the packaging if a physical product.

On the sales page or website of a digital product.

However, remember that classification markings are there to provide consumer advice, they should be easy to find but they do not need to be intrusive like warnings on cigarette packets.

Q16:

The government should set the guidelines and regulate where possible

Industry should regulate based on government guidelines where it is impractical for government to do so

Users should restrict access to themselves or their children based on advice from government for and industry

The government should NOT censor adult's access to material.

Q17:

yes, as I have alluded to above.

Q18:

Mobile and online games and video

Q19:

Yes, as well as for small independent games (assuming they must be classified at all). This new era of user created content should not be hindered by government fees.

Q20:

The existing guidelines seem fairly straight forward, with the exception of the max level ratings for games and movies. Without an R18+ rating, are MA15+ games for adults? Or are there no adult games?

The difference between M and MA is often unclear in conversations I have with friends as well.

Q21:

M and MA could perhaps be merged, or at least made more distinct (possibly with a name change).

an R18 rating for games is desperately needed. It makes no sense that adult games are unclassified while adult films are, when adults are the largest market for both.

Q22:

Generalized guidelines assessing the content and it's impact, remaining aware that different types of media are more effective at imparting a message than others. Films tell stories, while games allow players to experience them. Sometimes telling a story is a more effective means of communicating a message since timing and camera can be controlled. Sometimes allowing someone to play in a system is a more effective way to teach. Sometimes playing a game harms the message, as players start to concern themselves with the underlying system and ignore the media content.

Q23:

While media converges, some media still has its unique features. The more the guidelines are consolidated, the more generalized they must become. The more format specific they are, the more risk there is of problems with cross-media products.

Perhaps a consolidated classification guide with format specific notes where necessary.

Q24:

A leading question that ignores the fact that online content cannot be prohibited, even if we wanted it to be. People that want to access such content will no matter what restrictions are put in place. People that don't want to access it won't go looking for it in the first place. Parents that want to stop their children accessing it must rely on supervision and opt-in filters that they can customize to their situation.

Q25:

Refused classification should not be restricted in the first place (unless the content is illegal - child porn, snuff films, etc). It is not the government's roll to determine what an adult can and cannot watch in private.

Q26:

It should be set by the Federal Government, not by unanimous agreement by states and territories. The current system is subject to the approval of the minority when seeking change, despite the desires of the majority.

Q27:

A Commonwealth scheme that sets the guidelines for classification from children to adults for all forms of media.

That is able to evolve with the changing media landscape (especially moving into an NBN enabled future) and does not require the unanimous agreement of a few select people to alter.

That promotes content awareness and industry self regulation.

That is used only as a consumer aid only and not as a means of censorship.

Q28:

Yes, it is silly that we should still expect there to be differences between each state's access to media, when the internet has effectively eliminated national borders.

Q29:

Less emphasis on restricting media and more on empowering the public to make informed choices.

Other comments: