CI 398 R Budge

First name: Richard

Last name: Budge

Q1:

I feel that improving elements, rather then a completely new framework will be a more cost effective solution. I feel that certain media, books/movies/etc, lend themselves to the submit, get classified model very well. Other media, such as interactive entertainment (video games), is much harder to review and classify in such a manner, and the current method, as I understand it (a presentation from the distributor of what they feel are the most graphic parts) is inadequate.

Q2:

Making classification consistent between states and territories.
Making classifications consistent between different media types.
Making the classifications better match the views of the general public.

Q3:

Instinctively I say no, as if we are going to classify things then we should classify everything. However in some cases I believe that classification is infeasible by the current method of a review panel, so standards for an industry based classification should be developed, with a sample checked by the classification board or similar to ensure that the industry is playing by the rules.

Q4:

If as stated in Q3 that an industry based classification is implemented then absolutely if there is a complaint raised about some content then it should be reviewed by the board. If there are cases where material is unclassified (for example, a website) then that too can be reviewed by the board.

Q5:

This question assumes that different content types have different impacts on people. To my knowledge this has not been proven in a credible study, so my answer is no, content should be classified based on what is, not what its "impact" is deemed to be.
Yes, content designed for children should be classified, to ensure that it is suitable for children. The decision of what content is designed for children should however be made by the content creators, not by the classification board.

Q6:

No, as I have already stated, if we are going to classify things, then we should classify everything. However I think that the relative market of content should determine the costs of classification. For example a $1 (or free) iPhone App is unlikely to be willing to cough up $2000 for a classification before sales have been made, so a more reasonable price-point will lead to more classification being done on this type of content.

Q7:

Yes, as I have already stated, if we are going to classify things, then we should classify everything.

Q8:

Yes, as I have already stated, if we are going to classify things, then we should classify everything.

Q9:

No, as I have already stated, if we are going to classify things, then we should classify everything.

Q10:

No, as I have already stated, if we are going to classify things, then we should classify everything.

Q11:

Q12:

If you are talking about controlling access of inappropriate content by minors, then there are many tools available to parents/guardians to achieve this, with varying levels of success, the most important being taking an active parenting role in the child's use of the Internet. If you are talking about restricting RC content to everyone in Australia then I know of no effective measure of doing this.

Q13:

There are tools available to parents to control their child's online activities, but the best tool (I believe, as a parent), is to educate your child about inappropriate content. So perhaps better education of parents or tools to help them educate their children would help.

Q14:

I believe the current system where it is the responsibility of the store owner to check for ID before granting access of restricted content works well.

Q15:

On the packaging, where is is visible before purchase. Warnings placed after purchase are redundant and unnecessary.

Q16:

Government should outline the rules and categories for classification. Industry should ensure that the content they are producing falls into those categories, in the case of industry based regulation, even more so. Users (and by this, I am speaking deliberately of parents) should ensure that content they allow minors in their charge to view is appropriate to the age of the child.

Q17:

I believe it would be.

Q18:

I do not believe that this is a valid reason for an industry classification. Either an industry is doing it's own regulation and classification, or the Government is.

Q19:

I mentioned previously about different pricing for different content, so perhaps that kind of system could be used in this example. If that is called a subsidy, then so be it.

Q20:

The lack of published details on what is/isn't RC probably causes a large amount of confusion.

Q21:

I believe all the categories are present, they just vary across different types on content, this should be fixed. From what I have read about the RC category where it comes to adult material, adult classifications should be expanded, with possible new levels for better consumer information.

Q22:

I believe the current markings are fairly consistent across different media formats, just some categories are lacking for some formats.

Q23:

Yes, with care taken to ensure that all relevant information for a media type is in one section so content creators can easily sort out what they need to know about the classification of their content.

Q24:

I have already stated that I do not believe an effective method for achieving this is available, so this question is moot.

Q25:

I feel the RC category, specifically relating to adult material (which I have read about recently), is too restrictive and does not represent an accurate portrayal of what the average Australian adult considers offensive to the point of refusing classification.

Q26:

Yes, it is important that classifications are consistent across the country. I do not believe this needs to be "promoted", as I believe many people would assume that this is how the system already works.

Q27:

I am unsure as to the meaning of this question. If you are talking about what level of Government should be responsible for maintaining the classification system, then a federal system with representatives from each state where decisions can be reached by general, not unanimous decisions.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29: