

CI 779 D Duffy

First name: Douglas

Last name: Duffy

Q1:

The current legislation and framework for media classification only requires amendments to remain viable in today's Australian society. Standardizing classification across all media types (including video games) should be the primary focus of any upcoming changes.

Q2:

To be informative and helpful upon first glance for the general consumer base that rely on it. The scheme should not hold any bias when rating content with relation to differing media sources, and it is important to maintain the same classification categories in all media sources under the Classification Board's consideration.

Q3:

In some cases it would be extremely difficult to limit the accessibility of content from particular platforms, so choosing where to govern will always be key to success in the future.

Q4:

On a case by case situation this scenario might be effective, but we shouldn't rely on the general population to perform the role of a government body because it defeats the purpose of their role.

Q5:

Trying to estimate "potential impact" is circumstantial, subjective and may lead to individual members of the board taking their opinions and arming them as facts. Yes children content should be classified across all media.

Q6:

No, content should not be given classification based on the developers or market reach potential.

Q7:

This is definitely a good idea that should be looked at more regarding a scheme that would require galleries to submit artwork for review prior to any public showing.

Q8:

Yes. There is no reason not to classify and regulate all audio media for the safety of Australia.

Q9:

No. Regardless of the audience capacity and composition, all media content should be classified accordingly.

Q10:

No. The whereabouts of someone consuming media should not affect if the content can or should be classified. This could lead to potential loop holes where providers or distributors exploit locations for profit, and risk exposing the content to an inappropriate audience.

Q11:

I believe that if a product is being marketed to the public in any shape or form, it should be given a rating so we can protect ourselves against content we do not wish to consume. So regardless of the

composition or capacity of audience any given media product might reach, it should be rated accordingly.

Q12:

There are a couple of ways to prevent consumers from reaching black listed websites, but overall all methods are archaic and can lead to a backward step in the technologies they govern eg: ISP filters are insufficient tools that ultimately slow traffic flow for their consumers and inadvertently alienate hundreds of other harmless sites/content.

Q13:

Parents. It is up to every parent to restrict their children's internet usage to appropriate content. The simplest form of a parent restricting the content their child is able to view is via their hardware modem or router. Most hardware which allows access to the Internet will also come with a built in filter, allowing the parent to restrict what content their child is able to view online.

This method can not be circumvented without the child knowing the password to the hardware governing the Internet.

Q14:

Current controls are adequate.

Q15:

When it is deemed to be for persons (M)15 years or over.

Q16:

We can only hope that the industry bodies realize there is a roof on how much they can be free with their creative concepts when creating content for users. Overall it is the job of industry bodies to submit their content for review and classification for the consumption of an Australian audience. I believe that a heavy amount of responsibility will fall on the government agencies to classify this content accordingly, to have said content reach the right audience.

It is in my opinion that the user then has a very large obligation to be aware that not all content may be suitable for them and that is why it has been classified.

Q17:

I believe that both these model structures will work, provided they are implemented and monitored within reason. The video game industry will benefit from regulating itself greatly, but overall the procedure to have this happen would be costly and I can only see one industry benefiting from a co-regulatory model.

Q18:

G rated material and PG to a lesser extent, provided the criteria is known to be well met.

Q19:

I don't believe that there is currently a need to subsidize classification rights.

Q20:

I believe that the current classification scheme is understood well in our current community. The only discrepancy being that thousands of Australians are wondering why there is still no R18+ rating for video games.

Q21:

There is a very strong need for addition of at least an R18+ rating for video games. The industry is classified under the Films and Computer Games guidelines and yet while the film industry is rewarded

with the R18 rating the video game industry is neglected while not having a rating for adult consumers.

This particular area absolutely needs refining immediately. To have the two industries under the same guideline is not the issue, the issue is that only one is recommended a rating at adult levels of maturity and the video game industry itself has noted that they're making games for their adult consumer base (18-30s) because it is their largest consumer group. It's vital to remember that with today's technology, a video game is really a lot like an interactive film.

Q22:

Unified colour and symbol coding. Have clear elements to media that define what criteria denote a specific rating, eg: frontal nudity, sex scenes, strong violence, strong coarse language etc, would result in a R18 rating.

This could be applied across all platforms and unified with a single classification marking. Having markings much like the current film classification markings across all media including video games and other home entertainment media would result in a much more unified coding system that would inevitably become more inherent for consumers to understand and utilize.

Q23:

In my opinion it is in the best interests of the public that all media content be consolidated under one set of criteria guidelines. These guidelines at present are in place to protect groups from content they do not wish to consume. It is also a guideline for parents in choosing what content they expose their children to. Considering that we have an understanding of what criteria belongs in which classification category, it would unify and simplify the classification system for the Australian public.

Q24:

lawfully illegal materials

Q25:

In part, but not in relation to the video gaming industry (that has no R18+) rating. Where a game may be refused classification in Australia, it is given classification (R18) in other first world countries and also has online content for viewing / listening that is suitable to adults.

Q26:

Having consistent classification laws across all states and territories would solidify guidelines for content introduced and created in Australia. I believe that in order to prompt this change and unify all state and territory classification laws it will be necessary to arrive at a decision for a legislative scheme that can be adhered to by all states and territories, possibly creating a new one to suit the times. I believe we should also move forward with majority votes being able to pass new legislation and legislative amendments. Having all the Attorney's General come to a unanimous decision is archaic and opens up leads to exploitation.

Q27:

I personally feel the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995 and code is still relevant in today's society and reflects how we should have media rated as it applies for release. The only thing requiring review in that legislation act being the lack of R18 classification in the computer games industry. The code currently states "adults should be able to read, hear and see what they want", and yet the current legislation deems video game ratings above MA15 non-essential. So if we needed to replace the scheme, I'd suggest it be similar to the current 1995 act, and yet reflect

a change in society from the previous. My opinion is that we do not replace, but amend the current 1995 act, to include an R18 rating for computer games.

Q28:

Yes. We most definitely need to refer power to the Commonwealth in order to defer power from the Attorney's General in each state to get the ball rolling faster for;

i solidifying how content is classified and distributed across the nation

ii introducing a new R18 rating for the video games industry

Q29:

Solidify and consolidate classification legislation and criteria across all states/territories and media, making it easier for parents and consumers alike to judge content across states and different mediums.

Introduce a long awaited R18 rating to video gaming industry and allow game developers to release content for adults, with the understanding that every household is responsible for its media content.

Other comments:

The current act works well for all media except computer games. That the Attorney's Generals of each state were unable to reform this neglected rating system for said media is appalling. In hindsight it reflects the great need to remove the decision making process from the Attorney's Generals and refer power to the Commonwealth.

I'd like to reiterate that the code currently states "adults should be able to read, hear and see what they want", and yet the current legislation deems computer game ratings above MA15 non-essential. It is a blatant contradiction of the code, and yes there are adult gamers in Australia. The notion that computer games are for kids is myth and this issue as well as a unified reform for classification guidelines needs to be addressed.