

CI 780 T Peel

First name: Tim

Last name: Peel

Q1:

Improving the existing framework. For the most part, the classification system works - with the exception of an equivalent of the restricted 18+ classification for electronic entertainment/gaming.

Q2:

To ensure media content is provided responsibly to the Australian public in a way that protects children from inappropriate material while allowing adults to consume any media they wish to - within the boundaries of the law. To provide clear, identifiable classifications of content that inform the public of the content portrayed in all media.

Q3:

No. There is no scientific proof to the often claimed theory that a given media type has a greater affect on individuals than others.

Q4:

Yes - Mobile apps/games, that is, applications and games for phones and handsets sold via mass market digital distribution such as the Apple iStore or Android Market are vast in number and not practical to be reviewed by an Australian body such as the Classification Board. This media type would be suitable for a review-on-complaint-only style system.

Q5:

No. Providing proof that content is "designed for children" could be a problematic issue and could be abused as a "loophole" to sneak products through the review process.

Q6:

Absolutely not. All media and products should be treated equally.

Q7:

I would suggest this is another potential case for a review-on-complaint system. If a particular exhibition of art received a certain number of complaints prior to its showing, the Classification Board could then be asked to review content.

Q8:

Given the vast amount of content and the variety of ways it is distributed to Australians today, I would recommend this media-type be suitable for a review-on-complaint system.

Q9:

In a fair and equitable classifications system, I fail to see how the potential size or composition of the audience would be relevant to the classification. This question appears to be angling at an issue but not fully explaining what that issue is. I do not have enough information to answer this question satisfactorily.

Q10:

No. With the increasingly high level of technology that is able to be carried in an individual's pocket, the line between "content to be viewed at home" and "content to be viewed in public" is almost completely invisible. It is impossible to make such a differentiation.

Q11:

-

Q12:

Attempts to centrally filter content on the internet are expensive, excessively restrictive and easily circumvented. If content is considered illegal (child pornography for example), it can be reported directly to the police and other authorities.

Q13:

The responsibility for filtering content not suitable for minors rests squarely with parents. The Australian Government should provide advice, assistance and tools to parents to inform them of their responsibilities in this area and assist them in protecting their children. Client-based filtering is a viable option and orders of magnitude cheaper than an all encompassing filtering system.

Q14:

Existing laws prohibit the sale of restricted content to minors. If this is found to be insufficient, additional funds should be allocated to enforcing these laws, educating retail operators as to their responsibilities and potentially better controlling lines of distribution.

Q15:

All content that has undergone review by the Classification Board should be marked as such and the rating provided by the Board. Warnings and consumer advice should be used where content is seen to be of a level over what is reasonably accepted for that media type. IE, swearing in music albums, graphic violence in video games and movies etc.

Q16:

Governments and industry bodies should be responsible for defining the boundaries of what is fair, reasonable and acceptable by the Australian public. The Government should aim to provide the minimum level of intervention possible to ensure that media is consumed by users with an awareness as to the content of that media. Users should be responsible for understanding and accepting the advice provided via the content classification system. Parents, as a specific subset of users, should be responsible for ensuring that content that is inappropriate for minors is not available to them. It is not the role of the Government to restrict from adults, the availability of content not deemed illegal, as a means to protect minors from that content.

Q17:

With appropriate measures in place to ensure that abuse of the system is not made by industry members, this is potentially a very advantageous model. I highly support such a model.

Q18:

In any industry, the creators of the media are the subject matter experts on their craft and its intended impact. This is especially true of film, television and gaming. These types of content would be well suited to self-classification - with appropriate protections to ensure that the system is not abused/misused.

Q19:

Australian-made content across all media types should be subsidised by the Australian Government.

Q20:

With the exception of RC - Refused Classification, and what this specifically implies, especially in terms of games, I feel the classification categories are well understood.

Q21:

Refused Classification should/could be renamed to be more descriptive and better understood - Illegal Content or words to this effect may suffice. There should be an R18+ classification category for electronic entertainment/games as there is for all other media types.

Q22:

By having equivalent classifications across all media types. TV, gaming, music, film etc should all share all classification categories.

Q23:

Yes. A refined classification criteria leads to a more effective Classifications Board that is not required to juggle multiple and potentially contradictory guidelines.

Q24:

Illegal content should be pursued and removed from the internet at its source. This includes highly violent sexual content, child pornography and other content already prohibited by law. The Government should not concern itself with trying to police or control content online or anywhere else that is not purely destructive in its nature or illegal.

Q25:

No. The current classification system does not allow for the classification of any game or electronic entertainment media that is deemed to be unsuitable for those under the age of 18. Given the vast percentage of the Australian population online are over 18, it makes no sense to censor content that may appeal to them.

Q26:

Yes. A national approach to the issue of classification should be implemented. The internet is an international marketplace and differing laws by State only increases the cost and complexity of enforcing classification policy in Australia. Furthermore, the increased cost associated with having to deal with multiple classification laws in multiple Australian States may cause some international media content creators to elect not to sell the products in Australia.

Q27:

-

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

-

Other comments:

The introduction of an R18+ categories for electronic entertainment/games should be adopted as a matter of priority. Current legislation denies Australian adults access to content that they otherwise would be able to legally consume. The lack of a R18 category also results in loss to Australian retail companies and distributors via grey-imports as Australians seeking RC games order such content from overseas vendors.