

CI 898 D Coombs

First name: David

Last name: Coombs

Q1:

The existing framework works, but needs to be standardised and expanded across other forms of media such as games.

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to provide a standard framework for consumers to make purchasing decisions. In addition to this objective, a classification scheme should provide protection for children from inappropriate content. This is best enforced by adjustment of the unclear MA15+ rating and the introduction of an R18+ rating for games.

Q3:

If the content is deemed to be mass media rather than art, then standard classification should be applied to the content, irrespective of platform or technology.

Q4:

Content which has been traditionally free of classification, such as literature and art, should retain this independence. In the event of complaint, then the classification board may choose to review and classify the material. Despite the absence of a classification system, the last 2,000 years of artistic expression have not caused the destruction of society, nor psychological abuse of the general public.

Q5:

While classification is by nature a partially subjective system, assessing the *potential* impact of content is best done by its audience. A standardised structure for classification across all forms of media will allow parents to assess content for their children's consumption.

Q6:

The size of a products market should not be a factor in the decision to provide classification.

Q7:

The danger with classifying difficult artwork is the risk of homogenisation or sanitation to gain a wider audience. Providing consumer advice is desirable when dealing with confronting content, but art of significant cultural or societal value should not be classified. Restricting the viewing of Michelangelo's David to an audience aged 15 and older for example, provides no psychological, social, or cultural benefit.

Q8:

Music and sound recordings (such as audio books) fall under my definition of art, and as such should continue to be free of classification. The guidance already provided for music with significant adult themes and language is sufficient.

Q9:

The size of an audience should not determine the need for classification.

Q10:

No. The goal should be to provide standard classification of media, irrespective of where it is viewed.

Q11:

Content which is targeted towards children should always be classified. Art, literature, and music should retain their existing independence of classification as free (legal) expression is critical to cultural and societal evolution.

Q12:

Restriction of online content is largely ineffective. Educating parents in a non-alarmist way, and providing practical strategies for discussing and monitoring internet usage with children would be more useful.

Q13:

While the objective of ISP level filtering is protection, it has several drawbacks. It provides a false sense of security and doesn't keep parents engaged with their children's internet use. As mentioned in Q12. I believe parents should be more involved with the online activity of children through education and participation. In addition the effectiveness of local third party content filtering software should be classified to better inform potential customers.

Q14:

The display of age restricted content should be handled in much the same way as cigarettes and alcohol. They should not be displayed where children are likely to see them, they should be packaged securely, and fines should be issued for non-adherence.

Q15:

Content which has been classified should be required to display that information.

Q16:

Government should provide a clear, standardised framework for media and classify it accordingly. Acknowledging that not all media is designed for children, industry bodies must advertise and distribute content appropriately. Users should be aware of the classification system, understand why a piece of media received its rating, and make a conscious decision when purchasing or viewing as to its suitability for themselves or their children.

Q17:

Industry understands it's demographics and would be able to effectively implement a ratings system. Industry should have the right to co-review content with the classification body and vote accordingly on ratings. This would mean both industry and government have accountability for content.

Q18:

A co-regulatory body would be best equipped to answer this question.

Q19:

In order to provide a robust and fair system, co-classification of content should be Government subsidised.

Q20:

While the existing classification system is widely understood, the lack of an R18+ rating for games is not. Much of the content in an MA15+ rated title is not appropriate for children, yet because it's not classified as adult, it's often sold for the consumption of minors. Ratings must be consistent across all forms of media, and content designed for adults should be classified accordingly. Further education as to the use of the MA15+ rating is also desirable.

Q21:

Q22:

Placement of classification should be predetermined to ensure consistency, and the guidelines for each rating must be available to the community. The guidelines for ratings must not change depending on the format of the media, for example sexual content which would gain an MA15+ rating in one form should not be rated more highly, or refused classification in another.

Q23:

Q24:

Criminal content should be prohibited online.

Q25:

Q26:

Classification should be standard and implemented nationally, based on the majority.

Q27:

Q28:

If states cannot agree then the decision should be made by the Commonwealth. A robust and effective classification system is in everyones interest and should not be tied to individual preference or prejudice.

Q29:

The demographic of consumers should be taken into account when determining if media is to be refused classification. Games are one area where there is clear disparity between existing classification guidelines and the consumers.

Other comments: