

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee

Classification (Publications, Films and
Computer Games) Amendment (Classification
Tools and Other Measures) Bill 2014

August 2014

© Commonwealth of Australia 2014

ISBN 978-1-76010-078-0

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Australia License.



The details of this licence are available on the Creative Commons website:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>.

This document was produced by the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee secretariat and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate, Parliament House, Canberra.

Members of the committee

Members

Senator the Hon Ian Macdonald (LP, QLD) (Chair)

Senator the Hon Jacinta Collins (ALP, VIC) (from 1 July 2014) (Deputy Chair from 10 July 2014)

Senator Catryna Bilyk (ALP, TAS) (from 1 July 2014)

Senator Barry O'Sullivan (NATS, QLD) (from 1 July 2014)

Senator Linda Reynolds (LP, WA) (from 1 July 2014)

Senator Penny Wright (AG, SA)

Former Members

Senator the Hon Lisa Singh (ALP, TAS) (Deputy Chair) (until 30 June 2014)

Senator Sue Boyce (LP, QLD) (until 30 June 2014)

Senator Gavin Marshall (ALP, VIC) (until 30 June 2014)

Senator Zed Seselja (LP, ACT) (until 30 June 2014)

Participating Members

Senator Scott Ludlam (AG, WA)

Secretariat

Ms Sophie Dunstone, Committee Secretary

Ms Sandra Kennedy, Principal Research Officer

Mr CJ Sautelle, Acting Principal Research Officer

Mr Nicholas Craft, Senior Research Officer

Ms Jo-Anne Holmes, Administrative Officer

Suite S1.61

Parliament House

CANBERRA ACT 2600

Telephone: (02) 6277 3560

Fax: (02) 6277 5794

Email: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

Table of contents

Members of the committee	iii
---------------------------------------	------------

Recommendations	vii
------------------------------	------------

CHAPTER 1

Introduction and background	1
Referral and conduct of the inquiry	1
Background.....	1
Overview of the Bill	4
Key provisions of the Bill.....	4
Financial and regulatory impacts and human rights issues	9
Acknowledgment.....	9

CHAPTER 2

Key issues.....	11
General support for the Bill	11
Issues raised during this inquiry	12
Schedule 3—Exemptions	17
Schedule 4—Modifications	18
Schedule 5—Determined markings and consumer advice.....	18
Schedule 6—Other amendments	19
Schedule 7—Simplified outlines	19
Other issues	19
Committee view.....	20

Appendix 1 - Public submissions	23
--	-----------

Appendix 2 - Public hearings and witnesses.....	25
--	-----------

Appendix 3 - Tabled documents, answers to questions on notice and additional information.....	27
--	-----------

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The committee recommends that the Bill be passed.

Recommendation 2

The committee recommends that the government ensures that the Bill's implementation and supporting material are clear and understood by stakeholders, in particular information regarding the approval and trial of classification tools, and the appeals process.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction and background

Referral and conduct of the inquiry

1.1 On 27 March 2014, the Senate referred the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Amendment (Classification Tools and Other Measures) Bill 2014 (the Bill) to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee (committee) for inquiry and report by 19 June 2014.¹

1.2 Details of the inquiry, including links to the Bill and associated documents, were published on the committee's website.²

1.3 The committee wrote to more than 70 organisations and individuals inviting submissions by 1 May 2014. The committee received 17 submissions, which are listed at Appendix 1.

1.4 The committee tabled an interim report on 27 May 2014, extending the final reporting date of this inquiry to 27 August 2014.³

1.5 A public hearing was held in Sydney on 28 July 2014. A list of witnesses who appeared at the hearing is at Appendix 2.

1.6 The committee's interim report, all submissions received and the *Hansard* transcript from the hearing can all be accessed on the committee's website.

Background

1.7 In Australia, every film and computer game, as well as some publications, need to be given classification ratings through the National Classification Scheme (NCS) before they can legally be made available to the public (see Figure 1).

1.8 The NCS is designed to provide consumers with information about publications, films and computer games, so that they can make informed decisions about appropriate entertainment material for themselves and their families. The NCS is underpinned by the principle that:

...adults should be able to read, hear, see and play what they want while recognising that minors should be protected from material likely to harm them and that everyone should be protected from offensive unsolicited material.⁴


1 *Journals of the Senate*, No. 26—27 March 2014, p. 741.

2 The committee's website can be found at www.aph.gov.au/senate/legalcon.

3 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Interim Report: Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Amendment (Classification Tools and Other Measures) Bill 2014*, 27 May 2014, p. 1.

4 Explanatory Memorandum (EM), p. 2.

Figure 1: Australian classification ratings for computer games and films



Source: Australian Classification website at www.classification.gov.au/Industry/Pages/Approvednotices.aspx

1.9 The NCS is a cooperative agreement between the Commonwealth and state and territory governments that was established in 1996.⁵ It is administered by the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department (the department) within the portfolio responsibility of the Minister for Home Affairs and the Minister for Justice.⁶ It consists of three central elements:

- the underpinning legal framework *The Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995* (the Classification Act), which makes provisions for the National Classification Code (the Code)⁷ and establishes the Classification Board and the Classification Review Board;
- the Classification Board, an independent statutory body responsible for making classification decisions based on the Code; and
- the Classification Review Board, also an independent statutory body, that is able to review some classification decisions made by the Classification Board and provide a fresh classification decision where appropriate.⁸

1.10 Over recent years the NCS has struggled to keep pace with the technological shifts in the way Australians are choosing to consume media products, as well as the number of products available on new platforms, such as online TV and video games on portable devices.⁹

1.11 The Minister for Justice, the Hon Michael Keenan MP (minister), outlined the situation in the second reading speech introducing the Bill:

Currently, the Classification Board does not have the capacity to classify the vast amount of content that is available on mobile devices and online. As an example, last year the Classification Board made over 6,000 classification decisions across all forms of content. However, the digital market offers hundreds of thousands of computer games to consumers—which presents significant practical, logistical and compliance challenges for the current National Classification Scheme.¹⁰

1.12 In 2011 the Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC) was commissioned to undertake a formal review of the NCS. The ALRC's final report made

5 'National Classification Scheme', available at www.classification.gov.au/About/Pages/National-Classification-Scheme.aspx (accessed 29 July 2014).

6 The Minister for Justice, the Hon Michael Keenan MP, available at www.ministerjustice.gov.au/ (accessed 14 August 2014).

7 'Classification Code', available at <http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/F2013C00006> (accessed 9 August 2014).

8 'National Classification Scheme', available at www.classification.gov.au/About/Pages/National-Classification-Scheme.aspx (accessed 7 August 2014).

9 The Hon Michael Keenan MP, Minister for Justice, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 19 March 2014, p. 2383.

10 The Hon Michael Keenan MP, Minister for Justice, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 19 March 2014, p. 2383.

57 recommendations, which, if implemented, would establish a new NCS designed to better respond to the current digital, convergent media environment.¹¹

1.13 The minister stated in his second reading speech that the development of this Bill has been informed by the ALRC's recommendations and represents only the 'first tranche' of government reforms to the NCS.¹²

Overview of the Bill

1.14 The Bill seeks to amend the Classification Act, the legal basis for the NCS. It also makes some consequential amendments to the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992* (Broadcasting Act). If enacted, the provisions of the Bill would:

- allow certain content to be classified using classification tools (such as online questionnaires that deliver automated decisions) (Schedule 1 of the Bill);
- broaden the scope of existing exempt film categories and streamline exemption arrangements for festivals and cultural institutions (Schedule 3 of the Bill);
- create an explicit requirement in the Classification Act to display classification markings on all classified content, and a new requirement to include consumer advice for G rated content (Schedule 5 of the Bill);
- expand the exceptions to the modifications rule so that films and computer games that are subject to certain types of modifications do not require classification again (Schedule 4 of the Bill); and
- enable the department to notify law enforcement authorities of potential Refused Classification content without having the content classified first, to help expedite the removal of extremely offensive or illegal content from distribution (Schedule 2 of the Bill).¹³

Key provisions of the Bill

1.15 This section discusses the key provisions of the Bill by schedule.

Schedule 1—Classification tools

1.16 Schedule 1 of the Bill seeks to amend the Classification Act to enable the minister to approve the use of classification tools being used in the NCS to rate certain content. The Explanatory Memorandum (EM) to the Bill states:

Classification tools, such as online questionnaires, might be developed by government, industry or classification bodies overseas. These tools will be capable of classifying content cheaply and quickly and will enable

11 ALRC, *Classification—Content Regulation and Convergent Media*, available at www.alrc.gov.au/publications/classification-content-regulation-and-convergent-media-alrc-report-118 (accessed 6 August 2014).

12 The Hon Michael Keenan MP, Minister for Justice, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 19 March 2014, p. 2383.

13 EM, p. 3.

producers of content that is currently sold and distributed unclassified to more easily comply with classification legislation.¹⁴

1.17 The EM makes it clear these tools would supplement rather than replace the work of the Classification Board (Board). The Board would continue to play an important role in the classification of content, particularly material not able to be rated using tools or instances where the ratings given by a tool are overturned by the board – either on its own initiative or through a requested review.¹⁵

Types of classification tools that could be approved

1.18 The Bill makes a general provision for classification tools to be approved by the Minister, without making stipulations about their precise nature. However, existing classification tools are most commonly in the form of online questionnaires developed by industry or governments. Two examples will be discussed here:

- the International Age Rating Coalition (IARC) tool for classifying games and apps; and
- the Kijkwijzer (Watch Wiser) system, developed by the Netherlands government to rate to films and television programs.

1.19 The Attorney-General's Department is considering trialling the IARC classification tool for games and apps not currently submitted to the Classification Board.¹⁶

1.20 IARC was developed by the global interactive entertainment industry. This tool substantially streamlines the classification process for industry, as it allows developers to obtain ratings for many jurisdictions simultaneously by answering a single, simple set of questions online about their product. IARC is able to generate appropriate ratings for the product, taking into account the classification regimes of each country the product will be sold in (see Figure 2).¹⁷

1.21 The IARC system currently provides ratings for around 1.4 billion people in 36 countries.¹⁸ IARC also produces generic ratings that may be used by industry for products being distributed in territories lacking an official classification system.

1.22 Another model highlighted to the committee by some submitters as a potential basis for a new Australian system is the Watch Wiser system, used in the Netherlands to classify films and television programs.

14 EM, p. 13.


15 EM, p. 13.

16 Attorney-General's Department, *Answers to questions on notice*, received 11 August 2014, p. 2.

17 'About IARC', available at www.globalratings.com/about.aspx (accessed 8 August 2014).

18 These countries include the USA, Canada, Brazil and Germany, as well as the 31 member countries of the Pan European Game Information (PEGI).

Figure 2: How IARC works



Source: IARC website available at www.globalratings.com/about.aspx

1.23 Like IARC, Watch Wiser is based on an online questionnaire filled out by producers. It has also been used to inform the development of the European system for rating video games and apps, the Pan European Game Information (PEGI).¹⁹

1.24 Watch Wiser is regarded as being a very successful part of the Dutch classification system, as both government and the general public have been satisfied by the reliability of the ratings it has been responsible for. Some notable features of its design include:

- its development by a scientific committee, which also maintains oversight of its functions and the ratings it gives;
- transparent processes, including public access to its underlying code;
- a good training system for assessors; and
- frequent review of the classification system for reliability and public satisfaction, including consultation with parents.²⁰

Schedule 2—Referral of material to law enforcement agencies

1.25 Schedule 2 of the Bill amends the Classification Act to enable officers of the Attorney-General's Department to notify law enforcement authorities of certain content without first having the content classified by the Classification Board.²¹ The EM states this provision is in the public interest, as some serious content, such as child abuse material, should be removed from distribution as soon as possible.²²

Schedule 3—Exemptions

1.26 Schedule 3 of the Bill seeks to: broaden some of the existing exempt film categories; establish additional exempt film categories for certain films covering natural history and the social sciences; and create exemptions allowing some unclassified content to be screened or demonstrated at festivals or special events by festival operators or cultural institutions.²³

1.27 These provisions are designed to streamline and simplify the current legally complex arrangements for content exempt from classification under the Classification Act.²⁴

19 Netherlands Institute for the Classification of Audiovisual Media (NICAM), *Kijkwijzer: An overview and account of the various principles underlying Kijkwijzer*, available at www.kijkwijzer.nl/upload/zijbalk2/50_NICAMkijkwijzerGB_02_Overview.pdf (accessed 8 August 2014.)

20 See Australian Council on Children and the Media (ACCM), *Submission 13*, p. 3.

21 EM, p. 17.

22 EM, p. 17.

23 EM, p. 19.

24 EM, p. 19.

Schedule 4—Modifications

1.28 Schedule 4 of the Bill would amend the Act to: improve the clarity of certain provisions; address legislative anomalies; and specify that certain modified versions of content will not need to be separately classified by the Board.²⁵

1.29 In particular, this schedule will allow for films and games being modified in minor ways to keep the rating previously given to them by the Classification Board, as long as the modification is unlikely to result in a new classification. Some examples of this include:

- format changes to films or video games, such as converting 2D versions to 3D, or vice-versa; and
- minor modifications or upgrades to computer games, such as the addition of costumes, provided these modifications are not likely to result in a different classification to the unmodified game.²⁶

Schedule 5—Determined markings and consumer advice

1.30 Schedule 5 provides for the minister to determine high level principles relating to classification markings as well as the display of those markings and consumer advice. It further stipulates these markings and consumer advice must be displayed on relevant products.²⁷

1.31 Schedule 5 also makes it mandatory for the Board to provide consumer advice for films and computer games at the G classification. The EM states this is being done because 'parents and guardians value additional classification information in relation to what their children see and play'.²⁸

Schedule 6—Other amendments

1.32 Schedule 6 clarifies certain provisions of the Classification Act to address legislative anomalies and to enhance its administrative efficiency. This schedule also makes consequential amendments to the Broadcasting Act.²⁹

Schedule 7—Simplified outlines

1.33 Schedule 7 makes provision to include simplified outlines for each part of the Classification Act. These outlines are intended only to assist readers to understand the broad provisions of Classification Act only, and do not replace the more comprehensive substantive provisions.³⁰

25 EM, p. 28.

26 EM, pp 28–32.

27 EM, pp 33–34.

28 EM, p. 34.

29 EM, pp 35–46.

30 EM, p. 47.

Financial and regulatory impacts and human rights issues

1.34 The implementation of the reforms introduced by the Bill would be met from existing resources by government. These reforms are expected to generate savings for industry, as they reduce the current regulatory and administrative burdens imposed by the current classification process.³¹

1.35 The EM states that the Bill is compatible with the human rights and freedoms recognised or declared in the international instruments listed in section 3 of the *Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011*.³²

Acknowledgment

1.36 The committee would like to thank the organisations and individuals that made submissions and gave evidence at the public hearing.

31 EM, p. 2.

32 EM, p. 3.

CHAPTER 2

Key issues

2.1 The committee heard general consensus that the National Classification Scheme (NCS) is in need of reform and that various stakeholders welcome the provisions of the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Amendment (Classification Tools and Other Measures) Bill 2014 (the Bill).

2.2 However, some submitters and witnesses raised issues about particular provisions of the Bill, most significantly:

- the types of classification tools the Bill will allow to classify content, and whether it is appropriate for these tools to classify some high-rated material;
- the need for tools to be transparent in their underlying principles and implementation;
- the potential industry abuse of self-assessment tools to give lower classification ratings to their products;
- what would happen should the approval of classification tools be rescinded by the Minister for Justice (minister);
- the power given in the Bill to officials of the Attorney-General's Department (the department) to refer material that has not been classified to law enforcement agencies;
- the changes to exemption arrangements, including for cultural and industry events, and whether the definition of 'social sciences' is too narrow;
- the new requirement for the Classification Board to include consumer advice for G rated content;
- whether the amendments made in Schedule 6 inadvertently capture television delivered online in proposed offence provisions; and
- other issues, including who would pay for the cost of appealing classification decisions made using classification tools.

General support for the Bill

2.3 Submitters and witnesses generally agreed Australia's classification regime needs updating and the Bill represents a positive first step towards wider reform of the NCS.

2.4 For example, Interactive Games and Entertainment Association (IGEA) described the current *The Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995* (the Classification Act) as 'an analogue piece of legislation in a digital world' that is in need of significant reform.¹

¹ Submission 4, p. 2.

2.5 The submission made by the Australian Home Entertainment Distributors Association (AHEDA) strongly supported the Bill, which it said makes 'modest and sensible first steps in what we hope is a wider reform process'.²

2.6 The Australian Christian Lobby supported most of the Bill's provisions, which it said makes 'some useful amendments to facilitate more efficient classification in Australia'.³

2.7 Mr Bruce Baer Arnold and Dr Susan Priest noted the Bill would begin to address the difficulties the NCS is currently facing while maintaining existing safeguards for people who needed protection, including minors. They commented that the amendments achieve an 'appropriate balance between the need to provide effective protection for vulnerable people and reduction of regulatory burdens'.⁴

Issues raised during this inquiry

2.8 As noted, evidence received by the committee overwhelmingly supported the provisions of the Bill. However, some submitters raised issues about the Bill that should be discussed in this report, as they highlighted either provisions that were particularly welcomed or provisions that could be improved. These issues will be discussed in turn, by schedule.

Schedule 1—Classification tools

2.9 In general, witnesses and submitters supported the Bill's introduction of classification tools to the NCS, as they considered they offered a common sense improvement to the classification system. Evidence received by the committee suggested classification tools would give increased confidence to consumers about the material they accessed, as well as reducing costs and enhancing the compliance regime for industry.⁵ However, there were several concerns raised about the use of classification tools, including:

- whether tools should be limited to assessing low-level material or simple products only;
- the need for transparency in the design of tools and their adoption by government, as well as the need to maintain oversight of their efficiency and reliability when implemented; and
- the processes around classification tools losing approval.

2 *Submission 5*, p. 3. Note also that the Motion Picture Distributors Association of Australia (MPDAA) and the National Association of Cinema Operators – Australasia (NACO) both made submissions explicitly supporting the views expressed by AHEDA. See *Submission 6* and *Submission 14* respectively.

3 *Submission 11*, p. 1.

4 *Submission 8*, p. 2.

5 For example see: AHEDA, *Submission 5*, p. 4; IGEA, *Submission 4*, p. 2; Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association (AMTA) and the Communications Alliance, *Submission 15*, p. 1.

Appropriate use of classification tools

2.10 The committee heard concerns from submitters about tools being used to classify material with high ratings (that is, above M or MA15+). There were also concerns raised about maintaining the reliability of lower levels ratings (G, PG and M). Moreover, the committee heard concerns that films and television programs would be better classified by human assessors, as they could apply more sophisticated frameworks than was possible through automated tools.

2.11 Family Voice Australia and the Australian Christian Lobby both submitted that tools should not be allowed to classify full-length films and computer games with high ratings, which they argued should still be classified by the Classification Board.⁶ Both organisations were concerned self-assessment classification tools could potentially lead to certain sectors, particularly the pornography industry, intentionally giving lower ratings to their products to circumvent the classification system.⁷

2.12 The Media Classifiers' Association of Australia (MCAA) welcomed the introduction of a tool to classify simple mobile and online games that 'lack realism, emotional impact and narrative complexity' but argued questionnaire-style tools would be unsuitable for classifying films and television products, which should be left to the human assessors because:

Accurate classification and consumer advice requires careful consideration of a program in full. It is not only an assessment of impact of the six classifiable elements (themes, violence, sex, language, drug use, nudity), but also an important assessment of context....In the MCAA's view [the nuances of context] would be very difficult to capture in a questionnaire-style tool.⁸

2.13 Other submitters and witnesses disagreed, arguing classification tools should be able to assess products at all classification levels. For instance, Mr Ronald Curry, Chief Executive Officer, IGEA, told the committee:

We believe the classification tool must be able to classify the total spectrum of the game content which includes MA, R18 and RC for three important reasons, which are volume, engagement and for purpose. On volume, if we look at the ratio of restricted games classified last year by the Classification Board, it was around 17 per cent.... If classification tools cannot be used for restricted content, we doubt whether the board would be able to classify this massive amount of content by themselves. As far as engagement, if we look at a classification tool that can only classify part of the range of classification determinations, it is unlikely it will be fit for the purpose. Therefore, it is unlikely to be adopted by stakeholders, and we end up in the situation we are in today where nobody is using the scheme to classify a digital product.

6 Family Voice Australia, *Submission 2*, p. 3; Australian Christian Lobby, *Submission 10*, p. 2.

7 *Submission 10*, p. 2.

8 *Submission 12*, pp 3–5.

[On purpose]...Limiting the use of a classification tool to only unrestricted content will not prevent that content from being accessible. Rather, it will ensure that such content continues to be made available without the safety net of having appropriate advice of the content's age appropriateness...⁹

2.14 The submission made by the Australian Council on Children and the Media (ACCM) argued the government should not be complacent about classification tools being able to accurately give ratings at the lower end of the spectrum. It argued young children were more likely to be exposed to products at low classifications, and so:

...for the everyday protection of the child audience, it is vital that content is accurately classified at the G, PG and M levels...ACCM is opposed to any scheme that places the classification of materials at the lower levels in a self-regulated system, without full and public scrutiny of such a scheme.¹⁰

2.15 The department told the committee there were some safeguards in place to ensure ratings given by tools were reliable:

If people want to be totally malicious and put something in we would pick it up through a number of other mechanisms, or safeguards, such as complaints that were coming in. If it was an R18+ level and above it would be subject to the audit that we do during the trial period. Also, if the product, let us say it is a games app, is available through a shopfront you will find that the shopfronts do not normally sell or would accept material that has a rating that is incorrect to that degree. So there are a number of different safeguards that we have available.¹¹

Transparency and review of classification tools

2.16 The committee received evidence that classification tools should be transparent in their underlying methodology, as well as in their approval and implementation by government, in order to ensure continued public confidence in the NCS and to facilitate early detection of any flaws in or abuses of classification tools.

2.17 For instance, the Cyberspace Law and Policy Community, University of New South Wales Law, submitted there should be transparency in the underlying methodology of classification tools:

Where a classification tool relies on a questionnaire in making decisions, it is important that the Regulator and the public understand how particular answers correspond to particular classifications. Where a classification tool employs a computer program to evaluate content, the source code should be made publicly available. In the event tools were to be designed based on

9 *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 4.

10 *Submission 13*, p. 3.

11 Mr Zahid Gamieldeen, Senior Legal Officer, Classification Branch, Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 26.

machine learning techniques, third party evaluation would require at a minimum access to both the training data and the algorithm employed.¹²

2.18 Professor Elizabeth Handsley, President, ACCM, told the committee the Bill should include provisions to regularly review ratings awarded by classification tools, with the results available publically:

We would want to see regular spot-checks, if I can use that kind of language—to see that there would be some kind of system for pulling out five per cent or 10 per cent of them and running them through the traditional system and seeing if they are lining up, and then having a report on what comes out of that.¹³

2.19 Civil Liberties Australia also considered that all decisions made by classification tools must be transparent, and furthermore considered their ratings should be easily challenged by industry. It therefore suggested trialling a shared system where an agreement between publisher and tool must be reached before a final classification is decided.¹⁴

2.20 The Arts Law Centre of Australia agreed any use of classification tools should be monitored carefully, stating in its submission:

It is essential that any classification tools are subject to random auditing or similar by the Classification Board or the Minister in order to confirm the tools are achieving the desired outcomes.¹⁵

2.21 Mr Bruce Arnold and Dr Susan Priest recommended some government review of classification tools to ensure their effectiveness, undertaken within three years of the Bill being passed.¹⁶

2.22 Many of these concerns about transparency of ministerial decisions, the trial of certain tools and the possibility of review were addressed by the Attorney-General's Department:

The approval and the conditions surrounding each tool need to be published on the web.... Guidelines for approving classification tools have to be published on the department's website. The approval of the tool also has to be on the website, along with any other conditions. Every decision that the tool makes will be put on the national classification database, so they will all be publicly available.¹⁷

2.23 The department thought it was unlikely the underlying coding or algorithms underlying tools would be available for public scrutiny:

12 *Submission 8*, p. 3.

13 *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, pp 21-22.

14 *Submission 3*, p. 2.

15 *Submission 17*, pp 3-4.

16 *Submission 8*, p. 3.

17 Mr Gamiieldien, Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 26.

On the actual coding and so forth behind it: I think if you have been spending two or three years to develop a tool to meet specific needs you would not give that coding or the logic behind it away unnecessarily. That would be commercial-in-confidence.¹⁸

2.24 Moreover, the department suggested in their answers to questions on notice that knowledge of the underlying code of certain tools was unnecessary, as their performance would be judged on results alone:

...the Department would not enter into technical debate with producers of tools in the future about the algorithm or assumptions that they rely on to demonstrate the benefits of their tool – the most important factor in determining whether the Minister should approve a classification tool is that the tool produces classification decisions that are consistent with those of the Classification Board.¹⁹

Classification tools losing approval

2.25 The submission made by the Cyberspace Law and Policy Community informed the committee that it was not clear what would happen under the new legislation should a tool lose its approval. It argued the Bill should include provisions to inform relevant consumers, the producer or host of the material, and the classifier of the material, of a relevant tool losing approval.²⁰

2.26 The department confirmed the Bill has provision for the minister to vary or revoke the approval of a classification tool, but confirmed ratings given by that tool would still be valid. However, they informed the committee the new legislation:

...will ensure there is sufficient capacity for misleading or incorrect classifications to be remedied. These include:

- new section 22CH, the Board retains the power to revoke an incorrect classification decision produced by an approved classification tool even if the approval of that tool has been revoked
- under the Classification Act the Minister can seek a reclassification once a two year period has elapsed from the initial date of classification; and
- under the Classification Act, a review of the initial classification decision is available on application.²¹

Schedule 2—Referral of material to law enforcement agencies

2.27 The Attorney-General's Department responded to claims that the amendment would grant its officials new discretionary powers to refer content to law enforcement

18 Mr Stephen Sanders, Acting Assistant Secretary, Classification Branch, *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 26.

19 Attorney-General's Department, *Answers to questions on notice*, received 11 August 2014, p. 6.

20 *Submission 9*, p. 4.

21 Attorney-General's Department, *Answers to questions on notice*, received 11 August 2014, p. 2.

agencies by informing the committee the amendment did not give the department new powers, but rather reflected current practice in legislation:

The current practice of the branch is to refer RC material to law enforcement. This does very little to change what is actually happening at the moment. It just makes the power explicit. So, in terms of creep, I do not know that there is very much risk of that because this is what is already occurring.²²

Schedule 3—Exemptions

2.28 The committee heard broad support for the reforms made by Schedule 3. For instance, IGEA thought they would result in lower compliance costs for digital games exhibitions and trade shows hosted in Australia, which would have both cultural benefits for the Australian community, as well economic benefits for local industry.²³

2.29 However, some submitters raised some concerns about provisions for exemptions made by the Bill. For example, the Australian Christian Lobby supported classification exemptions for low-rated content shown at cultural institutions or film festivals. However, it recommended classification be compulsory in cases where material is likely to be rated at MA15+ or higher.²⁴

2.30 The Arts Law Centre argued the minister should provide further guidance to content providers interested in obtaining exemptions, including clarification of:

...what proportion of content constitutes "mainly" comprising an exempt genre...and how to determine classification of their content as "content likely to be classified higher than PG...".²⁵

2.31 The Cyberspace Law and Policy Community suggested the Bill's definition of 'social sciences' was too narrow and omitted to mention many mainstream subjects, such as history and law.²⁶

2.32 Regarding the definition of 'social sciences' being too narrow, the Attorney-General's Department told the committee:

Social sciences has a definition, which is exhaustive at the moment, in order to exclude particular types of social sciences. There is also a legislative instrument making power through which we could expand the range of social sciences that would be included in that category, if we found that those were not working.²⁷

22 Mr Gamiieldien, Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 28.

23 *Submission 4*, p. 5.

24 *Submission 10*, p. 2.

25 *Submission 17*, p. 4.

26 *Submission 9*, p. 5.

27 Mr Gamiieldien, Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 28.

Schedule 4—Modifications

2.33 The provisions of Schedule 4 were broadly recognised as positive steps towards reducing the current burden of compliance on industry, increasing the competitiveness of Australian businesses, and streamlining classification decisions for low-risk material.²⁸

Schedule 5—Determined markings and consumer advice

2.34 The committee heard some concerns that the introduction of compulsory advice at the G classification was not necessary, and may confuse consumers. For instance, the MCAA submitted this amendment was 'redundant, misleading and alarmist', as:

By nature, the G classification is a safe place that does not require the provision of consumer advice. To provide additional classification information in this instance would be counterintuitive and confusing to consumers.²⁹

2.35 Mr Marc Wooldridge, Chairman, MPDAA, supported this view. In the public hearing, he told the committee consumers are already familiar with the meaning and implication of a G rated product and there is no reason to change the current system:

By way of reminder and clarification, the G rating is given to content suitable for a general audience—that is, for all ages—and this has been communicated to consumers for many years. Where the Classification Board has felt it to be necessary, they have the ability currently to provide additional consumer advice for G-rated films in the rare instance when it is deemed useful to consumers. The process seems to be working very well currently.³⁰

2.36 Professor Handsley, ACCM, was also sceptical about the need for more information to be given at the G rating:

We have always taken the view that G means it is general, it is appropriate for everybody; there is really nothing you need to know about that material and so there should not really be consumer advice on G. We can see that parents like having information..... But to mix it up as consumer advice tends to open up that possibility that G means something other than it is fine for everybody and that could maybe send mixed messages and have unintended consequences.³¹

28 See for example: the Interactive Games and Entertainment Association and the Game Developers' Association of Australia, *Submission 4*; MPDAA, *Submission 5*; AHEDA, *Submission 6*; and Arts Law Centre of Australia, *Submission 17*.

29 *Submission 12*, p. 4.

30 *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 2.

31 *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 19.

2.37 The department addressed these issues in their answers to questions on notice:

The Department is of the view that making consumer advice mandatory at the G classification is desirable because it will assist parents in making better and more informed choices about the content that their children see and play. Moreover, consumer advice is particularly important for content in the lower classification categories because the youngest children are more sensitive to exposure to certain content.... This amendment will also make the G classification category consistent with all other classification categories in relation to the requirement to provide consumer advice.³²

Schedule 6—Other amendments

2.38 The submission made by the Australian Subscription Television and Radio Association expressed concern in its submission that television services provided online may be inadvertently captured under the proposed offence provisions in the new section 8AA of Schedule 6 of the Bill. It recommended that the explanatory memorandum to the Bill should include a clarifying statement that this provision does not apply to online television services.³³

2.39 In its replies to questions on notice, the Attorney-General's Department confirmed that section 8AA of Schedule 6 does not apply to online television services, and that the government would consider making this clear in the Bill's EM.³⁴

Schedule 7—Simplified outlines

2.40 The committee received no comment from submitters or witnesses on Schedule 7 of the Bill.

Other issues

2.41 Professor Handsley, ACCM, raised the issue of who would bear the cost of appealing decisions made under the new classification regime. The department told the committee that it would cover the cost of review, should it be in the public interest to do so:

On the issue of payment for a review, the normal application for review of a computer game fee would apply. But I would also note that there are exemptions to those fees—that if a community group approached their Attorney-General then that would be a cost that is borne by the Commonwealth, for that review to be carried out. So, there can be a few waivers in that situation. The director of the board also has the opportunity and the right to look at a game if she receives enough complaints or if the complaints are serious enough. In that case there would not be a cost to the applicant.³⁵

32 Attorney-General's Department, *Answers to questions on notice*, received 11 August 2014, p. 3.

33 *Submission 6*, p. 2.

34 Attorney-General's Department, *Answers to questions on notice*, received 11 August 2014, p. 5.

35 Mr Sanders, Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 28 July 2014, p. 24. See also: Attorney-General's Department, *Answers to questions on notice*, received 11 August 2014, p. 6.

Committee view

2.42 The committee heard a range of views about the proposed amendments this Bill would make to the NCS. However, it was evident that submitters and witnesses overwhelmingly regarded the provisions of the Bill as being good first steps towards long-overdue reform of the Australian classification regime.

2.43 There were some valid concerns raised about particular provisions of the Bill. In particular, submitters were concerned that the introduction of classification tools should not compromise the integrity of the NCS or reduce public confidence in the reliability of the ratings given by the Classification Board. The committee sees that there are some valid concerns about classification tools, particularly these tools being used to give high ratings to products. However, it is clear that the NCS does not have capacity to give ratings to every electronic game accessible to Australians, given the sheer number of products available and the limited resources of the Classification Board.

2.44 Considering this, the committee believes it is better for these products to be given a classification rating through the IARC trials, than for them to be available with no rating whatsoever.

2.45 The committee heard some concerns from submitters the Bill may extend the power of the Attorney-General's Department to refer certain material to law enforcement agencies without classification. However the committee understands this provision does not extend the powers of the Attorney-General's Department, but that it simply formalises a well-established procedure in these cases, which is working well.

2.46 The committee also heard concerns about the new requirement for the Classification Board to include consumer advice for G rated content, particularly that it may lead to public confusion about the G rating. However, the committee considers that this amendment will not confuse consumers unnecessarily. Rather, it is confident it will give consumers more information about what films and games are suitable for them and their families.

Recommendation 1

2.47 **The committee recommends that the Bill be passed.**

2.48 However, over the course of this inquiry, the committee heard some concerns that need to be addressed in this report. In particular, the committee would like to highlight the importance of transparency and accountability for the trial of classification tools. Additionally, the committee heard a compelling case for the provisions of Schedule 6 to be made clearer in the EM for the Bill.

2.49 Most importantly the committee sees a definite need for the Attorney-General's Department to approach trials of classification tools very carefully. This means that the decision to trial particular tools is transparent, with the department publishing the underlying guidelines informing ministerial decisions, as well as the approval instrument authorising particular tools.

2.50 It means also that the trial of particular tools must be monitored carefully by the department and the Classification Board. All decisions made by classification tools

should be subject to auditing throughout the trial period, and a full review undertaken upon completion.

2.51 Moreover, all ratings given by classification tools should be made public, to guarantee the classification process can be trusted by industry and the public alike. It should also be made clear how these decisions can be challenged by members of the public or by industry stakeholders. In cases where tools have been revoked, the decision and underlying reasons for the decision should be made clear and public through the National Classification Database.

2.52 The committee also heard that the amendments made by Schedule 6 of the Bill could be made clearer, to assure the television industry that the Bill is not inadvertently capturing television content delivered online in the proposed offence provisions.

Recommendation 2

2.53 **The committee recommends that the government ensures that the Bill's implementation and supporting material are clear and understood by stakeholders, in particular information regarding the approval and trial of classification tools, and the appeals process.**

Senator the Hon Ian Macdonald
Chair

Appendix 1

Public submissions

- 1 Western Australian Police
- 2 FamilyVoice Australia
- 3 Civil Liberties Australia
- 4 Interactive Games & Entertainment Association and Games Developers Association of Australia
- 5 The Australian Home Entertainment Distributors Association (AHEDA)
- 6 Motion Picture Distributors Association of Australia
- 7 The Australian Subscription Television and Radio Association (ASTRA)
- 8 Mr Bruce Arnold and Dr Susan Priest
- 9 Cyberspace Law and Policy Community, UNSW Law
- 10 Electronic Frontiers Australia
- 11 Australian Christian Lobby
- 12 Media Classifiers' Association of Australia (MCAA)
- 13 Australian Council on Children and the Media
- 14 The National Association of Cinema Operators – Australasia (NACO)
- 15 Communications Alliance and the Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association (AMTA)
- 16 South Australian Police
- 17 The Arts Law Centre of Australia
- 18 NSW Council for Civil Liberties

Appendix 2

Public hearings and witnesses

Monday, 28 July 2014—Sydney

BUSH, Mr Simon, Chief Executive, Australian Home Entertainment Distributors Association

CATER, Mr Daniel, Intern, Cyberspace Law and Policy Community, University of New South Wales Law Faculty

CAVALERI, Mr Joshua, Legal and Policy Counsel, Interactive Games and Entertainment Association

CURRY, Mr Ronald Alexander, Chief Executive Officer, Interactive Games and Entertainment Association

FLEKSER, Ms Lori, General Manager, Motion Picture Distributors Association of Australia

GAMIELDIEN, Mr Zahid, Senior Legal Officer, Classification Branch, Attorney-General's Department

HANDSLEY, Professor Elizabeth, President, Australian Council on Children and the Media

REDDY, Ms Michele, Attorney-General's Department

SANDERS, Mr Stephen, Acting Assistant Secretary, Classification Branch, Attorney-General's Department

VAILE, Mr David, Co-director, Cyberspace Law and Policy Community, University of New South Wales Law Faculty

WOOLDRIDGE, Mr Marc, Chairman, Motion Picture Distributors Association of Australia

Appendix 3

Tabled documents, answers to questions on notice and additional information

Answers to questions on notice

Monday 28 July 2014

- 1 Attorney General's Department – response to a question taken on notice at a public hearing on 28 July 2014 (received 11 August 2014)

