

CI 264 B Napier

First name: Benno

Last name: Napier

Q1:

The ALRC needs to have a complete standardizing framework across all media types, thus including video games. A clearer understanding of the different ratings and what is included in each would be a good point aswell. The inclusion of an R18+ rating as a main point.

Q2:

To establish a clearer, broader understanding of the individual classification levels across all media types by expanding the framework.

Q3:

No, no matter what platform the content is on it should be merited in the same fashion as all others as the classification is related purely to the content, not on what platform it's based.

Q4:

No. All media content should be classified.

Q5:

No, as 'potential impact' is a completely objective representation it represents no area needed for classification. Children s content should be classified across all media.

Q6:

No, as this is not a defining factor of the content.

Q7:

Yes artwork should be treated this way, as it's a public display.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No, audience size is not a reflection of the content.

Q10:

Yes and no. Public content should be classified as this affects people possibly under no consent were as at home I think that is probably unnecessary.

Q11:

Who the content is aimed for (or target audience) should be a factor in classification.

Q12:

There aren't any complete, across the board ways of preventing online content (that I know of) and shouldn't be considered anyway as people should be able to access the content they want, not determined by select peoples opinions or restrictions.

Q13:

This regulating should be controlled by the child's parent or guardian as again there is no preventative way across the board.

Q14:

Secure packaging of the items and a better way of regulating purchases, sectioning off, etc.

Q15:

Classification displays should be displayed on every product classified, restricted or not. If it's been regulated people should know.

Q16:

Better advertising to their key audiences and clearer display of classifications.

Q17:

Unlikely.

Q18:

G (children's content) and R18+ (adult content) ratings as they are rather easily distinguishable.

Q19:

Never.

Q20:

For the most part it's very clear. There is still a bit of misunderstanding between M and MA15+ ratings though, an easier option I believe would be to remove the MA15+ rating and just have M and R18+.

Q21:

Well apart from an R18+ rating for video games, no. Just a complete, across the board classification is needed.

Q22:

Have a standardized rating system across all media forms. Expand.

Q23:

Unknown.

Q24:

Child pornography, rape, torture, terrorism in any form should be completely prohibited online.

Q25:

No. The current scope of the RC is an unfair way of ruling video games. The current rate of banned video games makes Australia a mockery when compared to other countries that have long had systems set up to allow the purchasing of such games allowed. The games in which have been banned have content no dissimilar to the movies that get sold here so it is hard to understand why this hasn't been changed. The games that get banned here are not intended for children, they are intended for adults and should be marketed and sold the exact same way.

Q26:

Yes consistency is important in sustaining an easy and understandable classification system. The changes from state to state could also result in currently 'illegal importation' of restricted goods, while in another state it is completely legal, it doesn't make sense.

Q27:

The introduction of an R18+ rating for video games.

Q28:

Yes, individual restrictions for each individual state are confusing and unnecessary.

Q29:

Other comments: