

## CI 1820 A Topperwien

First name: Andrew

Last name: Topperwien

Q1:

New

Q2:

To advise on the type of content, and it's suitability for different age groups. It should be informative rather than restrictive. The only types of content that should be refused classification are those that are illegal.

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Defining potential impact is highly subjective and while it should be considered it should not be a major part of classification. Content for children should be classified across all media.

Q6:

Generally it should not affect what should be classified. One exception might be user-generated online content which could be impossible to effectively classify, due to the volume of content.

Q7:

Maybe

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

I have found no existing method to control access to online content that does not also prohibit access to content that would not be classified as restricted. I consider the freedom to view unrestricted content to be more important than the benefits gained by using a content filter that unintentionally blocks unrestricted content.

Q13:

By parents/guardians/carers taking a more active role in their children's time online.

Q14:

Q15:

On packaging at point of sale, on any promotional materials, and for video or video games it should be displayed onscreen prior to the main content.

Q16:

Q17:

Possibly. There exist a number of systems overseas that work that way, and they appear to be effective.

Q18:

Q19:

Classification of independant content should be subsidised when the expense of classification is considered to be a significant hurdle to making the content accessible to the public.

Q20:

Most of the existing catagories are easily understood, however the different categories for different media may cause confusion.

Q21:

All classifiactions should be equivalent across all media. This would include the addition of an 18+ rating for video games. There maybe a case for merging or replacing the M and MA ratings.

Q22:

Classification markings must be identical across all media to eliminate any possible confusion when comparing similar content presented in differing media. Criteria and guidelines need to be adjusted to be equivalent across all media. Ideally there should be no case where something that would be rated as MA in one type of media would be rated as anything else when presented in another type of media.

Q23:

Yes. The easier it is for creators of content to be able to judge in advance what classification a particular product is likely to receive, the less time will be spent on requests for content to be reclassified.

Q24:

Q25:

No, the current scope is too ambiguous and needs to be reviewed first.

Q26:

Consistency is required at least as far as ensuring that the same content has the same rating in all states and territories.

Q27:

A combined scheme

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: