

CI 503 H Simms

First name: Harley

Last name: Simms

Q1:

New framework

Q2:

To effectively inform what material is appropriate for certain age groups in order to protect the young while maintaining the ability to enjoy age-appropriate entertainment.

Q3:

No, people should be able to know the nature of the content they wish to access to the best degree possible without unnecessary restriction. E.G. A video accessed through the internet is still viewed the same way as a rented DVD or a televised movie.

Q4:

Perhaps. For most available entertainment, some classification is appropriate, however, it is difficult to determine where to draw the line of classification.

Q5:

Yes, the impact of content should be the main focus on classification. Content designed for children should be easily recognised so that parents have an easy way of picking appropriate content.

Q6:

No, it should not affect whether it is classified or not.

Q7:

Depends on the nature of the artwork. For example, an artistic film should be classified like any other film, however, paintings or sculptures should not need to be classified. Although perhaps voluntary classification by distributors or galleries could be an option.

Q8:

Not necessarily restricted in classification, but acknowledgement of certain content (explicit language, certain themes, etc.) should be present.

Q9:

No

Q10:

It should not affect the classification, but certain class ratings may not be appropriate for mass public viewing.

Q11:

Purpose of the content (i.e. educational, communicative, forum, art)

Q12:

Voluntary home browser filters (for parents to pick and choose what they feel their children should be exposed to), Easily accessed public domain websites allowing access to a broad range of content, with well developed categorising of content.

Q13:

Effective voluntary browser filters, easy to use for parents. Perhaps added security measures for children, like the ability to change filter options only available to administrator accounts.

Q14:

Availability is not an issue, they are currently well labeled and people know what content is explicit and what isn't, however, parents need to be educated regarding WHY children should not access this material.

Q15:

Classification markings should be available while choosing content, for easy recognition, and should be required briefly before viewing to avoid any confusion.

Q16:

Informing the public of possible impact of content, and educating on what content is appropriate for children, and what is not. Enforcing the restriction of high-impact content where it is deemed harmful for younger people.

Q17:

To a certain extent, yes, as the artists/producers themselves know their target audience, and the subtleties of the content, it would also free-up personnel for broader roles in classification. However, the governing bodies should still be present to stop any rampant disregard of guidelines by individual industry sections.

Q18:

Unsure.

Q19:

Unsure, it should be subsidised in a way that no area of industry or culture is excluded due to the inability to gain classification. This is where self- and co-classification would come into play.

Q20:

I don't think any cause confusion, they are well understood. However, there needs to be more education into the impact higher-rated content has on impressionable children. People often ignore classification.

Q21:

I think most categories are fine. However, there needs to be a review of classification of interactive content to include R18+ ratings or a similar class, as too much content is being altered negatively to fit in to low classifications, or is being inappropriately classified as lower impact due to lack of a more appropriate classification.

Q22:

A standardised classification scheme outlining what type of impact is appropriate for various ages, where certain genres or areas of industry can use a sub-scheme with more detailed examples relevant to specific media and content.

Q23:

Not sure whether full consolidation is necessary, but it could work. Certainly there needs to be more recognition of the similarities between the film and game industries.

Q24:

Content that would breach federal law should be restricted, however, other sensitive or high-impact content should perhaps be monitored rather than prohibited.

Q25:

Yes, if content is deemed completely inappropriate for any existing audience and is thus refused classification, then it would breach federal law, and should therefore (as discussed above) be restricted or prohibited entirely online.

Q26:

Consistency is very important, however, enforcing of certain things (like prohibition of online content) should be kept at the Federal level, and not brought down to the whims of the state, as it would cause too many complications.

Q27:

Unsure.

Q28:

Yes, Federal legislation should always be a priority when attempting to create a national standard.

Q29:

As previously stated, education is very important in gaining public cooperation with classification schemes.

Other comments: