

CI 1109 S M

First name: S

Last name: M

Q1:

Do not develop a new framework - too many resources and time involved in re-implementing and re-educating the public. The existing framework is quite clear and concise.

Improve the existing framework and its application to themes that aren't suitable for minors. Create an R18+ classification for gaming media as there is for movies.

There should be no prohibition of content that users in other countries such as America and Europe can access.

Q2:

Clarity of communication to consumers. There is no point in having classifications if the end user cannot easily interpret them at a glance.

The scheme should not restrict access to content for adults, it should just classify the content as such.

Q3:

Even though I could anticipate a marked difference in:

A) Seeing a series of scripted acts on a screen (tv/movie) vs

B) Carrying out those acts in an interactive manner in the shoes of a virtual character where the consumer can exhibit choice (video games)

.. and that it may impact whether the acts may be reenacted by some consumers (especially minors).

I believe it is too complicated to have separate classification tiers in regard to how content is accessed.

If the classifications are suitably strict through pushing certain content within interactive media into an R18+ classification, an access-based difference might not be required.

Q4:

It depends on the nature of the content and the complaints. If a notable number of complaints are received the content could be subject to review, not automatic classification.

Q5:

Yes and Yes.

Q6:

Not any differently to others. The framework should be all encompassing based on content; not its reach.

Q7:

If classification makes the difference between it being shown or being prohibited, then yes. However, in all likelihood - any art is unlikely to show anything more graphic in a still image or display than anything a simple internet image search would reveal given a few key words.

Q8:

Yes. Music and recordings can convey content just as easily as other forms of media.

Q9:

No. Content should be classified without regard to the anticipated characteristics of the audience. What if the audience changed over time (i.e. the content became suddenly famous and sought after by millions)?

Q10:

No. Whether the consumer is viewing something alone at home or in a large movie theatre should not make a difference.

Q11:

-

Q12:

Offer (do not enforce) an in-home proof of age/identity system, perhaps a free one offered for download by the government, could be implemented within the end-user's home.

The NCS should not seek to control access to content as they cannot presume what will or will not offend. What any end-user finds offensive/inappropriate is highly unique.

Q13:

Education of parents as to the tools they can use to limit access within in the home.

Q14:

Better advise and enforcement toward merchandisers selling to minors and better security within stores (perhaps similar to cigarettes being locked behind the counter of newsagents).

Q15:

Always. It should be clear displayed on covers of DVDs, CDs, Games, Movie posters, etc. Clearly displayed during the description and purchasing screen of content online. It should be available before purchase/hire, viewing or use.

Q16:

This is a strangely vague question.

Government Agencies: Education of users, enforcement of media sellers, etc.

Industry Bodies: Clear communication of classifications.

Users: Feedback of classifications, self-regulation of their own exposure to content and of minors in their care.

Q17:

I believe it would.

Q18:

The answer is in the question: any content that is obvious and straight forward. But guesses should not be made and if it is somehow borderline the restrictive classification should be taken.

Q19:

If a co-regulatory model is used, most of the work would be done before it got to the Government. So yes, it should. Especially educational / documentary media.

Q20:

On the most part, yes.

M15+ rating is a bit unclear. A lot of parents would let their 13 year olds watch M15+ content, but is it suitable for them?

Q21:

THIS IS MY MAIN CONCERN.

There is a great need for an R18+ category for video games. Both for the full experience of the games and so that certain content can be restricted above the M15+ classification.

Content being removed/cut or media banned due to the lack of this classification is not fair to the end-users; the majority of whom are over 18 years of age.

Media that is available in countries such as America and in Europe should not be banned here.

Access by children should be regulated by their parent/guardians and access by adults should be regulated by themselves only.

Q22:

-

Q23:

Whatever will make them clearer and easier to apply.

Q24:

Obviously such areas that should be entirely prohibited online are areas that are heavily criminally orientated (surely no one needs to list such acts) and require strict intelligence gathering and prosecution of those who are committing the crimes in both of supply and demand in these areas. It should not be a matter of prohibition as much as a matter of law enforcement.

Q25:

There should be no prohibition of content online (that does not break any laws).

Classification is classification.. it should be provided as advice to users, not as reason to block access for them.

Q26:

Classification laws should be consistent across and implemented on a national level.

Q27:

-

Q28:

Yep. There's no real difference between viewer across the country: why have a series of varied frameworks across the country?

Q29:

Other comments: