

CI 1115 G M

First name: Gemma

Last name: M

Q1:

The current framework for classification is clear (as it possibly can be). However it needs to be updated to include video games.

Q2:

To assist consumers in making an informed choice as to what they read/watch/play. Not to censor what is available to the public.

Q3:

Q4:

If online content is to be classified, I think this approach is best.

Q5:

I think it's really difficult to determine what kind of impact something is going to have on an individual. Certainly it's appropriate to include the level of impact in advisory notes, but something being "high impact" shouldn't lead to refusal of classification.

Q6:

This approach might be useful in the classification of online games.

Q7:

No

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

Yes. For example, outdoor advertising should be subject to different standards than advertising on television or in print media. It is much more difficult to restrict the exposure that children have to outdoor advertising.

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

I don't think this can be done through classification. Parents need to be better informed of the dangers present online and be educated as to not only how access can be restricted but also that they're not iron clad,

Q14:

I think this is done well now.

Q15:

Always.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

I think they are.

Q21:

There should definitely be an R 18+ rating for video games. The lack of classification in this area leads to games being RC or games that are not suitable for children 15+ being available to them. The games market is wide spread and includes both adults and children. Adults should not be limited in what games they can access and parents should have more choice in classification when deciding what games to allow their children to play.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Illegal content e.g. child pornography

Q25:

Q26:

Yes

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: