

CI 1015 D Gerrard

First name: Dave

Last name: Gerrard

Q1:

A new framework would be ideal, if it included changing the way classification is handled. Changing the classification scheme for video games is such an impractical process. Introducing an R rating has been very publicly supported, yet it can be held up by just one contrary opinion.

Q2:

To introduce an R18+ rating for video games so that we can join the rest of the first world in classification, protect minors from harmful and no longer hinder harmless free speech.

Q3:

Yes. Some platforms (like the internet) are so vast, and the experience can be so subjective that it can't be classified in any realistic way. To even attempt to do so would fail, and it'd just cause more harm than good.

Content that is illegal should be brought down through the proper authorities. Unsuitable content that children might access (that would usually be classified) should be the parent's and schools responsibility to prevent.

Q4:

No, classification serves a useful purpose, but it should be efficient and useful for Australians. Not hinder us.

Q5:

I think so, but only when it is realistic to do so.

Q6:

No, not really. Obviously it shouldn't be a priority as much on small market sizes, but it should be based more on if classification is realistic for the platform and the content.

Q7:

Generally, no. Maybe in extreme cases.

Q8:

Yes, but more similar to book classification.

Q9:

No, it should be based on the content.

Q10:

Yes. Content that is mostly accessed in private should have a lot more leniency in the classification process.

Q11:

Q12:

Parental supervision. Definitely not a nation wide filter.

Q13:

Parental/teacher supervision, PERSONAL internet filters. The internet is not a toy for children to use in the first place, a nation wide internet filter will just give parents a false sense of security.

Q14:

They are already "over-controlled".

Q15:

On the cover of the physical product and in the TOS.

Q16:

Government: Classify content that is and SHOULD be legal to help consumers make decisions.

Restricting content should very rarely ever occur.

Industry: Nothing, they just have to create legal content and submit it for classification. They should have a large say in the classification policies though as they are familiar with their content and consumers and can defend their stances quite reasonably.

Users: Make their own choices on content based on their own decisions, and guidance of the rating.

They should have the largest say in classification policies though

Q17:

Yes. Government is out of touch and unrealistic about a suitable code and procedures.

Q18:

Film, Video Games, Books, Music.

Q19:

Yes, small independent operations need support.

Q20:

Classifying video games that should receive an R18+ rating under MA15+ is ridiculous. It actually makes content more available to unsuitable audiences. Not having an R18+ rating for video games is also ridiculous as it stops adults from accessing harmless material for no justified reason.

Refused Classification (RC) material is also confusing. Only illegal content should be restricted.

Content that is legal to own or produce, but can't fit our flawed rating system (ie. Not having an R18+ rating or something else) should have a rating created for it.

Q21:

Yes. R18+ for video games. Largely to stop the banning or modification to games that suit adults fine, but we currently don't allow because we HAVE to make them available to those aged 15+.

I see no problem with relaxing the X, or NVE rating too. Adults aren't children.

Q22:

Films and video games should have a very similar classification system.

Music, audio, books, art etc. should have a similar and even more progressive classification system as it deals even more with the issue of free speech.

The internet should have no classification system. It's a very VERY important communications tool and anything short of crippling it SEVERELY will have no useful effect. Illegal content should be

removed using the proper channels, not poorly censored. More education and understanding on the internet should be communicated to Australians so that we can manage it ourselves.

Q23:

Yes they should be redone to be more lenient with video games. An R18+ rating should be introduced for reasons stated before. The classification criteria should be much more consistent and it should be approved by Australians.

Q24:

Highly illegal material only. Content should be taken down at the server end. Matters like child pornography should be investigated by the police. A consumer-side filter will help nothing.

Q25:

No, not at all. RC is a very broad and useless category.

Q26:

Yes. Make the classifications at the federal level or unify the state laws.

Q27:

See my opinions, make appropriate legislation around it.

Q28:

Yes, but only if the states have their input too. Ultimately it should be about Australia as a whole though.

Q29:

Other comments: