

CI 1312 T Erwich

First name: Timothy

Last name: Erwich

Q1:

Aside from a few key issues (eg: the need for an R18+ rating for video games, and more well defined boundaries between ratings), the existing framework seems sufficient.

A new framework should be developed if the required changes are beyond the scope of the existing framework, or starting from scratch is more efficient.

Q2:

Introduction of an R18+ rating for video games.

Reforming the criteria on which media, particularly games are classified to reduce ambiguity and more clearly define the boundaries of each rating.

Q3:

No. Content is essentially the same regardless of how it is accessed, and classifications should reflect this.

Q4:

No. All content should be classified. Complaints should be viewed only as a reason to review an existing classification, and only when the complaints are consistent and widespread.

Q5:

Yes on both counts.

Classification serves little purpose if it does not account for the impact of the media in question.

Presumably, content designed for children will invariably receive a "G" rating (or equivalent), but it should still be classified under the same scheme as other media.

Q6:

No. Content should be classified based upon its own nature, regardless of its potential popularity or the companies involved in its creation and distribution.

Q7:

No. Publicly displayed artworks should not be subject to classification. Note that it is assumed that in this context "artworks" is assumed to refer to sculptures / paintings / etc displayed in galleries rather than, for example, films displayed in theatres.

Q8:

No. Warning labels for offensive language, etc would be sufficient.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

Attempts to control access to online content would be either futile, or unreasonably inconvenient for legitimate viewers. It should be considered beyond the scope of the classification scheme.

Q13:

By their parents, or opt-in client side filtering tools provided by the government. Censoring/blacklisting of websites through ISPs should never have been considered, and should certainly not be implemented.

Q14:

Fines and penalties can apply to retailers who sell such items to minors. Aside from this there is little else that can reasonably be done.

Q15:

Q16:

Industry bodies should have little input other than the ability to petition the government to change an existing rating.

Relevant government agencies should be responsible for reviewing relevant media and assigning ratings to it, as well as issuing penalties to retailers who breach the ratings system (for example by knowingly selling R18+ material to minors).

Users should be responsible for determining what media is viewed by themselves and any minors in their care, based on the ratings assigned to the media in question.

Q17:

Maybe. The precise terms of the co-regulation and government oversight would determine how effective and practical such a scheme would be.

Q18:

Content aimed at children could be a candidate for this, as could strictly adult content.

For example an adult film maker might be granted the power to assign an "X" rating to their films, but could not assign a lower rating without petitioning the relevant agencies.

Q19:

Classification of low budget / independant media could be subsidised.

Q20:

They are, though in some cases the classification of content can seem arbitrary.

For example, a movie given an R rating in 1990 might be considered relatively tame (ie: more in line with an MA15+ rating) today due to changing social norms.

Q21:

Aside from the introduction of an R18+ rating for games, the existing categories can largely be kept. However, the criteria they are based on should be reviewed to better define the boundaries between them.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Child pornography

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes.

Q27:

Rather than requiring unanimity between all states / territories to alter the classification system, a majority should be sufficient.

Q28:

No.

Q29:

Other comments: