

CI 1518 E Wong

First name: Eric

Last name: Wong

Q1:

I don't think that the current framework is broken beyond fixing, honestly, whatever takes less resources/easier to implement.

Q2:

The classification scheme should not be set out to CONTROL purchase but to provide enough information to the public so they can make their own INFORMED choices.

Q3:

No. Unless the technology or platform has content itself which needs to be classified - then it becomes content itself doesn't it?

Q4:

No. Changing classifications due to complaints is just means you got it wrong in the first place.

Q5:

No. Potential impact is vague and open to interpretation.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes. Why should "art" be excluded?

Q8:

Yes. What difference between audio books and books? Why should audio books which are to many - easier to access have different standards.

Q9:

No. We are classifying the content, not the audience.

Q10:

No. This should not be the responsibilities of the classification scheme to control how people use the products that are being classified.

Q11:

Nothing. Only CONTENT should be classified.

Q12:

The responsibility of providing classification warnings/restricting access should be on the content provider.

Q13:

There is no reasonable way this can be done.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Industry already tailor their products to meet classification guidelines. I don't see this as a very far step. But there are concerns about corruption/favoritism if the government works too closely with the industry.

Q18:

Q19:

No. This undermines the classification itself.

Q20:

Maybe change the "Mature" classification to something more relevant. Mature seems to be a bad word as it's often used in the context of after teenage years. PG - shouldn't be a specific classification, all content for minors should be encouraged to be "guided" by parents.

Q21:

More would be better. More specific on the content instead of general age guidelines.

Q22:

Making the symbols a bit more prominent or packaging and maybe a public awareness campaign (tv ads). I believe the classification symbols and colour scheme are already consistent across the media.

Q23:

Don't have the expertise to comment, but if it's not too difficult why not? Having one set of rules beats having 4.

Q24:

If any content, Illegal content. If I'm legally entitled to watch/view/read/participate content why should it be prohibited?

Q25:

No. Definately no. All games unsuited to minors? Double standards for printed and visual media?

Anything offensive to a "reasonable person"?

The current RC category is terrible.

Q26:

Yes (not terribly so). Consistent is fair, and if the government isn't fair then why does it exist.

Q27:

I would be happy to not have one. Waste of resources and effort to "solve" a problem which I believe doesn't really exist.

Q28:

Yes. I don't see what reasons classifications should be state-specific.

Q29:

The emphasis on empowering the people to make their own decisions by providing accurate and unbiased information.

Other comments: