CI 1569 D Salisbury

First name: Drew
Last name: Salisbury

Q1:
Either where the result is achieved, though I suspect a new framework is the best path to a revised rating system

Q2:
To inform / warn of specific types of content and how it relates to age groups or key demographics. The choice should ultimately be with the consumer to purchase or not, although reasonable restrictions such as preventing children from purchasing mature or inappropriate content is worthy.

Q3:
Not unless the content is directly altered from its source by that platform and is in need of custom assessment of content rating for that particular platform

Q4:
No, all content should be eligible for classification - that is not to say all content must be classified. A complaint may be a worthy trigger to rate a subject.

Q5:
Yes

Q6:
As per my response to Q4, all content should be eligible for classification if justified - potential mass-market reach of material is solid grounds for classification. Inversely, niche material may not be necessary to classify (although "Not Classified" should be used in these cases rather than barring that material outright).

Q7:
Yes, where appropriate or deemed necessary

Q8:
Yes, where appropriate or deemed necessary

Q9:
As per Q6, reach of the material should be considered when applying or reviewing the need to apply a content rating

Q10:
No, at least not for content that remains unchanged regardless of access location or platform (see Q3)

Q11:

Q12:
Education of users, ready access to access control tips/guides, opt-in filtering services at the ISP level, readily available and effective software for PC's.

Q13:
Education of parents, ready access to access control tips/guides, opt-in filtering services at the ISP level, readily available and effective software for PC's

Q14:

It shouldn't be on display in public areas unless it's made clear what the nature of content to be found in that place/area is

Q15:

Where it could be damaging, influential or inappropriate for a particular audience

Q16:

Everyone should be given a voice when establishing policies, government should enforce the policies and industry bodies then follow. Policies should be able to change through agreement of all involved parties.

Q17:

Unknown - the danger is that any bias of industry may influence the content rating, but I'm sure this could be avoided / governed, perhaps by QA process.

Q18:

Some regulatory check or QA process should perhaps be followed, but if that's the case then the industry powers suggested by the question may improve efficiency for appropriate content, though I myself don't know what that content is.

Q19:

If subsidisation is a means to appropriate and justified classification, yes

Q20:

I believe they are understood, however the lack of an R rating on computer/video games is confusing, limiting and subsequently frustrating.

Q21:

An R rating on computer/video games

Q22:

To my knowledge, current classifications and marking are largely consistent with the exception of an R rating for computer/video games

Q23:

As a concept it sounds logical, yes, and likely to reduce any confusion and streamline processes

Q24:

None, guides can be put in place however content is not a one-size-fits-all and any wide-scale prohibition would treat it as being so

Q25:

Potentially. Likely it does somewhat. This should be reviewed with any new framework.

Q26:

Consistency is important and, where the classification framework is renewed and made suitable, should then be applied nationally through federal policy - state-by-state exceptions are likely to confuse.

Q27:

A single, national scheme

Q28:

Yes, where the commonwealth is then forced to shape new legislation with input from all relevant parties, including the public, to deliver a considered and effective policy.

Q29:

Unsure.

Other comments: