

CI 1632 C Fulton

First name: Casey

Last name: Fulton

Q1:

Improving existing framework.

Q2:

Confirming the rights of Australians to consume the media they wish to, recognising video games as an artform whose target audience is largely over the age of 18.

Q3:

No, it is not the place of classification to police the method used to purchase material, only to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the material itself.

Q4:

Not sure. If it is feasible to classify everything, why not do so? If it is not feasible, perhaps work on a top down approach starting with most popular to least with content that has had criticism levelled against it given a higher priority.

Q5:

It could be a factor in determining priority. In the end it is still the parent's responsibility to limit their children's viewing of material they deem unsuitable.

Q6:

Yes, that is a good metric.

Q7:

"Providing consumer advice" is excellent. "Restricting access" is not. The end decision to consume or not consume should lie with the individual or their parent or guardian.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Yes, that is a good metric.

Q10:

No, the method of access is irrelevant.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

Providing an OPT-IN software program that limits their individual's computer's access. An Australia-wide firewall is nonsense.

Q13:

Via an OPT-IN software program that limits their individual's computer's access, and better education of parents.

Q14:

Better education of parents.

Q15:

When it has been classified.

Q16:

Advisory to consumers, not restrictive.

Q17:

Probably not.

Q18:

Classification is rarely ever straight forward. The badge of "art" seems to make virtually anything PG.

Q19:

That makes sense. Media generated by non-profit organisations would also be a good place to start.

Q20:

The existing classification system is well understood, both the scale (G, PG, etc) and the content descriptors.

Q21:

Adding an MA and R classification to video games would be a fantastic addition. As it stands, Australia seems to view video games as a "just for kids" medium of entertainment, which doesn't at all represent reality. New classification levels are required to allow adults to access content previously denied to them on the grounds of it not being suitable for children.

Q22:

The consistency is already there.

Q23:

If it means adding MA and R classifications to computer games, absolutely.

Q24:

Nothing. Preventing access to content online is a no-win situation. People who wish to find child pornography will always be able to do so through the likes of TOR, and no amount of internet filtering or Australia-wide firewalls is ever going to stop this, or make it even an iota more difficult. In the end it just ends up being a hurdle to legitimate users seeking legitimate websites. Case in point: Encyclopedia Dramatica, a fantastic compendium of Internet culture, was recently lumped in with sites proliferating child pornography. How does that work?

Q25:

Not at all. See Q24. I reject the very concept of "prohibited online" as impossible to accomplish.

Q26:

No. Make classification a strictly federal system. What about your geographic location changes some media's classification?

Q27:

It should not be replaced. It's not that far gone yet.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Recognising video games as a medium enjoyed by far more than 6 to 18 year old Australians.

Other comments: