

CI 1799 J Evans

First name: James

Last name: Evans

Q1:

Assuming that the current classification framework classifies mediums based on their content and context, then the current system needs only to be improved - mainly in the area of an R18+ rating for video games. How this classification is used is the responsibility of individuals.

Q2:

To provide a clear, concise guideline and outline of content within a particular work (films, books, etc). The only function of a national, or otherwise, classification scheme should be to inform users. This will assist parents, when purchasing for their children, and general consumers in making decisions about what they want to view and interact with. This should also be done with minimal subjectivity - classification should purely inform, not persuade or ban. The government has no right to censor or ban any content (unless under extreme circumstances, such as child pornography), as opinions should not be a factor in determining the classification of content. Classification must also be constantly evolving (what was taboo previously may no longer be taboo, etc.), allowing it to remain relevant to contemporary societal perspectives - an outdated classification model will be of no use to anyone; it will fail to properly classify material and, by extension, to adequately inform.

Q3:

No, all content should be classified. However, how content is classified must vary from medium to medium, but should remain consistent in having the same ratings across all mediums.

Q4:

No, it should be classified regardless.

Q5:

It should be classified regardless of potential impacts, whether positive or negative.

Content, not only designed for children, should be classified across all media.

Q6:

All content should be classified, regardless of the size of the market for any producer/distributor or the potential reach of the material. To suggest that either of these should affect whether or not content should be classified is an absurd notion.

Q7:

It should be classified to provide consumer advice, taking into account the content and context of the artwork, which would require close consultation with the artist/s. Unless under extreme circumstances, access should not be restricted.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No, it should be classified regardless.

Q10:

No, it should be classified regardless.

Q11:

As previously stated, all content should be classified for only informative means. No content should be banned, unless under extreme circumstances.

Q12:

Optional Internet filters; each individual/household should be given the option by their ISP of filtering websites, and what areas this will cover. There should not be any forced Internet filter. How content is online should be classified similar to other mediums, allowing individuals to make informed decisions.

Q13:

See above. This would allow parents to choose to filter the Internet as required to prevent children from accessing inappropriate content.

Q14:

With proper classification, select age restrictions and informative measures.

Q15:

Classification markings, which should entail warnings and consumer advice, should be displayed at the point of sale/advertisements - prior to viewing and use.

Q16:

The government should provide an informative classification of content, which does not restrict adult users (as is the case with R18+ video games). Users should only interpret and act with this information on hand.

Q17:

The government and the developing/publishing industry should work together when classifying content to ensure that proper information about content and context can be provided. I see no reason why this would not be more effective and practical than current arrangements.

Q18:

None - that would be purely subjective. It should be a collaborative effort between the government and industry.

Q19:

Government classification of content should be done for the benefit of all. The government should not charge those submitting content, regardless of whether they're individuals, small industries or large industries.

Q20:

To a degree. M and MA15+ are often believed to be the same. Perhaps changing the classification of, or specifying an age for M (eg. M13+), would better signify the difference between the two. In addition, the lack of an R18+ rating for video games often bans material for adults or pushes through borderline content into the MA15+ rating, which would otherwise receive an R18+ rating, allowing younger people to purchase such content.

Q21:

As stated above, an R18+ is needed for video games. Not only would this prevent ridiculous banning and misclassification of content, but it would also help inform individuals and parents alike of the actual content. Existing classification categories should be better defined - perhaps a rough age

outline for each classification would help. Classifications categories should remain the same, from G to X18+, except for RC, which should be removed.

Q22:

The best way would be to create a standardised classification scheme across all media formats. However, the different context and purpose, as well as how the media conveys these and its content, must be taken into account.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None. See Q12.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Wouldn't that be the whole point of a national classification scheme? Consistency is important, as it reduces confusion for both consumers and industries. Promoting this would be done through a standardised classification scheme across the country.

Q27:

The national classification scheme?

Q28:

Yes. The current method - with all State Attorney Generals required to reach a unanimous agreement - is completely absurd; I thought this was supposed to be a democracy?

Q29:

By updating the current, outdated model, with proper classifications across all mediums.

Other comments:

The government needs to become more efficient in passing law reforms - the current method is far too slow.