

CI 1897 D Bell

First name: David

Last name: Bell

Q1:

I believe a new framework is necessary for classification, simply improving elements doesn't address issues such as the number of apps requiring to be classified

Q2:

Being able to give clear guidelines on the content of the media so choices can be made without impinging on adults ability to view/play whatever media they wish. Very high offensive material still to be banned.

Q3:

No, just because the game is on a phone or a PC should not make a difference

Q4:

No, rapid communication through twitter etc will mean the content will be in even greater demand before classification or banning could take place.

Q5:

Yes, violent content and others should be assessed

Q6:

No, just because something is in a smaller market should mean it gets to escaped classification

Q7:

Art is a difficult one, but yes I think art should be classified, computer games could, be seen as artwork and has to be classified.

Q8:

No, I don't see any reason for varying just because the content isn't visual

Q9:

No, I think a scheme that is consistent across the board would suffice

Q10:

No, if the scheme is about giving the right guidelines for people to make a choice then it shouldn't matter if it's public or not

Q11:

If it is to be viewed or interacted with then it should be part of the scheme, further down the track I would say that there will be other forms of media that will also need to be classified, this should be taken into account.

Q12:

Control through the distributors, rather than have a small group assess every piece of content which would be logistically difficult have the content makers or distributors self assess and have rigorous auditing and a complaints system to catch any missed content

Q13:

Difficult question, I don't see classifying individual websites or national filters being the answer. I think that answer best lies with the parents, most web browsers have an inbuilt child safe function that

should be more widely realised. I think monitoring of the child rather than leaving them to their own devices is necessary

Q14:

I think the current system we have is fine, clear indication of the material is given, parents need to be aware.

Q15:

Any time it goes above M, or is not intended for General viewing

Q16:

government should provide a framework and auditing, industry needs to self assess and users need to be aware of the system and restrict access for children when required

Q17:

Yes, current central based assessment is not logistically possible for all content

Q18:

Games, phone apps, music, TV

Q19:

None, classification should be a reasonably easy process to do

Q20:

To some extent yes, but I think there is some confusion between M and MA15+. Some believe they are roughly the same.

Q21:

Yes, MA15+ should be removed and a R18+ installed for all content

Q22:

use the same markings and guidelines for all content

Q23:

Yes, I don't see any point in having several documents for what is pretty much the same outcome

Q24:

yes, anything related to misuse of children. however difficult to do with the advent of torrent distribution

Q25:

yes

Q26:

really shouldn't be state laws, being able to get something in one area and then driving home has always been an easy way to get prohibited items. Federal law would close this loophole

Q27:

A federal based scheme

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Be flexible enough to cope with upcoming technologies, this whole issue was brought about as games were seen as kids toys and no need was seen for a R classification. New content delivery may also come through toys and the system needs to be flexible enough to incorporate that

Other comments: