

## CI 2236 S Macfarlane

First name: Sean

Last name: Macfarlane

Q1:

The inquiry should focus on improving key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to inform of content in a product and restrict access to media/games to under 18's so that a parent can decide whether the item is appropriate or not for the own child. Adults should be able to choose what they believes appropriate for themselves without restriction or censorship

Q3:

Yes, content on platform like the internet should not require classification, it is very easy for parents to filter and review content accessed by a child in a feasible manor, where as nationwide it is impractical, Where as what is aired on tv where it is difficult for a parents to prevent access to it without removing the product it makes sense to have classification and times when certain programs are not appropriate to air.

Q4:

Yes, some types of content should be required to have classification in this manner, In the case of both Iphone and android games they already have rules preventing explicit products being placed on them. In addition to this the cost of development is such that the cost to get classification for the product end all current and future Australian ventures into the market.

Q5:

Q6:

No, size or market position of particular content should not play a role in classification

Q7:

Artworks in an exhibition if they have potential for being offensive, consumer advice should be provided . However access should not be restricted, art is a part of culture and if a young person is interested in it, they should not be prevented from viewing it just because some other people consider it to be offensive.

Q8:

Music should be classified and regulated the same way Movies are. However Audio books should be treated in the same way books are as they are only a version of the book pre-read out loud for the consumer.

Q9:

No, size and composition of the audience should have no affect on whether something is classified

Q10:

Yes, something played in public should be classified, at home however, where it is a choice to view the product, classification should not be so much of a enforced restriction, rather advice to the consumer so they can choice whether it would be appropriate for themselves or the children

Q11:

Q12:

None, internet access should be unrestricted, any kind of internet content filter is easily circumvented and it is too easy for draconian practices to occur on such a system.

Q13:

Educate parents on how easy it is to setup a filter at home and to monitor what is being accessed, or have the child use a computer in a communal room in the house. It should be up to parents to decide what is appropriate or not for their child not someone else.

Q14:

Current methods seem acceptable, not selling material to under 18s as well as preventing content being viewed in the shops is effective enough.

Q15:

Classifications should always appear on the product box in the store, and before the product is about to air on tv.

Q16:

The Governemnt should provide the public with information advising the content of a product for parents to decide what is appropriate for their children.

Industry bodies can self regulate to some extend but the government needs to enforce regulations.

The users role should be to decide what is appropriate and non offensive to themselves and for the children without government censoring or refusing classification products

Q17:

The only products that should be industry classified are products with R18+ and X18+ ratings. No higher rating should exist.

Q18:

Any content that would receive a R18+ rating or a X18+ rating should be industry classified as there should be no higher classification.

Any content that does not fit under a lower classification should recive this rating.

This could be industry classified as the only product that should have classification refused is something containing child pornography.

Q19:

Yes, the cost of classification should not prevent small independent film makers or independent game producers from releasing products. Particularly with the increasing number of independent developers of games for phones and other hand held devices, often retailing for only a few dollars each, great caution should be exercised in introducing any requirements that would not be financially viable.

Perhaps subsidies should be available on the basis that when a product returns a profit, then the subsidy provided should be repaid, and perhaps money placed into the subsidy fund based on a percentage of the profit.

Q20:

Yes, they are easy to understand.

Q21:

Both R18+ and X18+ rating should be added to the classification of games. Games are not majority marketed towards children. The average age of a gamer currently is over 25 years of age, and hence

gamers should have access to products irrespective of the level of explicit content. Games should be treated in the same manner as movies: an adult may go and view a sexually explicit or violent movie if that is what they want to watch. The approach should be the same for people wanting to play computer games.

Q22:

They should all be treated under the same criteria and guidelines, and marked in the same fashion as each other

Q23:

Yes, publications, films and games are classified for the same content but have different level of restrictions, despite the content all being the same. They should therefore be consider the same and be classified using a single set of criteria.

Q24:

Child pornography should be entirely prohibited, but safeguards should be in place to prevent the use of such a prohibition for business purposes or political gain.

Q25:

No because the current RC category for games is to severe, just because a game is vilonce in it or sexual content it can be RC and these are both products that a adult should be able to decide whether it is appropriate for themselves

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Only if the framework isless restrictive and less likely to result in an RC category for a product than the state framework

Q29:

Other comments:

It has been seen in the past in countries such as the former USS and China that censorship can and will be used for political gain and personal views. Australia's proposed blacklisted internet filter is no different from what those countries have and currently do. Censorship and RC category products undermine the freedom of society.