

CI 2302 A Elliott

First name: Aaron

Last name: Elliott

Q1:

I'm open to either. I feel that the existing framework could be upgraded sufficiently, although there is merit in the idea of a whole new framework as well.

Q2:

A scheme which allows the public to make informed choices about what they are buying and given the responsibility of making that choice themselves.

Q3:

No. It should be uniform across all platforms/technologies. This might seem like a large task given the huge variety of mediums out there now but would be made possible if the industry could self-regulate, with the OFLC stepping in if complaints are made.

Q4:

No.

Content should always be classified although the industry should be able to self-regulate. Companies should have trained authorised assessors who assess the content in their own products. The applications would not need to be submitted to the OFLC, though if there is a complaint the company can present the application to the board to justify why the particular classification was given

Q5:

All content should be classified. Classifying content designed for children should be a simple affair, reports shouldn't be any longer than a page for content that has little to no contentious material.

And with self regulation, an assessment of content designed for children would be quick as there is little classifiable elements to cover and inexpensive as there would be no need to submit the content for classification.

Also, would it be fair to say that if content is designed for children (i.e everybody) then it's fair to say it wouldn't need a classification sticker as there is no warning to communicate to a consumer?

Something I'm undecided on.

Q6:

No. If content is reaching consumers then it should be classified. Because if it did, then how would you measure that? How do you decide what market reach deserves to be classified and what doesn't? What market is too small? Which producers market position is too small to deserve classification?

Q7:

Yes

Q8:

Yes, I believe there should be a system put in place for audio/music. As I've stated above, this should be self regulated.

Q9:

No

Again how would you measure what size an audience would/wouldn't need content classified?

Q10:

If this is in the sense of

Q11:

Q12:

I think the question should be less about how we 'control' online content. More so, how can we 'inform' people about the content they access online?

Further to that, are there any conclusive studies/evidence which proves beyond doubt that we need to control what all people see online, rather than allowing the public the responsibility to decide that for themselves?

Q13:

People can install security solutions for their home networks which can restrict access to minors. The police also play a part in monitoring and responding to complaints as they currently do.

I do not for a second support an 'internet filter' if that's what this question alludes to. Restricting access to everyone with a blanket ban, including those of us who are responsible enough to make our own decisions.

Q14:

Again, I have doubts that attempting to control everything beyond the restrictions that are currently in place will answer everyone's problems. I feel some restrictions could be put in place for certain content but I think it needs to strike a balance between sensible control mechanisms and allowing people to shoulder responsibility for what they choose consume.

Q15:

In a very broad and general sense, when it's been shown in the public domain. However common sense needs to be used here as as it would be very easy to become a markings & classification nightmare.

Q16:

- Industry bodies should have within their teams authorised assessors to classify their products. If they are found to not abide by the classification scheme, the government body investigates.
- Government agencies should carry out the authorised assossr training, and carry out the inspection/investigation of complaints into those industry bodies who don't abide by the scheme.
- Mature users are informed of what material they are purchasing and take responsibility for that decision rather than relying on a government agency to filter all contentious content. With respect to minors, there could be restrictions on where mature content is displayed or how children have access to the content but not at the expense of those mature enough to make the decision for themselves

Q17:

I strongly believe in self regulation of classifying content. That way, any content from all medium/devices could be classified by in-house authorised assessors. This way consumers are informed about the choices across any content. Any complaints about content would be reported to the goverment agency who would review then investigate and take action if the rules have not been followed.

Q18:

As previously mentioned, all content should be classified but if the classification is obvious and straightforward then the classification process should be straightforward as well. So if there is little to no contentious material, then the classification report should be a very short and simple affair to complete.

Q19:

If there was self regulation then there would be no need for subsidisation because they aren't submitting classifications to be approved.

Q20:

I'd say some get mixed up the current ratings and confuse it with an age classification. For example, when some see a G rated film they'd assume it's a children's film but that's not necessarily true.

Q21:

There is a need within video games for an R18+ category. If there is conclusive evidence to show we need it for other mediums but we can't include it for video games then I'm yet to see it.

If think if there was an R18+ category, it would be possible (though perhaps not necessary) to merge MA15+ with M.

Q22:

By including the same guidelines and criteria across all formats. Of course, common sense needs to be used here.

Q23:

In terms of the overall classification, Yes. I haven't seen evidence which proves beyond doubt that any particular medium has more of an impact on than other forms.

Q24:

I'm wary of any system a government wants to install which attempts to control what we view online. I see the merit in trying to block access of prohibited content but I think it will be used for more than that.

Q25:

In terms of film and other media, perhaps. In terms of video games, no. Mature aged users of games are being denied access to content which they should be able to view.

Q26:

Ideally, it should be consistent over all states.

Q27:

A scheme which is aged focused has some merit

Q28:

Perhaps, as this would help ensure a scheme uniform across the country. As long as the public input from forms such as this are taken into consideration

Q29:

In Summary:

Self regulation from industry bodies

Consistent classification scheme across all mediums (including R18+ for video games)

Stream lining the reporting process, making less contentious content easier to classify

Investigate ways of informing consumers of contentious material or restrictions on minors, without resorting to a blanket ban of content to all consumers

Updating the current classification framework, or overhauling with a new framework

Classification scheme which is consistent nation wide

Other comments: