

CI 2342 G Wootton

First name:

Graeme

Last name:

Wootton

Q1:

A new framework for classification, such as an Adult rating for video game content.

Q2:

To give develop a framework for adult rated video gqmes.

Q3:

Yes, due to the complexities of modern technology, some forms of these are very difficult to classify, particularly considering the varied content currently available through the international market, as well as the ability to access this content on the internet via direct or indirect means.

Q4:

Yes.

Q5:

Yes, the potential impact should affect whether particular content is classified. However, it shouldn't be the governments descision to ban adult content due to the format on which it appears. Certainly content like this should be available under an open classification not designed for children, but also one for adults, available across all media also.

Q6:

No, this shouldn't have a determining factor.

Q7:

I don't think artwork should be classified for restricting content, but providing consumer advice seems reasonable to prevent conflict.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

I'm sure you guys can argue about the details, so I'll say none.

Q12:

I don't think their is one, as circumventing such things is very easy with modern technology and the ability to share information through the internet. Hence, I think its a waste of time even bothering to attempt to restrict content on the internet.

Q13:

Parental supervision when using such devices is necessary for parents who think such devices are necessary. I don't think they are required.

Q14:

I think the current methods work quite well, and no revision is necessary.

Q15:

I don't think it really should. As it covers up the artistic work of the developers.

Q16:

Users should play all the roles, as governments are just wasting money attempting such silly things.

This is 2011, not 1901.

Q17:

No system at all would be best, where users make their own regulatory decisions. However, if I must choose, then yes it sounds like a wonderful way to waste money on a way of reducing the amount of money your wasting.

Q18:

Very young childrens products, for infants under 5, however above that age group, no classifications should be required.

Q19:

They shouldn't require any classification.

Q20:

Everything from M15+ above is a waste of time, just get rid of them all above this, or classify it all under one non-restricted classification for over 15's.

Q21:

We either need an R18+ for video games, or a restriction free above 15's category making all this content adult rated or similarly badged.

Q22:

They should only be guidelines, and non-restricted.

Q23:

It could be.

Q24:

None really, as it is an infinitely impossible task to attempt. Its just a waste of time and money.

Q25:

I think some of this content, particularly video games, shouldn't have this refused classification category. It should be non restricted for all.

Q26:

I think that it could be, but that this will only affect the classifications in a negative way, due to the conservative nature of particular states and or territories, and the relative open laws of others.

Q27:

One where the system is considerably more liberal in its restriction of content.

Q28:

It seems like a good idea.

Q29:

Introduction of an R rating for video games or the implementation of an open release policy on refused classification category.

Other comments: