

CI 374 P Miller

First name: Philip

Last name: Miller

Email: philmiller@gmail.com

Please treat this submission as: Public

Are you making this submission as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation? : Individual

Postal address: 18 Dorrit Black Cres. North Lynham. ACT 2602

State or Territory: **ACT**

Contact phone number: 0416367286

Q2: Provide a minimal, informative framework.

Q3: No. Open standards should be device / platform agnostic.

Q5: a: No. b: Yes.

Q6->Q9: NO

Q12: Parenting.

Q13: Parenting.

Q14: See Q12 and Q13? Whom is being hurt by 'sexually explicit magazines'? If there are issues in the creation of such material - that process should be investigated. How can access to rocks, falls greater than a meter or bad language be better controlled?

Q15: Self determined by the publisher of said material. Let the market / distributors make those decisions.

Q16: Peer recommendation and review is rendering role of government agencies and industry bodies meaningless. Third parties such as www.whattheyplay.com provide all the information I require to determine if a given game is suitable for my child (for example). This problem is being handled in ways far superior than anything I expect to emerge as a government mandate.

Q17: Yes

Q18: All of it.

Q19: It should be subsidized: by making the process free and voluntary. If I choose not to register my product with a classification agency, my means of distribution may be effected as per the market.

Q20: I am confused when games are refused classification. But that may not be what you mean. Alternative methods exist for obtaining those products regardless - though it often involves imports.

Q24: None

Q25: No. RC has been granted for content as (inanely) silly / light as Mortal Combat (2011) and Left for Dead 2.

Q26: Consistency is important.

**Other comments: This has been a disturbing experience. I hope this nonsense fails horribly.
Online submit not working.**