

CI 399 M Taulke-Johnson

First name: Matthew

Last name: Taulke-Johnson

Q1:

It should develop a framework that brings electronic media classification in line with the rest of the civilised world, by totally overhauling the framework or making appropriate amendments.

Q2:

To bring the Australia classification inline with the rest of the developed world.

Q3:

The platform on which the content is delivered should have no bearing on the classification of that content. The technologies, inclusive of DVD, Blu-Ray, Internatioanl Mailing, Internet downloads and any other technology are simply a medium to distribute content to end users. Educated and mature end users generally have the technical understanding to attain the content they wish by many avenues, prohibiting content in a backward manner only creates problems and does not resolve them.

Q4:

No, all content should be subject to scrutiny, and based on the content - a reasonable classification should be given to that content. End users who reach a certain age and have a reasonable level of maturity should then be given the option to purchase such content.

Q5:

Yes, potential impact should be a deciding factor when rating the content. A product developed for children and its impact should be given the relevant classification suitable for that age group. The same goes for content and products that depict violence, sex, drug use etc.

Q6:

No, all content should be classified and assigned an appropriate age group.

Q7:

That depends on where the art work is depicted and if it is a reasonable depiction for that environment. Some artwork will be clearly acceptable to the viewing by the general public whilst some may not. For instance, a billboard sign of a happy couple walking on the beach is totally reasonable, but a gunshot vitcim is out of content and is definatly not appropriate.

Q8:

Yes, regardless of how the content is distributed or what the content contains, it should be subject to scurity and reasonable classification for Australian citizens to make decisions about purchasing and

consuming that content.

Q9:

No, the content itself should be the only determining factor as to what classification it gets. Other factors such as distribution medium, potential size, potential impact and so forth should have no bearing on classification. As I mentioned earlier, educated mature Australians will explore many many avenues to get the content they want when they want it. The Australian Government should rethink its attitude towards classification of gaming media and content and realise that there is more to be gained than lost in terms of taxable revenue through GST, Government Popularity and world wide recognition with modern classification system.

Q10:

Please see point 9, "No, the content itself should be the only determining factor as to what classification it gets. Other factors such as distribution medium, potential size, potential impact and so forth should have no bearing on classification."

Q11:

I believe that the content itself should be the only determining factor when deciding upon a classification for a peice of content. The end user should take the responsibility to ensure that this content is viewed correctly and under supervision in their own homes (if applicable). It is unreasonable and unrealistic to think that an outdated classification system for video games will stop an underage end user from attaining said illicit content through means other than purchasing it from their local games shop.

Q12:

In stores, the best way would be for identification to be presented before purchase. For online mediums, this can never be stopped but could be culled by only allowing purchase with credit cards.

Q13:

Ultimately this cannot be monitored or enforced by any goverment agency. There is no 100% way to stop children from accessing content they should not be allowed to have. This responsibility lies with the parental units in each family to educate their children about what is appropriate and what is not based upon that families beliefs.

Q14:

Identification should be presented at points of sale for such material but again, this can never be 100% stopped.

Q15:

These messages should be presented on content packaging when they might be considered to be offensive to the general public, or anything with a MA15+ rating.

Q16:

A heuristic point system would be perfect for this task and would involve little manpower and

government resources. Assign points for each type of illicit content within a product from 1 to 5. For instance, the game might contain some infrequent drug use which will attract a point of 2 out of 5. Similarly it might attract a score of 4-5 for violence. Some of these point types could be things such as suicide, dismemberment, rape, depiction of sexual acts and so on. The companies that create this content should supply this to the government. The products points will tally up to a point range, which will determine the classification and ultimately suitability for the general public.

Q17:

Yes, please see point 16. The companies that supply the content, and the government must work together.

Q18:

Look to other classifications that other countries use when making their determination.

Q19:

This is beyond the scope of my opinions on the subject at hand. Money is irrelevant as this is about bringing Australia's content classification in line with the rest of the world.

Q20:

Yes, they are generally understood, but they could be boiled down to under 10, under 13, under 15, under 18 and 18+ and RC

Q21:

Please see point 20.

Q22:

A sticker, or logo for each classification.

Q23:

Yes, all content should be classified on the same basis.

Q24:

Cruel, inhumane or content involving young children.

Q25:

Yes.

Q26:

Yes, very important to have a federal classification system nationwide and not broken down by state.

Q27:

I am not in a position to suggest such things.

Q28:

Yes, as this will be more encompassing of the Australian nation.

Q29:

Other comments:

My comments and feelings have been mentioned throughout this form.