

CI 404 K Lynch

First name: Kelly

Last name: Lynch

Q1:

The way I see it is that as long as new technologies emerge and new societal normality arises things need to constantly adapt and change to fit new ways things are done. So in saying that, if the current system can adapt via improvements to the current system then by all means improve it (and continue to do so), but if you find that the current framework for classification is too far behind to deal recent technologies and recent and the current pace of technology then create a new framework that can be changed and adapted for unknown future situations.

Q2:

To allow people to have freedom to have access to content that they want. Obviously illegal material should be restricted and there should be restrictions in place to stop people from accessing content not for their age group but if a person is of age I think that they can choose what they are able to handle emotionally and what would be suitable from them.

Q3:

If platform refers to the means in which content is distributed then the platform. Using Apple's appstore as an example, many of the developers using that platform as a means in which to distribute their content would be able to afford the cost associated with having their content put before a classification review, many of the people developing these app's are only making them as a hobby, so increasing the cost on what is effectively a \$0 budget would not only severely hamper creativity but also limit the potential for Australian business to be recognised on a global scale (the Melbourne based Firemint video game studio is a fantastic example of how a small company can be brought to such a high level from publishing on a self-regulated platform). In cases such as the Android appstore (where the content is more unregulated), I think self regulation would be key to giving developers more freedom to develop for a certain demographic.

Q4:

If content is published on a self-regulated platform, then I think it would be very appropriate for people to be able to complain and an investigation into the material be conducted (although not at the expense of the developer to avoid abuse).

Q5:

I think a combination of self-regulation (this could mean anything from content creators making a judgement on their own content to non-government industry review), parental control and peer review would get rid of any adult material aimed towards children. People wouldn't stand for something like that happening.

Q6:

If a content developer could pay to have their content thoroughly reviewed through the current methods that are applied now, I think that should be encouraged. This should be done through positive gains through doing this (such as "seal of official classification") in order to have people who want to be sure about what content they are receiving to have a reassurance.

Q7:

Art is tricky. Art is an expression of a person's (or people's) vision that they feel they need to create and share with others. If classification is put on that, that would be like approving a conversation before it is spoken. Although at the same time I know that you can walk away from a conversation if you don't like it. So in saying that I think that if the artwork isn't being forced on anyone (such as in a heavily populated public area) it shouldn't be classified. Plus I think that if an artwork was extreme enough, the exhibitor would at least advise people before they view it.

Q8:

In my personal experience, nothing in audio form alone has been enough to have an effect on me or offend me. With today's technologies song's can be made and published within a day and released online for free, it would not be technologically viable to classify all of them. Plus if the same classification standards that are being applied today were applied to music, nothing would gain more than a PG rating due to the lack of visuals.

Q9:

I know of music artists and independent developers who have thousands of fans and wide ranging audiences who don't make any money. So going off that, I think just whether or not their able to pay for the classification should be the only factor. Plus a majority of their audience may not be Australian, so they might just not want their content classified because it wouldn't be worth their time, effectively depriving Australian's of content enjoyed by other nations.

Q10:

That couldn't be done. Content that could be accessed at home can now be accessed while walking around outside, it would cause to much confusion and the end user would easily be able to break the classification just by walking outside.

Q11:

- If it would be worth the creator's time.
- If they are able to pay for the costs involved.
- If the creator's feel their audience would be genuinely appreciative of the official classification.

Q12:

To put it short, you can't control content from the internet. It may not be the most satisfying answer but it is true. The internet isn't static, it's constantly shifting and evolving so if people want to gain access to something badly enough, they will find a way to gain access to that content. Furthermore, it's an international "zone", so in that respect, I think that you can't really enforce Australian law's upon the content.

Q13:

More opportunities for parental education and control about what they choose to expose their children to.

Q14:

Have punishments on people selling said material to minors.

Q15:

When a consumer views or buy's the product. Through my thinking there wouldn't be many circumstances in which it wouldn't be necessary to display classification information.

Q16:

Government:

- Make sure that identification is being checked
- Give people equal access to content across all forms of media

Industry:

- Give them the power to classify content themselves.
- Make sure that they are responsible enough to classify content

User:

- Make sure they're informed about classifications
- Make sure that they know what they're accessing

Q17:

Yes. All media industries don't want to be viewed down by the public. If industries were given a greater role in classification then I think a lot more suitable and responsible decisions would be made due to their understanding of the medium.

Q18:

Independent creations could have a possibility to be industry classified

Q19:

Definitely. It would be a great if people who couldn't afford to classify their games due to financial reasons to have a subsidy to take care of them. My only concern is that there would be too many items to classify. For example, almost anyone can make a video game that would have to go through classification, I still stand by giving the industry power to classify games.

Q20:

I think they're very understood. The colour coating and size of the labels make a great contribution to the understanding of the classification. The only confusion that I've witnessed is the confusion about no R18+ rating for video games, the rating should be applied to video games in order to give people a better impression of what's in games and to allow games into the country that would be allowed if

there was an R18+ rating.

Q21:

Just an R18+ for video games. Personally, I think that the categories are fine the way they are, sans the no R18+ for video games.

Q22:

I think they're fine the way they are. An effort to make the classification guidelines fall into similar categories as overseas systems couldn't hurt though.

Q23:

There desperately needs to be an R18+ rating for video games, so yes.

Q24:

None. However, if illegal material were discovered, I think that any ISP in any country would remove the content if contacted. This would be much more appropriate than just blocking material.

Q25:

No, I don't think there should be a refused classification category, just G to X and illegal material.

Q26:

Yes, it wouldn't make much sense to see a different rating just because you're in a different state. Likewise, the entire nation shouldn't be held back due to one states reluctance to implement the same laws as everyone else.

Q27:

A scheme that gives greater control of content classification to the specific industries and creators of said content.

Q28:

I'm not sure.

Q29:

Efforts to standardise classification across a global scale would be a great thing. Especially that since you can purchase products from other countries anyway, I think it would go a long way to help avoid confusion.

Other comments:

- An R18+ rating for video games is needed.
- Industry and content creators should be able to classify their own content.
- Mandatory Internet filtering won't work.