

CI 475 D Avery

First name: David

Last name: Avery

Q1:

A new framework.

Q2:

Providing informative classification of media so that parents can make informed decisions as to the suitability for their children.

Q3:

In cases such as App Stores for mobile phones, websites, etc, the cost (monetary and time) of classification would be overly onerous for the authors of said media.

Q4:

Yes.

Q5:

No.

Q6:

Yes. Independent developers and content creators generally don't have the resources to submit to and pay for classification.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

Q10:

Content accessed in public should follow community standards of acceptance (with access limited depending on content). Content accessed from home should be the prerogative of the home owner/parents and classification should be for informative reasons only (if at all).

Q11:

Q12:

Parental supervision.

Q13:

Parental responsibility.

Q14:

Parental responsibility.

Q15:

At the point of sale and/or on the packaging.

Q16:

Preferably, classification should be a voluntary industry effort, with government agencies only acting on complaints.

Q17:

Yes, certainly.

Q18:

Content potentially aimed at children.

Q19:

Yes. Also small software developers, etc.

Q20:

The division between M and MA is not particularly clear.

Q21:

Software needs a R rating (and potentially an X rating). Merging M and MA and possibly removing the enforced age limit.

Q22:

Classification marking and ratings should be identical across all media types (where classification is required).

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None. Any criminal activity is a matter for law enforcement. Everything else should be user discretion.

Q25:

No. I don't believe such a category is necessary in the first place, particularly as applies to online content.

Q26:

Yes. Classification should be managed federally, catering for the broadest common denominator.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29: