

CI 482 J Glover

First name: Joshua

Last name: Glover

Q1:

The focus should be on expanding the existing framework to bring the classification system for video games into line with the classification systems of movies, literature and other similar mediums. A complete reworking of the existing framework would not be strictly necessary to achieve the end of introducing an R18+ rating.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to provide information to the Australian public such that we as a nation of consumers may make reach clearer decisions in regards to the appropriateness of the content of material available. Critically, a national classification scheme should not be concerned with refusing classification (RC) to material found objectionable by unreasonable persons. In providing a clear framework inclusive of an R18+ rating, truly objectionable material will and should remain RC. With clear labeling and information about material, provided through a national classification scheme, adults whom would consider any R18+ material to be objectionable may be able to readily identify and avoid consuming such material.

Q3:

No, there should be no distinction made regarding the manner in which material is accessed. A uniform approach that makes no such distinction would provide greater clarity and would not be unduly complicated.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

This question is confusing. The potential impact of content on whom? What type of impact?

Q6:

No. A system of classification should and must be fair to all. Moreover, if content is classified based on it's severity in a number of predefined qualities such as level of violence, language etc... then this *content* classification is in no way influenced by the degree to which the product may then be marketed.

Q7:

Only if a complaint is made. Classification is an expensive and time-heavy process and should not be forced unless strictly necessary.

Q8:

Only if a complaint is made. Classification is an expensive and time-heavy process and should not be

forced unless strictly necessary.

Q9:

Only as far as it is commercially reasonable to subject given material to classification.

Q10:

Yes.

Q11:

Q12:

No method is effective. Use of filters, even at the ISP level, can easily be circumvented, particularly by the technologically savvy minors whom the classification is most likely intended to protect.

Q13:

Information and education of both parents and children.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Adult R18+ content. General Exhibition.

Q19:

Yes.

Q20:

MA15+ and the lack of R18+ in the classification system for video games is confusing. The lack of uniformity between the classification systems for movies and video games is a significant source of misunderstanding for consumers.

Q21:

Yes, the video games classification categories needs to be expanded to include a classification rating for R18+ content.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Access to extremely objectionable content by a reasonable person should be blocked. I would classify

this as a category well beyond merely RC, inclusive of illegal material such as child pornography and instructions on terrorism activities.

Q25:

No. The scope of RC is much too broad to be blocked. Attempting to do so would be impractical, and result in an unreasonable slowing of the internet infrastructure in Australia. Moreover, content that is RC but is not strictly illegal to view should be accessible by adult persons whom so choose to do so.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Introducing an R18+ classification for video games in line with the current classification scheme for film.

Other comments: