CI 511 T Rayner

First name: Trent

Last name: Rayner

Q1:

Considering that the old framework allows games that should be classified as R18+ in under the MA+15 rating, I believe that a new framework needs to be considered, using a pre-established and working framework like the movie rating system.

Q2:

To inform end-users about the nature of content available, and to restrict access to content not deemed appropiate for those under the legal age. Also to refuse content classification if it contains illegal content or incites illegal activity beyond the realm acceptable by a reasonable adult.

Q3:

No. There is no available studies to support that the interactivity of a computer causes any more influence than that of the silver screen. Furthermore, content that is rated, for example, MA15+ should not be in the hands of a minor (14 and under in this situation). This content should be restricted to the minor at either the point of sale, or by parental restraints that current technology allows, regardless of the platform or technology used to access the content.

Q4:

Content should be classified regardless of whether it has had complaints or not. What other point is there to having a system in place for classification?

Q5:

"Potential impact" is not really a measureable effect, and should not come in to the classification system. Content designed for children should still be classified, and would theoretically fall under the "G" in our standard rating system.

Q6:

No, the size or market should not influence the rating the content recieves. The content should be rated based upon the content itself.

Q7:

No, although this was a difficult question to come to a conclusion and justify. A lot of it comes down to the context of the piece, and in general, the classification of art has always been a tricky thing within society. In such an instance, it should be up to the individual art galleries and so forth to decide how to present individual works, rather than an arbitrary blanket decision by an overseeing organization.

Q8:

Musical recordings already have a rating system under ARIA, but this system holds no legal ground. It would probably be easy to bring them under the same umbrella as other forms of content. Since there

is already a rating authority in place for books, this should also cover audio books.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Context should always be a factor within the classification process.

Q12:

There are none, and it's a ridiculous idea. By all means, illegal content such as child pornogrpahy should be targeted and removed at the source, but the government should not be controlling our access to such a medium.

Q13:

This is up to the individual household to control. Parents should monitor their children's online usage, and our education system already has a filtering system in place for schools.

Q14:

This should be enforced at the Point of Sale.

Q15:

When that content is classified. Advertisments and other means of promoting the content should also bear the classification.

Q16:

It should be an industry run system, with the government only stepping in when complaints are made (to either uphold or regrade the classification). Classification should be for informative purposes, not law enforcement. Preferably do away with RC altogether - if it's illegal, hand it over to the police.

Q17:

My previous comment already covers this, but yes. A system for which the industry itself is responsible is preferable to the current system, although there should be some kind of independent input.

Q18:

Again, boils down to context. Material that has been discussed before, such as movies, games, etc should be classified regardless of whether it is straight forward or not. Other material, such as art? Context.

Q19:

In circumstances of independent and small businesses, classification should either by subsidised or no-cost.

Q20:

I think the only thing that causes confusion within our rating system is the diversity of it. We have different systems for different content, and more unified rating system would be preferable. For example, our television system has ratings such as "C" for children, which are not present under any of our other systems.

Q21:

No, but the existing categories should be used to cover more content, i.e. a R18+ system for video games.

Q22:

By working with industries to make a more unified content classification system.

Q23:

Q24:

Again, this implies some kind of government control to online content, on which there should not be any. Illegal content should be pursued by our police system in the correct cases, but there should be no top-tier restrictions on what can or cannot be accessed.

Q25:

As previously stated, content online should not be prohibited at a government level.

Q26:

It should be consistent. If I can buy something in my state at M15+, it should be the same in another state. Classification should be at a federal level.

Q27:

As stated previously, a scheme industry run, with assistance by the government on forming it, enforced at the point of sale.

Q28:

To be honest, I'm not entirely sure what this question is trying to ask. I assume you mean should we examine how other Commonwealth countries have introduced legislations for establish a new framework for classifications, and I can't see any reason why not.

Q29:

More consistency, industry-focus, and less governmental overbearing.

Other comments: