

CI 600 M Schaaf

First name: Menno

Last name: Schaaf

Q1:

Developing a new framework for classification

Q2:

To ensure an the classification is informative to people wanting to know about the type of content without limiting access for adults to content except where that content is illegal

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes - particularly games and applications. There is already a large amount of games available through things like Apple's App Store and the Andriod Marketplace that have not gone through the current submission process, and given their relative price, and the sheer number, it is not financially sound or practical to submit all these to the classification board. Instead, they should be able to self classify to begin with and be reviewed if a complaint is made.

Q5:

Impact should be taken into consideration when classifying, not if something should be classified.

Q6:

No, and the cost of classification shouldn't be a barrier to small market reach of the material

Q7:

No - Artwork should be available to all, though advice should be made from the exhibitor in regards to the suitability of the art to be viewed by certain groups

Q8:

Yes, music can contain much the same things as other mediums such as film, but consideration should be taken in that there is no visual impact with music.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

There are no effective methods of controlling access to online content. If people want to access content, they will. Encrypted networks such as Tor are impossible to control and eavesdrop on. Even using the Secure Socket Layer (SSL) on websites is sufficient to stop identifying what the content is on the site.

Q13:

By better educating parents in moderating their child's online browsing.

Q14:

Mandating ID requirements for such content.

Q15:

Any content that has a classification that is not for everyone, or has sufficient warnings/advice that it should be displayed prominently

Q16:

Government agencies should be there to set the classification scheme and enforce it

Industry bodies should be there to ensure those their content is classified correctly, and being sold appropriately.

Users should moderate other users behavior where appropriate (i.e. A parent should ensure their 13 year child does not have access to M/MA/R material)

Q17:

Yes. There is a large amount of smaller content (games in particular) that it is not practical for a single government agency to classify it all.

Q18:

Games - the game is often targeted towards a certain audience, and the industry knows better the content of the game than a government agency that doesn't even play it (and just gets told about it by the industry in the current system)

Q19:

If the cost of classification is likely to cause the content to not be distributed here otherwise, then it should be subsidised.

Q20:

The lack of an R18+ rating for games causes confusion within the gaming industry, communities and externally.

The close naming scheme of M and MA causes some confusion.

Q21:

The close naming scheme of M and MA causes some confusion. The should be renamed to be more individually distinctive, or merged entirely.

Q22:

By making a single classification scheme with the same requirements across all media.

Q23:

Yes, this would make classification a lot simpler and easier to understand

Q24:

The current laws about what is prohibited online are sufficient.

Q25:

Q26:

Yes, classification should be done at a federal level, not state.

Q27:

The current scheme of requiring all the Attorneys-General approval to change the classification scheme is shown to be difficult and impractical. This should be replaced with a scheme where an

significant majority of support is sufficient to change the scheme in order to prevent a single representative from preventing changes.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

An R18+ rating for games should be introduced with the same requirements as an R18+ film.

Other comments:

An R18+ rating for games should be introduced with the same requirements as an R18+ film.