

CI 601 A Thomas

First name: Andrew

Last name: Thomas

Q1:

Developing a new framework should be the focus.

Q2:

To classify material based on it's content into consistent levels of impact across all media types.

Q3:

On all platforms except mobile phones/tablets I think that no, the platform should not affect whether content is classified. On mobile devices, however, there are simply far too many games and applications being produced on so many differing devices that it would be a monumental task to keep up with classifying it all.

Q4:

The question is not clear. Is the content already classified when it is sold? Is it classified by the industry that created it? Or is the industry selling unclassified material?

If the industry is self classifying material or selling unclassified material then when sufficient complaints are received the content can be examined and reclassified by a government body.

If a government body has classified material before sale then I would expect a larger amount of complaints would be required before reassessment is needed.

Q5:

No, the potential impact of content should not affect whether it should be classified or not.

Yes, content designed for children should be classified across all media. This is very useful tool for parents to assess whether content is appropriate for their children or not.

Q6:

Perhaps content only released in one region or state should not require classification.

Anything released on a national scale should be classified I think.

Q7:

No, I don't feel art needs to be classified before exhibition.

I think that should be left up to the artist and the promoter to warn viewers that the material might not be suitable for everyone.

If enough complaints are received about artwork on display then the promoter should take further steps to inform viewers of the objectionable content.

If still more complaints are received then perhaps the government might, finally, need to provide a

standardised classification of the artwork but should not restrict access to the artwork.

Q8:

No, I don't feel music and other sound recordings need to be classified or regulated in the same manner as other content.

The current system of marking when a recording has strong language or adult themes is sufficient in my opinion.

Q9:

Related to Q5. A small regional target audience should not require the content to be classified.

Composition of the audience should not affect whether the content is classified or not.

Q10:

No, I don't think the location content is accessed should affect whether content should be classified or not.

However, if something is accessed in a public location and sufficient complaints are received then that content could be classified with an 'only for personal viewing' or similar classification, which would restrict it from being displayed in public places.

Q11:

None that I can think of.

Q12:

Require the accessor to supply a date of birth or a valid credit card number are effective methods for controlling access to online content in my opinion.

There aren't many other simple options for controlling access to online content .

Q13:

With better parental supervision.

This is one area the government simply can't effectively control. It is up to the parents to monitor what content their children access online.

Perhaps there could be tools and support information provided by the government to help parents with this task.

Q14:

I don't think it can be better controlled than it is now.

Perhaps requiring ids to be checked for people who appear to be under the appropriate age limit.

Q15:

When the impact and frequency of adult themes in the content occurs in high frequency.

Q16:

Government should define what levels of content are appropriate for what age groups.

Industry should take care to adhere to those classifications and only sell to users who appear to be in the appropriate age group.

Users should report breaches of the sale of inappropriate items to the government to investigate.

Q17:

Yes, I believe it would.

The industry can self classify and release material without needing explicit government approval. This would benefit both sides as there is less work on the government side and less cost on the industry side and probably less time taken to classify something.

Q18:

Movies and video games should be classified by the industry.

The music industry could also supply the explicit language warnings by themselves.

Q19:

I do not object to locally produced, independent films and games receiving classification subsidies.

The circumstances I would have are:

Wholly, locally produced.

Total budget under a certain amount (different for films and games)

Not objectionable content (ie; pornographic or excessive violence)

Story features local landmarks, wildlife or Australian societal values.

Q20:

MA15+ and M cause confusion I think.

The lack of R18+ classification for games causes confusion. My opinion is that many parents see M games as fine for teens as young as 12 which is a problem as games can be classified M in Australia which received R18+ classification in other countries. Many parents are also not aware that we lack an R18+ classification for games, thus they may buy games for their children which I would argue they wouldn't do if we had an R18+ classification.

G and PG seem too similar in my opinion. PG should be clarified or changed to mean something like ages 10 to 15 or whatever age group is appropriate.

Q21:

G is fine.

PG is strange. Call it T for teen and specify an age group, like 10 to 15 years.

M and MA15+ should be merged.

R18+ and X18+ should be available for video games as well as movies.

I personally wouldn't buy an X18+ game but that doesn't someone who wants to should be stopped.

I would also consider changing to an international standard like PEGI. The advantage of doing this is cheaper distribution costs as packaging does not have to be localised to the Australian classification markings. The PEGI standard appears well thought out and contains all the necessary age groups and markings to classify content. It is also less ambiguous than using letters to represent age groups.

Q22:

By adopting one set of classification levels and markings that can apply to all types of media. Once again the PEGI classification markings are a good example. They could easily be applied to movies and music in my opinion. All exempt the 'Online Gamplay' marking make sense in the context of a movie or sound recording.

Q23:

I'm gonna go with Yes.

Q24:

No content should be entirely prohibited online.

Q25:

No online content should be prohibited.

Q26:

Yes, very important.

Flyers distributed in shops which can be read by consumers.

Q27:

The new scheme should be the Commonwealth classifies everything released on a national level or in more than one state.

States classify things released only in their state and only if the release will reach a large number of people.

States can object to Commonwealth classification of content. A re assessment of material will happen if a majority of states disagree with the Commonwealth classification.

All states use the same classification and marking levels.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

None that I can think of.

Other comments: