

## CI 616 D Gaetjens

First name: David

Last name: Gaetjens

Q1:

Q2:

-To inform users of artistic mediums of any material that may be considered offensive, or unsuitable for certain audiences within an artistic work in a consistent, easy to understand manner.

-To restrict access to certain artistic works to younger audiences, in instances where the artists work is deemed to be unsuitable for younger audiences.

Q3:

The technology or platform used to access content should only affect whether content should be classified if a technology or platform brings into question the feasibility of classifying its content.

Content accessed through the internet, such as websites or online-only games, may be infeasibly expensive, time consuming and numerous to appropriately classify.

It is unreasonable to let a technology or platform affect whether content should be classified for reasons other than feasibility. Whether a person chooses to watch a recording of a play, or to go to a theatre to view the same play live should not affect the classification of their experience. The type of television used to view a television show should not affect whether content should be classified.

Q4:

Content accessed through certain technologies are inherently difficult to classify, such as websites or online-only games. This content should only be required to be classified if the content has been the subject of a complaint for feasibility reasons.

Q5:

The potential 'impact' of content should not be a factor in determining whether content should be classified. As different consumers would regard the impact of content in different ways, the impact of material is too difficult to accurately quantify for the purposes of determining whether it should be classified.

Q6:

The size or market position of particular content producers and distributors should not affect whether content should be classified. The producers and distributors of materials do not have a significant enough impact upon the material itself to warrant consideration in whether content should be classified.

The potential mass market reach of the material should not affect whether content should be classified. potential mass market reach of most materials is too difficult to quantify.

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

The potential size and composition of the audience should not affect whether content should be classified. The potential size and composition of the audience is difficult to predict considering that

certain materials often become popular with by members outside it's intended audience. For example, many cartoons designed for younger audiences are popular with adult viewers.

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Access to online content cannot be effectively controlled without extreme measures, which would not be justified. Methods such as DNS filtering are simple to bypass for most laypersons (children included) through methods such as caching, translation services, alternate domain names, proxies, RSS aggregators, etc.

Q13:

Children's access to potentially inappropriate content can be better controlled online through further education of both children and their parents about online content and the methods for controlling access to content such as home filtering.

Q14:

Q15:

Content should be required to display classification markings, warnings or consumer advice, when access to the content is provided.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

The Government should subsidise the classification of content created by charitable organisations, or for charitable purposes as well as small, independent content producers.

Q20:

The classification categories in relation to film and videogames are a cause for confusion. Although the classification categories for these mediums share many of the same categories, the R 18+ and X 18+ are not applied to videogames. This causes confusion as to the suitability of MA 15+ games considering that many games which are classified MA 15+ in Australia are further restricted in other countries.

Q21:

There is a need for an R 18+ rating for videogames. The lack of an R 18+ rating in particular results in material which may otherwise be considered suitable for adults, being refused classification. The lack of an R 18+ rating prevents adults from purchasing material which would otherwise be suitable for them to access.

Q22:

The introduction of an R 18+ rating for videogames would make the classification markings more consistent among films and videogames.

Q23:

Q24:

For consistency reasons, only access to content which is in itself illegal, or accessed through illegal means, should be prohibited online. Access to content which is refused classification, or deemed inappropriate but not illegal should not be prohibited.

The same laws should govern the viewing of content which have been refused classification, yet are not illegal to own, whether they be viewed through a physical copy, or online.

Q25:

The current scope of the Refused Classification (RC) category does not reflect the content that should be prohibited online. Material which has been Refused Classification should not be prohibited online, as some Refused Classification materials are available through offline means.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29: