

CI 738 W Miles

First name: William

Last name: Miles

Q1:

Develop a new framework.

Q2:

To allow free access for person(s) of mature age to content that they would be allowed to enjoy in other countries such as England or America.

Q3:

No, it shouldn't, some argue that because games are more "hands on" they provide more impact, but this should not set them aside from any other platform or technology such as Television or movies.

Q4:

No, all content needs to be classified, you can't just wait for someone to complain before looking at stuff, because by that point the damage is done; that said, content shouldn't be classified based on one "review" of it, content should not be given the maximum rating until someone complains and a secondary inspection takes place, independent from the first.

Q5:

Potential impact shouldn't affect classification, different people react differently; and grouping those people under one banner is and saying they'll all be affected the same way is ignorant and irresponsible.

Q6:

Not in all cases, if a company consistently produces games which are proven to have a very negative effect then that should affect the classification, but not otherwise or in any other circumstances.

Q7:

No, as long as people are informed as to what they will be viewing; and are of age to make the decision, then they should be allowed the choice to view it.

Q8:

Yes, all forms of art and media should be classified in the same manner

Q9:

No

Q10:

No, that is a choice to be made by people as to whether or not they allow it to be viewed, classification should not be affected by this

Q11:

How the content has been treated in other countries should be taken into account here, after all, are we not as responsible as other countries?

Q12:

You cannot "control" online content, users will ALWAYS find a way around any block that is placed

Q13:

It can't be controlled once they are physically "online", as from there on unless they are directly supervised anything could happen, but better education about dangers and such could have an effect.

Q14:

It shouldn't be, it's the choice of the person to purchase such content; and the choice of the merchant to sell it. Freedom of choice is a basic human right; and controlling it is wrong.

Q15:

Always, so that people know what they are buying and can make informed decisions as to the content

Q16:

Q17:

Yes, most likely, this seems to be a logical step forward to solving the problem

Q18:

Q19:

No

Q20:

In the current Australian classification system, the MA15+ rating doesn't seem to be very well understood, simply because so much is attributed to it, it has too many "ranges" and people look at it and go "eh, it doesn't apply because in [insert example here] it didn't really work"

Q21:

Yes there is a need for new classification and no, no categories should be removed or merged (besides the "refused classification" category), all that needs to happen is for our classification system to follow the same pattern as the systems in use in other major countries

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

None. As long as people are informed as to what they are viewing then its up to them to view it, it's basic freedom of choice

Q25:

No

Q26:

Yes, it is just ridiculous to think that each state should have a different system, we are ONE country; and the system should be for the COUNTRY, not the states

Q27:

Q28:

yes

Q29:

Other comments: