First name: Samuel

Last name: Aldersea

Q1:

The focus should be on developing a new classification framework.

Q2:

To provide a uniform classification system that is clear about what can be seen and/or heard by particular age groups whilst being able to be consistantly applied to all forms of media.

Q3:

No, as all current technology platforms usually come with built-in safeguards that allow parents or guardians to lock minors out of accessing certain levels of content or system settings.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

Impact is subjective in nature and is, therefore, difficult to classify as certain pieces of content may have varying effects from person to person. There are some things, however, that should not be shown within certain age groups (for example, content that falls in the current brackets of MA15+ or higher should remain exclusive to people that actually fall within those age groups).

Content designed specifically for children should be subject to classification across all media.

Q6:

No, that should have no effect at all on the classification process.

Q7:

Yes, but ONLY for providing consumer advice. If someone chooses to ignore said advice, then they have waived their right to complain about the content in question.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Classification MUST be about providing advice to consumers so that they can make an informed decision about what is suitable for themselves or their children, it should NOT be about restricting access to content altogether.

If a parent or guardian chooses to ignore this advice, then they have waived their right to complain.

Q12:

The most effective method of controlling access to content is a matter of parent or guardian supervision and involvement. Parents and guardians need to be informed about the risks of certain types of content so that they can adequately monitor their children.

An internet filter IS NOT the way to go as it is subject to abuse by the entity in charge of it and can be bypassed by various hardware and software means.

Q13:

The ONLY way to control it is through supervision and parental involvement. This is the only way to reliably control what children access.

A national filter is both ineffective and too intrusive.

Q14:

Better classification, nothing more.

Q15:

Yes, but only if it has been or is required to be classified.

Q16:

Content needs to be regulated by an independent body to provide the necessary checks and balances in order to to prevent any government lobbyists, industry lobbyists, or consumer interest groups from having too strong an influence.

Q17:

Yes; the industry in question should be given the right to provide its own preliminary classification of the content in question to the classification body.

Q18:

Anything that falls within the X rating in the current classification system.

Q19:

If the content in question is small or independent in nature, the government should subsidise the cost of having the content classified.

Q20:

Not entirely; the M and MA15+ ratings currently cause confusion as many consumers simply do not understand the difference between them.

Q21:

There is currently a need for an R18+ rating for video games as some pieces of said content are either shoehorned into the MA15+ category (while in other countries the same content falls into an 18+ age bracket) or are outright refused classification even though they are released in other territories with an 18+ classification and are able to be played by consenting adults.

While none of the existing classification categories should be removed or merged, there should be a change made to further differentiate between the M and MA15+ ratings.

Q22:

A standard set for all types of content is required, ideally in line and in common with other countries. All symbols need to be standardised and sensible, and colour could be made use of to indicate the new levels.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

NO online content should be censored or filtered. However, content that is illegal under Australian law should be logged and investigated and the necessary steps should be taken to prosecute those partaking in illegal material.

The role of the classification board is not to censor content, but to rate it.

Q25:

No, the only content that should be refused classification is that which is deemed illegal by Australian law.

Q26:

Yes and it would be best promoted by creating a new classification framework that applies to ALL states and territories on a federal level.

Q27:

The legislation of any classification scheme should be handled at a federal level in order to create parity in classification laws in ALL states and territories.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

As of now, there are no other improvements other than those that have previously mentioned.

Other comments: