

CI 823 M Lingard

First name: Michael

Last name: Lingard

Q1:

Yes if you cannot apply the same framework that is currently being used for film & literature. No if key elements in gaming change this such as immersive and repetitive elements.

Q2:

To keep up to date with technology and bring video games into line with classifications currently in place on other media

Q3:

Some consideration should be made on immersive technologies where you are playing from a 1st person perspective as opposed to watching the event as an observer. example: the difference between watching a sniper in a movie shoot someone when compared to roleplaying being the sniper in a game...Platform seems irrelevant.

Q4:

No all should be classified, however if there is significant and relevant complaint(s) then classification could be reviewed

Q5:

As above all should be classified, the content impact determines the level of classification only, Games should be classified for kids and family as per other media.

Q6:

Definitely not

Q7:

Yes-I thought they already were

Q8:

Yes-and again I thought this was already in place

Q9:

No

Q10:

No-but do not confuse this with restricting access via some kind of internet filter-kids should be monitored by responsible adults-not govt deciding for us.

Q11:

I have nothing to add, it should be purely assessed on content only in the same way as other media

Q12:

Alert pages perhaps, Software for Adults to control what pages their children can access.

Q13:

By better parenting- dont have every computer or laptop in the house online, I am a parent and if my kids are online they are in the main living area in full view of everyone else in the house, if my oldest needs to use her laptop online for homework then she has to use it in the main living area.

Q14:

I think the current controls are fine as they are.

Q15:

Whenever it is deemed appropriate- warn and educate do not ban.

Q16:

To educate us and display correct information to allow us to make informed decisions- NOT to make these decisions for us

Q17:

Well on one hand the industry itself would know who their intended market is (target age), so you could start off there-however the government would then need to make sure that the values that the company base this on are the same or similar to the governments

Q18:

None

Q19:

Is this a question of monetary, maybe I do not fully understand the question, do creators pay to have content classified? Alternatively does this mean concessions are made with smaller creators and looser standards are applied. If monetary then yes, if looser standards then no.

Q20:

Yes I think so, but I do not think many parents/people tend to pay much attention to the difference between M and MA15+

Q21:

No I think they are fine, however in regards to games some of the MA15+ games in my opinion should have been pushed up into the R18 category

Q22:

Current system is fine, just need to bring the R rating for games.

Q23:

Yes wherever possible

Q24:

Child pornography and related content.

Q25:

No

Q26:

In this day and age of the internet it is an exercise in pointlessness to have different rules for different states and territories. Remember when Underbelly was banned in Victoria-well everyone just got the series from NSW! Consumer purchases are not purely local and never have been, the internet has made this trade even easier.

Q27:

Content should be classified at a federal level

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

If there is any other media that is not now currently subject to the same classification categories as film, then this should be applied now.

Also why are news and current affair programmes exempt from this framework where they can show real footage without content warning, It seems ludicrous that we only apply these warings to fake (acted and special fx) images.

Other comments: