

CI 290 S Shaw

First name: Simon

Last name: Shaw

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework, namely, adding an R18+ classification for games and some online content.

Q2:

The addition of an R18+ category for games and some online content.

Q3:

No. It is fairer to apply across the board and it reduces confusion.

Q4:

Yes.

Q5:

Yes.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Yes.

Q11:

None, I actually don't think we should have classifications of content. As a parent it is up to me to decide whether something is suitable or not suitable for my children.

Q12:

There are no effective means of controlling access to online content. (I am a computer systems manager). Also see attempts by governments in Egypt etc to restrict access to material. Also see

statements by the US Govt on internet data restrictions/censorship.

Q13:

Supervision, parental education. Optional "Net Nanny" type software of the type introduced by the Liberal government. Children should be educated at school on the dangers of social networking as well. (Placing personal information online or inappropriate information that could be used against them later in life.) IPTV is a possible threat to children as material of different target audience could be screened when normal public free to air is already G or PG during the daytime.

Q14:

Current controls are sufficient.

Q15:

Never, except possibly material screened publicly in movie advertising or before a program starts on public free to air TV.

Q16:

Govt and industry bodies should focus on primetime public TV broadcasting, especially in the period from 5AM to 7:30PM.

Q17:

No. Self regulation does not work.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

No, it should be done by government or not at all. (With the exception of public TV broadcast).

Q20:

I think so.

Q21:

I think current categories are OK. A new one for computer games would be nice. Though people ignore the current system anyway when it comes to games etc.

Q22:

Null.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Null. Criminal material access can be handled by law enforcement agencies.

Q25:

RC is too strict. Only criminal material should be RC. (Child pornography, assault material etc).

Q26:

Good question. It would be nice to have same classification system nationally. However I would be leery of giving up state rights or having a stricter system imposed by Canberra, so no.

Q27:

Leave as is.

Q28:

No.

Q29:

Wider input to classification board. Increase the size of the review team.

Other comments:

Am totally against mandatory ISP or higher internet filtering.