

CI 162 A Wilson

First name: Adam

Last name: Wilson

Q1:

A new framework should be constructed from scratch to match the modern world and the scope of new media.

Q2:

To achieve a standard classification scheme across all forms of media, and ensure that adults can view, hear, read, watch and play what they want, while still protecting young minds from extreme content.

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes, it is impossible to classify all forms of media in the modern age.

Q5:

No. How can the potential impact be assessed accurately? Content for children should be considered for classification and then acted upon accordingly.

Q6:

No

Q7:

No

Q8:

Music should rely on industry regulation

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

All content online should be industry regulated, and only classified by the ACB if complaints are received.

Q13:

Parental education and OPTIONAL filtering systems.

Q14:

All content offline should be industry regulated.

Q15:

When on sale to the public.

Q16:

Government agencies should only ever step in to classify content when complaints have been received. All content should be industry regulated, and the ACB should serve as a review board only.

Q17:

Yes, there is simply too much content to be classified by the government and it does not reflect the desires of modern society.

Q18:

Everything should be industry regulated.

Q19:

Everything should be industry regulated. Independent film and video game developers simply can not afford the outrageous price to classify content in this country, and thus local releases are often skipped.

Q20:

MA15+ is a major concern since people still get confused between it and the unrestricted M classification. It should be re-branded as A15+ for young adults. The Refused Classification category is far too broad and needs to be removed.

Q21:

As mentioned above MA15+ should be changed to A15+ and the RC category should be removed altogether.

Q22:

Create a single classification scheme which incorporates all media but allows flexibility between different forms. Share the same classification categories across ALL media.

Q23:

The guidelines should be redesigned from scratch.

Q24:

Online content should only be restricted through opt-in filtering systems implemented by a user's ISP. It should be mandatory for ISPs to provide a filtering service, but perfectly acceptable for a user to

opt-out of using one. The restricted content could then be separated into different categories by the ISP such as a filter responsible for pornographic material only, or another for any content unsuitable for those under 15 etc.

Q25:

No. If the Refused Classification category is kept, it should only cover extreme illegal content such as child pornography.

Q26:

Having different classification laws in different states and territories (eg. X18+ legal for sale in the ACT and NT but nowhere else) is pointless and confusing. The country should have uniform laws regarding classification and be governed federally rather than by the state governments.

Q27:

As said above classification should be handled on a federal level and not decided by each individual state and territory.

Q28:

Yes, the current system is broken in that if one State or Territory Attorney-General disagrees on a classification issue brought to the table then the entire issue can not move forward. This is undemocratic and frustrating for the public.

Q29:

Keep to industry regulation with the ACB standing as a review board in the wake of complaints only.

Other comments: