CI 188 N Morris

First name: Natalie

Last name: Morris

Q1:

Develop a new framework

Q2:

Rate the maturity level recommended to watch/use/read the media.

Q3:

No, it should not. Violence in a video game is no difference to violence in a movie and vice versa.

Q4:

No, things should be classified regardless of whether there is a complaint or not.

Q5:

In general, the potential impact shouldn't matter that much. In the case of things target specially at children however, it should be classified as such across all medias.

Q6:

No

Q7:

For providing consumer advice, yes.

Q8:

Not really, perhaps a warning if the contain strong language or themes, but not a rating in the traditional sense.

Q9:

No

Q10:

Public content needs to be classified, however solely private content may not. (Depending on circumstances)

Q11:

Who it is targeted at.

Q12:

It is close to impossible to restrict access to online content. Instead, the focus should be that people who access illegal content (ie, something which required an illegal act to create it) are found a

prosecuted. It is meaningless and frustrating to attempt to control access online in a traditional sense.

Q13:

Parents. Have the government create a voluntary filter which parents can easily adopt (I believe there was something like this in the Howard government?) Offer basic training on how to implement it, and also encourage parents to keep the computer in the living room or something while the children are young.

Q14:

To my understanding, it is already adequately controlled. Use if IDs to purchase it, and having it in a closed of space essentially.

Q15:

Yes

Q16:

First the industry should issue a rating it deems fit, then the government should 'double check' in a sense to see whether it is appropriate, then after its released, of consumers don't agree with the rating given they can challenge it and provide submissions so it is reassessed in light of these.

Q17:

Yes. The government should work as a safeguard for industry regulations.

Q18:

Industry should classify and the government double check.

Q19:

Ideally, yes. Look at the budget for the film, and if it is under x amount, allow a % subsidy from the classification cost.

Q20:

Yes, they are understood.

Q21:

Refused classification criteria should be tightened, and anything refused classification should have a mandatory extra committee agree on it. Also, R18 for games! It's silly that there isn't this already.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

None. It's extremely difficult to prohibit content online, and you will always have major internet groups condemning and working against it. Your best bet is to focus on catching people who view child

pornography and the like, and prosecute them, as opposed to trying to ban masses of things.

Q25:

No

Q26:

Yes, it is. I understand the states wants to self govern etc, but it is extremely complicated to have different ratings between states, and there should be an attempt at consolidation. (Similar to how the new Australian Consumer Law was implemented)

Q27:

A new cth one which has an R18 rating for games!

Q28:

Yes. However they should retain the ability to challenge classifications on a case by case basis, in order to both act as a safeguard and provide for unique circumstances of their state.

Q29:

R18 for games, stringent requirements for refused classification.

Other comments:

R18 for games.