

CI 226 L Rosa

First name: Luke

Last name: Rosa

Q1:

Developing a new framework.

Q2:

It should seek to educate users about the content contained within a good. It should not seek to ban a good by perceived values held by the community.

Q3:

Yes. Platforms like Apple's app store (iOS and OS X, as well as Android/Windows 7) already provides classification and with so many apps, classifying each one would be extremely expensive and redundant. The focus should be on areas where there aren't already classifications provided by the platform.

Q4:

Yes. For example, outdoor advertising.

Q5:

No. Content for children is quite straight forward and should be classified by the industry. The perceived impact of a good should not be the basis on which classification is decided.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No!

Q8:

Yes, music should be. Audio books should not be classified.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

The cost/length if time needed for classification.

Q12:

Not through the use of a filter. Through education and extra resources for the Federal Police.

Q13:

Through education. Parents should take an active role in teaching their children appropriate behaviour online. It should not be the government's role. However, optional filtering software and education pamphlets should be free for parents.

Q14:

It shouldn't be 'controlled' per se. Restricted magazines or movies, etc, should not be hidden in separate rooms, behind curtains, etc. However I do believe that they should be covered with a piece of paper (like what was done in Borders) and put on a higher shelf away from the reach of children.

Q15:

All of the time for goods that I've indicated should be classified.

Q16:

Preferably it should be done by the industry. This won't always happen, of course. So governments should only step in when there has been a market failure. Users should have a method of complaining (an appeals process) about the classification of a certain good.

Q17:

Current arrangements seek to decide the morals and values held by its citizens (e.g. Ban of R18+ games). This should not be the aim of classification and should instead seek to educate users on the material contained within the good. It should not seek to ban the good.

Q18:

Things like mobile phone applications, computer applications (excluding games), magazines, etc. Things of this nature should not be classified by government.

Q19:

Yes. As the classification system as it currently stands is extremely expensive and would only relegate independent films to failure/drive them underground.

Q20:

R18+ causes confusion. It seems to hint that anything with adult material should be given an R18+ classification. But then some goods with adult material is banned. This becomes confusing.

Q21:

No.

Q22:

It shouldn't be converged. Classifications for physical media (e.g. Books) is a very different beast to classification for applications or websites. Each should be treated with the obvious differences.

Q23:

Q24:

Only content that can have a consensus in the community should be banned (e.g. child pornography).
But there should be an appeals process for individuals to fight against a ban.

Q25:

No. Access to drug, euthanasia, information should not be prohibited. Neither should adult material (e.g. Pornography).

Q26:

Government classification, again, should not seek to impose morals on citizens. Classification should be a duty of the Federal Government.

Q27:

Q28:

Yea, but a consensus should first be reached across all states on the new classification system.

Q29:

Don't base it so much on perceived morales of the community. Content that can be classified as educational should not be banned (e.g. euthanasia information).

Other comments: