

CI 2472 K Gilroy

Full name: Kate Gilroy

Proposal 5-1:

Adults should be able to see, hear and read whatever they please. Effective filtering options should be available on an opt in basis.

Proposal 5-2:

Abolish Act introduce an advisory code that provides for all types of media content.

Proposal 5-3:

A single agency should provide advice, not regulation.

Proposal 5-4:

Yes - but for the code.

Proposal 6-1 :

TV is already self regulating. Cinema could be regulated by the distributors.

Proposal 6-2:

Self regulation by games distributors.

Proposal 6-3:

As we recommend a code, not and Act, there is no need for exemptions.

Proposal 6-4:

See above.

The current situation with the Territories, is anomalous and absurd.

Proposal 6-5:

See above.

Proposal 6-6:

N/A

Proposal 6-7:

N/A

Proposal 6-8:

This should be applicable across the board.

Proposal 7-1:

Self regulation, with a board of review (Media Content Advisory Board)

Proposal 7-2:

Self regulation to provide media content advice

Question 7-1 :

See above

Proposal 7-3:

See above

Proposal 7-4:

Certification should be available for people working as media content advisory officers.

Proposal 7-5:

Guidelines will inform the instruments which can be used by the media content advisor.

Question 7-2:

Australian Qualifications Framework

Proposal 7-6:

The classification board should be abolished and just the review board left to respond to appeals.

Proposal 7-7:

No

Proposal 8-1 :

Distributors should maintain their responsibility to ensure age appropriate restrictions.

Proposal 8-2:

Distributors should maintain their responsibility to ensure age appropriate restrictions.

Proposal 8-3:

Fine.

Proposal 8-4:

Filters should be available, but opt in.

Question 8-1:

Their self regulation should provide for that.

Proposal 8-5:

This should be strongly recommended. In fact ancillary regulations should make this mandatory.

Proposal 8-6 :

Again this should be strongly recommended. In fact ancillary regulations should make this mandatory

Proposal 9-1 :

These should be advisory.

Proposal 9-2:

Fine

Proposal 9-3:

Yes

Proposal 9-4 :

Yes

Proposal 9-5 :

Yes - sociologists need employment too

Proposal 10-1:

Should just be subject to current criminal law

Proposal 11-1:

The code and the office and the regulations are all that is required.

Proposal 11-2 :

Only complaints should go to the media content review board.

Proposal 11-3 :

The chief media content advisor should do this.

Proposal 11-4:

Make it complaints driven if the self regulation is failing

Question 12-1:

The media content review board should fullfil this function.

Proposal 12-1 :

Our proposed media content review board should be responsible.

Proposal 13-1 :

Fine for a code

Proposal 13-2:

Yes

Proposal 14-1 :

Yes but through Telecommunications and Broadcasting Act or the Crimes Act

Proposal 14-2 :

Proposal 14-3:

Under other legislation

Proposal 14-4:

No need for new crimes.

Proposal 14-5 :

OK

Upload supporting documents:

[wocau.pdf](#)