

CI 878 S Wehrle

First name: Sebastian

Last name: Wehrle

Q1:

A new framework is needed. Consumers should have better and different information (from current contexts) available about the kinds of interactions in a medium. Films and other passive media differ in the contextual experience of a "videogame".

Q2:

To properly alert consumers to the nature of the content they are purchasing / participating in.

Q3:

No, but it should affect the way in which it is classified.

Q4:

No, all commercially available content should be classified (content that is "free" should also require classification if it is distributed through a "marketplace" or as an addition to material being sold).

Q5:

No, it should however be a key factor in restrictions placed on sale and use (R18+).

All content that is not of scientific or documentary purpose should require classification across all media, regardless of whether it is designed for children or not.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Any artwork that causes controversy should be examined upon the receipt of a complaint about an uninformed experience. I believe most place exhibiting works would be quite good at alerting the viewing public to the nature of the content.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Define "public". Films, books, music, video games, well pretty much all content can all be accessed in public if "public" is sitting on the train, travelling in a car, sitting in a park. In other words, no.

Q11:

Will the act of experiencing this content by informed and consenting persons cause real and measurable harm to said persons. Also, in experiencing the available content has said persons knowingly or otherwise aided in the uninformed, involuntary, real and measurable harm caused to other persons in order to create or produce the content being consumed.

Q12:

I don't know, but as a parent I would hope that I will be involved in my children's online experiences; when they start to use a computer.

I think it's up to parents and commercial public internet providers. With clear classifications they can make an informed decision.

Q13:

Parents, in conjunction with ISPs.

Q14:

The clear classification of content and age restrictions on purchase. The main control however, they're called parents, and some of them need to get more involved in their children's lives.

Q15:

When it is for sale or marketed consumption.

Q16:

Government: Classification, clear guidelines and overseeing regulation. Policing of restrictions and suitable ramifications for failure to comply for individuals and corporations.

Industry: Enforcement of age restrictions and self monitoring to anticipate content classification using the clear guidelines provided by government.

Users: Responsible use and availability of restricted content. (don't watch porn on the bus)

Q17:

Possibly, but there would have to be a very clear code. A review process involving government for content that the industry feels there may be potential for concern, and legal ramifications for any form of deception or abuse by any party involved, including the government.

Q18:

With a comprehensive and clear set of guidelines, all content. In reality, anything that obviously falls short of potential for age restrictions.

Q19:

A more effective system might be a very small per-sale cut. Say 0.05%. If the content sells well the publishers more than pay for the classification process but with no out of pocket expenses.

Q20:

MA15+ people do not understand that it is actually an age restriction on sales of the content.

Q21:

Just lose the M and have content rated either PG or MA15+.

Q22:

I'm not sure... Take the worst case that is acceptable for a particular current classification in all formats, take the worst of those, and make that the benchmark for all other formats?

Q23:

Yes, but carefully.

Q24:

Factual depictions of acts of victimisation and violence (sexual or otherwise) against persons whom have not offered or are unable to give their consent.

Q25:

No. It is too inconsistently restrictive against fictional scenarios within Films and Games.

Q26:

Yes, the individual state and territory laws should be abolished. One classification system nationwide please.

Q27:

Federal guidelines, laws and enforcement.

Q28:

Yes, but the Commonwealth should take into consideration input from the states during the process.

Q29:

By excluding persons from the entire process who may have motivations based on any form of religious doctrine.

Other comments: