

CI 925 A Knoll

First name: Avi

Last name: Knoll

Q1:

Developing a new framework, or at least introducing adult-only classifications such as R and X consistent across various media.

Q2:

Providing a framework that clearly advises the public with regards to the nature of media content. If an adult wants to buy a video, they should be able to know if it will contain excessive violence or pornography. If parents want to purchase media for their children, it should be immediately apparent what items are or are not appropriate for their children. No adult should be prevented from buying pornographic or cartoon-violent material because religious lobby groups believe the material is inappropriate.

Q3:

Yes: Books and written media should never be classified.

Q4:

Yes: It is impractical to classify online content as it is produced.

Q5:

Yes: Libelous or inciteful material should be classified on that basis. Material targeted at children should always be classified, so that parents can make informed decisions for their children.

Q6:

Q7:

No! Definitely not.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Only in that private publications cannot be reasonably classified.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

Reviewing material based on submitted complaints is the only realistic approach to classifying online material. There is simply too much of it, produced too quickly, for all material to be classified without stifling public discourse.

Q13:

Educate their parents.

Q14:

If proof of age checks are required, then there should be no problem.

Q15:

When it may be inappropriate for children, or harmful to the health of consumers.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

You cannot reasonably restrict access to online content, although it is beneficial to restrict the *publication* of libelous or inciteful material online from Australia sources.

Q25:

No. The current scope of the refused classification category is far too broad.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: