

CI 1080 A Williams

First name: Aidan

Last name: Williams

Q1:

New framework

Q2:

reducing the level of censorship adult video gamers are subject to, while providing extra protection to minors from inappropriate content

Q3:

No. Content should be classified in isolation, irrespective of the platform used to consume it.

Q4:

As Australians we should have the ability to make our own judgements on what we deem appropriate for ourselves and our children, and not be subject to the whims of those who are motivated to rail against content they find objectionable, simply because they feel they know what is best for us.

Q5:

Yes. Purchasing content which is clearly, or questionably inappropriate for children should require photo ID as proof of age

Q6:

No

Q7:

Yes

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

Yes

Q11:

Content classification should be minimalistic, allowing consumers to use their own discretion when choosing content

Q12:

The most effective would be a national whitelist of approved sites, but that would render the Internet all but useless, as new sites appear far too quickly for any whitelist to keep up in any meaningful manner... but nothing can prevent a person employing some kind of proxy to bypass any content filter put in place by anyone.

Q13:

Parents should take personal responsibility for their children's online activities. To suggest anything else seems like a dereliction of parental duty.

Q14:

It can't. You can only play cat and mouse. Any form of filtering or restriction put in place can be circumvented by a motivated individual.

Q15:

When displayed in public

Q16:

Classification; approval/rejection of government classification; personal discretion.

Q17:

I would imagine so.

Q18:

Anything specifically designed for pre-teen children

Q19:

Yes

Q20:

I believe I understand them, though I can't speak for everybody

Q21:

Yes. A restricted classification for video games should be introduced to allow adults to not be subject to the personal judgement of content censors.

Q22:

A standard, broad classification scheme across many types of content (video games, movies, television, music, etc)

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Content should be prohibited on a case by case basis (child porn, snuff, etc), though the enforcement of this prohibition would be ultimately futile.

Q25:

No

Q26:

Yes. It places undue burden on content creators to tailor their content not just for Australia, but for its individual states.

Q27:

A national content classification scheme, without need for censorship

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

It could be a lot less puritanical.

Other comments: