

CI 1083 S Panetta

First name: Stephen

Last name: Panetta

Q1:

Q2:

The objective should be to identify and highlight relevant content and educate consumers so that they are able to make informed purchasing decisions. It should not affect the availability of reasonable content.

Q3:

There is no reason content should be classified differently across different mediums. However in the context of a dynamic technology such as the Internet, it is impossible to accurately classify content as it changes so frequently.

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Who decides what the potential impact and target market is? If a piece of content identifies itself as designed for children, then yes it should be classified.

Q6:

Dynamic and emerging technologies would be hindered by classification and should instead rely on a complaints process. In particular, technologies where a significant portion of the content and experience is provided by the users of the content (such as user generated content or online communities).

Q7:

For providing consumer advice, yes.

Q8:

They should be classified but not strongly regulated.

Q9:

Yes

Q10:

In general, yes. Privately consumed content should not require classification except as a guide

Q11:

Q12:

Education

Q13:

Parents should closely monitor their children's Internet browsing.

Parents should not be lulled into a false sense of security with an inadequate solution.

Parents should be able to install optional software on their computers which can do the heavy processing required to identify suspect pieces of content. The parents should then have the option of allowing or disallowing the content (for the case when a false positive or negative is found)

Q14:

There is no pressing need to control this more than it currently is. To buy a magazine such as this, ID is required.

Q15:

Q16:

It should be the role of government agencies and industry bodies to classify content to identify and accurately state the intended audience for the product. Government agencies should not regulate the availability of content unless that content can directly cause harm to individuals

Q17:

yes

Q18:

User generated content, content with direct and clear comparisons (i.e prior classifications)

Q19:

The Government should always subsidise classifications. Small ventures and independent entertainment should not be charged.

Q20:

Classification categories across film, television, literature and video games should be identically marked. There should be no special case given to one medium over another. The lack of an R18 rating for video games causes a huge amount of confusion as to the legitimacy of the system. This undermines the basic idea that the classification system is there to help consumers make informed decisions and instead makes the classification system appear intent on restricting our freedoms.

Q21:

There is a definite need for an R18 category for video games. There is no reason to refuse adults availability to something that is suitable for them. Category labels should remain consistent across different mediums.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Q25:

No. The scope of RC is far too large to prohibit the content that is available online.

Q26:

No.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: