

CI 1267 A Monterosso

First name: Adam

Last name: Monterosso

Q1:

New framework. The existing framework is terrible and is the laughing stock for the civilised world.

Q2:

To ensure that citizens are properly informed on a media's content so that they can effectively choose what media they wish to consume and are properly warned of content that they may find offensive.

NOT to restrict the choices of Adults.

Q3:

No, the way content is delivered is immaterial. In order for the platform to stay relevant it should not refer to specific delivery technologies.

Q4:

A complaint is an inconsistent measurement for whether a content should be classified or not.

Currently many complaints are based on religious or other bias which are irrelevant when it comes to what content citizens should consume.

Q5:

Content should be classified safe for children as a guideline for parents to know what is suitable for kids in certain age groups. This however should be a guideline. For example religious groups may find sexual education of any form unsuitable for any children of any age. This is a view not held by a majority of society but these groups are often the most vocal and thus could affect views on whether content has any negative impact.

Q6:

Possibly, large industries are self regulated, if they fail to properly inform their audiences they often lose competitive edge. It makes no sense for a distributor to offer content to the wrong audiences. It also makes no sense to restrict an adult audience from viewing adult content, regardless of medium.

Q7:

What is considered an artwork? Is game design any less of a work of art than a painting? Is a nude painting considered offensive and thus should be classified? Who determines what is offensive? This is where trying to choose what adults view and consume fails.

Q8:

It should be rated for the audience, but not refused sale.

Q9:

Should the government step in to advise a large audience of what content they should consume? The answer is no.

Q10:

The public should be able to make an informed decision on viewing content. If it is public then they will make that decision on the spot and either walk the other way or stop and consume that content.

Q11:

A distinction needs to be made in what classification means. If it means that the government will actually prevent members of the public from obtaining this content then the burden is on the government to produce evidence that it is acting in the public interest and not acting on the bias of a minority, ie religious views.

Q12:

The internet is a free and open medium. No measures should be taken to restrict access under any circumstances. If material is illegal, likely to cause harm or the result of harm caused (child pornography) then resources and law enforcement efforts should be direct at protecting citizens from harm before content is created. If it does nothing to help children if they are abused and content is simply not visible to the general public, it is more effective to prevent the abuse in the first place. It is well known that any methods currently proposed by the government do not actually address the mediums by which this content is distributed and so constitutes an inappropriate and wasteful measure.

Q13:

By parenting. How do we stop them playing with matches? By banning matches?

Q14:

The only audience that we would wish to control access to for this material is minors. This means parenting is again the answer. If we are talking about adults, where is the government suggesting that they should at all control what an adult views?

Q15:

At any time when it is not clearly obvious to the common man that the content may be inappropriate for children or not meet their reasonable expectations. It should be advice, not a restriction.

Q16:

Government agencies should regulate a consistent framework for advice across all information mediums. Industry bodies should ensure they adhere to this framework, users should ensure that they are performing their duty of care if they are legally responsible for children viewing content.

Q17:

Absolutely, many solutions would be more effective than the current arrangements.

Q18:

Pornography is not sold in a milk bar, it is not accidentally found in the Sunday paper, it is obvious that it is adult content for adults to decide to seek out. Content that may be found in a location accessible by children should have warnings for parents so they understand that the content is not suitable for their children. Retailers / businesses should take responsibility for not advertising in a way that children may be accidentally targeted.

Q19:

The government does not need to subsidise or classify an independent film. The industry can self-classify and advise their audiences of what their film is about. Then the public can choose whether or not they wish to see it. The government is not needed.

Q20:

MA15+ is clearly the category that makes no sense as there is a big difference between a 15 year old and an 18 year old. We consider 18 to be adult age in Australia, and therefore the lack of an adult

category is extremely confusing. Due to this there is confusion around the highest current category which is MA15+

Q21:

An R18+ category simply needs to be available for what is reasonably considered adult content. This frees up MA15 to be simply "Teens" and no questionable content is then squeezed in.

Q22:

This already exists. There are clear labels already but Australia lacks an R18+ for games.

Q23:

If necessary, there is no reason to treat games as a separate medium of artistic expression.

Q24:

None. It is not up to the government to choose what content is consumed by the public. If there is bomb making instructions then that should be handled at the source, not as a general filter. If there is child pornography then again the crime is happening to the children and needs to be stopped at the children. Blocking this content does not help them and has been proven to be ineffective as the Internet browser is not the avenue that they use to distribute / view.

Q25:

No. There should be no RC. You should not be able to decide what an adult views.

Q26:

Yes, it makes sense that we have a consistent system of advice around content.

Q27:

A country-wide scheme.

Q28:

Yes, there is no reason we need to have differences between the states.

Q29:

Simply treat adults like adults and allow them to make choices for what content they wish to consume. Ensure parents are educated and understand their roles in parenting and protecting children from content they are not old enough to understand or view.

Other comments: