

CI 1630 G Williams

First name: Geoff

Last name: Williams

Q1:

A new framework should be developed, taking into account the modern day ethos and views.

Q2:

To apply a rational and transparent label to products that is easily understandable by the general public, and accepted as a sensible guideline.

Q3:

No. Classification should be based on the nature of the content, rather than the method used to access it.

Q4:

Yes. All content that is not refused should be presumed to be pre-classification.

Q5:

The potential impact should be considered. Much content will be self-limiting in its audience, and will not be a problem. The risks with designing everything for children is that we stop behaving like adults.

Q6:

Yes. Classifying small, niche exhibitions that are not likely to have a wide impact only serves to waste resources better used elsewhere. Classifying high-impact material pre-release, and other material when complaints are made optimises resource use and requires consumers to actively consider whether something is appropriate.

Q7:

Yes. High-impact material should be classified.

Q8:

Yes. High-impact material should be classified.

Q9:

Yes.

Q10:

Yes. Private viewing requires an element of discretion and requires that the consumer consider their choice more carefully. Governmental classification is unnecessary interference.

Q11:

Intent, popular ethics of the time.

Q12:

Education of consumers to respect and consider the classifications seriously. In a free society, you cannot control people like animals, but you can make the thought of viewing material distasteful.

Educate people to choose not to view restricted material.

Q13:

Better parenting and supervision.

Q14:

Education, regulation of distributors.

Q15:

When it is classified. Material not yet classified should not bear classification advice.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide trusted advice that people can use to base decisions on. Industry bodies should actively discourage unintended groups, and should support the agencies. Users ultimately need to be educated enough to make a personal choice.

Q17:

Possibly. A trial would need to be conducted to properly answer this.

Q18:

Industry should not classify material, but rather should provide advice of intended audience. Only government agencies should classify material.

Q19:

Subsidies should be based on the size of the producer, rather than the classification of the material.

Q20:

Generally, classifications are understood but not respected.

Q21:

Possibly "NR" - not recommended for viewing (e.g. technically "legal" material, but of such an offensive nature that the content is nearly prohibited).

Q22:

Government agencies should apply the same criteria across all media formats.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Illegal material

Q25:

No, it is entirely too limiting.

Q26:

Yes. Classification should be consistent, and the federal government should appeal to states to subscribe to a national standard.

Q27:

Call it whatever you like. Legislation should be focussed on guiding the public on choice of entertainment material.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Make requests easily available and widely publicised.

Other comments: