

CI 526 F Qazi

First name: Fudz

Last name: Qazi

Q1:

Yes they should. The current system does not cater for content that is directed at adults over 18 years of age.

Q2:

To provide a set of guidelines for people as to what is contained in the content they are about to view, or what they might allow their children to view.

Q3:

Yes, only broadcast platforms should be considered under the classification system. All communication platforms should be exempt from such classification schemes (eg Phones, Internet)

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Only across broadcast media.

Q6:

Q7:

Only for providing consumer advice, and restricting access to minors.

Q8:

Only if the music/sound recordings are purchased through an Australian retailer, or across broadcast media.

Q9:

No

Q10:

Yes

Q11:

What the target audience of the content actually is.

Q12:

Education and client side parental controls. Anything that allows the govt to control access to a communications protocol should not exist in a Democratic country such as Australia.

Q13:

It can't. The only thing one can do is better educate children on the dangers of the internet. Parental controls are also an option (and often the best method).

Q14:

You will have to treat restricted offline content the same way as retailers treat cigarettes, keep them behind the counter.

Q15:

Any content that is targetted at adults

Q16:

Govt agencies should design the framework of the BROADCAST classification scheme, and educate the relavant industry bodies about it.

Industry bodies need to acknowledge that their product isn't for everyone and warn people accordingly. Users need to regulate themselves, and educate their dependants.

Q17:

Q18:

Childrens content.

Q19:

Small indie films, games, tv shows should be subsidised

Q20:

The current categories are pretty well understood, except for the fact that there is no adult category (18+ or 21+) for video games.

Q21:

Yes, 18+ or 21+ category for video games.

Q22:

Keep the same, or similar markings to reduce consumer confusion.

Q23:

Yes it should (someone obviously had some fun writing the above question)

Q24:

you cannot prohibit content online, it is technically impossible as it is a communications platform, not a broadcast platform.

Q25:

The scope is irrelevant as a democratic society cannot prohibit/censor content transmitted over a communications platform.

Q26:

Yes, it should be promoted as a unified system across the nation. There should be no ambiguity when it comes to broadcast or retail content nationwide.

Q27:

A liberal one, with a lot of emphasis on education (as opposed to censorship or any such eradication of civil liberties)

Q28:

As long as the framework is liberal, then yes.

Q29:

Having a 18+ or 21+ category for video games.

Other comments:

Many politicians seem to think that it is possible to censor content online, and bring in nationwide filters under the guise of "protecting the children". While I do not condone showing adult content to minors, or promote the sharing of explicit images of underage humans, bringing nationwide filters will not stop the problem (contrary to what the Govts of the UK or France will have you believe). These nefarious communities work with encrypted channels within the internet and beyond the scope of ANY such filters. They have to be dealt with using regular police work (and I'm all for that). Also, as there is no oversight to this blacklist that will be used to filter content, and any successive govts may be tempted to censor content it does not like (any govt, no matter from which country, is not above corruption).