

CI 767 D Quant

First name: David

Last name: Quant

Q1:

Improve the present framework.

Q2:

Streamlining media formats together. Providing clear details of content to the consumer is also of far more import than content restriction to the consumer.

Q3:

No, all media formats can connect with the user and some users connect more effectively to one format over another, as a result in my eyes it would appear bias to make claims of one media having more effect than another.

Q4:

Yes, if no one minds it, why control it?

Q5:

It is important to point out what is safe for children in all media formats definitively. As to impact control, the perception of content impact appears to directed by media scandals more than factual studies, so I would be wary of implementing too many controls on such a subjective concept.

Q6:

Only to a degree, it would be a waste or resources to review every B-grade piece of media to hit Australian shores, but anything of note should be classified to the same standard (rather than say, more strict classification on larger name products).

Q7:

No, I don't see any reason at all to waste the resources of both producers and the government on something as pointless as this.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

Public media does have a need for classification more than private if only to maintain an external moral aesthetic.

Q11:

Practicality of classification, ie: if it is online content at least in part created by the user, it seems impractical to assess, so maybe only asses the content the producer has included in such a case.

Q12:

Teaching people to avoid content they don't wish to view, teaching users to take responsibility for their own and their children's consumption habits.

Q13:

A government subsidy on net nanny programs and access to community minded computer literacy courses for parents. Then if they want to control the content their children can access they have the

tools and skills available to do so. This approach has another advantage of not punishing none parents in their product use (ie: internet speed for the service they pay for) and it drains minimal national resources for an individual problem (unlike the ISP based internet filter).

Q14:

It is already bagged and limited to R rating in many states, I don't think more needs to be done.

Q15:

All content classified should state what the content contains, that's the point of classification, to allow the consumer to make informed choices.

Q16:

Minimal on the personal level, perhaps more so if a producer is trying to side-step classification of their content.

Q17:

Much more in my mind, less drain on the tax payer and more responsibility for the producer (who know their market better than an independent body would) it's a win-win.

Q18:

Most genre's of media are straight forward and obvious as to their content, it's how they gain definition in the market and a customer base.

Q19:

Only if they would otherwise be banned, it's hardly fair to only allow the large scale producers the chance at marketable creativity.

Q20:

Lack of R rating in video games is an issue, and I think some parents struggle with the PG to M difference.

Q21:

I think it's a well structured system, bar the lack of R for video games and X for most media formats.

Q22:

Streamline on content rather than perception of impact.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

None online, it's counter productive to try to control it all and would be more resource effective to deal with the results of media access (ie: arrest the consumers of kiddie porn rather than trying to stop them being able to access it, they will find a way regardless of fences, but removing them from common society can only be beneficial).

Q25:

No

Q26:

I'm not fussed on this, consistency is good, but I would also think a state government would know the desires of their demographics better than a federal organisation.

Q27:

Maybe a minimal one? Seems to work well enough for the USA

Q28:

Maybe

Q29:

A focus on information and accuracy over control.

Other comments: