

CI 882 A King

First name: Alex

Last name: King

Q1:

I think it should improve its existing framework

Q2:

to warn people of the content that is in the media they are buying. seriously banning it is dumb if anyone wanted R18+ stuff they would download it illegally all the ban does is hurt local sellers.

Q3:

if the content platform already has strict clarification such as the app store, then it seems pointless. why make developers pay an extra \$400 to get your app classified twice. an example you make bus time table app you submit it to the app store you have to pay \$100 to get it classified by apple then an extra \$400 so Australian developers are already -\$500 at the start of deployment, killing Australian devs.

Q4:

I think thats a good idea, saves time and money

Q5:

yes, yes that seems fair

Q6:

yes if there is distributors that doesnt allow anyone over 18 into the store or only allows for 18s to register then it makes sense.

Q7:

i think artwork shouldn't be classified.

Q8:

omg no its so annoying. why change that artist's work? why not put a shirt and pants on all of the stone statues in the art gallery

Q9:

yes if there is like a club or a bar everyone is over 18

Q10:

no

Q11:

who is mostly going to see it. weather it will be more effort then result to classify it (apple store)

Q12:

omg why do you want to? the internet filter is such a bad idea the problem is the government things kids are dumber then them, if a child wanted to look at something i would take them 15min tops to get pass any filter the government thinks will protect them.

Q13:

it shouldn't be there is no point. seriously my dad tried to block me one time when i was 13 i was like fine this will help me work but as soon as it stopped me doing something i wanted to do, it annoyed me and i broke it in 1min 1st try. i realize you have to do something so just do something that doesn't cost much money cause its really not going to work

Q14:

card people. on sexually explicit magazines why they hell are small boobs and inner lips not allowed? so only perfect looking women are allow in porn mag? there is something wrong with the classification board that is messed up. so girls have to look unnaturally perfect to be in magazines? what needs to be controlled is you

Q15:

before its seen

Q16:

to sort the content into groups and ban generally unacceptable material (child porn and stuff)

Q17:

yes way better.

Q18:

games,mobile apps,the internet

Q19:

when its grossly wrong, yes. if the classification is fine why change it.

Q20:

yes they are understood , although there should be a R18+ rating, its supported around the world why are we behind?

Q21:

R18+ for movies and games. i think its well stepped.

Q22:

it would be based on games , tv shows, movies, magazines. compare magazines against magazines. games against movies tv shows and games plus take into the account of acting out the action. so if a movies nudity and is MA a game with nudity should be MA

Q23:

i think it should be revised, Australian has some of the strongest classification in the world i think we should ease up

Q24:

Im going to say none. the internet should be free for everyone. if you start blocking things where does it stop? and if your trying to stop people, they will just go somewhere else it would be easier to let them be and just catch them while they aren't hiding

Q25:

nope

Q26:

not really

Q27:

national classification

Q28:

no, why cant we just do it

Q29:

dont do ridiculous things?

Other comments:

just add a R18+ rating. Make the laws normal and not force unrealistic ideas on people get the inner lips and small breast laws removed omg.leave the internet and mobile app devs alone.