

CI 907 E Mikulic

First name: Emil

Last name: Mikulic

Q1:

Q2:

To provide guidelines on how consumers can get advice on content.

Q3:

No. Because it's irrelevant. Every kind of content can be format-shifted.

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

No. This appears arbitrary and unfair. Small producers should not be, and should not be seen to be, disadvantaged.

Q7:

The exhibitor should decide.

Q8:

All formats should be on equal ground.

Q9:

No. This is even worse than Q6 because it appears to treat minority groups differently on the audience side of the equation.

Q10:

This is not a distinction. All content will be accessed everywhere.

Q11:

Q12:

Restricting access to content on the internet is impossible. Grandstanding about doing it makes us look stupid as a country.

Q13:

With parenting.

Q14:

Q15:

Retails should decide whether to display advice.

Q16:

Consumers should regulate their own consumption.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

I hear video games have insufficient coverage. This should be fixed.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

The same laws should apply to online content as they do to non-online content. In part because this is not a distinction: any kind of content can be placed online.

We should be careful not to conflate prohibition (which can be a reasonable thing to do with the law) with access control (which is impossible in practical terms)

Q25:

If it's Refused Classification offline then it should be Refused Classification online. If it's not illegal to own offline, then it should not be illegal to own and access online.

Q26:

It's important to have less consistency between states in the future, so that consumers will have more choice about where to live and conduct commerce.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: