CI 101 R Nehmy

First name: Richard
Last name: Nehmy

Q1: A new framework to cater for changes in technology and community standards and requirements.

Q2: To protect the vulnerable and to advise and inform. Existing legislation should be used to deal with issues not falling within this category.

Q3: No - the content is the issue.

Q4: No, classify everything - retrospective or reactive classification can result in significant distortions of the overall system.

Q5: No - assessment of potential impact could be very problematic. Yes

Q6: Not generally, but there are shades of grey, ie user generated content. However, consistency is a virtue - ie should not have unclassified films screened at film festivals.....if they can be screened once, they should be freely available....

Q7: For consistency, yes

Q8: For consistency, yes

Q9: No, but user generated content could be an issue. However, once classified, content should be generally available. For example, if a film is exempted for viewing at a Film Festival it should also be available for general access.

Q10: No, but level of classification and access could differ, depending on how accessed.

Q11: If we are to classify, classify all content in relation to protection, advice, information and consistency.

Q12: At platform/ISP level

Q13: Ultimately, its a parental responsibility, but some basic technological safeguards - passwords etc.

Q14: Restricted areas.

Q15: Anything above a "G"

Q16: A co-regulatory model. User generated content should be moderated/regulated by the host.

Q17: Yes. See Q 17

Q18: Anything either similar, consistently rated at a similar level in similar markets elsewhere, Film Festivals directly importing (but then make available for wider rescreening to group members). For books music, magazines, games etc similar standards should apply, and allow Film Festival type direct importation.

Q19: Distinguish between Australian and overseas generated content, subsidisde small, independent films on the basis of overall production costs, including Federal or State funding (not guarantees)

Q20: Its very messy......and, for example, individual TV stations appear to use differing systems, even given industry standards. Further, distinctions such as M and MA are not well understood. The film system, up to and included X but minus MA would seem to be the best understood.

Q21: See above. Perhaps include the Television P and C classifications as well, for DVDs etc.

Q22: See above - recognise content, perhaps with platforms as subsets, then minimise any differences/distortions - ie recognise potential fior different impacts between platforms without adding subjective assessments.

Q23: See above - yes - simplicity, ease of classification, community understanding

Q24: Illegal Acts not within the context of enterrtainment or education/information. Of course the tricky part is how much of a terrorist bomb manufacturing process could be shown in a blockbuster action movie.

Q25: It would appear that some content portraying activity which is not illegal is currently covered. Consistency would dictate that, if its not illegal, it should not be refused classification.

Q26: Absolutely - promote via Commonwealth encouragement/promulgation of proposed national system resulting from this review.

Q27: Referral of powers, with Commonwealth legislation under S51 of the constitution as a backup.

Q28: Yes - see above

Q29: Define content and classificationsas objectively as possible.

Other comments: The tension between individual freedom and community requirements is always going to be an issue, but in a mature first world society which acknowledges the need to protect the vulnerable, adults must still be treated as such, but provided with sufficient information to make informed choices.