CI 1488 T Neill

First name: Tim
Last name: Neill

Q1:
Improving key elements of the framework. The system works, it's just a bit behind the times.
Q2:
Focussing on classification only in order to set up a series of guidelines, not nanny the country.
Q3:
No.
Q4:
Yes, but at the end of the day there will always be complaints. It is better to cut out the headache of dealing with pointless bureaucracy and just put everything through the classification system
Q5:
No? What is being asked here? "Potential impact" is a vague and subjective term. How often will content be 're-classified'? The status quo is changing continuously, and the term "potential impact" should not be a determining catch-phrase in any new legislation.

As for part 2: What does this mean? Classified the same way? If so, then yes, of course. Children are the same across different media. There is no reason that passive interaction (such as television) should be classified (i.e. treated) in a different way to active interaction (such as video games). If there is a just cause for concern, then the content should be classified more strictly, basically.
Q6:
Not at all. This would effectively favour particular content producers, which is not the role of the classification board at all.
Q7:
There should be no restriction of any form to content in this field, merely consumer advice. In any case, children attending art exhibits will likely not fully comprehend what they are seeing, so it will be in the hands of the parent or guardian in any case, so informing these people should be the priority.
Q8:
There is no reason why this should not be the case. Content production is content production. That is, if a song reaches a level of saturation that one can hear it anywhere, it will have evidently passed all criteria for distribution (in terms of classification).
Q9:
This is entirely similar to at least three of the questions above.

No, the only thing that matters is the content itself, and how it scores against the checklist of criteria.
Q10:
It should always be classified if it is designed for distribution or consumption. Classification of materials on the Internet is a laborious and unfeasible task that should not be considered in this case.
Q11:

If it exists in the temporal plane and is created in order for other living, functioning human beings to experience it, then yes, classify the content.

Q12:

You cannot control access to online content, merely educate people on the what, where, and why. Attempting to classify a network of billions of interrelated nodes is a fool's errand and a monumental waste of human time and resources.

Q13:

See above. Education of both parents and children as to what the Internet is, how to stay out of trouble, cyber-crime, and other related issues that are not related to the content itself. In a perfect world, we would not have horrible things. This is not that world. We can only guide people (through education) as to what is "recommended" and what should be avoided.

In any case, and type of "control" applied to a beast such as the Internet would quickly fall out of date and be a tremendous waste of resources. You will find that we are also coming into a time where a generation of people who grew up with technology are having children. These people know and understand the consequences of this technology first- and second-hand. Limiting the vast amounts of information at their fingertips would be counteractive to a functional society.

Q14:

There doesn't appear to be a problem here. The weakest link in any system such as this is the human distributor, not the content producers. The classification in this regard appears to be an accepted norm. In any case, there is a larger move to digital distribution for these materials, so those businesses will be applying age-check measures themselves to avoid breaches in Australian law.

Q15:

This is too vague a question to intelligently answer. Always? What about standard fiction? Never? What about pornography? "Sometimes"? What is "sometimes"? There doesn't seem to be any problem with the "level" of advice given at this point, merely the brackets of classification that the system offers.

The formulation of a comprehensive set of guidelines will answer that question. This appears to be a chicken-and-egg question.

Q16:

Industry bodies have no place if the term "industry bodies" refers to content distributors or producers. At present, it appears as though there is a level of user interaction (i.e. this questionnaire). These types of polls need to be conducted more often in order to get a better feel for the status quo.

The government agencies, presumably, will be in charge of running the classification process. Probably in a way that wastes too much money and takes too much time.

Q17:

No, not at all. You are letting the inmates run the asylum. A goverment-regulated model of classification that can be applied to an industry (or industries) is much better than self-regulation.

Q18:

This question is rubbish. None.

Q19:

Why should films pay for their own classification? You are giving the green light for larger business to stomp all over smaller content producers in this case.

Q20:

They are understood, but the categories themselves are so dated that they have lost all meaning. There seems to be an inordinate volume of content in the vicinity of the "15 years" age bracket, which is a ridiculous and arbitrary number.

Q21:

Of course there is a need for new classification. A points-based system (although unwieldy) would be a better system than the current one, merely for its flexibility. As long as the system is open-ended, it will be a successful one.

Q22:

There is nothing wrong with the current consistency of markings from what I can tell. The shapes are quite distinct.

Q23:

If these content types are being treated differently based on their platform, then yes, they should, and this platform needs to be discounted.

Q24:

None. Breaking the law online is breaking the law offline. If people choose to incriminate themselves, that's their prerogative.

Q25:

This is a loaded question. Their should be no "refused classification" category, merely a sufficiently high rating.

Q26:

Absolutely. Promoted? We live in a digital age, this can happen in a heartbeat. This is a ridiculous question.

Q27:

No answer.

Q28:

If that's what needs to happen, then I don't see why not.

Q29:

As stated earlier, an open-ended system for classification will be the most flexible, moving forward.

Other comments: