

CI 1701 K Haines

First name: Kevin

Last name: Haines

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework

Q2:

Consistency of classification across different media types, as well as across all states and territories.

Q3:

Definitely not.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

No. This presumes we can accurately assess the impact in advance. Childrens content should be classified across all media.

Q6:

Definitely not. This would create a potential classification loophole which content producers WOULD take advantage of.

Q7:

Q8:

Yes, where the recording contains dialogue. Spoken words can be just as classifiable as written words.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

I don't believe there are any truly effective methods.

Q13:

As a parent, I believe it is my job to protect my children. I do not expect to rely on government or other mechanisms.

Q14:

Existing measures are sufficient.

Q15:

Whenever one has be assigned. If it's been classified, show the classification. An alternative would be to consider 'G' rated material to not require a classification - but having the 'G' is a positive reassurance to parents that the item has been reviewed and classified.

Q16:

Q17:

This may be too prone to 'drift' due to industry constantly trying to push the limits.

Q18:

I think the final classification should lie with a body such as the Australian Classification Board - however if industry can provide the expected classification up front, this should be beneficial.

Q19:

Q20:

I believe so. If there is an area of confusion, I believe it would be between M and MA15+ - although reading the definitions makes it clear,

Q21:

Consider removal of the E (Exempt from classification) self-assessed category. As is only applicable to specific materials & must be at most PG content, removing this classification would simplify the system with minimal impact.

Q22:

Use the existing film classification markings.

Q23:

Yes. Create a common set of classification rules, which are media agnostic. With the rate of technology, who knows there we will be in another ten years.

Q24:

Illegal content. Restriction of this can be handled by law enforcement agencies as per current practice.

Q25:

The RC category's role should be limited to material that is restricted under other criminal laws.

Q26:

The danger in consistency is the simplest solution is all states are limited to the tightest existing standards (i.e. the most restrictive state imposes their limits on others). While consistency across states is desirable, it should not be to the detriment of those more permissive states & territories.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: