

CI 1892 P Starkey

First name: Paul

Last name: Starkey

Q1:

I think the existing framework is fine as it is clear and understandable. But I feel that it just needs to be made consistent across the board. All items to be classified work within the same levels of classification.

Q2:

To introduce one clear and consistent set of classification standards that apply to all media types.

Q3:

No.

Q4:

No, everything should be classified.

Q5:

Again, everything should be classified.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No, everything should be classified.

Q11:

none, everything should be classified/

Q12:

There aren't any truly effective preventative methods. It really up to the user to restrict themselves.

Q13:

By their parents taking responsibility of what their children are accessing.

Q14:

Sealed packaging, or not on display. Has to be bought from the counter, similar to cigarettes.

Q15:

At all times. If an item has been classified people should be told.

Q16:

.

Q17:

No, a separate classification board is required. Basically the use of an impartial group.

Q18:

.

Q19:

No.

Q20:

I believe they are easy to understand.

Q21:

There just needs to be a single consistent rating system for all forms of media.

Q22:

You have a single ratings system, and then apply that across the board.

Q23:

Yes, there should be a single point of reference to refer to.

Q24:

Access to any real life criminal activity (rape, murder...) should be prohibited.

Q25:

It does and it doesn't. It does because it covers a lot of stuff that people shouldn't access, but it doesn't because we do not have a single consistent ratings system for all forms of media.

Q26:

All of Australia should abide by a single classification system. It helps make the ratings system clearer for the public.

Q27:

Uncertain

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Always be transparent and consistent.

Other comments: