First name: Zik
Last name: Saleeba

Q1:
I think the existing framework can be improved.
Q2:
A national classification scheme should apply equally to all forms of entertainment. Video games should not be singled out for uniquely harsh censorship.
Q3:
No, classification should be independent of platform except on platforms where it's impractical to classify content.

ie. films and blockbuster video games should be classified alike. Web pages and small video game titles are impractical to classify, so they should not be classified.
Q4:
No opinion.
Q5:
Before a "potential impact" can be assessed we need scientific studies to assess these impacts. Currently the results of these studies are controversial or contradictory. It's unlikely that any strong impacts will be found. On that basis no impact assessment should be made, since we have no convincing evidence of any impact.

Content for children should be classified across all media (where it's practical to do so) since there's no evidence that the type of medium used has any effect.
Q6:
"Art" markets might be provided some latitude in censorship since they have an accepted role in society. Where it's impractically expensive for classification to be made due to a small market there should be no requirement for classification. Where scale or speed affects the practicality of censorship (such as in the internet) there should be no requirement for classification.
Q7:
As long as classification is inexpensive and its cost doesn't discriminate against smaller content providers then this is ok. Otherwise dropping classification before exhibition would be preferable.
Q8:
Again, where cost and practicality allows.
Q9:
Censorship is comforting in that it enforces social values, however it's not necessary for survival. If the cost of implementing censorship for materials with a small audience affects its economics of distribution then there should be no requirement for classification.

Currently there's no evidence of significant impact from not censoring material. On this basis only

social values relating to the audience should affect the classification of content. If social values indicate that children should be protected from some material, then this should affect its classification.

Q10:

This is another question of social values. I believe that most people are more comfortable with viewing "stronger" material in their own homes, so yes - I would grant people considerable latitude of their own choices in their own homes.

Q11:

-

Q12:

No technical methods would appear to be effective or desirable. Education and maturity would appear to be the most effective methods of dealing with online content.

Q13:

Parental supervision seems to be the most effective method. Technical approaches are easily bypassed.

Q14:

Sexually explicit magazines are of waning importance. I'm sure existing mechanisms are fine.

Q15:

Markings and warnings can be helpful but as a mature consumer I'm comfortable with or without them.

Q16:

Government agencies should implement the law as required with minimum cost and timing impacts. Industry and users should be affected as little as is practical.

Q17:

Co-regulatory models will almost certainly lead to industry gaming the system. On the other hand establishing a well-understood code would be beneficial even without co-regulation.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

I prefer a model where small independent films are unregulated. This avoids the cost issue entirely.

Q20:

I think the existing classification categories are preferable to changing the classification categories and causing more confusion.

Q21:

-

Q22:

-

Q23:

-

Q24:

No online content should be prohibited. Establishing a mechanism for prohibition would have worse effects than the materials being prohibited.

Q25:

No online content should be prohibited on the basis that it's impossible to police this prohibition.

Q26:

Yes, classification laws should be consistent Australia-wide. They should become federal law.

Q27:

A federal system.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Consideration of the methods used in other parts of the world would help. Many parts of the world have less censorship than Australia and appear to suffer no impacts. There would appear to be no compelling reason not to reduce the level of censorship in Australia.

Other comments: