First name: John
Last name: Gardner

Q1:
A more efficient use of public money would be to improve the existing system, which is generally working well, rather than starting again with a new framework. Although it can be argued that rapid technological change has made the existing system outdated, this argument does not stand scrutiny, since it suggests that any newly developed system will similarly be outdated in the near future. A new framework is not justified.
Q2:
To inform consumer choices. It is not the government's role to protect people from themselves. By all means, put depth markings on the pool, but don't get in my way when I want to go swimming.
Q3:
No - this is a nonsensical idea - with the cross-platform integration that is already occurring, the lines between different platforms is already blurred, and it would seem likely that this blurring will continue.
Q4:
My understanding is that this approach is primarily designed to reduce regulatory burden, and with that goal in mind, this is a sensible mechanism. Mass-market physical material needs to classified in advance of release, but other material (online content in particular) does not require this level of attention.
Q5:
I support the notion that more extreme content is more in need to classification and regulatory oversight. Content for children does not need to be classified acorss all media - a government mechanism should not be used as a substitute for parental involvement in a child's activity.
Q6:
It makes sense for material with greater mass-market reach to be classified, and for material that is of niche interest and/or limited public exposure to not require classification. This is really a recognition of the inevitable - there is no way that a regulatory system can encompass *all* content that is produced.
Q7:
No, this is an unnecessary impost on those who display and distribute art. Let's not match the hysterical response of a small number of people to a small number of artworks with a reactionary regulatory response.
Q8:
Again, this is an unnecessary regulatory impost. The current parental advisory system for music is operating well; there is no need to "fix" it with a more expensive system.
Q9:
At face value this sounds like a reasonable suggestion, but if this sort of argument is used, all online content immediately requires regulation because of its huge "potential" audience, even though in the large majority of cases the potential audience dramatically outweighs the actual audience.
Q10:

Public access should involve higher levels of regulation.

Q11:

It is not sensible to distinguish any longer between DVD movies and videogames in the classification framework. They are both mass-market, physical products that are typically consumed in a private setting by people who know what they are purchasing. The lack of an R 18+ classification for videogames is an artefact of the current system's age. To reiterate, the primary purpose of a classification system should be to inform consumer choice, not to prevent consumers from accessing the material that interests them. And not to act as substitute parent for people who apparently want the government to regulate what their child accesses so that they don't have to do it themselves.

Q12:

If you want to attempt to restrict online content that is broadly and generally accepted to be inappropriate for everyone (only child pornography comes to mind), then by all means list a set of websites and supply these to ISPs, with a requirement that they be blocked. But such a list *must* be made public - otherwise there is a very real risk of some future government conducting internet censorship that is self-serving and against the public interest.

Q13:

Children's access to online content *cannot* be controlled by a regulatory framework without creating massive disruption for everyone else. Might I humbly suggest we let parents do their job? I don't see anyone suggesting that children's access to their parent's supplies of alcohol or cigarettes at home be regulated. It is the government's responsibility to inform adult choices, not to restrict everyone's activity for the dubious benefit of placating a few loudly outraged people.

Q14:

Are sexually explicity magazines really that much of an issue? Surely there is all the sexually explicit material anyone could want available online for free?

Q15:

When it contains graphical displays of violence and or when it contains explicit sexual images.
When uninformed people might buy it for children without realising what it contains.
When uninformed people might access it themselves without understanding what it contains.

Q16:

No comment

Q17:

Are there any current examples of co-regulation that work?

Q18:

No comment.

Q19:

No comment.

Q20:

I believe that they are well understood.

Q21:

R 18+ for videogames needs to be introduced to update the currently outdated classification system.

Q22:

Using the same labelling on currently physically-available mass-market content is enough here.

Q23:

yes.

Q24:

It is a nonsense to believe you can restrict online access. The content changes too quickly, and site mirrors are generated too often, for any sort of classification system to be effective. You would restrict content only to have to appear somewhere else the next day.

The only system that has a chance of working is a user-generated complaints system (as per YouTube), in which people flag content for consideration for regulatory review.

Q25:

Yes, insofar as such a system could be implemented, as described above.

Q26:

One national system is surely the most efficient approach.

Q27:

No comment.

Q28:

That'd be nice if it saved public money.

Q29:

Recognise that there are aspects of the online environment that make formal regulation impossible, except at the cost of the freedom of access to the internet which is an increasingly important part of education, leisure and work.

Other comments: