First name: Lachlan
Last name: Murray

Q1:
Improving key elements of the existing framework. Classification works best when people understand clearly what each classification means. The closer we can stay to well-known and existing classifications, the more readily understandable they will be.
Q2:
Consistency across states and territories; consistency with other media (esp. film).
Q3:
No. Technology will shift and change, attempting to define it in legislation will result in either legislation so broad as to be meaningless or outdated before it is passed. More, different classifications for different delivery methods works against consistency and so reduces ease of understanding and creates potential for loopholes, exceptions and abuse.
Q4:
No. If classification is understood to be advisory, then requiring all media to be classified is an important public service _if_and_only_if_ there exist sufficient classification 'levels' or 'categories' that all material can be classified to some degree and even if one of these categories is something like 'unable to be classified'
Q5:
No. Classification should be based on clear and concrete guidelines not on potentialities or other nebulous and ill-defined considerations that can shift and change depending on which expert you listen to or how you phrase the question. Yes, content for children should be classified across all media for the sake of consistency and as a guide and advisory to the public.
Q6:
No. Classification needs to be even-handed, fair, impartial and based on well publicised and concrete guidelines.
Q7:
Classification should only be advisory not restrictive or prohibitive. When you can define what art is and is not, then you can usefully classify it separately.
Q8:
Yes. Consistency in classification is going to aid the public. Film already has classifications that cover content and language, so too can music and audio-books so long as these classifications are advisory and neither proscriptive nor prohibitive.
Q9:
No. Classification needs to be even-handed, fair, impartial and based on well publicised and concrete guidelines.
Q10:
Not if the classification is advisory. The more consistent classification is across all media, the easier it is for the public to use the system to make informed decisions.

Q11:

None. Classification needs to be even-handed, applied to all material equally and with clear and well-defined guidelines.

Q12:

Restricting access is pointless. Prohibition barely works with physical objects that can be seized and interdicted. Ideas and concepts are impossible to restrict, all you can do is inform people as to the nature of the material and allow them to make informed choices about what they do and do not wish to expose themselves to.

Q13:

At a parental and/or carer level - nothing else is effective or appropriate. Attempting to universally restrict access is impossible and simply creates a contempt for the entire system. Children are unable to sign up for internet access on their own - it is being supplied to them by an adult (be that a parent, teacher or business owner) who should be monitoring content and restricting access. Aiding parents and or businesses to do this (via opt-in filtering tools for example) is suitable, restricting everyone's access 'in case' some child gets unmonitored access is not.

Q14:

It cannot be without impacting the ability for adults to access the material. It already requires proof of age to purchase or access, is sold sealed in obscuring covers when in a mixed premises.

Q15:

All content should display consumer advice in the form of standardised classifications (such as are used by film). This includes music, games, magazines, newspapers etc.

Q16:

Govt. bodies should provide clear and consistent guidelines for classification as well as a common framework across all content. Industry bodies should be offered the chance to self-regulate and to submit voluntary classification of their own material subject to complaint/appeal/investigation by a govt. classification body. Users should be educated as to the nature of the classifications and then trusted to make the best choices for themselves as to what material they wish to expose themselves to.

Q17:

Yes. The various media industries have far more knowledge of their content than does the government and a vested interest in targeting their markets as closely as possible. Providing inaccurate classification information is simply going to drive away the very market the content was aimed at. This would also help eliminate some of the bizarre inconsistencies with classification even within the same industry, let alone between different industries and by increasing consistency, allow users to make better and more informed choices.

Q18:

All material if the classification scheme is well defined and if facility exists to challenge the proposed classification (by interested parties and/or spot checks by government body).

Q19:

No. Classification should be voluntary and industry led. The government should provide framework/guidelines and a body to hear and investigate appeals and/or to run spot checks to ensure that the industry bodies are adhering to the guidelines.

Q20:

Classifications for movies are well understood as they have been in use for a long time, have considerable penetration and broad exposure. They should be used as a guide for all content for these very reasons. The classification categories that are less understood are those that deviate from these (especially those that bear some similarity but differ or are incomplete - game classification for example which lacks an adult-only or R classification)

Q21:

No, this is contrary to the main need for classification - to advise the public. New classifications would need to be explained and would take time to penetrate. Adding additional reasons to existing classifications, if necessary, is more useful.

Q22:

By using the most common and commonly understood classification system as a standard and applying it universally (for example, the film classification system). By not confusing the issue with different systems for different mediums, but rather creating a basic, broad and flexible framework that doesn't bow to the current hysteria over online content.

Q23:

Yes. Consistency is important for better understanding and adherence.

Q24:

Laws already exist to prohibit certain acts (robbery for example). Online content that promotes illegal acts should be investigated and prosecuted under such laws. In the event that the content is not provided locally, then the matter should be pursued in the same fashion that international crimes are currently pursued. Inventing new laws simply because something is 'online' is neither effective, nor good law. It will be difficult to police, impossible to implement effectively and adds nothing to the ability to prevent criminal activity.

It runs the real risk of creating situations of 'thought crime' where the only criminal act is the accessing of prohibited material and as previous attempts at implementing 'internet filters' have shown, the capacity for material to be prohibited that has nothing to do with illegal activity (such as a dentist's web-site) is high.

Q25:

Online content should not be prohibited. Either it is illegal and the source should be investigated and/or prosecuted under existing laws, or the material is not illegal and should be classified to allow adults to decide if they wish to expose themselves to it. Censorship for the best of reasons leaves the door open to censorship that is used to suppress political discussion and limit social discourse.

Q26:

Yes and it can be achieved by allowing the various industries to form their own advisory organisations to provide nation-wide classification.

Q27:

One that allows for voluntary industry based classification.

Q28:

Q29:

Make it advisory. Trust people to make the best choices for themselves without needing to ban, prohibit or otherwise enforce that decision. Especially in light of the ease with which material that has

been refused classification in Australia can be purchased from overseas, banning simply provides a cachet of the forbidden without offering any real obstacle. Recognise the impossibility of restricting all access and instead provide tools to those who wish to restrict their _own_ (and their children's) access. Encourage people to take responsibility for their own and their children's access to material they find offensive, rather than expecting everyone to adhere to their values.

Other comments:

Please stop using a US spell-checker.