First name: Peter
Last name: Thomas

Q1:
Focus should be on developing an entirely *new* framework
Q2:
Recognise that the existing framework (un-changed in 20 years) no longer reflects societal trends and perceptions, and descriminates against certain material based on old prejudices. The new classification scheme should align with what is socially acceptable for this culture in this era, in a way that coalesces with the global market (something that the current system clearly is not designed to handle).
Q3:
No, definitely not. The *platform* (e.g.: ISP) should unequivocally *not* be in a position to judge the merit of the material. This should be left to content-makers themselves, who would be responsible for adhering to the framework guidelines.
Q4:
This is very context-sensitive. In general, though, any classification scheme needs to be very comprehensive. Creating exceptions and loopholes usually only leads to disaster. If a "classication upon complaint" scheme is introduced, it needs to be managed very carefully to ensure it is not misused - for example - for specific agends
Q5:
If something is obviously harmless, it should be classification-free. Anything more complicated should be subject to a standard classifcation scheme that aligns neatly across most mediums.
Q6:
No, material should be classified on its own merits; not on the size of its audience.
Q7:
There should be *warnings* of content (so people can make an informed choice), but no direct classification. This applies to 'exhibition' artwork where the viewing is an intentional and deliberate act. If something is going to be installed in a public space, there is a separate argument for classification there.
Q8:
As before, something that is obviously harmless should be classification-free. Everything else should be subject to a standard classifcation scheme that aligns across all media types.
Q9:
As before, things should be assessed on their own merits; not on the size of the audience.
Q10:
Potentially. For example, going to an art museum is an *intentional* act, and there are certain behavioural expectations that accompany it (e.g.: people should expect artists to express views that may be controversial). People should *not* have to expect such confrontation when simply walking

their children to school. With that said, though, I refer to my previous statements that say - generally - things should be judged on their own merits.

Q11:

The scheme should aim to be as inclusive across as many media-types as possible, to ensure that benchmarks are streamlined and consistent.

Q12:

Unequivocally NOT an enforced Internet Filter. While I have previously said that things should be assessed on their own merits, this is difficult to achieve with online content, but this is no excuse to force people onto a filter system, just because there isn't an *ideal* solution.

Q13:

Better parenting. Or at least, better computer-literacy in parents.

Q14:

Better education within the community. And hefty penalties for those who distribute it inappropriately.

Q15:

When there is violence, sexual content, or mature themes.

Q16:

Provide classifcation standards, as well as to communicate those standards and help people understand them effectively.

Q17:

Yes - definitely. Look at the video game industry for one example.

Q18:

Movies, Video Games, TV.

Q19:

Any case in which material is at risk of being discriminated against for financial reasons (e.g.: small film indsutry; video game industry (in Australia, currently, anyway)), should be considered for subsidies.

Q20:

The MA15+ classification is sometimes abused, simply because the current framework does not offer anything higher. Some argue that this is a good thing, however the evidence clearly shows that this is counterproductive. Whilst the concept is understood, it is equally understood that it doesn't hold any real "currency". Introducing a broader classification scheme with higher levels may require more education, but will produce better results.

Q21:

R18+ should be introduced, as should an "Un-classifiable" category of some sort, as opposed to simply *refusing* classification.

Q22:

Introduce a broader spectrum, with clearer rules, that is consistent with options across the global market, and reflects the new 'standards' of acceptability in Australia. A learning curve will follow this, so perhaps new labelling, and a new media campaign is also necessary.

Q23:

Without having an in-depth knowledge, I say "yes". Anything that simplifies and standardises what is currently little more than a farce is a good thing for everybody.

Q24:

Child exploitation. However, this should be managed through penalties for offenders, rather than forcing the average Australian into an "internet filter" scheme.

Q25:

Not in the least. The current standards of "Refused Classifcation" cover *some* specific scenarios, but much of it would be comical by today's standards, if it weren't for the fact that it genuinely *does* discriminate against some content-creators.

Q26:

It should be consistent acros the country, not per-state. It should also be possible to understand in the greater global world as well.

Q27:

I don't understand this question fully. The breadth of knowledge that is required to address this fully is well beyond that of the average Australian (unless I'm missing some obvious and implicit meaning?)

Q28:

Once again, this question is a little too complex for me to give an informed answer to, and I feel many people are in the same position.

Q29:

Introduce greater classifications for video games. Introduce a greater spectrum for movies, to address the current "refused classification" criteria.

Other comments: