First name: Christian
Last name: King

Q1:
The main issues with existing framework stem not from the classification of content, but the censorship of content. Unclassified material which is not otherwise illegal should not be prohibited from sale / distribution / importation to adults.

Q2:
The Australian classification scheme's only objectives should be to provide guidance to potential viewers (or listeners, or players, etc) about the content of the publication, so they can make informed decisions about whether it is suitable for them, and their children / dependants. The government has no place telling adults what material they can and cannot view (or listen to, or play, etc) in their own home.

Q3:
No. However, classifying the entire internet is impossible, so some concessions will need to be made.

Q4:
I cannot see the benefit of such a system.

Q5:
Classifying content in the lower brackets (g, pg, m) should be the highest priority. If other content is unclassified, and clearly marked with a symbol showing that it is unclassified, people concerned about causing distress will avoid it and chose classified content of a suitable level.

Q6:
Unclassified material should not be illegal to distribute, and as such classification would be the choice of the producer/distributor. Those aiming for lower classification brackets (g, pg, m) would be more likely to seek classification for their content.

Q7:
They should not be required to do so, but they should be free to request such if they wish.

Q8:
Yes.

Q9:
Classification should be optional. Producers/Distributors should be able to determine for themselves if their audience will benefit from classification.

Q10:
No.

Q11:
Producer/Distributor's choice.

Q12:
There are none. I am a computer security professional, with years of experience in the field. There are no effective methods to control access to online content.

Q13:

Parents should control what their children see online by installing filtering software. It is not the government's responsibility to control content online.

Q14:

I think the current controls are appropriate.

Q15:

Before sale / distribution. Online material should be assumed to be unclassified unless a classification mark is present.

Q16:

The government should decide what classification content meets. Users should complain about incorrect classification, where it is discovered, and any breaches of guidelines concerning the sale/distribution of content.

Q17:

No. Industry has a very poor track record of self regulation.

Q18:

None

Q19:

The government should not subsidise the classification of content, however classification should not be prohibitively expensive.

Q20:

Yes.

Q21:

Yes, "Unclassified" should be given a mark, and should be legalised for sale/distribution. Games should be brought into line with other media, and have R18+ and X18+ ratings introduced.

Q22:

A single set of guidelines should be created for all media regardless of format.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Prohibiting content online is an impossible battle. Child pornography is already illegal regardless of whether it is obtained offline or online, we do not need special measures to prohibit it online.

Q25:

No, refused classification (which is not illegal for some other reason) should be free for sale and distribution between adults both online and offline.

Q26:

Yes, the states should continue to work together for a single unified code.

Q27:

The current cooperative scheme should stand.

Q28:

Only if the states cannot agree on a single scheme.

Q29:

As per previous comments, unclassified material should permitted for legal sale and distribution, so long as it meets certain restrictions on display and advertisement.

Other comments: