First name: Jason
Last name: Martin

Q1:
Improving key elements of the existing framework.
Q2:
Clear, unambiguous information. To that end, there should be consistency across media.
Q3:
Yes - the volume of online content means it is unreasonable to expect it all to be classified.
Q4:
Yes - as per Q3, online content should be treated this way due to the volume and rate of generation of new content.
Q5:
Yes, but I think the lack of objective standards for 'impact' are a problem. As far as is reasonable, children's content should be classified across all media.
Q6:
No.
Q7:
Yes - I think artworks should be treated on a 'per-complaint' basis.
Q8:
Yes.
Q9:
No.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
Practical considerations - the volume of content produced by 'app stores' makes classifying it all unfeasible, so these would be better handled on a per-complaint basis.
Q12:
Personal filters.
Q13:
Parental supervision, and filtering software.
Q14:
Strict identification requirements for age-restricted material, and strong penalties for retailers failing to meet these requirements.
Q15:
At point of sale or advertising, and on packaging.
Q16:
Government agencies should provide clear, detailed information regarding content; industry bodies should support government by encouraging content makers to provide full and detailed information to

enable accurate classification; users should inform themselves about the classification system and use it to make appropriate decisions regarding content for themselves and their children.

Q17:

While this system appears to work well in the USA, I believe the current Australian system has proven effective. Classification by a government agency allows for a degree of separation from the content producers, giving some confidence that classification is not influenced by economic factors.

Q18:

Q19:

I would support the subsidisation of classification for independent films if a fair system was in place. I don't know what costs are involved in classifying content, which makes it hard to comment.

Q20:

Generally, yes. I think there may be some confusion about exactly what the current 'M' rating represents - 'Recommended for mature audiences' is a fairly vague statement, and I think some parents have a rather inflated sense of how 'mature' their children are.

Q21:

Yes - there needs to be an R18+ category for video games. The lack of this category is based on the misguided belief that either games are only for children (clearly inaccurate as the average age of gamers is in the 30s), or that if R18+ games are permitted they will inevitably fall into the hands of children (by this logic, there should be no R18+ category for films either).

Q22:

See Q21.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Content that depicts actual criminal activity, e.g. paedophilia, bestiality.

Q25:

No. The current prohibition of 'fetish material' is outdated and vague.

Q26:

Yes. Classification should be a Commonwealth issue.

Q27:

A single national scheme for classification and regulation of content.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: