First name: M
Last name: Taylor

Q1:
Completely overhaul the whole classification framework and create new processes to align with the framework.
Give definition to mass-market and narrow-market media and mass-market and narrow-market distribution/access channels.
Refer the legislation to the anti-discrimination laws.
Q2:
Ensure mass-market media is classified/aligned to a range of ages.
Ensure narrow-market media may be classified/aligned to a range of ages.
Ensure classifications are applied to media distributed to the mass-market.
Ensure classifications may be applied to media distributed to narrow-markets.
Q3:
No.
Q4:
Mass-market media must be monitored and follow the classification framework. Narrow-market media should voluntarily follow the classification framework and if they fail to do so, fall in to the monitored, mass-market media, bucket.
Q5:
It is impossible to define what impact any media will have on any specific individual or group of people. Any attempt to define an impact will simply be a exercise in psychologist V psychologist / expert V expert. A picnic day for lawyers. A mine-field for out of touch judges. A farce waiting to be played out by special interest groups.
"Content designed for children" - is, by definition, for children. Therefore the need to regulate it across all distribution channels is unnecessary when taking in to account my responses to Q1, Q2 & Q3.
The content NOT designed for children should be regulated across all mass-markets and voluntarily assessed by narrow-market media distributors.
Q6:
This is touching upon the whole point of my submission: Mass-market V Narrow-market. Popular V unpopular.
Mass-market (eg TV (Free to air, Cable and IPTV), Radio, Print) have the most ability to influence.
Narrow-market popular websites with greater than 'X' visits per day [self monitored] could be treated as mass-market (eg facebook, bigpond, SMH).
Narrow-market channels such as websites and PC games should be covered as per my response to Q4 where narrow-market media should voluntarily follow the classification framework and if they fail to do so, fall in to the monitored, mass-market media, bucket.
Q7:

Only ever self classified. Effectively this is narrow-market media.

Art is in the eye of the beholder (ie photos of nudes are NOT extreme) if you don't like it, don't view it. If you view it, don't like it and the artist has self classified correctly with all appropriate modifiers/qualifiers (narrow-market) you can object, but you won't have much of a leg to stand on. If the artist hasn't classified voluntarily, they get to pay for a classification/dispute resolution.

Q8:

When the 'print' version is classified the audio version should be given the same classification.

Q9:

Scale on: Mass-market V Narrow-market & Popular V unpopular subjects.

Mass-market & Popular - Govt regulated

Mass-market & unpopular - Govt/Self regulated

Narrow-market & Popular - Govt/Self regulated

Narrow-market & unpopular - Self regulated

Q10:

As the public domain reaches in to the home (eg TV, internet, print) the differences can't be readily defined. But if for example a collector has a rare, not for public viewing, book, which may have questionable content, it could be submitted for classification, If it fails classification it should NOT be seized but the person given the option to store eg the book, outside Australian jurisdiction.

Q11:

Real violence - (e.g. 'Cops' TV shows) We know they are real, but even though it is 'justice oriented / public interest' it shows humans being violent towards other humans. These are minority TV shows treated as a 'norm' but they are NOT normal they are aberrations given a mass market which are then argued by special interests to be the norm.

Animated violence - (e.g. Computer shooting games) - We know it is fake. Do they actually teach how to kill or maim - no. Can they applied in real life - no. They are Fake.

Q12:

1) Education - Aimed at low education parents (their kids already know what to do).

2) Have a published list of classified websites which people may refer to if they wish.

It's my choice whether I watch a cartoon or a horse race or a violent show or a murder mystery, or a 18+ show or a 0-6 years old show..... and my responsibility, NOT the governments or the Australian christian lobby, as to whether I choose to let a child see website X or Y.

** I've been in IT for over 25 years, developing websites for 10, and never found a child porn site.

** This sort of data is NOT distributed over the internet - it is distributed via private networks and physical media.

** The government will ALWAYS be 2 steps behind the technology and can never stop a person handing a CD to another person.

** The people who do this sort of stuff are psychology disturbed and will go to extreme lengths. A filter will simply drive these people further underground. Beef up the federal police 'chat room' officers - they're doing a brilliant job.

This question blatantly demonstrates the bias of the submissions being requested as the question

assumes that 'online' is an area to which special consideration should be given.

This smacks of political agenda FUD 'internet filter'. Big Brother. Thin edge of the wedge. Secret blacklist.

The whole classification system is broken. Re-build it from scratch and treat all distribution channels the same.

Q13:

It can't be controlled. Inquisitiveness is a human trait.

Educate the parents.

This question blatantly demonstrates the bias of the submissions being requested as the question assumes that 'online' is an area to which special consideration should be given.

This smacks of political agenda FUD 'internet filter'. Big Brother. Thin edge of the wedge. Secret blacklist.

The whole classification system is broken. Re-build it from scratch and treat all distribution channels the same.

Q14:

Does it need better control? Every responsible adult knows to hide the playboys up in the cupboard.

Do you want to put a padlock on every page? Hide them behind the counter?

What's wrong with healthy sex ? I'm more concerned with the gratuitous violence shown on TV every night.

Q15:

Ensure classifications are applied to media distributed to the mass-market.

Ensure classifications may be applied to media distributed to narrow-markets.

Q16:

Ensure classifications are applied to media distributed to the mass-market.

Monitor classification applied to media distributed to narrow-markets.

Q17:

Government to define.

Government to act upon mass-market media.

Government to watch industry/self rfegulatory actions upon narrow-market media.

Q18:

narrow-market / unpopular / special interest.

Q19:

mass-market/popular should pay for a classification from the government - unless - they are self-regulating and a person could do it online for free. If they fail to register the government steps in and charges a fee and dispute penalty if the item is disputed.

Q20:

PG / M - Crossover?

M / MA - Crossover?

MA / A - Crossover?

A / AO - Crossover?

R - Do we have one ?

Child / General - Fuzzy.

Q21:

Basic construct:

(Similar to PEGI Pan-European Game Information)

0 to 6 years (Child), 7 to 12 years (Pre-Teen), 13 to 18 years (Teen), 18+ (Adult), 18+ (Restricted).

Informative Modifiers/Qualifications:

SV - Simulated/Illusory Violence (Asterix comic, PC Games) // V - Violence ("Cops" on TV, War Movies)

SS - Simulated/Illusory Sex // S - Sex

SD - Simulated/Illusory Drug Use // D - Drug Use (Includes alcohol & Tobbaco)

L - Offensive Language

PA - Paid Advertising

GOV - Government Agency

SIG - Special Interest Group

Q22:

The channel/medium of distribution is irrelevant when it's all available in digital format. Approach it from the reach/popularity of the product being distributed.

Mass-market TV is popular, some websites are popular, 99.9% of books are narrow-market, magazines could be either depending upon their reach/subject.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None.

Pointless even trying anyway as technical and non-technical work arounds exist all over the place.

This question blatantly demonstrates the bias of the submissions being requested as the question assumes that 'online' is an area to which special consideration should be given.

This smacks of political agenda FUD 'internet filter'. Big Brother. Thin edge of the wedge. Secret blacklist.

The whole classification system is broken. Re-build it from scratch and treat all distribution channels the same.

Q25:

Ref to Q 24 response.

NO RC just for online.

This question blatantly demonstrates the bias of the submissions being requested as the question assumes that 'online' is an area to which special consideration should be given.

This smacks of political agenda FUD 'internet filter'. Big Brother. Thin edge of the wedge. Secret blacklist.

The whole classification system is broken. Re-build it from scratch and treat all distribution channels the same.

Q26:

Yes. Don't promote it. Request the states secede power for classification and adopt 1 central federal body.

Q27:

Enforceable classifications, with an expectation of voluntary participation.

A strictly defined set of mass-market / popular 'government assessed' media.

A strictly un-defined set of narrow-market / un-popular 'industry assessed' media.

A channel between the government and industry regulators enabling media to change status to and fro between mass and narrow markets.

A channel between the government and industry regulators enabling media to change status to government and industry regulated.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

All parties, including Special Interest Groups (Industry bodies, government agencies, unions, companies, religious groups etc) must declare an interest when making a submission for media to be classified / reclassified.

Whether that be a loosening or tightening or voluntary or regulated classification change, from a censorship perspective, the SIG is asking for a change in the way something is treated.

The ability for a SIG to influence classification/censorship must require it to be fully identifiable and openly declared.

Other comments:

Many of the questions in this survey are worded very badly and will result in some responses being biased.

I assume the multitude of other surveys screaming for parity and adjustment of the classification system over the past decade years will be considered with equal footing to this survey.

Special interest groups and responses to this survey where responses have been cut and paste, to fit a special interest agenda should be treated as a single submission and given equal weight as any other single submission.