First name: Emma
Last name: Fitzgerald

Q1:
It should focus on developing a new framework.
Q2:
To inform parents about whether content they are purchasing is suitable for their children. For adults, to inform them of high levels of violence, explicit sex etc so that they can make informed choices about what content they wish to see.
Q3:
Yes, for practical reasons. It is not possible to manually classify the entire web and very difficult and costly to classify large amounts of content such as smartphone apps and games. In these cases it may be better to only classify content as it is reported in a complaint.
Q4:
Only where the large amount of content prohibits classifying all the content, such as on the internet.
Q5:
Where practical, all content for children should be classified as this is helpful to parents. In terms of potential impact, where practical content should be classified so that people can make informed choices and be aware of what they are likely to encounter before they view the content.
Q6:
Yes, if getting content classified is expensive. If there is no cost to content providers under a new scheme, or if content providers are allowed to classify their own content, then it is much easier to have all content be classified even from small providers. If getting content classified is prohibitively expensive for, for example, small software development studios, then this is harmful to Australian industries and should not be mandatory.
Q7:
Yes, but only for the purpose of providing consumer advice. Access should not be restricted.
Q8:
Yes, again, for the purpose of providing consumer advice, not restricting access.
Q9:
For practical considerations, yes. If it is too expensive and time-consuming to classify something that is only going to reach a small audience of adults anyway, then it isn't worthwhile classifying it. It would be better if content providers could provide their own advisory classifications, then it is much easier for all content to be classified.
Q10:
Yes, there should be some reasonable restrictions on content that is displayed in public as it will be viewable by all ages. Content with an MA15+ rating or higher shouldn't be displayed in public (e.g. billboards etc) where it can be seen by everyone, including children. Displaying content in public removes the choice of the viewer, so high-level classifications shouldn't be displayed in public.
Q11:

Q12:

There are no currently available effective methods of controlling access to online content without severely impacting the utility of the network. No content should be restricted to adults. Restricting content for children should be the responsibility of parents. Parents are free to employ software filters and/or supervise their children's internet access in their onw homes, there is no reason restrictions should be applied by the government or any other authorities.

The best way to deal with online content is for content providers to provide their own voluntary classifications (and parents can prevent their children accessing content that has not been classified), subject to random reviews by the Classification Board, which can also deal with complaints about content that has been misclassified. Classification should be used as consumer advice, not a means of controlling access - this should be parents' responsibility.

Q13:

By having computer usage be supervised. Computers should be placed in living rooms or other areas of the house where parents can see what their children are doing. There are also many products on the market to block websites etc that are unsuitable for children, however, no such product can be exhaustive or foolproof. Parental supervision is the only realistic way to ensure children do not encounter inappropriate content online.

Q14:

It shouldn't be. It's controlled too much as it is. What consenting adults wish to see is no business of the government's. The only thing that should be ensured is that such content is not displayed publicly where it can be seen by children without their parents being able to stop it (e.g. on the shelves of a newsagent). This is already taken care of by making such magazines have plain covers and/or be sold in adults-only shops. There is nothing more that needs to be done on this front.

Q15:

It shouldn't. If the content provider chooses not to display warnings, parents can steer clear of that content. Content for children is unlikely to sell without some information about what ages it is suitable for, so there is no need for the government to enforce the display of such information.

Q16:

Industry bodies should have their own codes of practice, which should include individual content providers classifying their own material according to industry guidelines. Government agencies should conduct reviews of the industry guidelines and also randomly check content to ensure compliance. Government agencies should also deal with complains from users about misclassified content. Users should read content warnings and make their choices appropriately. If there are no content warnings available for a product, users should either choose to avoid that product, choose to risk viewing, or do their own further research to determine if they should buy it. Users should not be restricted in what content they choose to view, aside from content that is harmful to others such as child pornography.

Q17:

Yes, this would be far better. It would be more effective as content providers are likely to know more about the content they are producing than a government agency and are better positioned to provide advice to consumers. This would also substantially reduce the cost of classification, which would be beneficial to small content providers and thus encourage industry growth. Government bodies are needed to provide oversight and deal with complaints, but should not otherwise be involved.

Q18:

As much as possible. Government agencies should be available to advise industry where the classification is not straightforward, but in most cases it is fairly clear who the target audience is.

Q19:

If classification entails a significant cost, then the government should encourage artists through classification subsidies. This should include film producers, musicians, game development studios, authors and any other content providers which provide content with artistic merit.

Q20:

I think the existing classification categories are fairly well understood, although M and MA15+ are slightly confusing. Also, the adult categories R and X should be combined - reasons for a classification are already provided so there's no need to separate two categories for the same age group.

Q21:

Yes. There should be an R18+ category for games to bring them into line with other content. R18+ and X18+ should be merged, so that, for example, content which is both violent and explicitly sexual receives one category instead of being refused classification. The refused classification category should be removed altogether and adults should be able to view whatever content they want, except where that content is actually harmful to others, such as child pornography, or perhaps videos of assaults on real people, etc. The only content which should be banned should be content that causes harm by simply viewing it (which child porn does).

Q22:

Have one set of guidelines and one set of classifications for all media. This also allows for future media types that have not been invented yet. Where possible, remove references to the media itself from the classification guidelines. The form of the content should not matter, it's what it contains that is important for classification.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Child pornography, and any other content where the viewing of the content is harmful to others.

Q25:

No. The RC category is far too broad and should be changed to only include content where viewing the content harms others.

Q26:

Yes, we should have a national classification scheme that is consistent across all states and territories.

Q27:

A completely new one; none of the current schemes are appropriate. The new scheme should have a much narrower scope of RC content, a single R18+ category instead of also having X18+, which contains any content not suitable for minors, and the current categories for minors: G, PG, M, MA15+.

Q28:

Yes. The current system of agreement between Attorneys-General is ridiculous and unwieldy. Classification should be treated as any other law and voted for by federal Parliament.

Q29:

Take the Attorneys-General out of the process and instead have classification dealt with by federal Parliament. Allow industry to classify their own content, with the government's role as advisory and for dealing with consumer complaints. Make it easier to make classification-related complaints online and publish online the ratings of content that has been classified so that it is easy for consumers to access.

Other comments: