First name: Andrew
Last name: Punch

Q1:
It would be possible to take the existing framework and improve it. Increased transparency is critical. Increase in rating by industry, media creators and end users is necessary to scale to the tsunami of media now available. The ratings should primarily be advisory - only the most socially unacceptable topics (e.g. violent sex) should be banned.

The government should only be involved in classification when:
* a classification is disputed (in which case fines may apply against the person/company who rated the material incorrectly)
* a classification is requested prior to release - where a media distributor does not feel confident in self rating
* reviewing material which needs to be banned (e.g. sexual violence)

Q2:
The primary objective of the national classification scheme should be informative. For example I do not want my children to watch depictions of violence. However depictions of consensual sex in a caring context does not concern me.

There is a secondary objective of a national classification scheme which is to reflect the values of society. In the case of real violence, real illegal activity, extreme violence, violent sex or paedophilia society should send a message that such behaviour is unacceptable by banning the material.

Q3:
Absolutely. The internet allows films to be distributed straight from the US, Europe and Japan where there is a significant difference in ratings. On that platform there is no longer a centralised distributor bringing the media into Australia - so the only practical scalable solution would be self rating or even end-user rating.

There may even be some cases where the end-user will perform the rating themselves with a tool on IMDB or youtube.

Q4:
The key thing is information. If there has been a complaint then someone has already not received enough information. So classification should happen both proactively and reactively - more open and efficient means of classification must be devised.

Q5:
Content designed for children should certainly be classified across all media. Content which is put forward as suitable for children should meet a set of guidelines in the form of an advisory rating.

Q6:

Media which has a large reach has a greater potential interaction with the community - so it makes sense to pro-actively classify those materials. Materials which do not have those levels of reach should be rated by the media creator according to published guidelines.

Q7:

Artworks should absolutely not be censored. However it would be helpful for controversial artworks to be classified - either voluntarily or by an independent body.

Q8:

Music recordings should certainly have an advisory classification. This classification may be performed by an independent body or self-rated.

Q9:

This is the same as question 6: "Media which has a large reach has a greater potential interaction with the community - so it makes sense to pro-actively classify those materials. Materials which do not have those levels of reach should be rated by the media creator according to published guidelines."

Q10:

Absolutely. It is reasonable that public media, for example billboards, should not make people uncomfortable. People have no choice but to view that public media everyday.

It is my strong view that responsible adults should be able to read, view or play any material they wish. The material should be rated as much as possible to give these adults a choice in what material they want to see. Material should only be banned in order to send a "message" that the behaviour depicted is not socially acceptable.

Q11:

Material should be classified, either by the producer, industry or government when:

* the material is being specifically marketed as suitable for children (i.e. C, G, or PG rating)

* there is any material that is not suitable for children

* there is any violence

* there is any nudity or sex

* there is any illegal activity

Q12:

Online content cannot and should not be controlled. There is no central authority and attempts at censoring webpages in the UK has failed miserably.

Q13:

Through client side filters and parents taking responsibility for their children's internet usage. Websites should assist parents by giving informative ratings.

Q14:

Sexually explicit magazines are already sufficiently controlled and I am not at all concerned about the availability of them.

Q15:

Any media that is broadly distributed within Australia should have consumer advice. Material which is niche and comes from overseas may require user ratings.

Q16:

Government should only become involved where there is a dispute whether material was rated correctly, where a material needs to be banned completely (such as exterme violence) and in an advisory role.

Q17:

An industry based or distributor/creator based model would be much more efficient than the current model. It would also mean a number of films that currently are not rated

Q18:

It is preferable that industry classify all material, unless a media producer specifically requests assistance or a complaint is made. Fines could be levied for material that is not correctly classified.

Q19:

Media producers should perform the classification. If the government needs to classify an artwork for a complaint the government should pay. If the government is classifying the work on the request of the media producer, the producer should pay.

Q20:

I think the existing classifications are understood, however there is insufficient transparency in how media is categorised into each classification.

Q21:

No, although X rated material should be available nationally.

Q22:

They are consistent enough.

Q23:

Yes. Games have no more or less effect on people than movies.

Q24:

This is the same as question 12: Online content cannot and should not be controlled. There is no central authority and attempts at censoring webpages in the UK has failed miserably.

Q25:

No. The RC classification is too strict. There are a number of innocuous scenarios which are currently RC. For example much of the debate surrounding the euthanasia debate has been censored.

Q26:

Some degree of consistency is necessary for efficiency in customs, media producers and classifiers.

Q27:

Legislation should be introduced which moves responsibility for rating to media producers. Penalties should be applied for a misleading rating or for not rating. Provision for end-user rating or distributor rating (for example when someone posts a link) should be included.

Q28:

It is not necessary to refer the powers but it may make the system more efficient.

Q29:

Better coordination with other countries, so the end user has a choice when they are considering watching content from overseas (e.g. via the internet) and so the end user can take responsibility for not viewing illegal content.

Other comments:

I have not had much time to make this submission - I have a very busy job and two small children - but I feel it is important that my children are not "protected" against free speech. Classification should be cheap and easy to access for media producers. End-users should be empowered through education, so they can self-rate for foreign content and take responsibility for not viewing illegal content.