First name: Simon
Last name: Bennett

Q1:
Definitely improvement - the system isn't completely broken. The biggest improvement would be to introduce a legally restricted R18+ rating for computer games. Another massive improvement would be to remove mandatory classification and make it voluntary, and only reach for outright banning when widespread and lasting social harm is anticipated from the work. This would bring us more into line with the USA and their "unrated" classification, and would break step with the idea that a privileged class of people has a right in this day and age to prescribe moral standards for everyone else by banning material that adults aren't even prevented from accessing.

Q2:
Adults should be able to see and hear what they want, and everyone (not just children) should be allowed protection against things that might disturb them. It is not for the government to act as a moral guardian, but it is good for them to do their part to allow people to make their own decisions.

Q3:
The platform affects whether it's practical to blanket classify content - websites are too numerous and are referred to the ACMA on a case-by-case basis. This gives more support to the idea that classification should ultimately be voluntary.

Q4:
Yes. Web content and digital images already work under this system via ACMA.

Q5:
Possibly - fair warning is welcome.

I can some sense in cross-media child-specific classification, but the child-centrism in the classification debate seems more about emotionally manpulative moralising on the part of organisations such as the ACL to the effect of telling people what to believe and how to live their lives.

Q6:
Yes - in particular niche cases, the government shouldn't be getting involved unless someone refers the matter to them explicitly and the work is found to be criminally illegal. Also, an independent publisher's material shouldn't get hit with an R18+ rating if something stronger from a big studio can appeal it down to an MA15+

If classification were voluntary, this would be a moot question.

Q7:
In the sense of artworks presented in a gallery, not necessarily. It's up to the gallery's discretion, not the government's.

Q8:
The graded system for music currently in place advising of strong or high-level impact seems adequate. Bringing it over to the film/TV/games ratings system could work for clarity's sake.

Q9:

Yes, as long as it's not bannable material the scope and composition of the intended audience should be taken into account.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Not interactivity.

Q12:

Good parenting, voluntary filtering systems, responsible computer use and good old adult discretion are fine.

If there were an opt-in scheme which allowed websites to voluntarily mark particular content as a particular strength, this could be integrated into browsers by use of plug-ins. This could be extended out to a voluntary community-based filter where users could submit content advice (mild, moderate, strong, high-impact, extreme, offensive) in real time to a central database, crowdsourcing the problem to humans and letting the computer normalise the results. Such a system would allow morally overbearing elements such as the ACL put their money where their mouth is to make a difference, instead of lobbying away the freedoms of other citizens "for the sake of children".

Q13:

Supervision helps, but teaching children from an early age that the Internet is full of potentially upsetting things is a good start.

Some sort of time allowance system on the computer, where the parent has to revisit the computer every fifteen minutes or so to enter a password or the networking capabilities of the machine shut off. This could be enforced simply by software on the computer acting as a timed firewall, or it could also be enforced at an ISP or vendor level with the client-side software having to make contact with a remote machine in order to keep the machine's networking running. The software could also implement its own voluntary blacklist. It could also run as an actual web browser instead of as a separate program for the highest level of protection integration.

Q14:

Confiscation and possession bans on a case-by-case basis where the individual has proven that for them to have access to pornography leads to a demonstrable detriment to society.

Q15:

If it's got a classification, it should be displayed pre-sale if it's something that can be bought. It should be displayed on the packaging and possibly the medium (e.g. on the DVD) if it's something on physical media, and if not it could be embedded into the media itself at the beginning if it's a stream or digital file, similar to how they do it on TV.

Q16:

Users should be able to see and hear what they like and be warned of things that might disturb them or those in their care. The government should classify applicable content according to its impact to provide that warning, and should be able to step in in extreme cases and ban content only when it is criminally illegal and therefore likely to cause widespread harm to the community. Under voluntary

classification, industry bodies shouldn't be compelled to display a classification on any given work but should be compelled to display a lack of classification ("U" for unclassified) on that work.

Q17:

Possibly. I have no direct experience of current arrangements.

Q18:

With the appropriate training, any of it, but the government should be free to step in in case the industry starts taking the piss (e.g. where a weaker classification than is justified is used to preserve their bottom line).

Q19:

As long as classification is still mandatory, subsidisation in cases of need is a very good idea.

Q20:

MA. It's got an M in it. NZ's R16 rating is clearer. I like the MA hexagon though, it's like a softer R diamond.

Q21:

G is fine. Lower PG's recommended age to 12. Keep M where and as it is. Name MA15+ something less stupid (15+ perhaps?). Keep R18+ as it is. X18+ could be broadened to cover anything that's RC but not criminally illegal (everyone understands that X is stronger than R), not just pornography, and availability of hire/sale of X18+ should (as it is) currently be restricted to strictly age-controlled vendors. The general message should be that with X-rated material, viewers are adult enough to decide for themselves what they're capable of taking in, and that it's not the government's place to step in as moral guardians until tangible criminality is demonstrated in the work as is indeed the case with child abuse material.

Q22:

No opinion.

Q23:

No opinion.

Q24:

To everyone? No content can be outright prohibited. There are far too many distribution channels even just online (the web, usenet, peer-to-peer filesharing like IRC, multicast technologies like Bit Torrent, streaming video, email, even online shopping) with far too many nodes of distribution for anyone with any sense to expect to be able to police them effectively.

Content should be classified and advice made available wherever possible, to the end goal that people should be aware of what they're potentially in for ahead of taking in a particular work, but online it's far from possible and the Australian Government doesn't seem to have accepted that.

Q25:

No. The RC cut-off point is somewhat low considering that the vast majority of adults are perfectly responsible for themselves, and in almost all cases extreme material needs to be deliberately sought out.

Q26:

Yes - RC material has been criminal in WA since the Gallup government, which is not the case in any other state. No opinion on promotion.

Q27:

One that doesn't leave R18+ ratings for computer games left in limbo for years despite overwhelmingly positive public support would be a good start.

Q28:

Yes. The AGs of the different states have proven with the R18+ for computer games debacle that distributing the decision to the individual states under the current system is painfully unworkable.

Q29:

Crowdsourcing the classification of online media using a central database could work, even if people are invited to do a short 30-minute course in classification communicating their responsibilities, provided that web access is not impeded unduly. Educating people as to their extended responsibilities under a voluntary classification system instead of expecting the government to babysit them and who are responsible for them would also be sensible.

Other comments:

An R18+ rating for computer games is massively overdue. Even NZ has an R18+ games rating. Make it happen.