First name: Vaughan
Last name: Knight

Q1:
Improve and extend the existing framework.
Q2:
To provide full classification of all content for distinct media assets. For example, videos, books, magazines, games.
Q3:
No. The means of consumption shouldn't change the classification otherwise it is the means of content that is being classified, not the content itself, which is ultimately the purpose of classification.
Q4:
Q5:
Yes. Content classified for children should be classified across all media to provide guides and confidence for parents purchasing for their children.
Q6:
No. The likely market vs the potential market are not the same. Potential reach of a game sold online is everyone with a computer, but it may be created by an individual. However classification process should be streamlined for those creating multiple instances of content to reduce the overheads of classification engagement.
Q7:
Providing consumer advice is required here. For example something to be seen as extreme may be placed in a particular location in an exhibit to ensure that it does not offend, however those attend should be well aware beforehand. I don't believe classification actually belongs on art on a retrictive basis, but should be used to guide consumers.
Q8:
Yes.
Q9:
No.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
The ultimate end result of someone accidentally consuming content they would be offended by. For example, if something is classified as highly offensive based on a consistent bar, and as a person I end up being offended, I am to blame. But if content is not consistently classified, the classification service is to blame. This is not to bar content that is offensive, but to allow it to be measured in a meaningful way to allow consumers to make the ultimate choice and have that responsibility themselves.
Q12:

Generally it's informing people, and providing opt in means for monitoring and control.

i.e
1. Making people aware for content considered highly restricted, and letting them make the choice to continue, without impeding their experience.

2. Partnering with 'net nanny' style businesses to provide the list to that software automatically, in turn allowing parents to control their childrens consumption.

3. Monitoring, either via a 'net nanny' style implementation, or providing access to internet providers when access to sites on the NCS and therefore monitoring access from a specific account.

Q13:

Parents not controlling their children's access directly is the first point. It's not anyone else's responsibility. However educating parents in how they can monitor and control access would be useful.

As discussed in Q12, generally it's informing people, and providing opt in means for monitoring and control.

i.e
1. Partnering with 'net nanny' style businesses to provide the list to that software automatically, in turn allowing parents to control their childrens consumption.
2. Monitoring, either via a 'net nanny' style implementation, or providing access to internet providers when access to sites on the NCS and therefore monitoring access from a specific account.

Q14:

Generally it's informing people, and providing opt in means for monitoring and control.

i.e
1. Making people aware for content considered highly restricted, and letting them make the choice to continue, without impeding their experience.

2. Partnering with 'net nanny' style businesses to provide the list to that software automatically, in turn allowing parents to control their childrens consumption.

3. Monitoring, either via a 'net nanny' style implementation, or providing access to internet providers when access to sites on the NCS and therefore monitoring access from a specific account.

Q15:

Content considered restricted to adults (18+). All other content i.e. MA, should be monitored/controlled by a responsible adult, be it parents or teachers etc.

Primarily this is to inform adults the content may offend them.

Q16:

Classification, and education.

Q17:

Yes. It is also more dynamic, and based on consumer driven requirements. Those not consuming the content in turn would influence the classification less, which should be the case, since the classification is for those consuming it, not a voice that doesn't really know.

Q18:

Content considered restricted to adults (18+)

Content specifically designed for children (i.e. rated C).

Content rated G

Q19:

Yes, specifically small independent films. Generally this is also because the content of independent films can vary from child like to extremely confronting material, but possibly educational, and as such the classification process can be complicated for this content.

Q20:

Current ones are fine, if they existed across all platforms. There is no R rating for games, and as such MA means what?

Q21:

Consistent ratings across all media content, including games (since it's the worlds biggest entertainment industry). i.e. R rating for games.

Q22:

Yes. If the same classification exists across media formats, then convergence between formats should be provided.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

If this refers to content access being blocked, the answer is none, content in the 'must block' category, should be monitored, possibly with a warning prior to access that you will be monitored due to the nature of the site. No publicly acceptable person would want to access such content.

Usage of that content in turn results in legal action if the usage is perceived to be real usage (not automated bot scripting or someone sending a hidden link to someone as a bad joke). For example, return visits to the site, continual browsing of the site and consumption of content.

This in turn means transparency to consumers.

If it is about what content, generally content that is unwilful exploitation of human rights for the purposes of that content. i.e. Child pornography, snuff etc. This isn't based on the consumption being offensive (since it could be fake and hence legal, i.e. any move where someone gets shot), it's primarily to oppose the illegal creation of the content.

Q25:

No. Currently it is not within the bounds of the same classification of other media, and therefore RC doesn't fall into a 'why RC' bucket at all. It's too broad.

Q26:

Yes. The consistency shouldn't be promoted. The laws should just be promoted as is. Advertising online, radio, and TV about where to get more information. This is about classification and education.

Q27:

Not an expert on how this should be structured, and therefore I am not in a position to respond.

Q28:

No.

Q29:

Provide consistent classification across everything, and think big, since video content online is online content already classified as per DVD/Movie releases. Video content in a game, even the exact same video, if rated R, means the game is refused classification. This simply makes no sense in a modern world where 250M people play the same single game, more than any movie ever produced. The highest selling game of all time, has brought in more revenue than any of the biggest movie titles of all time. The highest selling day #1 sales of games is more than Avatar. Yet we have classification for movies, when less people, and less money is involved, which in turn does not benefit commercial or consumer interests.

Other comments: