First name: Andrew
Last name: Delaney

Q1:
A new framework should be considered, the current system is both too narrow and requires too much work to maintain in times of increasing content creation.

Q2:
The primary objective should be classification not censorship.
The scheme should exist to aid members of the community in making informed choices regarding content that they consume, not to restrict access to large bodies of work, even if the community at large makes them distasteful. Whilst some material, that which creates harm in the process of creating or consuming it should be banned, most works should not, even if the majority of the population may not want to partake in viewing of that work.

Q3:
Only in so far as the practical nature of attempting to classify works that primarily exist beyond the legal reach of our government

Q4:
All content should be classified on a voluntary basis. There should be multiple levels of classification ranging from a measure put out by the content creator, to third party review and finally formal review by the classification board. If complaints are raise regarding a work then mandatory classification should then occur and penalties applied if the initially provided classification level is inappropriate.

Q5:
Content designed for children should be labeled as such, the platforms that deliver that content should be performing their own checks to ensure that all content they provide is as they have advertised, safe for children. If they fail to do that then the platform holder should be held responsible, the content creator if they have been deliberately deceptive regarding the appropriate audience for their material should also be held responsible.

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:
It makes sense from a consistency basis, but I believe that were this to be applied it would be best done on a voluntary basis goign forward rather than classifying all previous materials

Q9:

Q10:
Yes

Q11:

Q12:
Filtering software that parents can install on their own systems.

Q13:
Filtering software that parents can install on their own systems. Parental oversite

Q14:

The current system appears to work.

Q15:

At the distribution point.

Q16:

Oversight over

Q17:

Yes, the US system appears to work well and has avoided stifling innovation. It allows for more platforms to exist, including ones such as the Xbox Live Indie Arcade

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

R18+ and X18+ should be combined into the same category, the reasons for the rating are provided in short form at the point of purchase/distribution and the audiences limitations are the same, it is an unnecessary category.

Q21:

There needs to be an R18+ category for games.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Content that is harmful in the creation or consumption, such as child pornography (where a child is harmed in the creation of the content)

Q25:

It is far too broad and contains material that is not inherently harmful.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

It would help streamline the overall system.

Q29:

Other comments: