First name: Matthew
Last name: Lynch

Q1:
Focus on developing a new framework, that addresses the needs of modern mass information services, and more immersive entertainment.
Q2:
To ensure a sensible approach to classification is taken, and that access to legitimate forms of information and entertainment are not restricted by an over zealous framework.
Q3:
Yes. Though this is a poorly worded question.

Content accessible to children without supervision (e.g. content distributed through stores) should be subject to pre-sale/publish review and classification.

Content delivered via technology/platforms that can reasonable be subjected to adult supervision/moderation (such as the internet) should only be subject to classification when the subject of a complaint.

Though content on platforms such as the internet should be subject reasonable post-publication review and classification in the framework of the law, with civillian oversight where appropriate.
Q4:
Yes. Content distributed through platforms that can reasonably be moderated/supervised by parents (such as the internet) should only be subject to post-publication review and classification when the subject of a complaint (where raised by the public, or in the framework of law and review).
Q5:
As described in Q3 & Q4, I believe content that can be resonably moderated/supervised by parents should only be subject to classification in the light of complaints; however, content targeted at children by means of advertising should be regularly reviewed, and classified if required.
Q6:
Materials advertised to children should be subject to regular review for inappropriate content, and classified if required, but the market position/reach should not determine whether content is subject to pre-publication classification... beyond the exceptions described in my answer to Q3 (e.g. content not reasonably subject to adult supervision).
Q7:
No, though guidelines should exist for content to be exhibited in public places (see answer to Q9).
Q8:
Yes.
Q9:
No.

Q10:

Guidelines should be developed for content to be displayed in public places, and those guidelines should be enforced in the framework of the law, though content designed for public display should not automatically be classified.

Q11:

The main consideration should be whether the content can be reasonably moderated/restricted/supervised by parents or other responsible gaurdians (such as teachers). If it can not, than it should be reviewed and classified where appropriate. If it can (e.g. Internet content), it should only be subject to review and classification when the subject of a complaint, or within the legal framework (e.g. material deemed to be illegal).

Q12:

Supervision, and education.

Technological solutions for filtering should not be enforced except in the most extreme scenarios (e.g. dangerously illegal content).

Most technological solutions (e.g. deep packet inspection) have a serious impact on the performance of the internet, and yet are easily circumvented.

DNS level blocking should be used for dangerously illegal content (such as child pornography), though the list of blocked content should be subject to responsible civillian review to prevent potential abuse.

Anything beyond DNS level blocking is a waste of money, and will negatively impact the performance of the Internet. DNS level blocking achieves the desired outcome (restricting inadvertant access to highly illegal materials), without the draw backs of more intrusive solutions such as packet inspection.

But enforced filtering of content should only be applied to dangerously illegal content.

Restricting access to classified content online should be achieved by supervision, and if the guardians choose, optional filtering software such as Net Nanny.

Q13:

Supervision, and education. For further information see answer to Q12.

Q14:

Supervision, and education. For further information see answer to Q12.

Q15:

When classified, yes.

Q16:

To review content being made available via channels that are not subject to reasonable adult supervision (e.g. retail stores), and classify that content where appropriate.

To review content that is the subject of complaints, and classify that content where appropriate.

To regularly review content within the legal framework, and content advertised to children, and classify that content where appropriate.

Q17:

Yes. Self classification with in a framework of guidelines, enforced - where appropriate - by law would ensure a more effective system.

Q18:

With an appropriate framework of guidelines:

- Music
- Books
- Movies
- Television Shows
- Video Games

Q19:

I do not understand this question. If it is asking whether monetary incentives should be provided for classifying content that might not otherwise require classification... then I do not believe subsidies should be offered in any circumstances.

Q20:

I believe the existing classification levels applied to televisions and movies are fairly well understood, and should be adopted for all forms of classifiable content.

Q21:

No. The existing categories just need to be uniformly applied to any content that is subject to regulation.

Q22:

I am not sure I understand this question. Classification markings should simply be consistent accross all classified material.

Q23:

One framework for the classification of content should be developed.

Q24:

Dangerously illegal material. The definition of which should be well defined in law, and the scope of which (implementation of the blocking) should be subject to responsible civillian oversight.

Q25:

No. Currently many materials, such as video games, are refused classification simply because the current scope of classifications does not cover them.

Content prohibited online by enforced filters should be limited to dangerously illegal content, the definition of which should be defined in law.

Q26:

Classification laws should be federally mandated.

Q27:

I do not understand sufficiently the term "legislative scheme", but I believe classification laws should be enforced at the federal level.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

More faith should be put in the parents of the nation, and the government should not try to do their job for them. Classification should be applied to content that can not reasonably be moderated by parents, and within the legal framework (e.g. illegal content).

Other comments: