First name: Lyndon
Last name: Warren

Q1:
They should improve key elements of the existing framework.
Q2:
To classify material so that people can make intelligent decisions about what material they or their children view. It should not be a censorship system.
Q3:
No, because computers are not magical, therefore any content viewed on a computer is the same as content viewed in any other way.
Q4:
Yes, because there is far too much material in the world for the classification board to classify it all. In an ideal world perhaps we could classify everything in the world but it's simply not possible.
Q5:
No, only the actual impact of content should affect how it is classified. "Potential impact" opens the doors to bad policy shaped by inconclusive studies. If a study concluded that there wasn't any evidence either way that watching the Golden Girls turns people into homicidal lunatics it would be ridiculous to ban it just because of the "potential impact". Yet this is the precise attitude taken when dealing with censorship of videogames, and leads to terrible government policy.
Q6:
In a perfect world no, however, the classification boards current policy of forcing small companies to pay in order for their work to be classified makes it difficult for small companies to get their work classified. The fairest way to deal with this is to not force small scale projects to be classified until a complaint is made. Any other system would provide a serious barrier of entry for smaller scale companies hoping to grow.
Q7:
If a complaint has been lodged then they should be classified, however access to them should not be restricted.
Q8:
In all honesty, there is simply too much music in the world to classify it all. It's not like the old days where the local record shop contains all the CDs you can get. The internet has opened up a near limitless supply of new music. While it might be nice to classify it all, it's simply impossible. It shouldn't be government policy to attempt the impossible.
Q9:
No only the actual size and composition of the audience should affect whether content is classifield. Seriously, literally any thing could suddenly be popular on the internet. Lemon Party is a video of gay porn featuring old age citizens. Pretty nice material you'd assume, but that's now well known enough to be a running joke on mainstream television shows like 30 Rock.

Nobody can accurately assess the potential size of anything any more, but at the same time there is far too much pornography on the internet to sort through it all. The better policy is, if something becomes well known to have a complaint lodged against it then it needs to be classified. Any other policy it totally impractical.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

This question makes as much sense as asking "what are the most effective methods of drinking the sea". There are no effective methods to doing this because it's simply not possible. The best you can hope for is to classify material if a complaint it made.

Q13:

I'm more concerned about actually inappropriate content, and in that case the only reasonable answer is better parenting, and less hand wringing about things that "might" be a problem.

Q14:

The current system is fine.

Q15:

Whenever it is possible to do so.

Q16:

Classification, not censorship. Individuals and families should choose what content they want not governments.

Q17:

It would be preferable, given that the classification board is already stretched thin. They're already dependant on video game companies telling them what's in their games because the board doesn't have time to play through them.

Q18:

All of it, till a complaint is made.

Q19:

If we're not going to allow people to classfy their own work then yes it should be, but letting content creators classify their own work is a simpler solution.

Q20:

They are fine.

Q21:

No

Q22:

It's fine.

Q23:

Yes, they're similar enough to warrant the same code.

Q24:

Child pornography made using real children, not cartoon images, or text. There is far too much grey area for anything other than actual childporn made with real children to be considered child porn.

Q25:

No it's way too board. Do you know pouring some candle wax on a nipple is refused classification? That's pathetic.

Q26:

It's nice and should be a goal if possible, but it's not crucial.

Q27:

The current scheme just needs addmendment.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments:

It should never be government policy to attempt the impossible. The current government's current classification goals are simply not possible. Government must pick it's battles, and needs to stop worrying about "potential threats" more than actual threats.