First name: Ryan
Last name: Kellow

Q1:
Developing a new framework for classification, the current system is too aged and a new system would be far more effective.
Q2:
To allow the free access to entertainment for adults while protecting children who may come to harm from it.
Q3:
No. Regardless of evidence for or against if there is any doubt that children may be effected by any media they should be protected.
Q4:
Not at all I've witnessed the mess caused by the classification debate with the internet and general population up in arms, and yet their message still wasn't getting through. I have no faith in a system of complaints that has been unable to regulate feedback up until this point.
Q5:
The potential impact should definitely affect if it's classified or not. I've been following the r18 argument since I was 16 and trying to get it through. I have seen countless children buy games that they should never be allowed to, convincing their parents to buy games for them. With an R18 rating game stores will have the ability to refuse sale to parents who are clearly purchasing for their children, especially when the content is unfit for a child. All media should be classified if possible, but never blacklisted or banned.
Q6:
No. Children need to be protected, even if it's just a few being exposed it's the duty of the government to at the very least inform parents of the danger.
Q7:
Art is definitely a tricky subject, providing consumer advice would be a simple solution but we've already seen the line between pornography and art blurred.
Q8:
Yes, albeit the classification would likely be lighter.
Q9:
No.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
Everything that we can possibly classify should be classified. Restricting access to classified material however is a different argument. Consumers often act in idiotic ways, having an easily identifiable and reliable label is a quick way to remedy this.
Q12:

Easy, optional filters. Any mandatory filter scheme is going to spark protest and it's good that it does so, adults have the ability to decide what is right for them and any good parent would love the internet filter. So how do we protect children and families while giving free access to adults? Optional internet filter, if we can make a system that is easily configured based on classification that the parents and consumers can set themselves; families can protect their children based on their age and adults can keep their freedom. (say if a family has young children the filter could be set to block access to sites that may be alright for 15 year olds and when they turn 15 the filter can be moved to 18+ etc. although that would be a monumental task for the government to do.)

Q13:

As I said in question 12. The internet filter wasn't a bad idea, just the mandatory part of it was a horrible infringement on the rights of adults.

Q14:

It's incredibly hard to fix this. There are horrible parents in the world and definitely in Australia, these parents don't care how their children are raised and frankly their children turn out to be horrible little bastards. Perhaps giving a way for teachers and community members to express official concern over such children. For instance, if a pornographic magazine was found in a young child's possession the teacher would likely call the parents who* then actively abuse the school for not raising their child for them; and in the end give very little care for the child in question.

*(in my experience of being the child of a teacher and hearing such stories from other teachers, a lot of the time the parents simply don't care and expect the schools to do everything. An official complaint that allows government intervention and warning might be enough to keep the parents from ruining their child. Or at the very least allow the government to actually raise the kid instead of the parent.)

Q15:

PG and onwards.

Q16:

The government agencies should of course be the final word but the industry needs to know it's place, and I believe a great many studios and producers of media know this. They're actively trying to make their products easily definable and never once have I seen a piece of media that has attempted to lie in order to get into a lower classification. On top of this the users need an easy way to express concern. A telephone hotline simply isn't good enough, the current market requires something that allows a user to quickly explain their issue. An online form and complaint system would be a good start provided it is designed in a way that it actually functions; unlike a great deal of government sites.

Q17:

Yes definitely. We're seeing a responsible industry here, particularly the gaming industry. They know their products and they more than anybody else want to reach the right audience and protect themselves from scandal. Everybody wants to support this scheme, everybody understands why we need it and the industry isn't about to mess that up.

Q18:

Any content the industry can, it would better still if the industry only advised a classification. The advertisers classification board (I believe that's the correct name but I'm unsure) is a self regulated industry board that answers to a government system but otherwise operates entirely on it's own. It very rarely lets things slip classification because they understand the need to protect their industry.

Q19:

Not entirely sure.

Q20:

Nope. MA, and MA15+. People are actually completely idiotic when it comes to ratings. Perhaps a new scheme that is well marketed will be better, something trustworthy and easy to understand. Something simple as well, I understand that MA is just advisory but it's hard for other people to remember that. We need clear concise tiers of classification if this is going to work any better.

Q21:

Again we need a clearer system. If you have to advertise what the ratings mean then the system has already failed.

Q22:

Exact same format for the ratings, same colour code and the same standard of classification. We have some movies slipping into MA that should easily be R18. while some pg films get put into MA. That needs to be stopped. We as consumers need a reliable system that we can trust to be accurate, and if something is incorrectly classified there needs to be an easy method of reform.

Q23:

Scrap them, and MAKE THEM THE SAME AS EVERY OTHER FORMAT OF MEDIA. Also, don't ban games you don't like. Who the hell are you to decide if an adult is capable of seeing some content, let them choose.

Q24:

Anything that would otherwise be illegal. Child pornography is definitely one of them, the sale of illegal drugs another. It's hard to define a hard guideline but anything that supports an illegal act and bears witness to one should be blocked. An online movie depicting murder doesn't need prohibition since nobody was actually murdered but a real murder scene should be prohibited. If that makes any sense.

Q25:

No. The system is completely messed up.

Q26:

Yes, Everything, everywhere in Australia needs to be consistent. The law doesn't work otherwise, people need a scheme they can trust and they can't boycott.

Q27:

Australia wide classification.

Q28:

Yes. Because we've seen what Michael Attkinson has done for the gaming industry, Absolutely nothing. Instead he supported an archaic system that was hurting EVERYBODY. Not just adults, not just the industry but the children as well because he was too damn proud of himself to do his job properly. Individual agenda should not determine the saftey of a nation's people.

Q29:

Freedom of access to those who will not be harmed for it. Anything implemented by the government should be in the interest of protecting the freedoms of everybody.

Other comments: