First name: Dean
Last name: Robertson

Q1:
Improvements. Particularly in the case of R-ratings for video games.
Q2:
To advise people about the content. So it is clear what the rating means. To that end, an R-rating for video games should be okay for adults to buy and use and it will be obviour that kids shouldn't have access.
Q3:
No. classifications should be consistent.
Q4:
I guess yes if it is something that would not usually be classified, such as a website (good luck assessing and classifying the 1,000's of new sites created every day).
Q5:
I don't see why not. Isn't the classification about the potential impact?
Q6:
No, even things with little reach should eb assessed for thier impact. It does sound like this could be a lot of work.
Q7:
Yes. In the case of the art photos with nude kids a few years ago, I think classification advice would be positive. Although I do think that situation was blown out of control. I was suprised a few months ago at Melbourne Museum that there are full frontal nude photos of adolescents and adults on display. There was a warning and I am not offended, but it did make me a little uncomfortable. I classification rating for that display may help people make a decisison about entering the display.
Q8:
Yes, I do not see why not.
Q9:
No, see Q6
Q10:
No. I think the classifications may encourage people to be more discrete about what they access away from the home.
Q11:
Q12:
I would support optional filters such as net nanny or similar over blanket filters for internet content. If there is to be a national classification of internet including a filter for banned sites, the banned site list needs to be public and the reasons for banning public as well. I would not like to see r-rated and x-rated websites that are otherwise legal to be banned in secret because of an organised campaign from the moral minority.
Q13:

Parents need to install their own filters and ensure that computers are in living rooms where children are supervised.

Q14:

They shoudln't be sold to minors.

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

R-rated video games.

Q19:

I guess so. If the government chooses to classify media to protect the populace, is it not reasonable that the govenrment pays. If a producer pays system was contemplated, perhaps the film budget could be a guide to assessing the cost/subsidy.

Q20:

I think they are okay. The classifications should be consitent accross all media so an r-rating for video games would be positive.

Q21:

New r-rating for video games.

Q22:

My only answer to this is to MAKE THEM MORE CONSISTENT.

Q23:

I don't see why not is it helps for consistency.

Q24:

The content that is already illegal in Australia (beastiality, sexual violence, kiddie porn, etc.) but be public and transparent about it.

Q25:

Unsure about online. But RC for video games that would be R-rated if that classification was available is unfair.

Q26:

Yes.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

R-rating category for video games.

Other comments: