First name: Marc
Last name: Chee

Q1:
Q2:
Providing information to the consumer regarding the product they wish to purchase/view/play. It should not provide a framework under which the Australian government is given the ability to suppress freedom of speech.
Q3:
No. All entertainment media should be classified under the same rules.
Q4:
Q5:
All content should be classified based on its actual content, regardless of any other side issues. The classification should be independent of any outside factors and be focused entirely on the content itself.
Q6:
No. As before, all content should be judged on its content alone, rather than any outside factors.
Q7:
Artworks can be classified in order to provide consumer advice, but never for the purpose of restricting access. Consumers need to be informed so that they can make decisions themselves, but still empowered to make that decision rather than having it made for them.
Q8:
Q9:
No. Only the content itself is relevant.
Q10:
All content can be classified, but it's important that content for the home be largely unrestricted. It is for a consumer to decide for themselves what is fit for showing in their home.
Q11:
Q12:
Contacting the creator and provider of the content and asking them to not provide it.
Q13:
Educating parents on what is accessible online and how to help their children access what they want without trying to arbitrarily block portions of the internet (which has already been proven on multiple occasions not to work)
Q14:
Q15:
If content is genuinely restricted to a certain age group, it should bear markings for its classification.
Q16:
Q17:

Yes. The current classification scheme has made several glaring errors with the computer games industry, refusing classification on some games while providing "weaker" classifications on others. These inconsistencies are very well known amongst gaming media and within the industry, so working alongside the industry would be very beneficial.

Q18:

Content designed specifically for children/families would be easy for the industry to classify and relieve the burden of the work from the Government.

Q19:

A possible solution would be for the government to subsidise classification of any content that is expected to profit below a certain amount (the threshold for this would have to be calculated carefully) and if the content ends up profiting higher than that, will be expected to return the subsidy to the Government.

Q20:

Q21:

R18+ for Computer Games. This is necessary seeing as the average age of gamers is now reaching the 30s. Refusing classification for games above MA 15+ demeans the adults who enjoy computer gaming as a recreational pastime and are happy to play R18+ content.

Q22:

Classification markings should be identical across all media formats. Unfortunately, this will be infeasible for the majority of online content.

Q23:

Yes. Films and Computer Games should be under the same classification.

Q24:

None.

Q25:

Q26:

Consistency of state and territory classification is largely irrelevant as state boundaries are arbitrary. Likewise, nearly any classification scheme will always be able to be circumvented with imports/buying overseas etc.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes. The current system is bogged down in requiring all State Attorney Generals to agree before being able to make decisions regarding classification. If the same classification is to be used across Australia, it doesn't make any sense to have all states and territories working on the issue separately.

Q29:

Other comments: