First name: Matt
Last name: McCormack

Q1:
I'm not entirely sure this is the right question - either way could achieve the same end. An improved (or new) framework that takes into account the speed of technical innovation, the breadth of age and experience of computer users, and puts the onus for content on these end uses.
Q2:
This is a very odd question to be asking the public. Even after reading the scheme review document, I don't think that I (or anyone else without sufficient background knowledge) can accurately and usefully answer it. Regardless, some objectives might include:
- Allowing consenting adults to access legal content, regardless of media (i.e. television, video games, etc)
- Making a concerted effort to properly identify the spectrum of users for the media (for example, assuming that video games are for those underage is a flawed premise which has lead me to spend my time filling this form in)
- Having a standard, objective and informed framework that is uniform across various media (be it DVD, video game, iPhone apps, ...)
Q3:
No, as mentioned above. Trying to base access control on the technology ensures the framework becomes obsolete very quickly and doesn't allow for innovation, which then leads into arguments over technicalities, etc.
Q4:
No. Similar vein to Q3, it's an arbitrary measure. A 'complaint' can come from a genuinely concerned citizen, a political puppet with the intention of helping a certain (potentially misguided) cause, etc.
Q5:
Content designed for those under the legal age of consent could be treated differently to that of consenting adults, yes. However, properly defining what content is designed for children becomes very important in this case. e.g. "Video games are for children" leads us down a road based on a faulty premise, which would change the classification.
Q6:
That makes some sense.
Q7:
If this were to happen, there would be technicalities based on the classification of a piece. For example, if an 'art installation' is a movie reel of sex, is it appropriate for children to view it because it's 'art'? A less rigid approach is needed.
Q8:
Trying to fit classifications based on the media itself is short sighted. That being said, visual media could potentially have more of an impact. Splitting the classification into visual and non-visual might make sense.

Q9:

Composition of the audience, yes. If it's the same audience that you'd find at a Wiggles concert, then you'd want to restrict it differently to a room of 30-40 year olds.

Q10:

Publicly displayed content has a higher risk of being exposed to those it wasn't intended for, so yes. At home, the onus is on the guardian for content control.

Q11:

Whether it contains/portrays illegal activities.

Q12:

This is a giant can of worms. URL filtering does little-to-nothing. Attempting to censor the Internet is a technically futile exercise that infringes on people's right to choose.

Q13:

- By their parents. Online instructions for the less technically inclined parents on how to make their children restricted users on the computers, which then allows them to more effectively control the content they view and the software they install (i.e. if the parents are administrators on the computers, they can set up filtering software etc that can't be disabled by the child)

- A blanket scheme for Internet censorship is futile, but an OPTIONAL government software suite or proxy server could allow parents to filter content which is dynamically updated and controlled by the government specifically for protecting children. This is something that schools would enforce too.

- Making parents realize that they need to take responsibility for bringing technology into the household.

Q14:

see above Q13

Q15:

Depends on whether the content is targeted at those under 18.

Q16:

- To set out standards and guidelines around the content

- To provide an optional means for parents to restrict their children from some online content

- To educate parents

Q17:

Potentially yes. However, industry self-interest may make this unfeasible.

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

Blanket censorship doesn't work. You just raise the bar of technical expertise required to get around it.

Regulations that realize that you can't prevent people from accessing content, and account for the fast pace of technical change, would be useful.

For those underage, education for parents on how to restrict content, as well as providing the means for them to do so (by providing a government regulated and updated censored proxy or VPN) would be a great first step.