First name: Will
Last name: Kelly

Q1:
Developing a new framework, through which content can be classified more accurately.
Q2:
To advise purchasers and vendors as to the suitability of content for people of all age levels, and to classify all content to the best of the boards ability.
Q3:
No.
Q4:
Yes, content which is not being sold, or which is being distributed by a vendor that does not charge, particularly when the content is intended to be simple and non-offensive in nature.
Q5:
It should be rated across all mediums which are being sold through vendors such as Physical or online stores, however classifying all web content is impractical and ineffective.
Q6:
Yes. While it is impractical to focus on all bits of media, focusing on the major items will ensure that majority of potential harm (if any) is avoided.
Q7:
No, not unless complaints have been lodged.
Q8:
No, as such content is typically regulated by parents, and it is generally clear whether it is suitable or not for minors. A "coarse language warning" or "mature themes" warning should suffice.
Q9:
No.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
Q12:
Optional parental filters, placed on the computer directly, and not ineffective, costly and politically risky ISP level filters.
Q13:
Better parental supervision and education as to the dangers of communicating online.
Q14:
Increased penalties for offending vendors.
Q15:
When it is being sold amongst content of varying ratings - for example R 18+ content amongst PG rated works - a rating would be less neccessary if the content was being sold in an adult store, for example, or a G rating in a store explicitly designed for kids.

Q16:

Government agencies - To educate and set guidelines of acceptable content in various levels, and to bar grossly offensive material that goes against your average moral code.

Industry Bodies - to adhere to this code

Users - to be aware of the code, and purchase materials which would suit them.

Q17:

Yes. Providing that industry complied, it would be more effective, save government time and money, and allow for more extensive content classification.

Q18:

Documentaries and educational content.

Q19:

Small independent films should be subsidised, to provide an incentive for smaller filmakers to produce content. Australian content should also recieve a slight discount/overseas pricing be raised, to better assist local content in the marketplace.

Q20:

The M & MA15+ categories are similar in name, but dissimilar in meaning and content. Perhaps a different name could help prevent confusion, but this is a minor issue.

Q21:

There should be a new R18+ rating for video games. Content that is unsuitable for MA15+ games is currently making its way onto the market, which would be prevented with the addition of a new category.

Q22:

The same markings and guidelines should be consistent both in rules and in images, and have similar meaning across every medium and content type.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

No content should be prohibited online - Material which is already illegal generally (such as child pornography) should be controlled through increased policing efforts and greater co-operation between Internet Service Providers and Law Enforcement. However, blocking content entirely online (no matter how despicable or indecent) is a slippery slope which the government should be careful to tread. Intervention by police and long gaol terms for offenders is the best way of policing content online.

Q25:

The current RC category is too broad and should be made more specific, as it is currently very open to interpretation and abuse.

Q26:

Q27:

An international scheme would be ideal, which aims to provide classification for content from all over the world, without individual countries being forced to re-classify each work.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: