First name: Andrew
Last name: Ronfeldt

Q1:
The ALRC ought to seek to improve the existing framework; rather than redesign a system that already works reasonably well.

Q2:
A national classification scheme ought to provide useful information to users of content that can allow adults to make informed decisions about whether they wish to access particular content. It ought to have regard for shielding vulnerable populations from potentially damaging content (such as particular content for children).

Q3:
No; as technologies and platforms converge this model becomes less relevant. The scheme ought to have regard for the rapidly changing nature of content access frameworks.

Q4:
Yes; any content developed by a small business or a consumer ought not be required to be classified unless it has been the subject of a complaint or is reasonably expected to be the subject of a complaint.

Q5:
Yes; this allows the OFLC to focus its efforts on classifying high-impact, far-reaching or contentious content.

Q6:
Yes; the office ought to triage classification efforts to focus on far-reaching content

Q7:
Yes; on the basis that a framework for artistic freedom is maintained

Q8:
Yes; convergent media makes this a necessity.

Q9:
Yes; this allows the OFLC to focus its efforts on classifying high-impact, far-reaching or contentious content.

Q10:
No; however the office ought not impinge upon the implied freedoms for consenting adults to enjoy contentious content assuming its production does not harm anyone. By way of example; I support an R18+ rating for video games and would support restriction of this to places where minors are excluded.

Q11:
Classification must not be used as a barrier to entry to media markets. Small content producers and artists need to have equitable access to classification.

Q12:

There are no effective methods when it comes to controlling access to online content. Efforts should be focused on informing responsible guardians of minors, educating minors and law-enforcement for clearly unlawful content (rather than adult content which may be contentious, like R18+ video games)

Q13:

Education of children and their guardians is the only reliable way of managing this. Any technical solution is vulnerable to being bypassed.

Q14:

I consider that the status quo for offline content such as magazines is reasonably mature and appropriate.

Q15:

When it causes offense or injury, or is likely to cause offense or injury to a viewer or group of viewers.

Q16:

Users ought to take more responsibility for the content they access; government ought to spend less time controlling access.

Q17:

Yes; this is an effective measure assuming appropriate sanctions are available to and used by regulators.

Q18:

Feature films, television broadcasts, radio broadcasts

Q19:

Absolutely. Classification ought not be used as a barrier to entry for small producers of content

Q20:

Yes; they're understood well.

Q21:

Yes; there is a need for new categories for video games.

Q22:

There ought to be a standardisation of markings, criteria and guidelines across different types of content - that is, remove the context contingency from the classification decision.

Q23:

Yes, absolutely.

Q24:

Any material that relies upon the abuse of a child or other vulnerable person

Q25:

Yes; though it ought to be protected from political conversation being refused classification under the guise of preventing "sedition"

Q26:

Yes; there ought to be uniformity across the commonwealth

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: