

CI 1171 P Phillis

First name: Paul

Last name: Phillis

Q1:

I feel the ALRC should focus on developing a new framework for classification, making use of as many applicable parts of the existing framework as reasonable.

Q2:

The primary objectives of a national classification scheme should be:

- Uniform classification rules across different forms of media
- Base classification rules on evidence/fact based studies in regards to "harmful" content
- Prevent children from "harmful" content while allowing adults the freedom to decide what is appropriate for themselves

Q3:

The technology used to access content should not affect whether or not it should be classified. It should not matter whether a video is purchased digitally or from a physical store, what is effectively the same product (for instance a movie) should have the same classification regardless of the source.

Q4:

I feel all content should be classified, but it would be acceptable for content to only be reviewed by an official panel in cases of complaint.

Q5:

The potential impact of content should not affect whether it is classified or not, only how it is classified. Where there is considered to be an impact it should be backed up reasonably with evidence from studies, not merely assumed. Content designed for children should be classified across all media, as should content designed for adults.

Q6:

No, the market position of content producers and distributors, or the potential reach of the material should not affect whether or not content is classified.

Q7:

I see no reason why some/all forms of art should be exempt from classification.

Q8:

I see no reason why audio should be exempt from being classified, however the audio from an Audio/Visual stream will not necessarily have the same impact, any decisions regarding classification based on impact need to be backed up with evidence.

Q9:

No, the size/composition of the potential audience should not affect whether content should be classified or not.

Q10:

It should not affect whether or not content is classified, but any penalties should differ in severity based on the impact they have. An individual viewing content that no individuals were harmed/laws

broken during production in the comfort of their own home should not be subject to harsh/any penalties.

Q11:

All content should be classified, though this may be impractical. If certain media are shown (hard evidence required, not studies with very limited samples and inconclusive results) to have more impact than others, then those should be classified as a priority. Media with little to no impact may be left unclassified if

Q12:

The most effective methods of controlling access to online content are user discretion, education and (in cases of minors) supervision. Online content is better policed than restricted, blanket restrictions based on keywords, perceived content etc are easily circumvented and serve only to suppress (intentionally or otherwise) the freedoms of individuals.

Q13:

Education of parents and a lack of parents attempting to offload parenting duties to the computer. In much the way that an adult shouldn't allow a child to walk off into town unsupervised (depending on age), parents should not allow children unsupervised on the Internet with the expectation that the government should control the environment to make it "safe".

Q14:

In reality it can't, it is up to individuals to look after their own children and/or property. Other than requiring ID checks and trusting that vendors will abide/face consequences, there is little that can be done without imposing unfair/unnecessary restrictions on adults.

Q15:

Content should always be required to display classification markings, warnings or consumer advice. This does not mean that it should be a constant watermark/image but that content should always contain classification details on front cover/box/before tv show/movie.

Q16:

The government should make the regulations, and it should be up to individuals and industry bodies to conform, the government should not be in the business of directly restricting access.

Q17:

I believe that would be more practical to operated in this suggested manner, merely using review boards to sample random selections, or act in cases of complaint to see if companies/industry are complying.

Q18:

No content should be considered obvious and straight forward for the purpose of classification, industry however should be able to use strict guidelines to classify any and all content they produce (subject to review at random/on complaint).

Q19:

If industry follows classification guidelines, then this is largely moot, as it would be up to the producers of the content to classify the content.

Q20:

Border line classification categories are confusing. Our culture is largely focussed on the idea that 18 is the hard defined line at which an individual becomes an adult, content such as M and MA 15+ are

largely misunderstood as 15 is not viewed as an adult, and this 15+ material is often seen as suitable for early teens/mature children. 18+ as a classification sends the message that the content is designed for adults and not suitable for children.

Q21:

I don't think it is necessary for new classification categories, but the categories that exist need to be modified to suit all media, and extended to media that don't currently have them (such as no 18+ rating for computer/video games).

Q22:

Same classifications and markings on all products where possible, possibly a composite of audio (text on written/printed material) and image.

Q23:

Yes, the guidelines for film and games should be consolidated.

Q24:

The only content that should be restricted (if any) is illegal material, not things that are merely refused classification.

Q25:

No, the RC does not match content that should be prohibited online. Only content that is expressly illegal should be prohibited online, the rest should merely be classified where possible.

Q26:

Consistency across state and territory borders is important, I'm not sure how it should be promoted.

Q27:

At the least I think the support required to make changes needs to be a majority instead of requiring 100% support. I feel however that it should be a national matter decided by the federal government.

Q28:

The Commonwealth should be given the power to introduce legislation to establish a new framework.

Q29:

Potentially fewer categories breaking content into age brackets OR more categories based on the type of content and the level rather than an age, letting individuals decide whether they choose to rate violence differently from coarse language etc.

Other comments: