

CI 1334 A Mory

First name: Alastair

Last name: Mory

Q1:

the ALRC should focus on developing a new framework for classification that is better able to be applied across a range of media, as opposed to different ratings that apply to only one type of media.

Q2:

Q3:

Q4:

yes, for any content that had a limited audience this should be the case.

Q5:

where possible content that is intended for children should be classified -

Q6:

yes, content that is not intended for general release or has a limited audience or distribution should not be subject to compulsory classification, unless it is the subject of complaints.

Q7:

art should not be classified for the purpose of restricting access however when the art is in a form that would usually be classified it would be acceptable to classify the art for the sole purpose for providing consumer advice

Q8:

yes, however as their impact usually lies somewhere between that of audio visual content and artworks the level of classification they receive should reflect this.

Q9:

yes, content that has an expected audience below a certain size should not have to be classified - however if the size of the audience goes above this level that content should be classified.

Q10:

yes, It would be acceptable mandate the classification of content if it is to be accessed in public, however if it is only to be accessed at home classification of that content should be optional and up to the publisher of such content.

Q11:

Q12:

there should be no blanket restrictions to online content under the National Classification Scheme.

Q13:

It should be mandatory for ISPs to provide a filtering solution that is appropriate for children, either through hardware or software on the customers premises or through solutions at the ISPs end.

Q14:

Q15:

when the content has wide distribution and audience it should be required to display classification markings, warnings or consumer advice

Q16:

Q17:

yes, the industry itself should be responsible for classifying the majority of content however where a complaint arises a classification process similar to the current one should exist to officially rate content.

Q18:

Industry should be allowed to classify all content, however there should be penalties for underrating content (rating content that should be MA with an M for example) where complaints arise that content should be rated again by a government classification board.

Q19:

all circumstance where the content has been made to be officially rated due to a complaint should be subsidised by the government if the complaint causing the content to be officially rated is invalid.

Q20:

Not entirely.

RC, the difference between R and MA, and the difference between M and MA do not seem to be fully understood.

Q21:

yes a rating between R (or x) and RC or above RC should be created to make a distinction between content that has simply been refused classification and content that is illegal per se. content that has only been refused classification and is not in itself illegal should be illegal to sell, but not to own or import for private consumption.

Q22:

yes. the G, PG, M, MA, R and X with and E (exempt) and RC (refused classification) should apply across all forms of media.

Q23:

yes

Q24:

access to content that is in itself illegal (ie illegal currently through acts other than the classification act) should be prohibited - but not blocked by any technical means.

Q25:

no, the definition of rc as content that will "offend against the standards of morality, decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adults" is too broad. If RC content is to be prohibited online it should be limited to content that is illegal in acts other than the classification act (ie. child pornography, hate speech, instructions on committing crimes)

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: