First name: Sam
Last name: Dwyer

Q1:
The ALRC should focus on a new framework for classification. The current classification framework is obviously outdated and not able to cope with the amount of content requiring classification nor is it able to provide a consistent classification system across different media.
Q2:
Consistency across media, a clear explanation of how the classification system works and a clear explanation of how different content is evaluated so that it falls within specific classifications.
Q3:
No, content should be classified consistently within its given context.
Q4:
Yes. The sheer quantity of content requiring classification makes this necessary.
Q5:
The potential impact of content should not affect whether it should be classified. 'Potential impact' is too subjective and too dependent on too many variables to be a proper component of a national classification scheme.Content specifically designed for children should be classified across all media, but content that may simply be encountered by children or that may be avoided through simple action from a parent or guardian should not be considered as 'designed for children'.
Q6:
No
Q7:
Yes
Q8:
Yes
Q9:
No
Q10:
No
Q11:
Q12:
Removing access to the internet is the only effective method for controlling access to online content. Other, slightly more ineffective methods, may include: personal filters, police presence, parental and guardian watchfulness. Incredibly ineffective methods may include: ISP filters, blacklists and protocol based filtering.
Q13:
Personal filters installed on home computers.
Clear, honest and careful education.
Careful and watchful moderation by a parent or guardian when a child is online.

Let's be perfectly clear: The Internet is a potentially bad place. In the same way that a dark alley at 2am in a bad part of town is a potentially bad place. You don't let children wander dark alleys unaccompanied and you certainly don't let young children use the internet unmoderated. Expecting this to be part of the job of a National Classification system is nonsensical.

Q14:

Appropriate packaging

Clear, honest and careful education.

Careful and watchful moderation by a parent or guardian.

Q15:

When the user is able to make a choice as to whether or not they wish to continue consuming the classified content

Q16:

Oversight and transparency of classification and regulation of content should be role of all three

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Newspapers, advertising, books, audio, games, magazines, radio, movies, television, dance, theatre, opera, live performace, art

Q19:

The Government should subsidise all classification of content. Classification is a social requirement from the Govenment and, as such, should be up to society and the government to pay for it.

Q20:

Refused Classification (RC) is easily the worst offender within the current classification categories. Confusing, pointless and insulting for the vast majority of media and content it is applied to it should have no place within an improved classification framework.

Q21:

Refused Classification (RC) should be removed. Video games should get a R18+ classification.

Q22:

Remove unclear classification categories (such as RC) and make categories consistent across media. Currently different categories only apply to certain media.

Q23:

Q24:

None. Illegal content would still be illegal to view and punishable by law for accessing or creating. Classification of content is one thing, policing and prosecuting access to prohibited content is the job of the courts not a classification body.

Q25:

No. It does not. Not even slightly. Refused Classification is NOT illegal. There is no basis for prohibiting access to content that isn't illegal.

Q26:

Yes

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

The removal of the Refused Classification category would be the single best improvement for Australia's classification framework.

Other comments: