

First name:

Mark

Last name:

Pappin

Q1:

The ALRC should focus on improving key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

The primary objectives of a national classification scheme should include:

1. optionality [classification of content should not be a mandatory pre-requisite to distribution or access - classification should be permitted, not required, and those parts of the market to whom classification provides value will prefer classified to unclassified content]

2. technology-neutrality [existing use of technology must not be embedded into criteria or any part of the scheme - emergence of new technologies, or new uses of existing technologies, must not lead to inconsistencies in classification of the same content]

3. transparency [the fact that particular content has or has not been classified must be available to all; the reasons for the resulting classification should also be made clear]

4. immunity to scope creep [e.g. to investigate and prosecute on the basis of classification or lack thereof of content, rather than to investigate and prosecute the crimes which in turn lead to the production or possession of that content, takes scarce resources away from the latter and allows arguably more-harmful activities to continue]

5. ease of understanding by the public, not just of the end result (para 31), but also of the criteria against which content is assessed

Q3:

No, the technology or platform used to access content should not affect whether content should be classified. (Note: see Q2, response parts 1 and 2)

Q4:

Yes, content should only be required to be classified if the content has been the subject of a complaint. (Note: see Q2, response part 1)

Q5:

Yes, the potential impact of content should affect whether it should be classified.

Yes, content designed for children should be classified across all media. (Note: see Q2, response part 1 - this is a market segment likely to prefer classified to unclassified content; this is not a statement of requirement but of exemption-from-requirement.)

Q6:

Yes, size of content producers and distributors, or market reach of the material, should affect whether content should be classified. (Note: see Q2, response part 1 - this is not a statement of _requirement_ but of exemption-from-requirement.)

Q7:

No, artworks should not be required to be classified before exhibition for the purpose of restricting access. (Note: see Q2, response part 1)

Artworks (or any other content) should be _permitted_ to be classified for the purpose of providing consumer advice.

Q8:

Yes, sound recordings should be classified or regulated in the same way as other content. (Note: see Q2, response part 1 - this is not a statement of _requirement_ but of exemption-from-requirement.)

Q9:

Yes, size and composition of the audience should affect whether content should be classified. (See Q5 and Q6)

Q10:

No, location of access of content should not affect whether it should be classified. (Note: see Q2, response part 1 - this is not a statement of _requirement_ but of exemption-from-requirement.)

Q11:

Q12:

I suggest classification for the purpose of providing consumer advice and _not_ restricting access: access to no content would be restricted under the National Classification Scheme, and thus no action would be necessary to control access to online content.

The public should have access to filtering software and hardware that they can install to control access within their own premises as they see fit.

Those members of the public choosing to not filter their connection would have the responsibility to lodge a complaint about any objectionable material found online not displaying the appropriate classification symbol.

Enforcement resources would be directed to investigation and prosecution of criminal activities, of which any online content would merely be evidence.

Q13:

Supervision of children's access to online content is the only reasonable mechanism. The definition of "inappropriate" varies with the maturity of the child, and also with the parents' beliefs and standards.

Q14:

Promote the classification of content, and the display of classification symbols.

Q15:

Let the market decide - content displaying classification markings, warnings or consumer advice will be preferred by those consumers for whom this information has value.

Q16:

government agencies: classification of content when demanded by either content producers or distributors, or complainants

industry bodies: creation of codes of conduct and other guidelines

users: responsibility for their own actions; complain when necessary

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

No access to any content should be entirely prohibited online.

If production of specific content is prohibited, then those producing that content should be prosecuted.

If possession of specific content is prohibited, then those possessing that content should be prosecuted.

If the content is legal to produce and possess, then access to it can not reasonably be prohibited.

Q25:

No, because no access to any content should be prohibited online.

Q26:

Yes, consistency of state and territory classification laws is important.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: