First name: David

Last name: Henselin

Q1:

Develop a new classification system that is:

1. Developed for the 21st century.

2. Efficient.

3. Clear guidelines.

4. Transparent.

5. Consistent across all states and territories.

Q2:

1. Truly uphold the principle that Australian adults should be able to read, hear and see what they want regardless of delivery platform.

2. Protect children from content that was never designed for them.

3. Modification of the classification categories with clear guide lines.

4. New "Adults only" category for both movies and games.

5. A system that is less onerous on businesses.

6. More involvement with industry.

7. Removal of "RC" from the classification scheme and replaced with a "Legal" and "illegal" content framework.

8. Review of "Restricted Access System Declaration 2007" which appears to onerous and cumbersome on existing and future content providers.

9. Legislation to prevent governments (present and future) and lobby groups from widening the scope of content captured if "Refused Classification" is to be implemented for online content.

Q3:

Yes, trying to classify content on the internet which is a fluid medium imposes different challenges to those of the traditional world of television, print media, DVDs etc, for the following reasons.

1. Internet consist of over a trillion unique URLs and over 130 000 000 active domains (source domaintools.com) plus hundreds of thousands of applications for Iphone, Android, and Microsoft platforms. Thus classifing the internet would be very resource intensive.

2. A lot of this content changes on a hourly, daily or weekly basis.

3. Most domains exist and new applications that are created are in International jurisdictions.

4. Restrictions are easily circumvented.

5. Censorship creep is very real.

Q4:

Subject to a complaints system would best be applied to online content and Apps for the reasons given in question 3.

Q5:

No, because different people view the word "potential" in different ways, and judgement can be influenced by gender, enthical background, religion, etc. Instead clear standards (benchmarks) for

each classification rating similar to the present system would help minimise personal influences. Yes.

Q6:

No, so long as content is rated within a fair and open system.

Q7:

For consumer advice only, possibly with the implementation of a "Code of Conduct" that only applies within that industry including concerts.

Q8:

Music, audio books should continue using the current system of "consumer advice" only.

Q9:

No, except this becomes rather complex when talking about the internet.

Q10:

No, although open air venues which host concerts, music, drama, arts etc, would better suit consumer advice warnings rather than being subject to actual classification.

Q11:

Educational material should not be classified.

Q12:

First an open internet with a filtering system that only blocks "illegal content" should be the goal of the Australian government and not the implementation of the Refused Classification (RC) category. For those who seek further blocking of online content the Government could offer a free home based filtering system or extended ISP filtering beyond "illegal content" for those families and individuals that specifically request such a service, but this service should never become mandatory.

What ever system is used it needs to uphold the principle that Australian adults should be able to read, hear and see what they want regardless of delivery platform and ALRC needs to be mindful of the real possibility of censorship creep by current and future governments.

Q13:

1. Parents need to take better responsibility for their children's online activities.

2. Better Education.

3. Government offers free home based filtering system or extended ISP filtering beyond "illegal content" for those families that specifically request such a service and this service should never become mandatory.

Q14:

The present system would be sufficient if enforced properly, but in addition, magazines etc can be kept out of reach of children, example, not placed near confectionery and higher on the display stand and worded "Adults Only".

Q15:

All content should display markings, warnings or consumer advice except educational material.

Q16:

Government needs to develop one universal system that applies to the whole nation.

Industry should be allowed to self regulate with government intervention when breaches occur.

Q17:

Yes, definitely. The current system is cumbersome, expensive and would not be practical in the digital age because of the vast amount of
content being produced globally and the various platforms it is distributed across.

Q18:

1. Content produced specifically for children (G) .

2. Content produced specifically by the Adult Industry, X-rated material.

Q19:

Small independent film companies should receive some form of subsidy.

Q20:

Yes. If any i think MA15+ because of some confusion of an adult accompaning a child under 15 yrs of age.

Q21:

Existing classification categories are sufficient but with modification.

1. Add "iE" for industry classified Educational content.

2. Change G to "iG" for industry classified General content.

3. PG,M and R for movies kept as current.

4. MA15+ changed to "MA16+".

5. Introduce R18+ for video games.

6. X18+ changed to"iX20+" for industry classified Adult content and be available only in adult stores nation wide.

The "R18+" rating should not be subject to any more display restrictions then is currently being applied whether for hire or sale.

Q22:

The present Logo system of colour and size should be retained because most people understand it now except change MA16+ to orange,

R18+ red and X20+ to retain black.

Q23:

Yes, to provide consistency and less confusion.

Q24:

Only illegal content not RC content should be prohibited online as the current RC content is to broad, not clearly understood and misinterpreted.

Q25:

No definitely not. Australia appears to be unique in the Western World with "RC".

"RC" should be dropped and replaced with "legal" and "illegal" content with the classification system to inform on the impact of the former and Law Enforcement dealing with the latter. "RC" is not clearly understood and is confusing with it's definitions like "decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adults", or "describe or depict in a way that is likely to cause offence to a reasonable adult".

So what exactly is the definition of a "reasonable adult"?

Q26:

There needs to be one federal independent transparent governing body that enacts and enforces classification system.

Q27:

The requirement that all state and territory Attonery Generals need to agree on a piece of legislation, for example the introduction of a R18+ for video games should be scrapped, instead replaced by one governing federal body.

Q28:

Yes, federal government should enact a national classification system that takes precedence over state classification laws for consistency in Law Enforcement and provide a less confusing environment for both industry and consumers.

Q29:

Look at overseas classification models.

Other comments:

The present classification system was never designed for the fluid constantly changing online environment, the vast quantities of content that are beginning to flood the market or ever keep pace with rapid technological change.Unlike the recent Senate Standing Committee inquiry into Australian Film and Literature Classification Scheme i hope ALRC will think outside the "box" on this most important issue of classification and offer some real solutions for the 21st century that represent the rights of adult Australians at large and not just the views of ultra-conservative religious lobby groups that insist on taking the nation back 50 years.

I encourage ALRC to recommend the abolishment of the "RC" category and replace with a "legal" and "illegal" category, the introduction of an R18+ for video games, industry self-regulation for online and particular categories of content, introduction of new classification categories, the internet filter should only capture "illegal" content and the establishment of a new independent, transparent federal classification body.