

CI 1340 H Day

First name: Harry

Last name: Day

Q1:

The ALRC should focus on fixing the existing framework so that it better assists in its intended purpose of helping Australians identify the maturity required to watch a film/play a game. Instead of attempting to censor content. The ALRC should also work to better represent the views of the Australian public.

Q2:

To help parents and other members of the Australian public to identify the intended audience of a movie/game so that they can make an informed decision about what to buy or let their children watch.

Q3:

No, the platform should not effect the classification of media as it does not effect the content. The scheme should not however classify written media (including ebooks and websites without images). Media that is available for free should not be required to be classified as this is not economical viable and may prevent the release of said media, due to cost or time constraints.

Q4:

No, content should all be treated equally so as to avoid bias. Also a complaint based system would not help Australian consumers make an informed decision as only some content would be classified and even if said content was given a low classification (such as a G in the current system) the fact that it was classified would still be a black mark against it for consumers. A complaint based system would also open up content to targeted smear campaigns by competitors or other groups.

Q5:

No, objective and clear guidelines must be present to decide whether content should be classified. Objective guidelines can not be used to decide a subjective issue, such as what is and is not appropriate for children. The classification system should help consumers decide what content is appropriate for them and their children, not classify based on what the board feels is appropriate for a specific audience.

Q6:

Yes, media intended for commercial purposes should be classified where as content that is available for free should not as classification may damage the ability for the latter to be published at all and the purpose of classification is to help consumers make informed purchasing decisions which is not relevant with free content, which is not purchased.

Q7:

If artworks are classified it should be at no cost and only for the purpose of providing consumer advice. Artworks could not be classified under the existing scheme however and are too dissimilar from other media to be classified under the same scheme. The classification of artworks would not be possible under objective guidelines, which would probably damage the industry. The speed of the

classification of artworks must not delay their release as this would severely damage the industry against international competition and make it non-viable for many artists and small galleries.

Q8:

No, sound can't be classified in the same way as visual media. Audio books should not be classified for the same reason as written media such as books. If music has to be classified it should only be based on the use of profanities and should not include public performance. The classification of music would damage the newly developing shift to independent artists as they might not be able to afford the initial cost for entry.

One way music could be classified is if classification was only required for public broadcast on television or radio.

Q9:

Yes, media released for a specific event (such as a conference) should not be classified. Also media which only has a small potential audience (<1000 people) should not be classified as this may add unsustainable cost to a project.

Q10:

No, classification is there so consumers can make an informed purchasing decision this is not effected by the location.

Q11:

- The ability to classify similar content without bias.
- Whether it is feasible to classify said content
- Whether classification will help consumers

Q12:

Online content should not be censored and the classification scheme should help consumers make an informed choice not restrict access to content.

There are no viable methods of controlling online content and content could not be classified fast enough.

The only way to successfully control access to online content would be to block online content which allows for people to bypass the censor, this is not possible with our current technology and this content can also be used for legitimate purposes.

Q13:

By educating their parents on how to use the Internet and look after their children and providing them with tools to control their child's access to the Internet at home and on mobile devices.

Q14:

By making this content more obvious and targeting publishers

Q15:

On its packaging when it is on sale (or on its website if purchased online). It should also be displayed when it is publicly broadcast.

Q16:

A single government agency should classify content, it should directly consider feedback from users and update classifications and standards to be inline with public views. The body must be financially independent and non-for-profit with no industry ties.

Q17:

No, this would result in a biased system with little public oversight.

Q18:

The industry should not classify content.

Q19:

Yes, the government should subsidise the classification of content in all situations where it would not be financial viable for the content to be published otherwise. This would include small independent films and independent bands if they are included in the classification scheme. Classification should not be prohibitively expensive.

Q20:

Most of the categories are understood in the community, however many people do not realise that some content is banned because there is not an appropriate classification for it.

Q21:

New classification categories should be created, so that no content is banned and so that sexual content classifications are separated from violence classifications at higher rating.

Q22:

Classification criteria should be the same across games and movies.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

No content should be entirely prohibited online under the classification scheme, this is not the purpose of the scheme. Instead publishers of illegal content should be dealt with through the criminal justice system.

Q25:

No, no content should be prohibited online. Instead Publishers of illegal content should be dealt with via the criminal justice system.

Q26:

Yes, such consistency should be promoted via federal legislation. Consistency is important for economic purposes and to avoid confusion.

Q27:

The current scheme should not be replaced only modified to be more democratic and consistent with the public's views.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

By not banning any content and by making the framework more open and democratic.

Other comments: