CI 1700 A Orman

First name: Andrew
Last name: Orman

Q1:
The ALRC should focus on improving the existing framework. The current framework is a solid foundation, it's the parametres and classifications that need to be reviewed.
Q2:
Standardisations between the states and territories.
Clear communication to consumers on the content of a given material.
Enforceable accountability for retailers who breach the classification scheme e.g. provide R rated material to minors.
Q3:
No - only the impact of the material should be considered.
Q4:
Q5:
Yes - in fact this is the only reason material should be classified.
Q6:
No. The content of the material should be classified only based on its potential impact on an individual.
Q7:
Providing consumer advice - yes. This would seem to be a reasonable use of classification.
Restricting access - no.
Q8:
Yes.
Q9:
The size of the audience should be irrelevant. Classification should be applied with consideration to the individual.
Q10:
Yes, but only in cases where consumers may have no "choice" as to whether they wish to consume the material. For example, playing an R-rated song over loudspeakers in a mall would be inappropriate as mall-goers would have no control over whether they can hear the song.
Q11:
The combination of violence and sexual imagery.
Q12:
Q13:
Increased education of parents and carers about the dangers of online content, plus encouragement to only allow children to access the internet with supervision.
Increased education of children of the kinds of content (and online behaviour) that is inappropriate or restricted, how to identify it and what to do about it e.g. tell a teacher or parent.
The application of classification criteria to online content where practicable e.g. sites operating in

Australia.

A "black list" of sites with content that would be classified as MA or above that parents could refer to. The list could also be referenced by software installed on parent's computers and issue warnings when sites are accessed.

Q14:

The current system needs to be enforced i.e. legal action against retailers who provide restricted material to minors.

Q15:

Classification markers and descriptors should be nearly ubiquitous.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

The government should subsidise the classification of any Australian-made content.

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

The current classification markings for films are widely known, accepted and understood. Expanding the use of these markings, in combination with the content descriptors across other media will present a consistent system of classification for consumers.

Q23:

Yes - content should considered on its impact, rather than its medium.

Q24:

Q25:

Q26:

Yes it is important. Classification needs to be approached and promoted at a federal level. Our political leaders need to be willing to "get their hands dirty" in dealing with the touchy subject of classification and censorship, and be seen to be taking a stand on a country-wide classification scheme.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes, in the interests of consistency across states and territories.

Q29:

Other comments:

In the interests of full disclosure I should point out that I am a computer game developer.

I believe that gamers in Australia should have access to games that feature any content that would be available in any other medium. I believe that Australia needs an R18+ classification for games. I also believe that there are a number of gaming titles that are currently available in Australia and should be put into the R18+ category i.e. the R18+ category should be expanded.