

CI 1768 R Mohandas

First name: Ravi

Last name: Mohandas

Q1:

Given the concerns for available funding and an ever increasing supply of media for review I believe it would be in Australia's best interest to look towards establishing a new publisher/developer self-regulating system as seen in other countries (America, for example). The Australian Government's responsibility should be reduced in scope to establishing a set of guidelines for Publishers/Developers, and investigating reports made by concerned citizens for breaches of the guidelines.

Q2:

I believe that the scheme should establish a consistent set of guidelines that covers commercial multimedia of many different origins. I quite emphatically believe the government should not be censoring on behalf of the public, we as adults should be able to make choices of what we wish to engage with, and the guidelines should assist us in making choices for ourselves and our children on what material we believe is suitable.

Q3:

The technology used should be of no interest, the material involved is the same no matter its delivery method. As outlined above I believe a consistent set of self-regulated guidelines should be provided and any breaches of these should be investigated as opposed to everything being reviewed prior to release. I also believe that the media should be viewed as is, and that highlight reels of footage is not an adequate representation as it lacks context.

Q4:

All commercially available media content should be classified under a co-regulatory system.

Q5:

All commercial media should be classified to inform consumers of what they are purchasing or viewing. These ratings should be consistent from one form of media to the next as well as consistent between states and territories to avoid confusion.

Q6:

The size of the publisher should have no bearing on whether content requires classification or not.

The size of breaches of the guidelines and fines associated with them should reflect the scale of the breach. The law would serve no purpose if the fine was inconsequential to a largely published form of media, just as it may be too large for a very small company.

Q7:

In a self-regulated system, yes. Complaints could be registered just the same as other forms of media. Consistency is the key here to avoiding confusion.

Q8:

Yes, all commercial media should share the same classification guidelines and capacity for complaints by concerned citizens of breaches to be investigated and fined/suspended if found guilty.

Q9:

Size and composition of an audience has no bearing as to whether commercially available media should be classified or not.

Q10:

No, all commercial media should share the same classification guidelines. Private media that is distributed for a non-commercial purpose should not require a classification (For example; pictures and video's of my sisters new baby are not being distributed publically and therefor do not require a classification, whereas a movie or dvd of the same movie would.).

Q11:

The only area I foresee a possible divergence from my previous statements would be non-dramatised illegal activities. Refusing classification completely would mean that these sources of information may become unavailable to academia and police orientated "protection of the public" organisations. Perhaps some limits to the commercial use of such media would be sufficient without altogether banning of such material as may be of use, or simply exceptions made for those that have sufficient cause for owning such media for educational and legal purposes.

Q12:

Education for citizens so that they are aware of the tools already available and what dangers there may be so that people can protect themselves and their children. I absolutely disagree with the installation of any internet censoring methods such as is in use in countries like China, Iran and so forth. Please do not make my beloved Australia into a country on a short list with governments whose Human Rights issues and Freedom of Speech are so curtailed as to be a warning to all others. the Internet is possibly the last "free" media left to the world. That means we have to take the good with the bad out there but it also represents something fundamentally important to our national identity.

Q13:

An emphasis on parental supervision of usage should be encouraged; placing computers in public areas where the family congregates in the house together as an example. Any other method can and will be circumvented, although the inclusion of personal computer monitoring and censoring devices wouldn't go astray. This should be done at the household level, as their choice. It should not be forcibly implemented at an ISP or higher level.

Q14:

They should be rated the same as other forms of commercially distributed media.

Q15:

Any commercial media sold in Australia should be required to carry a classification marking that is easily noticable. It should provide a consistent and simple listing of what content can be expected to be found within it.

Q16:

The government should provide the guidelines for media classification, and investigate complaints that have been raised by citizens who believe a breach has been made. Industry bodies should self-regulate their media under the guidelines provided by the government. If an investigation validates a complaint that has been issued then the media's distribution should be suspended until such a time as it is reclassified under an appropriate level and a fine proportional to the size of the breach has been rendered. A public service announcement (at the publisher/developer's expense) should also be

issued to inform the public of the breach so that they are aware of the inappropriately listed classification.

Q17:

Yes. This would reduce the expense required on the government's behalf while also providing a means for citizens to raise complaints for investigation of breaches. This system is currently being used by a number of countries around the world and has proven effective. With the ever increasing volume of a global mass media market emerging it is the only practical course of action.

Q18:

All commercially distributed media should be required to carry a classification if it is to be sold within Australia. The guidelines and investigation of breaches should be conducted by the government, the publishers and developers of media content should have free access to these guidelines and provide their own ratings. Breaches of the guidelines should result in suspension of the offending media, fines proportional to the volume of the offense as well as a public service announcement made at the offender's expense to raise awareness of the issue.

Q19:

With a co-regulatory model the independent films would have free access to the guidelines and could provide a classification without enduring expenses, and no subsidy (for the classification) would be required.

Q20:

The existing classification categories coupled with the emergence of bullet-point highlights (Notable for Ma; drugs, violence, language, etc.) is entirely sufficient however some confusion is evident where the ratings system is inconsistent between media. Most notably there is no R18+ rating for "gaming" media while there is for other forms.

Q21:

The rating system should be consistent between different forms of media, notably "gaming" media has no R18+ category which forces many games to be pushed down into an MA rating, or refused classification entirely. This is the most obvious area where confusion is caused by a lack of consistency.

Q22:

All media should collectively share the same guidelines and ratings. In this way the Australian public may be confident of what they are purchasing is suitable for the intended participant.

Q23:

There is no need for individual media legislature. All media should share a consistent guideline and ratings system. All complaints for breaches should be handled by the same department.

Q24:

Only media which violates laws and cannot be legally owned (For example, child pornography), or content that breaches the privacy of others without their consent (Peeping toms / paparazo) should be prohibited. No Internet Censorship should be conducted by the government. No law should be passed that restricts the freedom of speech for individuals or organisations however they may in turn be held accountable and responsible (If someone is attempting to incite riots and violence then it would be acceptable for such individuals to be monitored to ensure public safety, if someone is conducting a non-violent protest then they would not be). Offenders should be found, and prosecuted. Instituting

some sort of internet censorship would only force deviants into less detectable methods and would make them harder to find and stop.

Q25:

After a number of searches I was unable to find a listing for exactly what represents the scope of the "(RC) Refused Classification" category on the ALRC's website. My only applied knowledge of this area stems from a familiarity of a lack of an (R) rating for gaming media which does not apply to online gaming as they are in a constant state of change. A self-regulated system would suffice to add ratings for online games. Complaints of violations could be registered with the government body the same as other forms of media and the appropriate investigation conducted on a per-violation basis.

Q26:

We are one people, in one country. All states and territories should share a consistent set of media classification laws that are also consistent across the various forms of media available.

Q27:

A co-regulatory system whereby the government provides guidelines for a self-listed publisher/developer system should be enacted. Rather than all media being viewed before classification, breaches of the guidelines would be raised by concerned citizens and only these instances investigated by the regulatory commission. This provides for the most economically feasible system that still promotes awareness and understanding for citizens and culpability for breaches of the guidelines. The content should be witnessed "as-is" as opposed to a highlight reel of material which lacks context for the imagery.

Q28:

As a fervent believer that a consistent ratings scheme should be introduced Australia-wide and across all media platforms, I believe the states and territories should refer this power to a singular source that best serves the interests of the people as a single entity. This would avoid confusion for the public and reduce bureaucratic overheads whereby the states and territories are replicating work across them.

Q29:

Other comments:

I would like to thank the Australian Government for the opportunity to express my beliefs but also raise a concern that such submissions go largely unheralded within our country's media. This leads me to question the thoroughness of such submissions whereby only those actively pursuing a cause may ever be aware of them. It would please me greatly to know about such submission requests in the future through some means, perhaps a listing of interest as a contact through Email for when submissions are being requested in general.