CI 1946 D Mann

First name: David
Last name: Mann

Q1:
The ALRC should focus on creating a new framework for classification.
Q2:
The primary objective should be to properly inform consumers of the content they will be purchasing, allowing them to make their own choice about whether the content is appropriate for them. It should NOT be for directly determining what should and should not be purchased and instead should be primarily a guide.
Q3:
No. All content is made equally and should therefore be treated equally.
Q4:
All content should be reviewed upon launch to determine the classification necessary and should not be directly due to complaints from outspoken individuals. However, direct complains should call for reviews of previously made classifications which will determine if a mistake in the classification system has been made.
Q5:
Potential impact should not determine classification. At most, potential impact should call for a warning issued with the sale of the product to ensure the consumer understands the content they are purchasing.

Content designed for children should be classified in a similar fashion to how everything else is classified.
Q6:
No, no outside inputs should determine the classification of a product. The product should be classified by itself without any background information that is not presented within it.
Q7:
Artworks should be reviewed and consumer advice should be issued to ensure the consumer understands the content that the artwork will represent. The artwork should not, under any circumstances, be restricted for the entire of the public. It may however be restricted for audiences under certain ages if the artwork contains adult material.
Q8:
Yes, all content should be classified in similar fashions.
Q9:
No, the product alone should determine the classification. The size and composition of the audience may determine any additional warnings to be presented along side the content.
Q10:
No, if the content is accessable then it is up to the consumer to educate themselves in a way which would determine whether they believe they can view the material.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

Content online should never be restricted and at most the user should be presented a warning to alert them to any potential impact the content may have.

Q13:

The education of children and parents will better protect children as they will learn to recognize dangers online which will help them in the future when they no longer have people to protect them.

Q14:

Offline content should require a person of a suitable age to make the purchase, however if that user deams the content to be suitable for viewing in a private area with persons of a non-suitable age it should be their right to do so. It should NOT be allowed, however, to present such material in a public location unless all participants have presented written consent from a person over 18 years of age.

Q15:

All content should be required to display classification markings, warnings and consumer advice to allow for a constant warning about the content.

Q16:

Government agencies and industry bodies should only educate the users in what content they should and shouldn't view. The final call about whether the user can view the content should always be up to the user, provided they are of an appropriate age. If the user is not of a required age it should be up to a parent or gaurdian of the required age to make the judgement for them.

Q17:

If the model is completely un-biased and balanced it could compliment current arrangements greatly.

Q18:

None. Industries may however apply for certain classification which are more strict than ones that were given by the classification board if they believe that the content would be better suited for another audience. This classification would only allow the content to be further classified however (e.g. a game that is rated PG would be allowed to have its rating changed to MA15+ at the industry's decision. However if a game is rated M it would not be able to have its rating changed to PG).

Q19:

Classification of content should never be subsidised.

Q20:

The difference between M and MA often confuse a great deal of the community. The current classification of MA in video games can also confuse a good portion of the community as they do not understand if the content is actually worthy of an MA rating or if it is actually content that should be rated R and has simply been bumped down due to the lack of an R rating.

Q21:

An R rating is required for the video game classification system. There also needs to be a clearer definition between the M and MA ratings as the line between the two is very blurry. If a clear definition between the two cannot be achieved, they should simply be merged together.

Q22:

There shouldn't be different classification guidelines between each type of media for consistency and clarity.

Q23:

They need to be altered for the changes in media and audiences that have occured since its creation in 1995.

Q24:

No content should be entirely prohibited unless it is exibiting behaviour which is against the law (e.g. child pornography, animal cruelty, illegal drug use, etc).

Q25:

No, the RC category covers a significant amount more than what should be prohibited online.

Q26:

State and territory classification laws need to be consistant over the whole of Australia because if they aren't, material could be more easily accessible in areas that do not allow it due to imports from neighbouring states and territories where the material may be allowed.

Q27:

No comment.

Q28:

The Australian Federal and State Governments should ultimately be in control however they should take advice and guidance from the Commonwealth and other countries around the world.

Q29:

Placing more control and responsibly in the hands of the consumer and to make the classifications serve more as guidelines and informative pieces of information to help the consumer make an appropriate choice about the content which they are interested in viewing.

Other comments:

I appreciate the Government's open approach to this issue and I hope that the matter can be dealt with appropriatly and quickly rather than simply attempting to ignore the issue, pretend that it doesn't exist and delay or ignore community input and disscussions.