

CI 872 P Mallett

First name: Peter

Last name: Mallett

Q1:

A new framework would be ideal, owing to the need for a R 18+ rating and a review of the MA 15+ rating.

Q2:

To alert customers and users of the content of what is on sale, and to give the customer a choice on whether they should consider it appropriate to show to minors. The onus falls on to the customer on what they feel they should show their children without restricting the sale of merchandise.

Q3:

There should be no effect whatsoever between different platforms: Movies and TV Shows have the range of ratings from G right through to R (though I believe there is one under G that I forgot), yet games do not have that range, they tend to have G, PG, M and MA. Ideally, all forms of media should be treated the same in that regard.

Q4:

Leave that to the industry that makes them and review it as it comes. Oftentimes "complaints" get issued by people who have a prejudiced view on games which leads to a minority that controls how things should be rated.

Q5:

That really should be up to the customer. The potential impact of events could affect some people more than others, so if they don't feel that they would be comfortable in seeing or playing something with those themes, then simply do not buy, watch or play it. If they feel it's not safe for children to watch or play, then simply do not let them access such material.

As for the second part, I don't really see a problem with that. It lets people know what would be safe for their children, just as long as it is left up to the customer to decide whether they would show their children content higher up the ratings when they feel it is appropriate.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

Regulation for minors only. There shouldn't be an issue with adults buying and listening to music no matter the content.

Q9:

It shouldn't have any affect.

Q10:

I would have thought that such products are being classified on the belief that it would be broadcast nationally, or at the very least state-wide. If they aren't then they should be in my opinion.

Q11:

If your everyday Jo/e Average would consider the content safe for minors, or if he/she would be offended by the content. Religious or political inclined individuals can simply not buy the game or DVDs or watch TV if a show has themes they do not like. It should be up to the person, not the government, to decide what they watch or play.

Q12:

If you restrict access to something, it is guaranteed people will find a way to access it anyway. You'd be much better off with people reporting questionable content, and if the law is against said content, then we roll from there.

Q13:

Parents being great parents basically. It's the most effective way really, and probably the cheapest and least restrictive.

Q14:

By educating minors. If they are more aware and in turn can become more responsible, then the "need" for restrictions would not be necessary at all.

Q15:

At any time where the customer would make the decision to get the product. Much like what we have now, where advertisements, the covers of the DVDs and games and also at the cinema complexes, how they show the classification with the product in question.

Q16:

Industry bodies provide an initial classification rating, the government reviews it and if necessary, adjusts the rating in accordance with the system we would have. A means to contact authorities regarding illegal content would be great too, especially if it was readily available, so that if there IS something that the person feels is entirely inappropriate for the rating it was given, then it can go from there. There's no need to have the government decide on if said product should be allowed to be distributed and save the average Australian from making an informed decision themselves.

Q17:

I am not sure. As it is, a small handful of anti-video game political figures seem to have more sway than the population itself, but having said government work with the industries themselves could work out well... if the government figures involved are impartial. Again, the point of this system is to give the end user advice on what the product contains, so it would help immensely if the people involved in establishing a rating adhered to that mindset.

Q18:

Children orientated themes. On the other end of the scale excessive violence/sexual content and the like would be quite obvious that it'd be more adult orientated.

Q19:

No

Q20:

Regarding games, the MA 15+ rating is very obscure, owing to the lack of a R 18+ rating. Most times games that would normally be considered R rated would either be designated MA, "kiddied up" to make it fit in the MA rating, or simply banned. In that respect the difference between MA 15+ and R 18+ should be made more clear in regards to games.

Q21:

R 18+ for games. The lack of this rating causes the aforementioned confusion in the previous question, and it also leads to a loss of sales for gaming companies who can't sell their product here because there's no place for such games. Customers are also dissatisfied because they would have to have the product filtered, as if they were not responsible enough to play said game in its entirety, or are not responsible enough to decide for themselves if their children should even access such content. With that R 18+ rating, a number of aspects from MA 15+ can then be clarified and possibly merged with R 18+, allowing the MA rating to be more clear.

Q22:

By having the people involved and more aware of the industry provide the details for classification, not people who don't have anything to do with said industry. It makes things much more clear and there's less risk of having the issues we currently face resurfacing.

Q23:

Indeed. It worked for movies and TV shows, why not video games?

Q24:

Generally what would ordinarily be considered illegal in the first place (such child porn and the like). Otherwise there shouldn't really be a need to prohibit anything. Just have a means for people to contact the relevant authorities if they spot something illegal.

Q25:

No. As it is a number of titles offline are restricted, that should be permitted owing to the customer not being given the responsibility to decide for themselves if it is something they wish to buy for themselves and/or their children. With the addition of the R 18+ rating on games, as well as a revision of that list so that games that would be considered R 18+ instead of RC can be allowed to be distributed, that list would become much more relevant.

Q26:

Naturally. It is the Australian way to give things a fair go, no reason to exclude states and allow other states. Keeping all of the states on one system makes plenty of sense, and let the states handle how that should be enforced.

Q27:

Can't really say it is my place to know about this, but preferably a scheme where the views of a few people who don't really know much about the industry they are deciding on can affect matters such as classification. Things like this need to be decided on by a group of people who ARE involved and are impartial.

Q28:

If necessary, yes.

Q29:

Get the industries more involved. They are the people who made the movies/shows/games, so they would have a better idea on what classification their products should be listed as.

Other comments:

There is no need to censor various products because the government wants to do a parent's job for them. More extreme cases of this have been demonstrated internationally and public opinion of those issues are quite low.

In addition, one person should not decide what the rest of the population sees, hears or interacts with. Impartiality is also key. Get a group of people together and soundboard their ideas and opinions off each other. Guaranteed something will come from that, that will likely be more tolerable to what we currently have.