

CI 1357 J Alexander

First name: Jarrad

Last name: Alexander

Q1:

Simply add an R 18 rating to videogame classification, it avoids the situation where a game is refused classification due to mature content (effectively banning the game from sale) and is toned down just enough to scrape by our current highest rating.

Q2:

Classifying content that is to be publicly distributed. Refusing to classify content on the grounds that we don't have a rating for it is absurd.

Q3:

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

Yes, small independant production companies often do not have the resources or the public impact to warrant official classification.

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Yes, publicly displayed content should reflect a public setting. I feel the need for classification should be higher for publicly displayed content and much less for private consumption.

Q11:

Q12:

You cannot control access to online content beyond a feeble agreement with the distributor (which can be worked around with torrents/proxies etc.). It would both be a waste of resources and time to attempt to control online distribution of anything less than major publishers.

Q13:

Better parenting and consumer level filtering software, there is no need for ISP level filtering, anyone who doesn't want to access mature content can install their own filtering software to suit their needs.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Government agencies should provide information to the consumer in order for them to make the right choice, nothing more. Users need to know the rating before they purchase/view the content instead of ignoring it and then complaining to the government about it.

Q17:

Possibly, though I doubt the impartiality of the industry bodies, however it would likely avoid the arbitrary debacle of no R 18 rating for videogames.

Q18:

Lower rated content, probably up to around M classification, as content around this level is mainstream and not very likely to cause additional harm. I believe content for children should be more regulated because they are more sensitive.

Q19:

I believe if the content will reach a large enough audience to be classified and the classification is not straightforward and obvious, a gradual drop in subsidies beyond a certain production budget would be appropriate.

Q20:

Q21:

There is a need for R 18 classification for videogames. We have R 18 (and higher) for movies, but effectively banning videogames for mature adults above the age of 18 is unnecessary and even counterproductive.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes, these guidelines allow adults to make informed decisions about the content they consume (rather than be sheltered from content deemed too mature merely because of the format it comes in) while still protecting children from harmful content.

Q24:

It is mostly a waste of time to try and prohibit content online, anyone who wants it is only a google search away from knowing how to get it.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

There is a pervasive mentality that videogames are for children. They may have been in the early 90's, but today the average age of a videogamer is older than 18 (as numerous surveys confirm). Australia needs an R 18 rating to let adults make their own decisions about what they consume. Often if a videogame is refused classification they tweak it until it just scrapes by MA 15+ (e.g removing blood splats on walls), this really is counter-productive to the mission of protecting children from harmful content; is a parent more likely to buy their 14 year old son an MA 15+ game or an R 18 game?