

CI 701 J Pek

First name: Jan

Last name: Pek

Email: jan.pek@gmail.com

Q1:

The ALRC should focus on developing a new or improved framework for classification based on the system currently in use. I believe the framework should include the G, PG, M, M15+ and R18 classification but perhaps should also then expand the framework to include warnings in relation to "frequent drug use" "violence" etc. There should also be a new classification for artworks which may include A (general artworks) A15+ (those depicting nudity) and A18+ (those depicting death, mutilation etc). I also believe there may be a call for a warning system in regards to religious views. Obviously a touchy subject and I have not yet seen any games that would require this, but I can see the need there for future reference if games become particularly anti islam, anti christian etc. A warning would again assist in determination whether to purchase the product.

A further warning may be included if the game can then be played online as this then opens up players to language, images and topics that may exceed the games classification. Most online games will also have chat functions which can lead to child predators, sexually explicit conversations etc.

Q2:

The primary objectives should be to let the purchasers of the games be aware of the content that may be inside. Obviously for those under 18, games should be rated into suitable levels and also include the required warnings so parents can make an informed choice. It should also allow Adult gamers to choose those games that may contain violence and other scenes unsuitable for those under 18. Freedom of choice is paramount in this society and the governments role should be to ensure the purchaser can make an informed choice. I dont believe R18+ games should be sold to those under 18 and ID should be requested as with alcohol and cigarettes.

Q3:

This should have no impact on whether the content should be classified. All games should be classified independent of the platform they are designed for. If additional add-ons then alter the classification of the game, the entire game should be re classified.

Q4:

No. All content should be classified. Saying that I believe the majority of content should be allowed to be played, with some minor exceptions for those depicting acts that can be instructional in every day life, such as excessive drug use, drug manufacture, excessive force inciting hostility against police and those government agencies put into place to protect the public etc.

Q5:

The different media should have no bearing on whether content should be classified. A "G" rated game should be a "G" rated game, a "G" rated movie and a "G" rated book...across all media and platforms.

The subject of "potential impact" of content should only be classified in those games already classified as M15+, R18+ and over. The issue with "potential impact" may be over analysed into a situation

where government is that deciding how the public will react to certain content. This is impossible to judge, with the exception as previously raised on games that may depict, encourage and educate the players on drug use, how to make weapons etc and in the use of excessive force. While able to depict warfare etc, games should not become training manuals for violence and those intending to break the law.

Q6:

This should have no impact on whether a product should be classified. This may not apply to updates, map packs, add-ons etc as long as it does not alter the original classification to a higher level.

Q7:

Artworks should be classified in a category of A (general), A15+ (art depicting nudity etc), A18+ (art depicting death, mutilation, bondage) etc. This informs the purchaser that there may be some content within that may not be suitable for younger children. An "A" rated game / software should not include any images depicting nudity etc. Warnings can then be used in conjunction in regards to what kind of content is inside.

Q8:

Music as part of a game / software should be classified. Audio books should not have any classification but should include warnings if there is profanity etc.

Q9:

Yes. There should be no discrimination against classification of games etc for private use for leisure etc. The exception of those used as learning tools but recognised institutions, schools, tafe, hospitals, etc should apply.

Q10:

No, this should make no difference.

Q11:

I believe all content should be classified with some exceptions as listed above, for those used as training aids, learning aids etc. Even then these items may require classification but obviously they may need greater flexibility and should exist under a separate framework.

Q12:

There is no method of effectively controlling access to online content. A parent or guardian can easily provide access to those under 18, or u18's can easily lie about their age. This should be left in the hands of the parent and all games should include in their terms and conditions, if the game is rated 18+, that only those over that age will play it. If this is then breached, the parent is responsible. Packaging may also be designed to clearly state this before the item is purchased and played. The government can in NO way restrict access to those who it may not be designed for.

Q13:

I believe the onus returns to the parent, not the government. Anything of a 15+ and definitely 18+ should have terms and conditions should be clearly explained, aside from the general terms and conditions, that any player is over the required age group.

The current use of entering a date of birth etc is very easily worked out. There is a possibility that all games should include a link to a government site which can include software to prohibit use of items classified over a certain age group...this item should then not be activated without a parents

permission. This still returns all control back to the parents which is obviously not working. But it is not the governments place to nanny children if their parents are failing in that regard.

Q14:

Unknown. It should not be up to government to do this.

Q15:

Any advertising should include all classifications and warnings. Packaging should clearly mark the same information. Point of sale-staff should possibly inform purchasers when purchasing items over R18+. Agreement should then be clearly visible prior to installation and again prior to setup and play. For those M15+ and over, perhaps an email address should be mandatory when installing the game, with an auto email sending to inform the player this game is rated M15+ or over and requires agreement prior to installation.

Q16:

Government Agencies - should classify content and give appropriate classification and warnings. All content (with exemptions as listed above) should be allowed with appropriate warnings.

Industry Bodies - Need to inform public of classifications / warnings prior to purchase etc in all packaging, promo etc.

Users - Should abide by the warning system or accept that they are responsible for allowing content to fall into hands of those under the classified age. Much as alcohol, cigarettes and everything else.

Q17:

It would be yes. If clear cut definitions are agreed too and adhered too this system would work.

Industry will then be able to engineer a product to a certain classification and not have any issues about it not being accepted. Saying this, strong penalties should apply if this is not adhered too.

Q18:

All content should be classified. Training content may be exempted with suitable warnings. Any other content should always be classified or at least given warnings to what it may contain. This then leads to public surety and confidence that they are able to select the correct content for their children.

Q19:

I tend to believe the fee should remain the same for all content, no matter its origin. Saying this I have no idea how much this process actually costs, but it should be part of any production cost. A lower cost may apply for those used in education and training etc but this should not be exploited.

Q20:

I understand them but obviously others do not as there are many children playing online with adult gamers and playing adult games there are rated over 15+ etc.

Q21:

My belief is that it could be clearer. C = Made especially for children, G = suitable for children. PG = parental guidance, M = Mature audience, M15+ = Mature audience over 15. R18 = restricted to 18+. Art categories- A = General, AM = art, mature audience, AR = art for 18+.

Q22:

There must be clear understanding in the industry of what each classification means.

Q23:

It should be considered, but improved upon.

Q24:

Im not sure if anything should be prohibited, although greatly restricted should be content depicting real life, and transferable to real life situations, excessive drug use, manufacturing drugs, manufacturing weapons, exciting violence towards any particular group in real life society. Anything that can teach skills in making drugs, making weapons, making war etc, should be restricted.

Q25:

No. The current scope refuses content which should be allowed online as an 15+ or 18+ classification. Some content should still be refused, but this should be on an exceptional basis.

Q26:

It is absolutely vital that state, territory and international laws be similar if not exact. Obviously Australias classification system should be federal not on a state by state basis. To promote this, it should become federal law. Industry should be given a voice as to what should be involed, the public should be given a voice, and when suitable resolution met, it should become federal law. This then must be promoted to the industry to adhere to. International promotion should also occur.

Q27:

A federal legislation should be introduced. A federal body should classify or agree to industry classifications for all games / software that is imported or playable online.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Agreement to become a federal system, industry involvement and public representation to ensure a harmony is achieved that will suit all shareholders.

Other comments: