

CI 20 T Lupton

First name: Thomas

Last name: Lupton

Q1: Modifying the existing framework to be more well-defined.

Q2: To provide information about the contents of a piece of media to a person unfamiliar with it.

Q3: Yes. Certain distribution methods, such as the Xbox Live Arcade or iPhone App Store are primarily focused on the work of small developers who would be deterred by needing to pay the hefty classification fees. These services are already regulated by the parent companies as well.

Q4: No, but there should be a method to have an inquiry about such content.

Q5: I do not know how to answer the first question. Yes for the second, as we already do.

Q6: Yes. As mentioned in Q3, the independent developers are hurt by needing to pay classification fees for products that may well not even recoup the costs. Classification should be aimed towards more major releases by companies, and not small independent groups.

Q7: Yes. Not all artwork or exhibitions are necessarily suitable for children.

Q8: The way we do it now is fine, having warning labels regarding the content on them.

Q9: This is related to Q3 and Q6 in a way. Small independent groups will likely have smaller potential customer bases. In the end this depends on if the cost of classification is reduced.

Q10: I cannot think of any content exclusively fitting the former category and so cannot answer.

Q11: I can think of no other factors.

Q12: I do not agree with controlling online access.

Q13: Parental monitoring and third parties such as "net nannies".

Q14: In regards to those sold in stores, they should be kept in a specific area of the store with clear markings.

Q15: On the front box/cover of any product.

Q16: It should be up to the government to classify any content sold in stores or accessed in public, such as films or video games. For digitally distributed products, it should be up to the parent distributor (Microsoft, Apple, etc.) to regulate what content is there. Internet access should be left to personal choices.

Q17: I believe it would be.

Q18: Music is all I can think of.

Q19: In the case of independent groups. They will be deterred from releasing products here if they must pay the entire classification fee by themselves.

Q20: The M and MA15+ categories are not clearly understood. Many do not see the difference between them, especially in the case of video games, where they currently lack an R18+ rating.

Q21: No to the first question. The M and MA15+ categories should be changed and renamed. MA15+ possibly being changed to 16+. There needs to be more clarification on the different levels of content in those two ratings.

Q22: An R18+ rating needs to be introduced to video games.

Q23: Yes.

Q24: None.

Q25: Yes, if it were to be.

Q26: Yes, but I don't know how it would be promoted.

Q27: I have no answer for this.

Q28: Yes.

Q29: I can't think of any.

Other comments:

I must emphasise the importance of an R18+ rating for video games. As it is, games directed at adults, that should be getting rated R18+, are being either slipped into the MA15+ rating or refused classification. Without the R18+ rating, adults are being refused content that they, as adults, should have a right to access, and children are being given access to content that is inappropriate for them.

An R18+ rating for video games will only be beneficial.