

CI 240 P Boyd

First name: Phil

Last name: Boyd

Q1:

The existing framework is fine except that it is lacking a "For adults entertainment only" or "R18+" rating that restricts the top end of the rating game to those mature enough to deal with it.

Q2:

The main objective should be to inform purchasers and guardians of the content of the material. It's not about restriction of content, it's about understanding the types and level of content that may be present.

Q3:

No. Content stands in and of itself. It is either appropriate for a certain group, or not, and should therefore be judged in this way.

Q4:

Sure, as long as the definition of "Some content" falls beneath a certain banner. Anyone who wants to claim their game is suitable for teen or child audiences should need to get their content reviewed before publication. 15+ ratings should be possible and only investigated after a complaint.

Q5:

The potential impact is irrelevant. The only important factor is what its' impact has shown to be, and all sensationalist media needs to be ignored in this regard. Rate things because of what they are, not what they might cause. Otherwise every novel would be pulled because it \*might\* result in someone assassinating John Lennon. Again.

Q6:

No. Content stands alone. It doesn't matter who makes it or who it's made for, it's what it IS that matters.

Q7:

Only insofar as they would need that classification anyway. We don't need R18+ material turning up in every single art exhibition, but by the same token, artists would not do that in the first place. Content can largely regulate itself. The manufacturers of content understand what they can and can't do.

Q8:

Yes. All content should be rated in the same manner and to the same level.

Q9:

Only to the extent that if the content is aimed at children, it should have a children's level rating applied to it. But again, the content creator would understand this and create content accordingly.

Size doesn't matter at all.

Q10:

No. However only foolish providers of content would place 18+ material on billboards. Self regulation of the classification system works well.

Q11:

Q12:

Education and parental guidance. Nothing else will work. Filtering the internet on a national scale is completely pointless, as it is easily circumvented via other countries. Filtering the internet on a global scale is also pointless, as it already is, and yet things such as child pornography are still out there. The only way to stop people getting access to material outside their age group is to educate them about it and ensure they understand that it isn't appropriate until they are older.

Q13:

Parental guidance and supervision. There is no other means to prevent them from accessing inappropriate material.

Q14:

Restrict sale of these publications to certain businesses (So called "sex shops" for example) and test for a mandated checking of identification when entering the store or purchasing the item.

Q15:

When content is not suitable for persons under 15, but only at time of access or purchase. Eg: Beginnings of movies, on the cover box of video games, on the front cover of explicit magazines.

Q16:

The government needs to ensure that institutions check for identification diligently and responsibly. The industry bodies are responsible for providing information about the levels of content present in their own material, and users need to ensure that they are aware of content levels, their implications, and the appropriateness of these for themselves and their children.

Q17:

Extremely so. The classification body would be free to ensure that content matches the industry bodies ideas as they saw fit, rather than being forced to assess every individual item prior to release. Industry bodies are able to self regulate. They understand the implications of releasing something into the wrong group of people and if anything would be more hesitant to release content lower than they might otherwise.

Q18:

Almost all of the content can be self classified by the industry, because the likely classification is obvious and straightforward in almost every single case. The only time that an industries idea of a classification has been different to the end result has been because Australia does not have the full

spectrum of classification levels to accurately and responsibly separate adult material from 15+.

Q19:

Only if self classification is not an option and the content does not already have another countries official rating.

Q20:

They are understood, but largely ignored. Parents don't look at them and happily buy 15+ rated games (which should be 18+ rated, but we don't have that option) and hand them to their children of 10-13 years old to play. The M level ratings are all largely interchangeable with the populace and don't have a clear distinction. Not to mention that content that should be rated 18+ is being rated MA15+ and thus seem more appropriate than they really are. A parent may well purchase an MA15+ game for a 13 year old because "he's mature enough to handle what a 15 year old can" but when the game is really an 18+ rated game, I feel confident in saying that the same parent is far more likely to say "No" to an R18+ rating for a 13 year old child.

Q21:

Extremely so, especially for video games. There is a dire need for an 18+ rating in this category. The Mature Audiences / 15 years ratings need to be reconsidered. All countries would ideally use the same ratings system with common and understood symbols.

Q22:

A standard set for all types of content is required, ideally in line and in common with other countries. All symbols need to be standardised and sensible, and colour could be made use of to indicate the new levels.

Q23:

Yes. This is perhaps one of the leading problems with classification at the moment. People are purchasing video games that would be rated R18+ for 13 year old children, but would not even consider purchasing an 18+ rated horror movie or pornographic film for the same child.

Q24:

No content should be censored or filtered, however illegal content should be either logged or investigated and the offenders punished under the judicial system. The classifications board's role is not to censor content, but to rate it. Illegal content will not get rated and it is the role of law enforcement to deal with it.

Q25:

No, it should be non-existent except on illegal material. If adults feel that something inappropriate is worth looking at, that is their choice. If it's illegal, then that is a matter for law enforcement, not the classifications board.

Q26:

It's important in so far as it is beneficial to have a standardised set of classifications. Ideally this would

be world wide.

However it is far more important that individual states or countries are not restricted because of one state's or nation's ideals on what ratings content should have.

Q27:

An industry-sided classification scheme where the state/national classification boards main purpose is to respond to complaints about material being in the wrong rating, as is currently possible. As far as possible, this should be nationwide, and either a new set or revised set of ratings labels introduced. The classification scheme should be consistent across all media and content.

Q28:

There is no particular reason either way.

Q29:

The main content providers for Australian consumed content need a collaborative effort to ensure that content is rated largely the same between them. That is, the UK, USA and Australia should reach attempt to reach a consensus and understanding between the 3 such that content is regulated in similar ways between all of them. This would allow freer exchange of content as it would already be correctly regulated, it would prevent circumvention of current ratings laws in Australia where people buy from overseas to avoid Australia's rating system and censorship and would end up with a closer to the ideal realisation of what the content rating scheme is trying to achieve.

Other comments:

An R18+ rating for games in Australia is desperately needed. As it stands, content is incorrectly labelled, resulting in misleading of consumers and the content being made available for those who arguably should not have access to it yet.

The internet filtering plan is both a foolish manoeuvre, and completely useless. It will not stop illegal activities, and will only hinder legitimate ones.

Content should be largely self regulated by the content creators as they understand exactly what is in their content, it's intention, audience and message better than any independent body.