

CI 1591 P Perusco

First name: Peter

Last name: Perusco

Q1:

I think improving elements of the existing framework should be fine. Or at least if another one has to be made, use the existing one as a base.

Q2:

As far as I'm concerned, more levels of classification allow for more variety of classified material. I.e. Nothing is banned from Australia from overseas and (depending on your age) you're able to choose from a wider variety of products.

Q3:

Q4:

No. Because someone's going to have a complaint (however ridiculous) about just about EVERYTHING that ever exists. Just use the agreed upon classification guidelines to determine classifications.

Q5:

Yes and yes. However, please don't get so pedantic as to give everything that could potentially be slightly offensive to someone or some group a rating of RC.

Q6:

I'd say it depends. I'm going to say yes, only because I don't want smart phone apps to start going through testing centres in Australia after they've already been approved for release by their respective companies.

Q7:

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Yes.

Q10:

Definitely. Publicly accessed content should definitely be more harshly judged than something only accessed at home. At least in a home environment you know you're classifying the product for the consumer, and not anyone who happens to be in the vicinity of him/her.

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

By their parents/guardians. It's not up to the government to take care of other peoples' children online.

Q14:

Q15:

When it has the potential to be exposed to anyone under 18 years of age.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Television programs, films, books, printed media (i.e. newspapers and/or magazines).

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

An R18+ rating for videogames. It is definitely required. However, I'm annoyed at the fact that a lot of the things in the proposed RC category are what I want to see in the R18+ category for videogames. The gaming community want to see the violent games full of stupidity, gore, bloody deaths, sex and drugs come to Australia LEGALLY. Sure, from a non-gamer perspective that might sound like a stupid idea, but gamers aren't the sorts of people who learn from these sorts of games that being horrifically violent in real life is a good idea. That's just a ridiculous rumour. And if children are exposed to these games it's the parents/guardians that are at fault, nobody else.

Q22:

Give each rating a set of guidelines that applies to every type of media and use the same logos across each media.

Q23:

Q24:

Q25:

No. I think the current guidelines for the RC category are far too harsh.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

More freedom, I guess. Add ratings for things that are too obscure to have any traditional rating. Add ratings for things that in any other case should have been refused classification. People, who are over 18, still have a right to view whatever content they want, and if it's banned they'll do it anyway.

Other comments:

Please give the gamers and nerds of this country a reason to be happy with its government. Give them an R18+ category.

In fact I'm learning to become a game designer or 3D film artist and I would very much like the opportunity to create something that previously would have been automatically banned because it's got slightly too much blood, or slightly too many guns or something.

Thank you.