

CI 1770 S Maher

First name: Simon

Last name: Maher

Q1:

The current classification system is unfortunately obsolete. It does not give a good description of what a rating means, arbitrary markings on a box without recommended age and a two word description do not have the same impact as the PEGI system which is age markings with image symbols.

The main focus should be on gaming classification, games have evolved and unfortunately the OFLC's system for gaming has not.

Q2:

The main objective of any classification system should be to communicate what is in the box. If it is arbitrary letters, with no age on the box, then an M rating would mean exactly the same as a G rating. The only current ratings that communicate what is in the box are MA15+ and R18+.

Q3:

No.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

No.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

The internet is meant to be a service for free information. In my opinion, there is no effective method for controlling access to online content.

Q13:

Getting parents to be proactive in teaching their children about how to use the internet.

Q14:

An enforced classification system with brighter colourful symbols stating that these are sexually explicit magazines.

Q15:

If a product has been classified, it must show what it has been classified

Q16:

The classification board should be an independent body like the ESRB (American Games Classification System)

Q17:

Yes, an example of where the OFLC failed at this was the PG Rating of the Wii Game We Dare. The developers asked for an M classification minimum, because of the way the game would be played, but the OFLC disregarded the comment and gave the game a PG, as the game did not have anything "on the screen".

A representative of the respective industry should be on the decision board, so they have a broader range to give a classification with.

Q18:

Anything that has been internationally rated with a PG equivalent or lower

Q19:

Educational content

Q20:

Unfortunately no. All the classifications under the current system should be put under question.

E: An exempt classification does not make any sense.

G, PG, M: These could be mixed up as there is no age connected to what it means

MA15+: Within gaming is both MA15+ and R18+. This does not currently give a good message of what it means to parents.

R18+ and X18+: To someone that does not know the difference, this looks like the same rating, and do not distinguish themselves from each other.

CAT1 and CAT2: I don't even know what this means

Q21:

Yes. The classification system should follow PEGI's system more closely, giving all content an age rating rather than just an arbitrary letter or two. For splitting X18+ and R18+ it should be closer to CERO's way of splitting their two 18 rated contents into two different categories rather than extremes.

CAT1 and CAT2 will need to be given a conformed classification, such as R or X, or the numbered age.

Q22:

All classification should use the same system and symbols. Currently Australia is in the lead with Games and Movies using the same symbols, but what is released as a movie should also be allowed to be released as a game, with the same classification level. Parents are less likely to let a child play an R18+ game rather than an MA15+ game.

Q23:

Yes, classification should be consolidated into a easier to understand, singular system.

Q24:

None.

Q25:

Yes.

Q26:

It is, to give better information to the people that this is meant to help

Q27:

A federal classification system

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

If there is an age referred, universal classification system which gives a clearer view of the content in the box, then the classification system would be easier to understand for everyone. A uniform classification system would mean that no matter what someone is buying, the consumer will understand exactly what they are buying

Other comments:

As a Games Development University Student, the main reason for me submitting this is the R18+ Classification for Video Games. The current classification system needs vast improvement to give everyone a better understanding of exactly what is in the box.

Unfortunately, the current OFLC classification system is in my opinion unreliable, and I follow the PEGI and ESRB ratings when I pick up a game.

This means, if I were picking up a game for a child, I am currently ignoring the OFLC rating, as I believe that it is arbitrary and inaccurate to what the content is.

If the rating system was conformed to the singular system showing ages, and an R18+ for higher impact MA15+ games, then this system will be usable for myself, and any consumer buying anything for children,