

CI 1836 N Fillingham

First name: Nic

Last name: Fillingham

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework by allowing video games to be classified as R18+ and/or relaxing the M15+ classification to more closely align with other international ratings boards (PEGI, ESRB etc.).

Q2:

To provide a consistent, easy to understand framework of content ratings that provide clear consumer guidance and instructions to retailers (for restricted content).

The national classification scheme should act only as a classification system, not a censorship body unless the content expressly breaks Australian laws.

Q3:

No

Q4:

No

Q5:

All content for sale or broadcast should be classified.

Q6:

No

Q7:

No. Artists should be free to create and exhibit providing their work does not break Australian laws.

Q8:

In theory yes, all media should be classified for the purposes of providing consumer guidance. This would be difficult to enforce given the sheer volume of releases especially in the music space. Independent and individual publishers should have the flexibility to add classifications to their works based on a published set of guidelines. "This work has been classified by the author as G" for example.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

None

Q12:

It is difficult to control access to online content, if not impossible. Therefore it is important to have a consistent, easy to understand set of guidelines for consumers to reference so they can make informed decisions.

Q13:

Parents must be educated and encouraged to take responsibility for ensuring that the content their children consume is appropriate. Therefore a consistent, easy to understand set of guidelines across all media types is needed.

Q14:

Restricted content should be separated from unrestricted content in stores and only sold to those with valid ID.

Q15:

All content that is required to be classified should carry its classification clearly.

Q16:

Government agencies determine the laws (ie that pornographic content should be restricted to adults 18 years and older) and classification systems based on those laws

Industry bodies should be responsible for classifying their content based on the system published by the industry body and ensuring content clearly displays classifications and consumer guidance.

Restricted content may need to be approved by the government agency.

Consumers should be aware of the classification system and what each of the classifications mean.

Especially for parents purchasing content for or on behalf of children. Consumers are free to request a review (to the government agency) of a piece of content that they believe has been incorrectly classified.

Q17:

Yes providing there are systems in place to catch (and potentially reprimand) content that is incorrectly classified either by accident or on purpose.

Q18:

Conceivably all content could be self classified by industry once the classification system is revised to include a R18+ category for all media types. Restricted content should still be submitted for approval to ensure it is permitted by law.

Q19:

The OFLC should not be a financial burden or bottleneck on industry or consumers. Empowering industry to self classify under oversight of the OFLC should reduce costs and increase efficiency.

Q20:

The lack of consistency in the video games rating space causes confusion and frustration. The video games category should be updated to include an R18+ rating inline with cinema/film.

Q21:

No. The current system just needs to be applied consistently to all media types, including video games.

Q22:

The classification system should be based on content, not the medium.

Q23:

Would have been helpful to provide a link here to read more on these two guidelines.... Without knowing the specifics of these guidelines, anything that helps make the classification system more consistent across all media types and allows adults to make informed decisions on the type of content they choose to consume (without refusing classification simply because there is no available ratings type) is a good thing.

Q24:

Content that contravenes Australia's laws

Q25:

No. RC applies both to content that should be refused classification because it contravenes Australian law AS WELL AS content that simply does not fall within an available category. Ie. R18+ for video games

Q26:

Australia should have a set of consistent, national classification laws.

Q27:

I don't know how the current scheme works. Again, would have been useful to provide a link here for more information on the question.

Q28:

Australia should have a set of consistent, national classification laws.

Q29:

N/A

Other comments:

Australia's media classification system, with respect to video games, is out of date and needs to be revised to include an R18+ category.

Australian adults are free to make informed decisions and purchase/consume R18+ content when it comes to film; video games should be no different.

Furthermore, refusing classification (to video games that would otherwise be classified R18+) adds a level of notoriety which can increase the awareness of RC titles. This can then lead to an increase in piracy as consumers are unable to simply purchase this media/content from a store which in turn hurts the content creators. Another possible outcome is that consumers will look to gray market importers and purchase content from overseas which impacts sales that would otherwise have gone to Australian retailers and distributors.