CI 2042a Clan - Team Revenant

Name of organisation: Clan - Team Revenant

Q1:
The current classification framework fails to account for the constantly changing nature of all forms of media. We consider that developing the guidelines through only addressing limited elements will restrict the review to preexisting understandings on what ratings should be.
Developing a complete new framework will allow a more flexible approach to ratings across all media. Recent technological developments have proven that a single standard approach across all mediums does not allow the flexibility that would be required.
Q2:
1. To ensure that all people are aware of the nature of the product or service (films and theater for example) which is being supplied
2. To make it easier for people to make decisions based on the content or nature of products and services
3. To prevent people from accessing material that is inappropriate for their age group
4. To provide clear definitions of each rating level, and how they should be interpreted
Q3:
All platforms should be classified.

This does not mean that each item must be classified individually, nor officially. For example, art is something which doesn't need to be classified individually, but could be classified on by gallery or by room. With a new ratings framework it could be possible to allow limited sets of media formats to be self classified. This is a case where it would benefit businesses to have their product rated. A clear set of guidelines would assist this type of scheme, something which our current guidelines could not support.

Some mediums must be rated officially. This includes:
-Video Games
-Movies
-Television Shows
-Mobile Applications
Q4:
As mentioned above, we believe that it would be beneficial to some areas to have self regulation. Providing a guidelines for self classification would allow there to be an advertised clear process if there is a complaint for inaccurately rated content. This would assist retail and service providers by offering a clear path of approach to offer the customer, while allowing them to make the appropriate changes to their own rating if they like.
We consider it important that individuals do not reflect the greater public. A single complaint should not force items to be rated. Individuals are often extreme in their views. We believe that an individual can provide a complaint, and it should be taken seriously. But it should not be taken in isolation. A

clear framework for the classification of content should not contain ambiguity. This is one of the current failings of our current system.

Q5:

All content, regardless of impact should be rated if it is in the list provided in Q3. If a piece of content has been designed for children, it should be rated as though it were. We consider it important that if a piece of content is being marketed across multiple platforms that there is some constant base rating. For example, X-Men Origins: Wolverine was a movie released in February 2009. It was given a rating of M, in toy shops, marketed at children are figurines for this film. This same approach is used for wrestling figurines. This is content that is inappropriate for minors yet it is being sold, with a rating much lower than the brand which it is selling though. These toys without ratings are trivializing our existing rating system by selling the brand directly to the children.

We suggest a consistent rating approach across platforms for brands. This may mean applying a base level rating for a brand which is then built upon for each movie or game. It is a failing of our classification system where a movie can have a rating of MA and tie in products are being targeted at children.

Q6:

No. All content should be classified regardless of size or market position.

Q7:

Artworks should be classified, but we believe that this would be best done by classifying the artwork on a per gallery or room basis rather than a per piece basis.

Q8:

All content should be classified. For that audio content that is tied across multiple platforms (for example, a film, a book and an audio book) the rating should be the same for all three at the rating level of the highest rated medium.

Q9:

No, this would only create loopholes that allow content to miss being rated.

Q10:

No, content most frequently displayed in public is done so in order to sell it to normal home users. Content should be rated on what it contains, not where it is shown. Classifications can recommend that content is not shown publicly, but the fact that it is shown publicly should not impact on the classification that it receives.

Q11:

All distributed content should be classified. Physical products (retail movies, films, books) or services (digital distributed products, Cinema, theatre and Art Galleries)

Q12:

No method should be used to control access to online content. We believe that the classification guidelines are there to provide information and support adults and children in making decisions on the suitability of certain content for either themselves or others.

It is the responsibility of parents to enforce the classifications online. The current system fails to act

consistently across each classification level and as such it is given very little value or ignored completely.

The recommendation that we have is that upon opening a digital product or service, that the rating which the product or service was given is displayed. Much like the current manner in which the ratings are shown for trailers at the cinema.

This would make it much more visible for parents and would make it harder for children to hide the type of content that they are interacting with.

It is important to teach parents about how to monitor their children access to the internet.

Ultimately it is the parents responsibility to monitor and restrict access to material which is not appropriate, especially in online content.

Q13:

Through the education of parents and an appropriate rating system. This should not be enforced or managed by any government body. These are classification guidelines, used by parents and guardians to make judgement as to the suitability of the content.

Q14:

This question makes the assumption that sexual content is rated at a level which is much worse than violent content. This is a false assumption. This question also assumes that there is a rating, equivalent to the R rating, will be used. We will answer this question in reference to the existing MA15+ rating and above.

Content that is rated MA15+ should not be be sold to someone who is under the age or 15, Nor should it be sold to someone who is not a parent if the content is going to be given to someone under the age of 15. This should be illegal. Equally, with content rated R18+ it should be illegal to sell it to someone under the age of 18 and it should also be an offence to purchase something rated R18+ with the intent to provide it to someone under the age of 18.

These restrictions need to be enforced at the shop front. All outlets stocking content of the more severe ratings (the equivalent of MA15+ and higher) need to be held accountable for providing this content to people who should not have access.

Q15:

Galleries should be displaying these on each room or section that has been rated. Music should be played or stream at times that have certain ratings, for example, using the existing ratings as an example maximum ratings, G and PG from between 7am to 7pm, M from 7pm to 10pm and MA15+ from 10pm to 7am. It is very important that music is classified.

Otherwise all products and services are able to carry their rating information all the time. I have listed in Question 12 a way that online content could be marked

Q16:

Government and industry bodies should play no role in mandatory censorship. Government and industry should provide tools and education to users to support them in regulating content in the manner that they choose.

Q17:

In some cases this would be the best way to approach the classification of some content. For example, this would be considered the best way to rate products such as music, books and art. Content across media such as games and film must be classified by a completely independent board as supplied by the government.

Allowing industry to regulate some content allows an avenue of appeal for the general public to the government if they believe that something has been rated incorrectly.

With products that are classified by a government board such as games, it should be known with complete certainty on release the likely nature of the content. Self regulation in these industries would be invited abuse as the potential gain is huge.

Q18:

Art and books. Music could be included in this but it is important to note the explicit sexual and violent nature of some songs should be closely monitored.

Q19:

Government classification should be charged based on the time it takes to classify. If something will take 1 hour to classify it should cost less than something that takes a day to classify.

Q20:

Existing classification categories under the existing system have seen so much content inaccurately rated that they carry no significance for many people.

Within computer games for example, there are so many games rated MA15+ that are given an equivalent of an R18+ rating overseas that the meaning of this rating is now valueless. There is also a large quantity of products that are rated MA15+ that should be rated lower that people no longer trust it as a rating, and by extension that of the M rating.

The current rating system needs a full refresh, with new rating categories and definitions to be able to move away from the ineffective and meaningless nature of the existing categories.

Q21:

The existing system contains all the ratings that it should have needed. The meaningless nature of many of these categories has since devalued them so badly that only new ratings will be able to be taken seriously by the public.

All the ratings, across all the platforms, should exist. There should be no rating that is treated differently depending on platform. This is true from G to R18+.

Q22:

The rating classifications should exist across all the platforms and carry the exact same meaning across all content. There should be no exclusions to this.

Q23:

These should be consolidated to allow for a single consistent rating system across all content types.

Q24:

Illegal content should not be accessible digitally or physically.

Q25:

It does with the exception of the manner RC is used in relation to computer games.

Q26:

Yes. State and territories should have no say in individually impacting the manner in which content is rated. They may influence how content at RC for example is prohibited, but they should not be involved in managing the way the rating system is arranged.

Q27:

The classification scheme and its ratings should be entirely monitored and managed at the Commonwealth level.

Q28:

The states should.

Q29:

Promotion and support. Currently there is very little information as to the reasons behind the various ratings and why certain content is unsuitable for certain age groups. With a new rating system it will be important to emphasis the reasons behind each level so that parents and guardians can make accurate judgements based of a system which they can associate with.

Other comments:

We suggest the following as important elements to consider for inclusion in the upcoming review and development:

- It is made possible that with introduction of new mediums which may require classifications reviews can take place without the requirement of states and territories.

- We suggest the use of Web 2.0 to assist in industry regulated classification

- We question the elements that makes sexual content much worse than violence. For example, the game Mortal Kombat which was released this year has a much higher impact than any normal sexual content.

- We consider the European and American rating systems far more accurate and useful to consumers that what we currently present.