

CI 2067 B Hill

First name: Brad

Last name: Hill

Q1:

I would argue that the most recent classification system is working and is well understood by the public (as mentioned in the strengths of this report). There are however some well documented cases of inconsistencies that should be rectified to bring this classification system in line with the rest of the world.

Q2:

Consistently applied and clear guidelines provided to allow consumers of media to determine what they, and their children should have access to.

Q3:

This question largely is used to differentiate between passive and active consumers. Foreexample, video games are said to have a highwewr impact because you are interacting with the media. However, more and more now that is just a reflection of the advances in technology rather. Interactive entertainment is becoming more commonplace and to have a system that actually makes it more confusing for the end consumer (by having different ratings for different media) will ultimately reduce the effectiveness of it.

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

By making parents more aware of the rating scheme and clearly making the ratings visible to parents (who ultimately purchase the majority of this content for minors). This is the primary reason that the R18+ classificaiton issue for video games is so important. A parent will give a 14 year old a game rated 15+ but will not provide it when it is rated 18+. Ultimately the parents, as long as they are well informed about the potential impact of the content, should be the informed parties who can make informed decisions.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Video games are by far the least understood. I have spoken to many parents I know and the overwhelming response i have is that they think that a MA15+ sticker suggested that this content is suitable to children 14 or 15 years old. I have played many games that have this classification and Do not want my 15 year old son (he is currently 2 and a half) playing these games at that age. They depict wars and violence, no differently than most action movies of the day, but content that I would rather see as being suitable to adults only. Having it RC'd will effectively restrict the majority of video game players (average age approx 30yo) from getting access. What I have seen this do already is lead to piracy or importing of RC material that is classified R18+ elsewhere in the world.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

I dont think there is any dount that the current RC classification should remain. Child abuse and other highly innappropriate material should be RC in any format. Apart from the most sick and twisted individuals, there is no demand for this material so having this RC'd and unavailable online is of no concern to the average consumer.

Q25:

As long as there is an adult classification for video games (R18+), then the remainder of RC'd material is totally acceptable.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

I think that the majority of people who will respond to this will be people like me. We have a clear understanding of the classification system and as it stands, apart from video games, it actually is easy to understand. I also think that a new parent, I will rely upon the classification markings, in addition to close monitoring of my childrens viewing/playing habits, to make informed decisions.

I consider myself informed about video games so I am not the one with the issue. Many parents who are not gamers simply have no idea what their children are playing, and it is these children that I am fighting for when asking for an R18+ classification. These parents rely solely upon classifications to determine if their children should access this material. An R18+ classification sends a very clear and well understood message to parents that this material is not suitable to children.

The overwhelming public response has shown there is an immidiate need for this and I hope that this is the conclusion.