## CI 612 J Powell

First name: James Last name: Powell

Q1:

Yes. A new framework IS NEEDED - the current system is BROKEN, as it doesn't to the job it was DESIGNED TO DO (i.e. protect children from graphic content yet allow adults the freedoms they deserve when it comes to gaming).

Q2:

Create a fair and unbiased scheme that gives EVERY game a rating rather than just blanket-banning it in our country.

Q3:

No. With the wide range of platforms readily available to all ages and genders in our country today, there is no need to change the rating of content based upon which platform was used to access it. Q4:

No. All content should be classified regardless of complaints, although if a complaint is made about a particular game it should then be reviewed to see if a new classification is needed.

Q5:

Yes. Like I stated in question four, in order to maintain a fair system and avoid discrimination, ALL CONTENT should be given a classification regardless of 'potential impact', complaints or target audience.

Q6:

No. See Q5.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No. See Q5.

Q10:

No. See Q5.

Q11:

ALL content should be given a classification REGARDLESS (see Q5)

Q12:

The most effective (however perhaps not the most efficient) way to go about this would be to have an Australia-wide system that allows a user to have a 'content access' account that proves their age - this way, access to content that is classified as R18+/MA15+ etc can be limited to those who have a 'content access' account.

Q13:

Again, see Q12.

Q14:

Check for ID over the counter. How hard is this, people?
Q15:
Before the consumer has a chance to open the product - this way, if they are not happy with the
content then they can complain all they want but at the end of the day, they were given a fair warning.
Q16:
All parties would agree upon a set of criteria for classification of content. THAT simple.
Q17:
Huh?
Q18:
None. Even if it's Hello Kitty Island Adventures and quite clearly the 'G'est of all 'G' games out there, it
STILL needs to be given the same treatment as any other game.
Q19:
See: Q5, Q18
Q20:
Yes, the existing categories have been around for as long as I can remember and are quite clear.
Q21:
R18+ for games in Australia. Simple enough?
Q22:
Again, a set of criteria valid for all media formats needs to be devised by the industry, government
and end-users.
Q23:
Yes.
Q24:
None.
Q25:
Q26:
Yes, our system is already so different from that of other first world countries the last thing we need is
to have differing standards in our own states and territories. The new classification system needs to
be nationwide.
Q27:
Q28:
Yes.
Q29:
Other comments:
I think I've said about as much as I need to say. How ridiculous is it that in our country, you can go
and watch as many R18+ movies as you like, but if you want to come home and kill some
Q29: Other comments: I think I've said about as much as I need to say. How ridiculous is it that in our country, you can go

I think I've said about as much as I need to say. How ridiculous is it that in our country, you can go and watch as many R18+ movies as you like, but if you want to come home and kill some computerised zombies (Left 4 Dead 2), you can't because it's been blanket-banned in Austral- oh wait, they just made the developers create a softcore version for Australians. We are a JOKE to other countries. Enough is enough, let's get a PROPER system and end this idiocy.