

CI 624 D Jeffries

First name: David

Last name: Jeffries

Q1:

The existing framework is effective and useful, when applied to everything except video games. The current classification for video games has a maximum rating of MA15+. This means that games restricted to those 18 and over in other countries are frequently rated MA, and available to 15 year olds. An R18+ rating for video games would allow mature content to be restricted to a more appropriate audience, and should be put in place not only for the benefit of consumers, but in order to nurture a growing video game industry in this country.

Q2:

The primary objectives of a national classification scheme should be to regulate content and ensure it is only consumed by those of an appropriate age, or with the consent of their parents. A classification scheme should also work to clearly inform parents of content, and allow them to make an informed decision on whether it is appropriate for their children.

Q3:

The platform used to access content is an important consideration. Online delivery mediums, such as video game consoles and mobile phone applications should use the same classification as a retail counterpart. In the event that the content is exclusively downloadable, this content should be self-regulated, unless there is sufficient public feeling that a particular piece of content needs review. This could be done via a submissions process. To classify all content coming through online services is impractical due to the large volumes of content released on a daily basis.

Q4:

Yes. As above, classification of content on online services is impractical, so a submission-based classification review would be the best option.

Q5:

Content designed for children should be regulated where it involves online interactions. Content delivered purely through online delivery systems should not be classified without a complaint, as it is otherwise impractical to do so.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

At present, there are notification stickers on recordings to warn of explicit lyrics. This is sufficient.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Yes. Public content should be limited in terms of violence and sexual content.

Q11:

Q12:

Due to the nature of the internet, effective restrictions on online content are impossible, and easily routed around. A more effective approach would be to classify only content that has had complaints against it, and give people the option to install software that notifies the user when they are about to access content above a specified rating.

Q13:

Parents need to be educated in online safety, and need to pass this information on to their children. For young children it may be appropriate to install firewall software on the computer, but educating them to be safe and responsible on the internet is the best method of protection.

Q14:

The current levels of control are sufficient.

Q15:

Wherever it is sold.

Q16:

Government agencies and industry bodies should be there to inform users of content. It is the consumer's responsibility to be aware of what they are purchasing, and showing to their children. It is the government's role to prevent restricted content from being sold to minors without the consent of their parents.

Q17:

In some industries, yes. This has worked very well in the USA for the video game industry, and it would make classifying online games far more practical.

Q18:

Video games, particularly downloadable ones. It is fairly simple to determine the level of potentially objectionable content, and the industry is responsible enough to do this itself.

Q19:

Classification should be subsidised for small independent content producers, be they in the film or video game industry. It should also be subsidised for non-profit charity organisations where appropriate.

Q20:

I believe there is confusion surrounding the difference between M and MA. It could be advisable to re-label these categories so people can better distinguish them.

Q21:

Q22:

The classification system for video games should be made consistent with that of the film industry.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None. It is not practical to restrict access to content online, and there is the question of who regulates it, to what standards, and how are they held accountable. It is certainly advisable to trace users of child pornography, however blocking access to even this would be ineffective, and a waste of money better spent on tracking down the producers and distributors of this content.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes. Without consistency, restricted content could be brought over borders illegally.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: