

CI 875 G Robinson

First name: Greg

Last name: Robinson

Q1:

They should do both. The existing framework is more or less fine, but needs some tightening up so that games that belong in the MA15+ rating do not end up in the new R18+ rating. The R18+ rating should be a newly developed classification and not just the current MA15+ rating with a new name. Much like with films, games classified R18+ should be games that contain adult content.

Q2:

Providing clear information for everyone concerned. Parents of younger gamers in particular need to be clearly informed if a game is not suitable for persons under the age of 18. Secondary to this, the rights of adult gamers to have legal access to reasonable adult content should also be considered.

Q3:

No. There is little, if any, real evidence that video games are any different to other forms of media. The interactive element of video games can be argued as both a positive and a negative factor in regards to the impact of the content. For example, although it could be argued interactive violence in video games is worse than simulated violence in film, it could also be argued that interactivity serves as an outlet for violent tendencies.

Q4:

No, all content should be required to be classified, with or without a complaint.

Q5:

No, potential impact should not affect whether content is classified or not. Content designed for children or adults should be classified appropriately across all media.

Q6:

No it should still be classified. This is where the secondary concern for 'adult liberties' comes into it. If a mainstream, mass marketed product (film or video game, it does not matter) is to be released in Australia, it should be put through the same classification system as everything else.

In my opinion anything intended for a mainstream, mass marketed release will not contain any content beyond that of an R18+ rating. Thus if an R18+ rating existed for all forms of media, there is no reason any of this material would be refused classification.

Q7:

Only for the purpose of providing consumer advice.

Q8:

Yes, I see no reason why not.

Q9:

No, same reason as Q4 and Q6 above.

Q10:

Again no. If it is to be accessed in public however, greater care needs to be taken to prevent inappropriately aged persons from accessing it, for example doing strict I.D. checks for MA15+ and R18+ films at cinemas the same way they are checked at bars and clubs.

Q11:

Nothing more than what already is considered, potential impact etc.

Q12:

If your goal is to prevent minors accessing R18+ content, educating parents in proper online practices will be far more effective than trying to block restricted content. Having to set up an online profile that links to a form of I.D. might also work, but will be difficult to implement.

Q13:

By better educating their parents and guardians.

Q14:

Much the same way alcohol and tobacco products are controlled, restrict the sale of such items to persons of the appropriate age and make I.D. checks mandatory.

Q15:

Whenever it is being sold.

Q16:

Government agencies should design the system by which to classify media,

Q17:

Yes and no, I believe both systems (Industry and Government) can work in parallel.

Q18:

All content should be classified by Government systems and Industry systems should be optional, but encouraged.

Q19:

If content will be made public, then the Government should classify it, but not censor it.

Q20:

For films, yes, for games no. Too many parents do not seem to understand that MA15+ means "not for 12 year olds to play." I believe introducing a new R18+ category for video games will help with this confusion, as there is no mistaking what R18+ means.

Q21:

There is a need for an R18+ category for video games. the existing MA15+ category needs to be tightened up, but not merged for removed.

Q22:

They are reasonably consistant now, but there needs to be an R18+ for video games as well as for films.

Q23:

Yes it should.

Q24:

Only things that are illegal and immoral such as child pornography.

Q25:

No, this category needs to be refined to be less "black and white" in its approach to classifying content as RC. If content is neither abhorrent nor immoral and does not actually contain anything illegal (for

instance, a film or publication that features images of women who are over the legal age of consent, but may appear to be younger) it should not be refused classification on principle. Doing anything on principle implies that no thought has gone into the decision.

Q26:

Yes it is, it is illogical to have some states and territories with stricter laws than others, all states should have the same classification laws as others.

Q27:

A system that is universal for all of Australia that is governed by one body, rather than by each state.

Q28:

Given that the current system can result in decisions being dragged out over months or even years due to the requirement that all Attorneys-General be present at meetings and that they must reach unanimous consensus before a decision can be made, referring powers to the Commonwealth may be better in the long run.

Q29:

Questionnaires such as this one to allow public input, revising the laws as they become outdated.

Other comments: