CI 886 T Fry

First name: Thomas
Last name: Fry

Q1:
The focus should be on applying the existing framework with consistency across all media that currently receives classification. Namely, introducing the R18+ classification for video games.
Q2:
Introducing the R18+ classification for video games. This is the only bias in an otherwise fair and balanced framework.
Q3:
No. The technology, format and level of interactivity should not affect how content is classified, nor should it affect what c
Q4:
No. All published content should be regulated and classified on equal terms by the classification board, and not subject to the influence of external parties that may hold a biased opinion.
Q5:
No. Content designed for children needs to be classified across all media, because classification guidelines are important for parents and guardians to base purchasing/viewing decisions on.
Q6:
No. This is too subjective, and the content alone should dictate what classification is received.
Q7:
Potentially. While it is fair to suggest that consumers be given some measure of the potential impact of artwork in a public exhibition, the format and message of exhibition-based art is often too abstract to be effectively measured within a rigid classification structure.
Q8:
No. I believe existing language warnings are sufficient for music. Audio books should be treated the same as written literature.
Q9:
No. Again, this introduces a subjective and speculative element to classification that will only cause bias.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
N/A
Q12:
Online content should never be controlled or restricted at a Government level. Search engines such as Google already filter content such as child pornography. Parents need to be educated in how to take responsibility for what their children can access online, as the tools already exist to help ensure a safer experience for online. Do not punish adults who possess the maturity and intelligence to decide what is and isn't appropriate.

Q13:

By better educating parents and guardians in how they introduce children to the Internet, and guide their childrens' experiences online. By providing parents and guardians with optional tools and software to filter online content, but NOT make such filtering mandatory for all Australian residents - because that is a slippery slope away from the democratic freedom we value.

Q14:

Requiring proof of age identification to purchase such content.

Q15:

Whenever content receives a classification, that should be clearly displayed, along with the standard consumer advice that notes why such a classification was given.

Q16:

Government agencies should cooperate with all relevant industry bodies to ensure that agreement is reached on the standards by which classifications are made. Currently, the Government appears dismissive of video games as a legitimate media industry, simply by refusing to introduce an R18+ classification.

Q17:

Potentially. It is fair to suggest that industry bodies have the capacity to make relevant input on how their industry's content is rated, but only if all classifications are ultimately measured and balanced by the government and OFLC.

Q18:

N/A

Q19:

Not sure.

Q20:

The lack of R18+ classification for video games causes confusion, because some material that receives an 'adults only' classification in other countries currently receives the MA15+ rating here in Australia. As a result, parents are making poorly-informed purchasing decisions because there is a perceived 'grey area' on who can and cannot legally access MA15+ content. R18+ content, however, requires proof of age identification to purchase and thus sends a clear message about who the content is appropriate for.

Q21:

The R18+ classification needs to be introduced for video games. Otherwise, the existing structure is sound.

Q22:

There could potentially be more detail in the reasons for a classification that are noted on the published product.

Q23:

Not sure.

Q24:

Child pornography is an obvious choice, but once again the reality is that this content is already prohibited by search engines. My understanding is that such material is instead accessed on peer-to-peer networks, and a Government filter will do nothing to prevent access to such networks.

Q25:

Not sure.

Q26:

Classification should be at a national level. States and territories should not have the capacity to classify content differently, because such imbalance would suggest our country's moral standards vary from state to state.

Q27:

Not sure.

Q28:

Yes. On a related note, a single Attorney General should not have the power to control the fate of video game classification, especially when they have a proven bias against the format. That is not democracy.

Q29:

Realistically, all that needs to be done is remove the bias that impacts video game classification compared to its film and television counterparts. In short; introduce the R18+ classification for video games.

Other comments:

It is a statistical fact that most Australians who play video games are over the age of 18. And yet, with a lack of the R18+ classification for video games, we are not offered the respect to make our own informed choices about what content is appropriate as an adult.

Despite the ill-informed hysteria that opposes the introduction of an R18+ classification for games, the reality is that the rating will result in LESS games with mature content being available to children. Games that are sometimes able to sneak through at an MA15+ classification would be given the appropriate R18+ rating like in other countries, and so proof of age identification would be necessary to purchase them. In the rare case that a game featured content inappropriate for all audiences in Australia (including adults), it would still be Refused Classification under this structure.

Your consideration on this matter is greatly appreciated.