

I have not included a response to any of the sections to which I have no current issue with.

**1) Are the classification categories for films and computer games still appropriate and useful? If not, how should they change?**

No they are not.

The simple fact of the matter is that all of the games that have been banned from sale in Australia over the last 5 years are available to Australians one way or another. In the age of torrents, cloud, and VPN's these bans are more easily bypassed by the young than the banning is implemented by the old. It is farcical and a waste of time and effort.

The application of R18+ and X18+ to games should occur in lieu of banning them from sale. Information regarding examples of impactful conduct within the game should be clearly written in the case/summary/synopsis to assist the purchaser to make an informed choice.

The internet has exposed all who visit it to completely unregulated, un-redacted, and sometimes horrifying content, a good deal of it unedited and obviously taken from reality.

**2a) Do the provisions in the Code, the Films Guidelines or the Computer Games Guidelines relating to 'themes' reflect community standards and concerns? Do they need to change in any particular classification category or overall? Are 'themes' understood and is there sufficient guidance on what they mean?**

The post-release implementation of gambling mechanics into games must be addressed. An example is when a shooting game is released without 'loot-boxes' and/or an in-game currency to purchase a loot-box-like mechanic, a period of time passes and then the mechanic is introduced. This is deceptive conduct in the extreme resulting in informed adults making purchases for children that with the flick of a switch turns a (potentially) G-rated game into a M15+. A potential approach is to have these matters reported to the ACCC and a policy for mandatory investigation into the event subject to unconscionable conduct of the developer, for which regulations and pecuniary penalties already exist.

**2e) Do the provisions in the Code, the Films Guidelines and the Computer Games Guidelines relating to 'drug use' reflect community standards and concerns? Do they need to be changed in any particular classification category or overall?**

As I understand it, the simple existence of these 'themes' have been the reason that particular games have been refused classification in the past (e.g. Fallout having Morphine injectors), which should have it instead been allocated an R18 classification. This does not 'protect' minors from impactful material being that it is restricted from sale to that age group. Nor is it reasonable to say that a game that is advertised and very well known for its graphic violence, dystopian and grim landscape/script, and good/evil character choices is going to result in an 'unexpected impact' to an informed individual, especially if 'Graphic Drug Use' is remarked on the classification label. This example can be applied loosely across many 'refused classification' games.