

## Correspondence relating to feedback and complaints received by IFCO in Q1 2026

### Contents

1.	<b>28 Years Later: The Bone Temple</b> .....	2
2.	<b>Anaconda</b> .....	4
3.	<b>The Housemaid</b> .....	6
4.	<b>Hamnet</b> .....	8
5.	<b>Hamnet</b> .....	11
6.	<b>Various</b> .....	12
7.	<b>28 Years Later: The Bone Temple</b> .....	14
8.	<b>The Housemaid</b> .....	16
9.	<b>28 Years Later: The Bone Temple</b> .....	17
10.	<b>“Wuthering Heights”</b> .....	18
11.	<b>Enforcement of Age Ratings</b> .....	20
12.	<b>One Battle After Another</b> .....	21

## 1. 28 Years Later: The Bone Temple

I recently went to see the movie 28 years later: Bone Temple at my local cinema which is classified 16.

Having been a fan of the latest film in the franchise, I was left shocked by the sadistic graphic violence in the film which in my view, went far beyond what I expected to see in a 16 rated film.

The previous film in this franchise was also rated 16 and while violent and gory, it was mostly quick and against the infected characters, whereas this time around much of the violence is perpetrated against human characters.

In my opinion, a rating of 18 would be more appropriate for this film and certainly, when the film is released on DVD, I would hope it is rated 18 instead of 15, that is, if you are planning to give this film a DVD release.

### IFCO Response

Many thanks for your email. We appreciate all feedback on our classification decisions as it help inform our thinking going forward.

*28 Years Later: The Bone Temple* was classified 16 with this accompanying consumer advice published to the IFCO website:

*Strong gory violence with graphic bloody injury detail. Scenes of torture consistent with the franchise. Nudity and strong language. Drug use.*

I agree the sequence of sadism and cruelty in the barn that you refer to was particularly challenging, but it was felt that as it was mostly confined to just this one sequence it was acceptable within the 16 category. This is in line with other horror titles like *Weapons* and *Longlegs* that have also been classified at 16 in recent times.

With the 16 category not available for Home Entertainment, I can confirm this title will be rated 18 when released in that format.

Best regards  
David

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

**Further Correspondence Received**

Thank you for your reply, I appreciate seeing your insight into the scene and that given that it was just limited to one scene and that the villains are clearly identified, that a 16 rating for cinemas probably is appropriate for a film franchise such as this with a big fanbase.

## 2. Anaconda

I would like to make a complaint with reference to the movie Anaconda.

How in gods name did anyone think 12A was a suitable rating. We had a viewing for a birthday party yesterday that absolutely terrified the kids attending. Between language, violence, gore and suicidal talk the kids were traumatised.

Just because there is a little comedy involved doesn't in anyway reduce the impact of this movie.

Did the reviewers watch the actual movie or just the trailer?? Absolute failure in your responsibilities to protect children. Disgraceful. Somehow Saipan is 15A while Anaconda is 12A. Seriously. Get some official standards and guidelines for your reviewers.

### **IFCO Response**

I'm sorry to hear you and the party had an upsetting visit to the cinema.

As you note, *Anaconda* was classified at 12A with the accompanying consumer guidance published to the IFCO website –

*Moderate violence, threat and injury. Moderate sex references, drug use and infrequent strong language.*

We strongly recommend parents consult the IFCO website before deciding on the suitability of a film for their family.

While our classifiers noted the scary scenes you reference and some rude humour, we felt these were mitigated by the comic tone throughout and so could be contained at 12A (suitable for children of 12 and over). For reference, the film was similarly classified in other jurisdictions (UK – 12A, US – PG-13).

Many thanks for your email. We appreciate all feedback from parents or guardians as it can help guide future decisions. While you might disagree with us in this instance, please be assured a great deal of consideration goes into every age rating awarded.

Best regards  
David  
David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

### **Further Correspondence Received**

Thanks for the reply. However the definition as you describe to me is total nonsense. If a movie contains, moderate violence, sex references, drug use, injury and strong language. It is totally unsuitable for under 18's never mind 12 year olds.

The fact there is some humour in a movie does not in anyway negate the previous unsuitable material.

Who do I contact in relation to this to have the said definitions changed. It is ridiculous and no wonder that people are avoiding cinemas in their droves when they adults can't trust that allowing their children to attend a movie is safe.

Thanks again for your reply but the information provided is nothing but a cop out

**IFCO Response**

David forwarded your email to me.

IFCO classifies material with reference to our published guidelines which are informed by our experience and related research. The guidelines were reviewed in 2024/2025, and a copy of the current version is attached. As you will see moderate violence and sustained threat is permitted in films rated 12A. In addition, sexual content and references to harmful behaviour are permitted. By contrast an 18 rating as you have suggested would indicate strong realistic violence with graphic injury detail gore and horror. This was not the case. Therefore, I am satisfied that a 12 A rating was suitable for Anaconda. I appreciate that you do not share this view.

I am also attaching for your reference a research report we published in 2025 about audience perspectives on Harmful and Offensive Media Content. Among other things the research highlighted the key role parents see themselves playing in deciding on the suitability of content. In this context, classifications and advice are viewed as the most valuable supports for audiences. Consistence in the application of ratings and advice is critical to maintaining confidence in the system. In this context I am also satisfied that Anaconda was appropriately rated.

Thank you for taking the time to contact IFCO

Regards

Ciaran

Dr Ciarán Kissane  
Director  
Irish Film Classification Office

### 3. The Housemaid

I feel it necessary to write this email after attending a cinema production with a Friend today. We went to the cinema in Killarney to see the film 'The Housemaid' . The film was certified 15A.

We were both seriously 'surprised' to see a young mother with at least 4, possibly more young girls...children...come into the screening where we were.

I honestly thought at first that either we, or they, had gone into the wrong auditorium!

The film had several scenes of both a sexual and violent nature.

The children stayed for the whole film.

After it had ended, we spoke to the manager, questioning why these children were left in to see this Adult film.

We were informed that according to IFCO rules,....as these girls were 'Accompanied ', He had to let them in.

The Manager was very polite and professional at detailing his position, stating that it was the rules of the IFCO.

Surely, whoever is making these rules, needs to be questioned and give details of how they choose the age appropriateness of each film.

Both my friend and I thought it was a very good Adult Film, but, were both Very Upset and Dismayed at the presence of Such YOUNG CHILDREN in the auditorium.

#### **IFCO Response**

Many thanks for getting in touch and apologies for the delay in responding.

As you note *The Housemaid* was classified 15A with the accompanying consumer advice published to the IFCO website –

'Strong violence with graphic injury detail. Depiction of domestic violence, sexual assault and coercive control'.

<https://www.ifco.ie/en/ifco/pages/464913DB00512733>

Films classified at this category have been deemed suitable for children of 15 and over. However, they can be viewed by younger children if accompanied by a parent or guardian who knows that child best. In such instances we strongly recommend that parent makes an informed decision by availing of the consumer advice on the IFCO website.

While it does not appear to have been the case in this instance, our general experience is that parents appreciate having the ultimate call about what their child can view and take their responsibilities serious in this regard. I'm sorry to hear to caused you an upsetting experience at the screening.

Thanks again for getting in touch. We genuinely appreciate all feedback from the public as it helps inform our decisions going forward.

Best

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office.

#### 4. Hamnet

I am writing to formally express my concern and disagreement regarding the **12A classification** recently awarded to the film **Hamnet**.

Having viewed the film, I was surprised to find that it contains a depicted sex scene between the characters of William and Agnes. While I understand that IFCO's guidelines for the 12A category allow for sexual content "presented without explicit detail," the scene in question felt significantly more mature than what is typically expected for a 12A/PG-13 audience in Ireland.

My concerns are based on the following:

- **Intensity of the Scene:** While the scene avoids full nudity, the depiction of the encounter in the woodshed is quite visceral and intense for a pre-teen audience.
- **Suitability for Younger Children:** Because of the "A" (Accompanied) suffix, children significantly younger than twelve are regularly brought to these screenings. I believe this specific content crosses the line from "mature themes" into "adult content" that warrants a **15A** or **16** rating to better protect younger viewers.
- **Consistency:** Compared to other historical dramas that receive higher ratings for similar romantic intensity, the 12A rating for *Hamnet* feels inconsistent with the goal of providing reliable guidance to parents.

I appreciate the work IFCO does in providing consumer advice, but in this instance, I believe the classification does not adequately reflect the adult nature of that specific sequence. I would appreciate it if you could clarify how this scene was deemed appropriate for the 12A category under the current 2025/2026 guidelines.

I look forward to your response.

#### **IFCO Response**

Many thanks for getting in touch. We appreciate considered emails like yours as they can help guide future classification decisions.

As you note, *Hamnet* was classified 12A by IFCO with this accompanying consumer advice published to the IFCO website – *Some distressing scenes and scenes of a sexual nature. Bereavement theme.*

To be honest, the scene you reference did cause some back and forth between our classification team. We try and classify off the basis of the film as a whole rather than as a result of one short image or scene. In a film about the character of Hamnet, who he was and where he came from, it was felt this short scene of sexuality was justified at 12A.

It should be noted that our published guidelines do allow for 'sexual content without explicit nudity' at 12A –

<https://ifco.ie/Website/IFCO/IFCOWebV2.nsf/IFCO-New-Classification-Guidelines-2025.pdf?openfileResource#page=13>

Thanks again for your email. Although you might not agree with us in this instance, please be assured a great deal of consideration goes into every classification awarded.

Best regards

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

#### **Further Correspondence Received**

Thank you for your response and for sharing the context regarding the internal discussions held by the classification team.

I would like to draw your attention to a specific distinction in the wording of the 2025/2026 Guidelines provided in your link. In your email, you noted that the guidelines allow for “*sexual content without explicit nudity*” at the 12A level. However, the official document (page 13) states: “Sexual content without explicit detail, and brief sexual nudity, can occur in 12A films.” Because the guidelines explicitly separate “nudity” from “detail” it suggests that a scene can be considered “explicitly detailed” regardless of whether nudity is present. In the case of *Hamnet*, while I agree the scene lacks explicit nudity, the graphic depiction of the physical act coupled with the intensity of the characters’ behavior constitutes a level of “explicit detail” that I believe exceeds the mature themes usually permitted in a 12A film.

If “explicit detail” were simply a synonym for “nudity,” the phrasing in the guidelines would be redundant. Therefore, I would appreciate further clarification on how IFCO defines “explicit detail” in scenes where nudity is absent. Specifically, I would value your insight on how the team differentiates between a “detailed” sexual encounter and one that is deemed appropriate for the 12A/Accompanied category.

I believe this distinction is vital for providing parents with reliable guidance, and I look forward to your thoughts on the matter.

#### **Further Correspondence Received**

I am writing to follow up on my email from last week regarding the classification of *Hamnet*. As I mentioned in my previous message, I am particularly interested in how IFCO differentiates between “explicit nudity” and “explicit detail” within the 12A category. Given that the 2025/2026 guidelines list these as separate criteria, a clarification on what constitutes “explicit detail” in the absence of nudity would be very helpful for my understanding of the current standards.

I understand the team is busy, but I would appreciate a response on this specific distinction when you have a moment.

**IFCO Response**

As you note the guidelines at 12A state that ‘sexual content without explicit detail, and brief sexual nudity, can occur in 12A films.’

In terms of what constitutes explicit detail, our classifiers will consider the duration of the scene, how the scene is shot and its context in the overall piece. In the case of *Hamnet* it was felt with the sequence was relatively discreet (being shot at a distance) and sufficiently brief to be acceptable at 12A.

Best regards

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

## 5. Hamnet

Having reviewed IFCO own classification re 12A movies I do not understand how Hamnet has been given at 12A rating ??

Please can you explain given the explicit sex scene in this movie ??

### IFCO Response

Many thanks for getting in touch.

As you note, *Hamnet* was classified 12A by IFCO with this accompanying consumer advice published to the IFCO website – *Some distressing scenes and scenes of a sexual nature. Bereavement theme.*

We try and classify off the basis of the film as a whole rather than as a result of one short image or scene. In a film about the character of Hamnet, who he was and where he came from, it was felt this short scene of sexuality was justified at 12A.

It should be noted that our published guidelines do allow for 'sexual content without explicit nudity' at 12A –

<https://ifco.ie/Website/IFCO/IFCOWebV2.nsf/IFCO-New-Classification-Guidelines-2025.pdf?openfileResource#page=13>

Thanks again for your email. Although you might not agree with us in this instance, please be assured a great deal of consideration goes into every classification awarded.

Best regards  
David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

### Further Correspondence Received

Thank you for your response which is much appreciated.

Unfortunately however, I respectfully disagree. This was not just a "scene" of a sexual nature – the "audio" which accompanied the visual "scene" left viewers (and exposed minor children) in no doubt that the actors were having sex on the kitchen table.

## 6. Various

Thanks a lot for your response to my prior email about The Apprentice and Kinds of Kindness. I've noticed the recent Yorgos Lanthimos film Bugonia is actually a 15A, which I do feel might be a slight overcorrection as I believe it to be Lanthimos' most violent film, some of which, like the torture scene involving electrocution and the bloody gunshot suicide, are not quite mitigated in impact by the blackly comic undertones. While the sexual aspect of some Lanthimos films is notably absent, I feel like it would be better accommodated at a 16 rating because the 15A has no minimum age of entry, which could allow children to be brought to a film which would be highly likely to trouble them. I can understand the liberalisation at the 16 category even though it involves extremely violent films such as Bring Her Back and 28 Years Later: The Bone Temple being passed at a rating below 18, as a strict age restriction minimises potential harm, with older teenagers likely to be familiar with the trappings of gory genre fare. The 15A being similarly liberalised strikes me as a little bit more problematic due to the fact that harmless material with a small amount of swearing is being given the same advisory category as violent and sexual films.

A representative example would be Sentimental Value versus The Housemaid. The former would be easily accommodated at 12A in my view, given the tone is gentle, the F-word count is merely seven (as opposed to the recent Goodbye June, which has around fifty uses at 12A), with only one being sexual (the 12A-rated Maria has nine F-words including a sexual use). The suicide references are fairly detached and are mostly spoken in relation to a scene in a film the characters are shooting, as opposed to the 12A-rated A Man Called Otto, which includes various on-screen suicide attempts by the main character, and the references to torture, while momentarily impactful, have a historical context, with the accompanying still images being somewhat indistinct in nature. The Housemaid, while being a pulpy genre film, has some strong elements of sadism in scenes where people are forced to commit acts of self-injury to escape confinement, such as a woman having to cut herself on the stomach, a woman having to pull strands of her hair out, and a man having to pull his tooth out, along with a brief rape scene, which creates a cumulative effect that I don't think should be given the same rating as a gentle film like Sentimental Value (or, another example, The Life of Chuck).

A few other 15A films that have moments of violence I'd consider more aligned with 16 territory include some of the graphic weapon violence towards the end of Eddington, the intentionally excessive bloody climax of HIM (which is rated 18 in the UK), and Emergency, which has a disturbing scene of atrocities including a baby being killed by being slammed against a wall in front of its mother and several women being decapitated. I do believe part of the problem is parental responsibility, and the 15A is a much more satisfactory advisory rating than the US R which irresponsibly incorporates everything from The King's Speech to Hostel, however there are a good amount of 15A films that would indeed be appropriate for a supervised younger audience and a small handful that would not be. Back in the late 00s and early 10s there were occasional additions to consumer advices expressing that a certain film was on the high end of a certain rating (i.e. 28 Weeks Later was stated to be a borderline 16/18 and The Hunger Games was stated to be on the high end of 12A, so perhaps a reintroduction of this messaging might be a good idea to prevent potential accidental exposure of children to disturbing material.

### IFCO Response

Sorry for the delayed response. Things have been a bit hectic here the last few weeks.

You've put your finger on an issue that we've been working through here the last number of months. Namely, where the border is between 15A/16 and 16/18, particularly considering the recent research project undertaken by the Office. You can read the results of that here –

<https://www.ifco.ie/en/IFCO/Audience-Perspectives-on-Harmful-and-Offensive-Media-Content-Summary.pdf/Files/Audience-Perspectives-on-Harmful-and-Offensive-Media-Content-Summary.pdf>

I feel Bugonia sits well at 15A seeing as the scenes of violence and intensity are couched in the usual heightened Lanthimos tone and the film resolves itself in hard fantasy. As you say, it lacks the sexual aspect which pushed previous titles into 18.

As regards Sentimental Value and The Housemaid, I find it can be a challenge to directly compare two titles in relation to their rating as we try and rate a film purely on its own merits. Having said that, I think they both sit ok at 15A, albeit at the two ends of the category. I'm comfortable with the challenging aspects of The Housemaid in this category providing we can provide the consumer advice necessary to forewarn audiences who might be affected. In this case the advice on ifco.ie reads –

'Strong violence with graphic injury detail. Depiction of domestic violence, sexual assault and coercive control'.

<https://www.ifco.ie/en/ifco/pages/464913DB00512733>

I hope this is useful. Thanks for getting in touch and for the feedback.

Best regards

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

## 7. 28 Years Later: The Bone Temple

I've never emailed you before and generally never have a problem with film classifications/ratings, being a fairly open minded film lover of many genres. But I sincerely think that you made a mistake with the classification for 28 Years Later: The Bone Temple (2026). I went to see it in my local multiplex last night, having seen all the preceding films in this series. I generally enjoyed the film and though it was very well made, and quite funny in places, but I was quite disturbed by several scenes and did not sleep well last night.

I have no interest in censorship, but as a 51 year old parent of two teenage boys I would be worried at the impact of these scenes on developing young minds. My eldest son is very well educated in cinema and turns 16 in two months, and if he is not nearly ready for this film I would wonder if many other teenagers would be. We even watched Come And See (Klimov, 1985) together, so this is saying something.

I think that the BBFC got this one right in classifying it with an 18s rating. Apart from the grizzly decapitations, the scene in the barn alone is so gritty and shocking, even if the actual skin pulling is not shown in detail, that the deeply uncomfortable feeling of watching this innocent family being violently, and more to the point sadistically, tortured will stay with me for a long time. Not sure why Poor Things (Lanthimos, 2023) received an 18s rating and not Bone Temple.

One extra point is that it may be to do with audience expectation following the preceding 3 films, Bone Temple has a new director and not many people may realise this new direction before sitting down in the cinema. I realise there is not much you can do at this point, maybe consider my comments for future classifications. Apart from this I appreciate the work that your office carries out and don't envy you having to sit through some of the content currently being pushed out by the large and not so large studios. Enjoy the good ones!

### IFCO Response

Many thanks for your email. We appreciate all feedback on our classification decisions as it does help inform our thinking going forward. I'm sorry to hear the film caused you an unsettled night.

As you note, *28 Years Later: The Bone Temple* was classified 16 with this accompanying consumer advice published to the IFCO website:

*Strong gory violence with graphic bloody injury detail. Scenes of torture consistent with the franchise. Nudity and strong language. Drug use.*

I agree the sequence of sadism and cruelty in the barn that you refer to was particularly challenging, but it was felt that as it was mostly confined to just this one sequence it was acceptable within the 16 category. This is in line with other horror titles like *Weapons* and *Longlegs* that have also been classified at 16 in recent times.

I also agree that it's at the upper end of that category. In fact, with the 16 rating not available for Home Entertainment, I can confirm this title will be rated 18 when released in that format.

For your reference, *Poor Things* was classified 18 for 'frequent strong scenes of a sexual nature including explicit male and female nudity'.

I hope this response is useful and thanks again for your considered note.

## 8. The Housemaid

I just wanted to drop a quick note that is absolutely not a complaint, just a suggestion, my partner and I recently went to see 'The Housemaid' which is rated at 15A, which I totally understand as an acceptable rating, we are both aged in our fifties, but unfortunately my partner is a victim of domestic violence and abuse and found the film extremely distressing, I usually keep an eye on reviews just in case it may contain this kind of content but this one somehow slipped through, totally my own fault. I just thought maybe that there could also be an accompanying warning to this kind of content along with the age rating, unfortunately there is quite a large amount of domestic abuse victims in Ireland today, where age has no meaning, who may find a separate type of warning helpful.

### **IFCO Response**

Many thanks for your considered email. I totally agree with the sentiments expressed. We do our best to flag content that we feel might upset audiences in the consumer advice published on the IFCO website (IFCO.ie). This includes situations that are not necessarily age dependent and might be more likely because of personal experience.

For example, the consumer advice published to accompany the release of *The Housemaid* went as follows –

'Strong violence with graphic injury detail. Depiction of domestic violence, sexual assault and coercive control'.

<https://www.ifco.ie/en/ifco/pages/464913DB00512733>

If you consult our website in advance of future cinema visits, I hope we'll be able to provide all the info you need.

Thanks again for getting in touch.

David

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

## 9. 28 Years Later: The Bone Temple

Just curious as to how the decision was reached for a 16 rating on 28 Years Later: The Bone Temple.

Your guidelines say that “the strongest images of sadism and torture” aren’t acceptable in this bracket, yet this had an extended torture sequence where civilians are strung up and flayed alive with knives – we see close-ups of blades slashing through arms/chests, with heavy emphasis on pain, and prolonged aftermath of the victims with exposed bloody muscles

I understand 16 is relatively old, mature and a self-selective age to see a horror film, where gory shocks are the entire expectation going in but I just feel in this case, it was insufficiently lenient and the outright 18 is a more accurate warning, particularly for the especially sensitive.

I understand the stronger cinematic 16s are upgraded to 18s for home release (e.g. Joker and Strange Darling), as this inevitably will be but feel my opinion stands regardless.

Thank you again for your exemplary work, and consistently open rapport with the filmgoing public.

### **IFCO Response**

Many thanks for your email. We appreciate all feedback on our classification decisions as it genuinely does help inform our thinking going forward.

As you note, *28 Years Later: The Bone Temple* was classified 16 with this accompanying consumer advice published to the IFCO website:

*Strong gory violence with graphic bloody injury detail. Scenes of torture consistent with the franchise. Nudity and strong language. Drug use.*

I agree the sequence of sadism and cruelty in the barn that you refer to was particularly challenging, but it was felt by our classifiers that as it was mostly confined to just this one sequence it was acceptable within the 16 category. This is in line with other horror titles like *Weapons* and *Longlegs* that have also been classified at 16 in recent times.

As you also correctly suggest, with the 16 category not available for Home Entertainment, this title will be rated 18 when released in that format.

I appreciate that you don’t agree with us in this instance, but I hope you find this response somewhat helpful.

Best regards

David

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

## 10. “Wuthering Heights”

I am writing as an individual viewer to formally challenge the decision to award *Wuthering Heights* a 15 certificate.

I volunteer in a psychological support role with survivors of sexual violence. I am not writing on behalf of that organisation, but my experience in that setting inevitably shapes how I interpret what I see on screen. I left this film deeply unsettled and genuinely alarmed that it has been deemed suitable for audiences as young as fifteen.

Your published guidelines state that a 15 rating may include strong material, but should not contain content that is potentially harmful to younger adolescents, particularly in relation to sexual violence, coercion, or degrading treatment. An 18 classification is indicated where material may be harmful or disturbing to younger viewers, or where strong sexual content could pose a risk.

In my view, the portrayal of coercive and degrading dynamics in this film crosses that threshold.

We are currently working in a cultural environment where adolescents are already heavily exposed to violent pornography and online influencers promoting dominance-based models of masculinity. Girls aged 10–15 are presenting with beliefs that humiliation and coercion are normal parts of intimacy. Boys are absorbing scripts that equate aggression with desirability. This is not abstract. It is something many of us are dealing with in real time.

A 15 certificate does more than restrict access. It signals developmental suitability. It tells a 14- or 15-year-old that what they are watching sits within acceptable boundaries for their age group. In the current context, that signal carries weight.

I would like clarification on the following:

- How IFCO determined that the depiction of these dynamics did not meet the threshold for an 18 classification.
- Whether cumulative cultural impact and current trends in youth sexual behaviour are considered within your harm assessment.
- How the distinction between “strong” and “potentially harmful” material was applied in this case.

I believe this film warranted an 18 certificate under your own published criteria. I would appreciate a substantive response outlining the reasoning behind the classification.

### **IFCO Response**

Many thanks for your considered email. We appreciate all such feedback as it helps feed into our decisions going forward.

As you note, “*Wuthering Heights*” was classified 15A by our classification team and the coercive and degrading dynamics you reference were noted by them on viewing. The consumer advice published to the IFCO website to accompany the age rating was as follows –

*‘Strong sex scenes. Depictions of coercive control and self-harm. Violent scenes with bloody injury detail’.*

An attempt to reflect contemporary concerns and attitudes is at the heart of our guidelines that are periodically updated following public consultation with both parents and children. Ultimately, in the case of this film, it was felt that the heightened, highly theatrical, and artificial world that Emerald Fennell had created to interpret this story served as mitigation for some of the more provocative content. By way of the comparison, the film also received a 15 rating in the UK.

I hope this goes some way to explaining the rating. I appreciate you may not agree with us in this instance but please be assured a great deal of consideration goes into every age rating awarded.

Best regards

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

## 11. Enforcement of Age Ratings

On March 1st, I attended the *cinema* for a screening of *Scream 7* which is a 16 rated movie and found sitting behind me a boy that couldn't have been older than 12. I left the screen to flag this to a supervisor, providing them the movie name, the screen (4) and the row (M) to which they said they would take action on this. I returned to the screen and for the entirety of the film the child remained for the duration.

After the movie I spoke again with the supervisor who said she sent someone to check and that not only was there no child but there was 'no-one in Row M at all'. Which was just false in all regards. When I pressed the supervisor on the fact there absolutely were people in Row M and one of them was a child clearly under 16, her response was effectively a shoulder shrug as if to say 'What do you want me to do?'

This is not the first time I've experienced this issue at *this cinema*. In October 2024, when going to see *Smile 2*, I flagged to staff that a girl that couldn't have been older than 9 was in the row ahead of me. When I raised the issue the response I got back was 'Oh, are they talking?' and when I said No they responded 'So what's the problem?'. Which I think encapsulates the staff attitude to enforcing the IFCO's ratings.

In the FAQ of the IFCO's website, it says under "What should I do if I see a child who is clearly underage at a cinema screening?", it says to bring it to the attention of the cinema management, who should take appropriate action. It goes on to say 'you can report it to the Gardaí. You are also welcome to contact us at IFCO and we will follow up appropriately'. As I do not feel the cinema management took appropriate action and I do not think this is a matter for the Gardaí, I wished to raise this with yourselves as this is now the second time I've experienced this issue at the same location.

If you require more information or have any questions, please feel free to reach out.

### **IFCO Response**

Thanks for contacting IFCO. We have referred your email to *the* head office and requested a response.

Slán

Ciaran

Dr Ciarán Kissane  
Director  
Irish Film Classification Office

## 12. One Battle After Another

I brought my daughter, nearly 11, to the above film this evening on the basis that your categorisation (u15A) gave some indication of its appropriateness for a younger audience.

How mistaken I was.

My daughter found it quite upsetting (as did I) and asked to leave after 5 minutes.

As to how highly suggestive blowjobs and masurbation are suitable topics for an under 15 audience, I am at a loss.

Good to see that we are getting good value for our hard earned taxes as you clearly gave the matter a lot of thought.

### IFCO Response

Many thanks for getting in touch. We appreciate all feedback, in particular from concerned parents.

As you note, *One Battle After Another* was classified 15A by IFCO. Films classified at this category have been deemed **suitable for children of 15 and over**. However, they can be viewed by younger children if accompanied by a parent or guardian who has researched the title and decided it to be appropriate for their child. In such instances we strongly recommend that a parent makes an informed decision by availing of the consumer advice on the IFCO website.

In this case it reads as follows –

Strong language throughout. Frequent strong sex scenes and sex references. Violent scenes with some bloody injury detail. Mature themes including references to sexual assault and discrimination. Drug use.

<https://www.ifco.ie/en/ifco/pages/2966CBOE004E02BE>

Thanks again for getting in touch.

Best

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office

### Further Correspondence Received

I thank you for your email.

With respect, I made an informed decision, as a parent, when I consulted your classification.

I assume that is what it there for.

I wish to lodge a formal complaint.

I assume there is a procedure for doing so.

I look forward to hearing from you.

**IFCO Response**

I can confirm your correspondence will be recorded as a complaint in accordance with our complaints procedure found here –

<https://www.ifco.ie/en/ifco/pages/complaints>

For clarities sake and for future cinema visits with your daughter, 15A means a film has been deemed appropriate by IFCO for those of fifteen and over but younger children can attend if accompanied by a parent who has decided the film is appropriate for their child. These categories are designed to give final say to parents about what their children can and cannot see.

Full info about our age categories if found here –

<https://ifco.ie/Website/IFCO/IFCOWebV2.nsf/IFCO-New-Classification-Guidelines-2025.pdf?openfileResource>

Best regards

David Power  
Assistant Film Classifier  
Irish Film Classification Office