

CI 1644 B Coulson

First name: Brad

Last name: Coulson

Q1:

I believe that the ALRC should focus on the development of a new framework because the current framework is highly antiquated and fails to accurately reflect the current and future environments within which it operates. For example, the video game industry. This industry is arguably as big (if not bigger) than the motion picture industry and our current classification framework fails to recognise this, thus providing inaccurate classifications for various video games published.

As we've moved into a digital world, various materials (videos, games, music etc.) have become easily accessible for a wider range of people (illegally obtained or legitimate digital distribution) and given our ancient classification framework, we (as adult Australian citizens) are being forced into obtaining these materials that we should've had access to in the first place from other sources or distribution channels.

A new framework is required to bring Australian Classification up to the standards that the people deserve. However I do believe that key elements from the existing framework can definitely be utilised in the construction of a new framework.

Q2:

The primary objectives should be:

- To develop a classification framework that is robust, wide-ranging, easily accessible and dynamic (that is, can be updated on a more frequent basis).

- To provide the people of Australia with a standardised framework across all states and territories, thus reducing confusion with regards to classifications (in particular the "RC" classification should apply to all states and territories, not just a select few).

- To introduce an R18+ rating for video games to align with other forms of media.

- To standardise the use of classification ratings, and provide clear and concise information about each rating (ie. G, PG, M etc.)

- Reflect the changing environment and acknowledge the alternative methods which Australian's are using to access content, particularly from abroad.

Q3:

No, I don't believe the technology or platform should affect whether content should be classified.

This is because we are in desperate need of standardisation with our classification framework as it

applies to all media, regardless of how it is accessed. It is important for the framework to embrace technological change and remove all bias from technology or platforms with regards to content distribution.

Q4:

No - all content should be classified prior to distribution. If content is allowed to not be classified unless a complaint is lodged, I foresee big issues in lobby groups forming to complaint against particular content - much in the same way the ACL is causing problems in the video game R18+ issue.

Q5:

No - impact should be taken into consideration when classifying content.

I believe that children's classification is sufficient. The bigger issue is lax parenting attitudes that allow children to have access to content that isn't classified for them. At some point, parents have to take responsibility for what their children are accessing.

Q6:

No - all content should be classified.

Q7:

Yes - I don't believe art should be exempt from classification. Classifying artwork would allow us (as the general public) to make our own informed decisions and judgement regarding whether we would like to attend or not. Likewise, if this is appropriate for our children, so on and so forth.

Q8:

Yes I believe they should. Standardisation with classification is very important.

Q9:

No. It's up to the audience to make their own judgement if they are going to attend, based upon classification.

Q10:

If the content is publicly available for distribution it should be classified. On the other hand, if the content is private (i.e. amateur video, photo's, music etc) it should be exempt.

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

Parents taking responsibility and educating their kids, as well as providing adequate controls and supervision. Additionally the use of inbuilt filtering in browsers can be utilised, however it is not foolproof unless your child isn't smarter than a doorknob.

Q14:

Education of sales attendants at the point of sale i.e. checking identifications etc. I think it's important to acknowledge that restricted content cannot be eliminated - there will always be methods of obtaining it (e.g. Mortal Kombat).

Q15:

Classification markings should be displayed, however it is up to the consumer to decide whether or not it is appropriate for them. Stop this nanny state bullshit.

Q16:

Nothing. They shouldn't have a say and it should be up to an independent classification governance body to regulate content. The problem is that this body won't stay independent as inherent bias will creep in.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Not really. The difference between M, MA and AV is negligible at best. In essence the classification doesn't matter as long as we can get our hands on it.

Q21:

Clearer definitions of each category (particularly M and MA) are required. R18 for video games is long overdue.

Q22:

I find this question to be ridiculous. Create a framework, some pretty graphics - and start slapping them onto content. Done.

Q23:

Q24:

I don't believe anything should be prohibited as it clearly infringes upon our right to freedom of speech. For a country that prides itself on this right, we sure are highly governed.

Q25:

Q26:

Yes - all states and territories should have the same laws. Promoted through traditional avenues (newspaper, TV, radio) as well as online advertising demonstrating the need for change and what is being done about it.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: