

CI 2062 A Cascun-Valencic

First name: Adrian

Last name: Cascun-Valencic

Q1:

I don't think an entirely new framework is necessary - extending the existing one and ensuring it's consistent across media is a better use of the ALRC's time.

Q2:

The classification scheme should exist primarily for the benefit of consumers, but also for other interested parties. It should be a reliable and consistent way for consumers to make informed purchases for themselves and those in their care (especially children). Retailers should also be able to rely on it for the purpose of restricted content - they do already, and this should be preserved.

Q3:

In short: no. Content is available in such a range of options that this is a pointless restriction. However, it's understandable that the OFLC's resources are limited so it's reasonable to prioritise some platforms over others.

Q4:

No. The presence of a classification should be equivalent to Australian Standards certification: that this content has been examined and found to fit a certain profile. A properly educated consumer can then take lack of classification to mean "caution - we haven't checked this yet so be on your guard". Education is key!

Q5:

In short: no. WRT my answer for Q4, OFLC's resources are limited. Adequately educated parents would look for classification marks on such material and, if it is not present, would know to approach with caution. Assessing the potential impact of content takes valuable resources away from actually assessing the classification of said content.

Q6:

Again, no. This factor should influence the priority given to such content, but not whether or not it is classified.

Q7:

I don't have a problem with exhibitions or even individual artworks being classified, but I don't think it should be a requirement. An educated public will understand that a lack of classification simply means the content is unknown. The progress of art and culture should not be stifled by the limited resources of the classification board.

Q8:

Yes. Consistency across the board is crucial to the public being able to make informed purchasing/viewing/listening decisions.

Q9:

This factor should influence the priority given to such content, but not whether or not it is classified.

Q10:

This factor should influence the priority given to such content, but not whether or not it is classified.

Q11:

All content *should* be classified, as much as possible with the limited resources at hand.

Q12:

The most effective method is definitely a whitelist - but that's too restrictive for most purposes and constricts innovation.

Q13:

Better parental education and supervision.

Q14:

Arguably, the same way as cigarettes. I think current measures are adequate.

Q15:

Whenever such classification, warning or critical advice has been issued. Where such information has not been issued, the product should still be made available and a properly educated consumer will understand that the content is "unknown" and therefore potentially dangerous.

Q16:

Classification of all content that is not found to be actually dangerous or otherwise worthy of censorship; working together to ensure the system is consistent across formats, platforms and media types.

Q17:

Only where such codes can be kept consistent across industries. I'm not convinced that this is really doable without a central body devising and maintaining the codes.

Q18:

"obvious and straightforward" is an approach that leads to mistakes based on assumptions.

Q19:

Classification should be a centralised affair - Government or otherwise. Non-classification should not lead to non-publication.

Q20:

I think they are understood pretty well - the current classification scheme is fairly good already. But the community is not prepared to take responsibility for their own actions. Proper education as to the *responsibilities* of consumers will be more valuable than clarification of categories.

Q21:

R18 for games is needed. I see 8 year olds chatting about their accomplishments MA-rated video games. An R18 rating would really put parents on notice that video game content should be taken seriously as an adult pasttime. And as the average age of gamers rises, the classification system needs to keep up.

Q22:

Surely there are ways to distill the guidelines so that they can be equally applied to the different types of content.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None. Those who make illegal use of it will be more easily caught and prosecuted if they don't have to use ID-hiding technologies to distribute their filth.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes. By a centralised classification body.

Q27:

I'm not sure it should be replaced. Just made consistent.

Q28:

Only if the States are happy to become administrative sub-units of the Federal Government. On balance, I don't have a problem with that.

Q29:

R18 for games!

Other comments:

I've really said it all already: this is an issue that's bigger than R18 for games. I think that consumers need to take responsibility for their own decisions, and they can be helped by a consistent and adequate classification system that stretches across all media formats and types.

The only things that should be censored are materials involving, advocating or causing the actual sexual exploitation of real children. Nothing else should be refused classification, and lack of classification should not be a barrier to publication.

On the subject of protecting children, it bears remembering that there is no technological measure nor legal framework that perverts will not ignore in pursuit of foul, exploitative material. Efforts to restrict content are therefore wasted - if those resources are instead dedicated to detection and prosecution then offenders can be brought to justice.

This is just my opinion, as someone who believes that Australians are smarter than some might give them credit for; a person who believes in personal responsibility; someone who wants a system that people can rely on; and as a casual gamer and avid consumer of all other types of media.