

CI 1928 M McBride

First name: Mathew

Last name: McBride

Q1:

The 'end product' does not need to change, however, the underlying framework should be changed to account for changes in the media landscape.

Q2:

To provide advice to the consumer about the content in a product and its suitability for various types of audiences (i.e children)

Q3:

Yes. For example, a vast amount of 'user generated' content exists which is turned over at such a rate where classification is a hinderance, and unnecessary given the moderation schemes often put in place by the operators of these content platforms.

Q4:

Yes. Beyond certain uses of classifications in restricting the audience viewing certain content (i.e timeslot restrictions on TV, blocking physical sale to minors), the practical value of the classification may not warrant mandatory classification of the content.

Q5:

Content designed for children should only be classified to ensure it is fit for the consumption by children.

Q6:

Yes. As in Q3 the classification of 'user generated' content is not viable. Screenings of content where the objective is not for profit, and where the audience may already be informed of the materials content beforehand should be exempt - it is likely anyone offended by the material would exclude themselves from viewing such content.

Q7:

No. This will hinder appreciation of artwork and community debate.

Q8:

No. Music may be classified to provide some view on which audience it is appropriate for, but an industry scheme backed up by a complaints process to the regulator should be considered.

Q9:

No. Content should be assessed on its content only.

Q10:

Yes. Content accessed in public should be classified, but content accessed at home is a private matter.

Q11:

Q12:

There is no effective method of controlling access to online content. If online content is deemed restricted under the classification scheme, it is probably the result of illegal activity, and therefore, a police, not classification matter.

Q13:

By education only - increase parental awareness of how to best let their children access online content

Q14:

I do not see anything wrong with the present system.

Q15:

When the content attains a rating of PG or higher (to determine suitability for minors)

Q16:

Q17:

In the case of video games, the ESRB (North America) and PEGI (Europe) are successful industry-led initiatives. I do not see why the classification work should be duplicated by a third party (Australia), unless the content has primarily been made for an Australian audience.

Q18:

Q19:

When the content has been made locally.

Q20:

Yes. The existing classification scheme is straightforward.

Q21:

No.

Q22:

For content with a visual element (television, video games, movies), adopt the current film and television rating system uniformly, as they are the ones with the widest awareness in the community.

Q23:

Yes. Such a move should assist content producers and distributors in determining the likely outcome of the classification process.

Q24:

The distribution of content that is a result of a criminal act. Further, this issue may best be dealt with outside the classification regime.

Q25:

No. It should be narrowed to content that is a result of a criminal act only. Also see discussion point 122 and note that in the advent of the internet, the means exist to obtain content deemed legal in other states. Ultimately, such restrictive censorship may provide worse outcomes for consumers of content in that the opportunities to be advised of the nature of content (such as the rating label on the packaging) do not exist.

Q26:

Yes. Primarily concerning variations of what content may be distributed, and how (see point 132).

Q27:

Classification should become a Commonwealth-only legislative scheme.

Q28:

Yes (as noted in Q27)

Q29:

Other comments: