CI 2032 M Burgess

First name: Matt
Last name: Burgess

Q1:
Improve elements of existing framework, as it is good at its core.
Q2:
A national classification scheme should primarily be to allow people to be aware of the content of media that they may not like, and to make informed viewing decisions for their children.
Q3:
As the vast quantities of digital information available make content classification of mediums such as the internet impossible, the only rational response is not to classify it.
Q4:
Yes, and even then more than one complaint. Classification is intended to reflect COMMUNITY standards, not an individual's.
Q5:
Yes, though accurately assessing "potential impact" seems to be rather vague at this point.
Q6:
Yes. Smaller productions of content, such as artwork or independent films, should be subject to significantly less scrutiny than films (for example) with large marketing budgets and promotions.
Q7:
No. Artworks should be exempt from classification.
Q8:
No. There is no need, and no community standard to protect.
Q9:
Q10:
Not strictly speaking. The advent of services such as digital download of film allows people to download movies for watching much like rental, and classification of those films should remain the same.
Q11:
Q12:
Restricting access to online content may be a requirement for families, and should be done at the user end, using either commercially available or government provided filters. Filtering may also be done by an ISP specifically by request of the user. Mandatory filtering at ISP level is a disgrace.
Q13:
See above.
Q14:
Does it need to be? If someone reads a dirty magazine, regardless of HOW dirty, does anyone get hurt?
Q15:
At point of sale, and at the beginning of play.

Q16:

Minimal, if any. Classification and regulation of content are very different things. Classification allows choice. Regulation does not.

Q17:

Probably, assuming oversight was provided. Allowing, for example, the film industry to rate a popular film as PG instead of a more suitable M would translate to a significant increase in revenue for them. That situation should be avoided.

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

The M rating is too broad a classification, and is not helpful in assessing, for example, suitability for my 11 year old son. Many M movies are entirely suitable, while others are utterly unsuitable. Breaking this rating into a lower and higher bracket would be useful.

Q22:

The markings and guidelines are fine.

Q23:

Yes. They should be identical. Consistency between classification systems serves everyone better, providing a more clearly understood system for informing the public.

Q24:

None. It is not possible, and should not be tried.

Q25:

The current scope of the refused classification system is itself poor. The classification does NOT represent community standards, and should be significantly broadened to allow more "fetish" material.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Less restriction should be placed on individual choice. Primarily this should involve a broadening of the R and X categories to allow material currently deemed RC due to fetish behaviour. There is no reason to restrict this generally harmless material. Australia also should have an R rating for video games, as there is no good reason for blocking this content from gaming adults.

Other comments: