



## RESPONSE TO SCREEN AUSTRALIA PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Australian Directors Guild (ADG) NOVEMBER 14th 2008.

### **CONTENTS:**

1. Executive Summary
2. Key Recommendations

### **RESPONSES TO THE DRAFT PROGRAM GUIDELINES:**

3. DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
  - (i) Enterprise Program
  - (ii) Project by Project Programs
    - (b) Feature Drama Development
    - (c) Documentary Development
    - (d) Short Animation Production
    - (e) Workshops
    - (f) The Innovation Program
4. PRODUCTION FINANCING
  - iv. Feature Film Production
  - v. Feature Co-Productions
  - vi. Documentary
  - vii. TV Drama
5. SHORT DRAMA
6. INDIGENOUS PROGRAMS
7. APPENDIX A

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ADG acknowledges and supports the necessity of laying down a new vision for the Australian film industry, and we encourage the introduction of new Screen Australia initiatives that will stimulate growth, and build sustainable businesses and careers in screen production. We embrace the challenge to build a stronger, healthier and more productive screen industry.

The challenge, as outlined in the Statement of Expectations by the Minister for Arts, Peter Garrett, has provided an opportunity to make sweeping generational changes. However we are not convinced that the expectations laid down by the Government are being fully addressed in the proposed draft guidelines. In particular we refer to Mr Garrett's decree that: "*... if the industry is to survive, Screen Australia must be a major influence for change. It will need to be a very different organisation to the bodies it replaced. And it's also clear to me that the film industry and those who work in it must also change, looking outward to the country and the world and enthusiastically reaching out to them on the screen.*"<sup>1</sup>

Given such a golden opportunity, and a willing ally in the Government, we would have welcomed an active involvement in a thorough analysis of where we've come from, where we're going, and the best way to get there; and a continuing involvement in building principles and philosophies that would inform the aims and objectives of the federal screen agency.

The Minister has stated that *the industry will have a voice in this review process, so that its collective wisdom on these issues can be fully utilised*, and that our industry is known and respected for its creativity and that some of that creativity should inspire a new way to work. We do not feel that the Minister's directions here have been adequately realised. In any growing business, strategic planning would involve all key stake-holders. Instead, policy was largely crafted behind closed doors, and when consultation began, we were presented with broad principles that had been devised without any open debate about the big issues we face.

In fairness to those drafting the documents, the time frame was extremely tight, considerable efforts were made to communicate Screen Australia's thinking to us, and we endeavoured to respond articulately and responsibly to the Statement of Intent. However we stress that it is not possible to fully assess the impact of these programs on the industry before knowing:

- (a) the Terms of Trade;
- (b) the Marketing support guidelines;
- (c) how the available Screen Australia funds will be allocated to each program; and
- (d) how teething problems with the Producer Offset will be addressed in the context of expectations that the Offset will build a more sustainable film and television industry and grow levels of Australian production.

With that in mind we have addressed the key issues raised in the draft guidelines presented to us, and we recommend that Screen Australia further consult and review these guidelines with the industry when the Terms of Trade and Marketing support guidelines are available.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Hon Peter Garrett AM MP; address to the Melbourne International Film Festival; 25th July 2008

## SCREEN AUSTRALIA PROGRAM GUIDELINES: KEY RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The disproportionate emphasis on producers and production companies over directors and writers in the draft guidelines is of very great concern. The level of experience required for producers to access funding is in some cases a third of that required of directors and writers. This unnecessarily disadvantages directors and writers with the same level of experience and does not take into consideration who the creative initiator of a project might be. We strongly urge Screen Australia to review eligibility requirements for key creatives to ensure that they are equitable.
- We recognise that many independent producers have on-going obligations to service and manage projects, often from insufficient revenue bases; and recommend this be addressed in tandem with the Terms of Trade and Marketing guidelines yet to be announced, where the on-going demands on independent producers can be appropriately acknowledged.
- That Screen Australia's guidelines should include a key motherhood statement that reinforces the concept of fair and equitable practice in the sharing and allocation of copyright and profit sharing with those that create the intellectual property of the screen content produced. The ADG encourages a system that allows those creatively driving a project to retain the copyright in that project during development, rather than being obliged to option or sell off that interest during this stage. To quote the Minister's statement: *"for a creative practitioner anywhere in the arts, the most desirable situation is to have both creative and financial independence."*
- We also urge the practice of ensuring that appropriate separation agreements are in place between producers, writers and directors to protect the underlying rights of the originator or key driving creative in the event that a producer or production entity is not able to fulfil, or reneges on their obligations to the originator.
- That Screen Australia firmly advocate the adoption of 'best practice' principles as outlined in the Codes of Practice and Rate Cards the ADG endorse, and ensure adequate access to this information.
- Screen Australia needs to clearly communicate the rationale and philosophy behind the new program guidelines - the models researched, key criteria and data that has led to their creation in order to have a thorough and transparent debate with the industry it serves.
- Great stories and brilliant ideas are not born in banks or financial markets. Screen Australia must adequately support, nurture and guarantee that filmmakers are able to work in an environment conducive to creativity and which allows the freedom to explore, invent and imagine. This requires a strong and clear frame of reference firmly rooted in Screen Australia policy and cannot be assumed to flow automatically from sustainable business models. Further refinement to the detail of the guidelines must ensure that the benefits of the new system support the creative endeavours and careers of directors and other filmmakers as well as producers.
- The Australian screen industry has a rich history of inventive and resourceful screen directors, who have produced, written and directed. Their work generates considerable production activity in Australia through employment, sales, facilities hire, and makes a

substantial contribution to the economy. The draft guidelines must allow for enough flexibility for individuals with demonstrable talent who are not working within traditional production company models to access support.

- Directors, writer-directors, writers, animators, documentary filmmakers and many emerging and independent producers do not have the means or finance to access the legal advice and expertise that will be required as a result of a shift in support toward well resourced screen businesses. This shift threatens to seriously undermine the position of key creatives, requiring them to negotiate a range of critical creative issues including intellectual property rights, profit share and creative control. This must be taken into account in the guideline review process.
- It is unclear how Screen Australia intends to approach writer/directors. This must be resolved in the guidelines. Australia's cinema history is built on the back of successful writer/directors and director-initiated and driven films.
- It is important that external assessors with relevant and creative industry experience are included in all the assessment processes, not just "as required". Assessors should be sourced from appropriate peer industry groups, and have experience equal to, or greater than the applicants they are assessing. We recommend that experienced screen directors are engaged in all areas of Screen Australia assessment procedures and policy reviews reflecting their area of expertise ie: Drama, Television, Documentary, Animation.
- There has been great concern from our members about Screen Australia opting out of support for Short Drama Films. We urge Screen Australia to provide a national vision and policy guidance for short drama production, and oversee this critical transition to ensure that professionally made short drama can continue to be made in Australia.
- That *eligibility* across all guidelines allow flexibility so that experienced screen practitioners can cross-over from one medium to another, and be assessed from a less stringent definition of experience and success. History shows that experience in Short Drama, TVC's, Theatre, Opera, and Television have all contributed to our leading filmmakers' expertise.
- That Screen Australia ensure that filmmakers working in all regions of the country have fair and equitable access to Screen Australia programs; that geographical location be considered when assessing projects; and that issues unique to a given region or state are considered when balancing the allocation of funds across the range of Screen Australia Programs, including the diversity of businesses that could access the Enterprise development scheme. Interstate and regional filmmakers should also be given reasonable opportunities to engage and consult with Screen Australia on assessment procedures, guidelines and policy directions.
- That serious consideration be given to a review the SAC test.

## **DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Overview**

The ADG supports the goals of Screen Australia to develop and support a vibrant and diverse screen industry.

We would suggest that the wording of *'to support Australian screen producers in creating outstanding creative content'* in the second paragraph of Screen Australia's overview statement is inconsistent with the language used throughout the guidelines that reflects the genuinely collaborative nature of writers, directors and producers working together in teams.

## **ENTERPRISE PROGRAM**

The ADG applauds the introduction of a program to build sustainable screen businesses that support a wide range of creatives working in the screen arts. We believe however that further refinement to the guidelines is required to ensure that the benefits of such a system supports the creative endeavours and careers of directors and other filmmakers as well as producers.

We would like to see how the Enterprise Program will work in with the Marketing Guidelines yet to be announced, and recommend that the guidelines take into account the requirements of access to Marketing funds.

### ***Eligibility***

We recommend the wording *Credentialed Australian producers* be adjusted to read *Credentialed Australian producers and screen practitioners*.

### ***Assessment process***

In Enterprise Development we are talking about a potentially enormous investment of up to \$1.5M in one entity, and there should be a rigorous and transparent assessment process in place for such a large public investment.

We encourage a return to assessment procedures that allow for face to face interviews with eligible applicants; and recommend that the assessment panels be sourced from screen professionals including directors.

### ***The Business Plan***

We would like to see recognition and encouragement of enterprising/resourceful/inventive/adventurous filmmaking; and within that an openness to new and/or innovative business models that may not yet have proven commercial success.

### ***Track Record***

We would expect the definition of success to acknowledge critical, artistic and innovative achievements as well as economic, or box office success.

## PROJECT BY PROJECT PROGRAMS

### Feature Drama Development

The ADG believes that development assistance should be available to a range of screen practitioners with appropriate credits, including emerging/establishing producers, writers and directors; especially when taking into consideration the fact that some of those will be applying at the lower end of the \$50,000 per tranche. We would also encourage consideration of the *collective* experience of a team, and to allow for those practitioners crossing over with established experience in other screen content production modes.

In line with our key concerns about intellectual property rights we would encourage a system that allows those creatively driving a project to retain the copyright in that project during development, rather than being obliged to option or sell off that interest during development.

We also urge the practice of ensuring appropriate separation agreements are in place between producers, writers and directors to protect the underlying rights of the originator or key driving creative in the event that a producer or production entity is not able to fulfill, or reneges on their obligations to the originator.

#### ***Writers and directors applying without Producers:***

The wording here implies that project development is primarily about the script. This should be expanded to include a diversity of project development that allows directors to work in a variety of ways. Recent productions such as *Boxing Day*, *Kenny* or *Men's Group* have successfully employed innovative approaches to project development and visual story-telling. Development should encourage screen practitioners to explore and expand their creative work in a manner that will achieve the best results.

Eligibility requirements here are not appropriate for animators; for instance, an animated film of 25-30 mins (*Harvey Krumpet*, *Jasper Morello*, *The Safe House*) represents an equivalent professional and artistic achievement as a dramatic feature.

How does Screen Australia intend to approach writer/directors? The wording in the draft avoids using the term writer/director. This must be resolved in the guidelines. Australia's cinema history is built on the back of writer/directors<sup>2</sup> and director-initiated and driven films. Using the Minister's Statement of Expectation, the SIO response and the current Overview, it is an astonishing omission not to sufficiently address this in the current guidelines.

#### ***Funding is for:***

The guidelines here seem reasonable. However we question the value of "test scenes" - this has been tried in the past and was not good value for money.

Many of our more experienced directors are required to produce elaborate 'mood boards', 'tone scenes' and visual rationales that reflect a detailed understanding of the film they wish to make. This

---

<sup>2</sup> See appendix A; statistics on creative driving force of successful and/or popular Australian films

provides a practical support to the production and is as valuable as, and in some cases more valuable than 'test scenes'.

We remain concerned about experienced vs emerging "teams", and recommend that a flexible interpretation that allows for the collective experience of a group of screen practitioners be considered, e.g. it would be counter-productive to break up groups that have already formed tight, efficient and close working relationships.

We are equally concerned that less experienced but highly motivated, energetic teams will have to assign their rights to the 'experienced' producer. Less experienced practitioners should be rewarded for their enterprise, not punished.

***Eligibility:***

Presuming that not all applications will be at the higher level, we believe it is a disincentive to require such stringent *producer* attachments. At a lower level of funding a mentor producer or executive producer should be encouraged. Any sense that these guidelines are being enforced rather than encouraged will discourage applicants from exploring ideas and projects at a formative stage - and this could risk stifling innovation in creative story-telling.

We advocate a more flexible approach to the required credits, ie within reason, this should be at the discretion of the (suitably experienced) assessment team. For instance, recognition of the narrative skills of an experienced director well-versed in TV Drama and/or TVCs should be included in the criteria of relevant credits. We would also point out that for features no Australian festival or award is included in the criteria - given the focus on Australian audiences this is a surprising omission.

We would encourage a return to assessment procedures that allow seriously considered applicants the opportunity to address the assessment criteria in face-to-face interviews, as not all projects show their whole strength on the basis solely of the written application.

## **DOCUMENTARY DEVELOPMENT**

We recommend that, especially in light of the investment being made in new and emerging media, the requirement for a broadcast pre-sale for documentary projects be relaxed or removed. In the past, this requirement has inhibited many factual productions by experienced filmmakers, especially in the wildlife genre.

Further to this, we suggest that Screen Australia should consider developing a documentary project without a pre-sale where there is evidence of innovation in form or content and/or particular cultural merit.

***Eligibility:***

We recommend a more flexible approach to assessing an applicants credits, and suggest that two broadcast credits, or in exceptional circumstances where a project has performed well, one broadcast credit, should be adequate.

## TELEVISION DRAMA

We note with alarm there are no guidelines for Development of Television Drama and would stress that Television Drama benefits greatly from the early development of innovative and untested ideas and concepts.

We understand Screen Australia's thinking is that production companies accessing the Enterprise Development scheme will invest in TV Drama development; however we recommend an allowance (separate to the Enterprise scheme) for development of TV Drama concepts at a formative stage - in particular those projects that are exploring ideas or concepts not established in mainstream television. This could include projects balancing content with cross-platform elements, and projects potentially falling within the Low Budget Television Drama Program. These programs are more likely to attract emerging filmmakers, and we believe that appropriate development assistance in Project to Project development will be a valuable investment.

In particular, we stress that allowing and encouraging directors to be part of the development process at an early stage bears enormous benefits for a production, both creatively and practically.

## SHORT ANIMATION PRODUCTION

There needs to be an understanding within the Funding body fostering the career paths of independent animators that a short animated film can be a work of art that stands alone, or it can be the calling card for longer works or even a feature film. The process of animation production is not like drama production, and it is inappropriate to apply guidelines that use drama production as a model.

In these guidelines there is no specific area identified for *development* of animation projects, as distinct from feature development. Many successful animation films have benefited from seed money<sup>3</sup>, and adequate provisions for the development of animation projects is as important as for drama or documentary production.

As the animation process, both in terms of development and production, is specific to the medium, there is an overwhelming sentiment from the animation community that there is a critical need for an animation specialist to be among the Screen Australia project officers; we recommend this be taken into consideration when staffing allocations are being decided.

### ***Applications must come from the Producer.***

Many animators produce their own works. The guidelines encourage teams; however, the concept of teamwork is entirely different in animation, principally because it is usually very labour-intensive, through long periods of production, and uses very few (if any) staff or resources. In the guidelines there needs to be allowance for animators producing their own work. This also facilitates the animator in maximising the return from their artistic investment.

---

<sup>3</sup> Oscar nominated Jasper Morello (d: Anthony Lucas), and the feature Mary and Max (d: Adam Elliot) were seeded with development support from the AFC.



An added benefit is that emerging animators are able to learn and build experience and skills that help develop their careers<sup>4</sup>, and contribute to a growing talent pool of animators that have the unique production skills required for animation. Feedback from our animators highlights the scarcity of experienced animation producers, and those that are experienced work closely (and often exclusively) with individual animators.

***Available funding:***

We suggest that two tiers within Animation production funding be considered:

- Short Animations up to \$60-80,000
- Short Animated Features up to \$250,000

There is a compelling case for supporting stand alone animated films up to 30 minutes. *Harvey Krumpet, Jasper Morello, The Safe House* are successful Australian examples. *Wallace and Grommit, Robby the Reindeer* are others.

We recommend the funding guidelines be further reviewed in consultation with the ADG and an Animation specialist.

The ***Application materials*** are taken from the template for other programs and are not all appropriate for animation. We recommend these be reviewed in consultation with an animation specialist.

To avoid confusion we recommend that the term “animator” is used instead of “animation director” as ‘animator’ is the most common term for short form animation.

**STATEMENT FROM ANIMATORS:**

The short animation culture in Australia that has been nurtured by the AFC and Film Australia in the past has made a huge impact at overseas festivals and is respected and watched around the world. They have won Oscars, been nominated and won awards at Cannes and all the major festivals, creating great cultural cachet for our country.

Short animations have proved they have a long and lasting shelf life. Despite being given little marketing assistance they continue to be part of our screen culture, and inspire new generations. Investment in animations of all kinds - at short and feature length, as drama, documentary, or experimental is vital, as animation is fast becoming a part of every film genre.

It is imperative in particular that independent animation be nurtured as it is the wellspring of risk-taking, original and innovative work, which in turn nourishes mainstream and commercial animation, and not least, the rapidly evolving field of SFX.

---

<sup>4</sup> Anthony Lucas was producer or co-producer on all his early works, gathering valuable production experience that contributed to his Oscar nominated Jasper Morello, and the Cannes winner My Rabbit Hoppy.

## **WORKSHOPS**

The ADG supports the continuation of professional development through high-level workshops and masterclasses, and sites the *Indivision*, *Spark* programs of the AFC as models to build on.

Many of our members have benefited from the diverse skills such programs offer - particularly in areas such as marketing and audience expectation.

We strongly encourage Screen Australia to work in partnership with the ADG and other industry associations who are already providing workshops, and to support rather than compete with existing industry initiatives.

We are especially interested in allowing filmmakers opportunities that facilitate and promote the building of creative partnerships. We would like to explore opportunities to link screen practitioners with business, marketing and distribution experts.

## **INNOVATION PROGRAM**

The ADG encourages support for those working in new media, multi platform and emerging screen technology.

We would like to know how Screen Australia imagines the Innovation Program working with the Enterprise scheme and Program to Program support? Multi-platform, new media and interactive forms are raised in those programs as favorable elements to include in business plans and applications - and clearly a crossover with innovation support would be desirable, e.g. a feature, documentary or TV series might be concurrently developing multi-platform and interactive elements which will often be viewed as different and unique content production, even when connected thematically to more traditional forms.

The additional costs of cross-platform production also need to be considered in the weight and balance of support programs being drafted by Screen Australia.

## **PRODUCTION FINANCING**

We await the review of the Producer Offset, and would like to re-state that directors have found many teething problems that will need to be addressed if the Offset is going to achieve the objectives hoped for.

We also observe that the range of production being undertaken by Screen Australia encompasses the previous AFC level of low budget up to the highest investment level of feature production. The ADG urges Screen Australia to build flexibility into their guidelines to allow for the maximum scope of Australian production to be realised. A clear understanding of the differences in budget level, approach and appropriate attachments must be in place.

### **Feature Film Production**

#### ***Eligible Projects***

We believe the SAC test needs to be reviewed, and await further details of the outcomes of current projects completing Producer Offset finance.

#### ***Market Attachment Requirements***

The need for an international sales agent is excessive for a low budget Australian film as it forces producers to sell off territories to gain investment eligibility. While this is a reasonable expectation for larger budget films, it can be a disincentive for low budget films.

Feature films up to \$2-3M could anticipate reasonable returns from the domestic market, and productions that focus on local market returns and appeal to the Australian market should not be compelled to show an international market attachment as a pre-requisite. Screen Australia statistics show that some of our most successful films locally and internationally have been produced without international sales agreements in place at development or financing stage.

Arguably these same films would have struggled to attract an international sales agent at concept/script stage; in particular some projects with a uniquely Australian perspective.

We urge Screen Australia to keep an open mind to business models that anticipate a return to profit from the Australian market, and to broaden the definition of market attachments in light of the rapidly evolving distribution and exhibition landscape.

We also draw attention to the cost of servicing and producing cross platform elements, which reduces the available spend on principal production e.g. a \$2M film is arguably becomes a \$1.8M film when allowing for the cross platform elements and the definition of a 'low budget' film should be adjusted accordingly.

#### ***Level of Funding:***

With low budget films in mind we would appreciate a clearer explanation of what exceptional circumstances would be considered when funding combined Producer Offset and Screen Australia investment to the 75% level.

**Assessment criteria:**

Regarding a project's readiness, we believe that a suitably qualified and experienced assessment panel will be able to make a fair judgment from ALL the available application materials and remain open to innovative and/or non-conventional approaches to what defines "production ready".

As mentioned above, the ADG encourages a return to assessment procedures that allow for face-to-face interviews with eligible applicants, and a less prescriptive overall approach, and recommends that the assessment panels be sourced from screen professionals including directors.

**Budget notes:**

We advocate that "*industry norm fees*" be defined as those recommended by the appropriate guilds, such as in the Rate Cards for directors available through Screen Australia and on the ADG website.

We stress that to properly assess the full potential of these guidelines, an understanding of the proposed Terms of Trade is essential.

**FEATURE CO-PRODUCTIONS/  
THEATRICAL DOCUMENTARY FEATURES**

As for Feature production, we believe the guidelines should be less prescriptive and more flexible in the level of market attachment for lower budget productions.

We recommend Screen Australia broaden the definition and requirements for theatrical distribution, and consider a broad range of distribution platforms for eligibility, especially where theatrical is a smaller part of the overall recoupment strategy of a film.

We also believe that in the current climate, the requirement for a sale to a third territory will hinder rather than encourage co-production ventures.

**DOCUMENTARY PRODUCTION**

The ADG supports the decision to shift existing programs such as the National Interest Program and History Initiative from an Executive Producer model to a project manager model with a higher level of responsibility being transferred to the production industry.

We support the continuation in funding to the special documentary fund.

Regarding the assessment of documentary projects, we recommend that assessment panels be made up from peer industry practitioners with appropriate experience at least equal to that of the applicant and within the same medium, and that, in further reviewing the guidelines, the ADG and experienced documentary filmmakers be involved in discussions regarding assessment procedures for all documentary programs.

## **TELEVISION DRAMA**

### ***Eligible Projects***

We recommend flexibility with the guidelines when referring to animation productions, and that the guidelines be consistent with the Producer Offset guidelines as for short form animation and reflected accordingly, i.e:

*A short-form animation is a programme of one episode or a collection of episodes, predominantly utilising cell, stop motion, digital or other animation of not less than one commercial quarter hour in total duration. This means, for example, that a collection of six five-minute animated episodes (one commercial half hour) would be regarded as a short-form animation, as the film would be exceed the required one commercial quarter hour.*

## **LOW BUDGET TELEVISION DRAMA**

We firmly endorse the continuation of a program to support and encourage low budget television drama.

## **CHILDREN'S TELEVISION**

### ***Eligible Projects***

As with adult TV drama we recommend flexibility with the guidelines when referring to animation productions, and that the guidelines be consistent with the Producer Offset guidelines as for short form animation and reflected as copied above.

## **DISTINCTLY AUSTRALIAN CHILDREN'S DRAMA PROGRAM**

We support the continuation of this initiative.

### ***Eligible Projects***

We encourage Screen Australia to be flexible as to the format, program length and episode number, especially in the changing market of new media and delivery platforms.

As with adult TV drama we recommend flexibility with the guidelines when referring to animation productions, and that the guidelines be consistent with the Producer Offset guidelines as for short form animation and reflected as copied above.

## ON SHORT DRAMA

There has been great concern from our members about Screen Australia opting out of support for short drama films.

The ADG appreciates that we are in a changing industry, and that support for short drama is a considerable drain on Screen Australia's resources. We have several concerns:

For our entire film history, the AFC and its predecessors have been the national body that oversaw and nurtured shorts, and those organisations played an integral part in supporting and guiding filmmakers through their careers with short drama.

In an industry that is working efficiently and effectively, a combination of skills and experiences is relevant to building a sustainable career. Historically, experience in short drama, TVC's, theatre, opera, and television have all contributed to our leading filmmakers' expertise. This should be acknowledged in Screen Australia's expectations.

Short drama is a unique form in itself, and should be recognised for that, rather than being seen as purely a stepping stone to features. In a future world of emerging platforms, with short form screen content and screens of small and large size, short drama will arguably have a greater relevance and use. Shorts have a value as a calling card - not just for filmmakers, but more importantly for the brand of Australian Film, and the industry has traded profitably on that for many years.

It has been suggested that television production is a more suitable training ground for writers and directors. While we support crossover opportunities for writers and directors, Television is an entirely different medium to features, with its own unique demands and creative challenges. We believe that television is the best training ground for television, and should be respected as such; and furthermore, where does Screen Australia expect the growth in training opportunities in Television to come from?

It has also been suggested that new technology helps make short film production cheaper and more accessible. We advocate an industry where professional screen practitioners are paid professional wages, and work to fair and equitable codes of practice. If Screen Australia, as we expect, wants a proportion of short film production to reflect industry practice, then these principles must also be considered and encouraged.

As the national body supporting and financing our industry we ask Screen Australia to consider the repercussions of bowing out of short drama, and how to best address the legacy they leave. To presume that the state agencies and screen training institutions will pick up where they left off is a massive expectation.

We urge Screen Australia to provide a national vision and policy guidance for short drama production, and oversee this critical transition to ensure that shorts can continue to be made in Australia.

## **INDIGENOUS PROGRAMS**

The ADG supports the inclusion of programs targeted to indigenous filmmakers and to develop and support the production of Indigenous films.

At this stage we support the focus and intention of the draft guidelines, however we recommend there be further consultation with the ADG and indigenous screen practitioners when the Terms of Trade, and guidelines for Marketing are drafted. This will enable a comprehensive understanding of the full implications and benefits of the programs in this draft.

## APPENDIX A

Research statistics into successful Australian films.

Four out of five of the AFI/Australia Post most popular drama features were by directors working as writers, co-writers, or story originators, with one director also a producer.

Screen Australia figures for highest gross box office since 1999 on average 75% are by directors working as writers or co-writers, 40% are by directors working as producers or co-producers.

60% of the 20 most successful Australian films of all time are by directors working as writers or co-writers. 30% are by directors working as producers or co-producers.

This does not take into account critical acclaim, overseas success or popular films in other formats.

| FILM TITLE  | DIRECTOR            | STORY | WRITER | CO-WRITER | PRODUCER/CO-PROD |
|---|---------------------|-------|--------|-----------|------------------|
| <b>AFI/AUSTRALIA POST: AUSTRALIA'S TOP FIVE FAVOURITE FILMS:</b>                                  |                     |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert</i>   | STEPHAN ELLIOTT     |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>The Castle</i>   | ROB SITCH           |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Muriel's Wedding</i>   | P J HOGAN           |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>Lantana</i>  | RAY LAWRENCE        |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Gallipoli</i>  | PETER WEIR          | YES   |        |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 4 ARE WRITTEN, CO-WRITTEN OR STORY BY DIRECTOR; 1 is co-produced or produced by director |                     |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>AFC TOP GROSSING</b>   |                     |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2007</b>   |                     |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Happy Feet</i>   | GEORGE MILLER       |       | YES    |           | YES              |
| <i>Romulus, My Father</i>   | RICHARD ROXBURGH    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Rogue</i>  | GREG MCLEAN         |       | YES    |           | YES              |
| <i>Bra Boys</i>   | SUNNY ABBERTON (CO) |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Razzle Dazzle: A Journey Into Dance</i>  | DARREN ASHTON       |       |        |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 3 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 3 are co-produced or produced by director       |                     |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2006</b>   |                     |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Happy Feet</i>   | GEORGE MILLER       |       | YES    |           | YES              |
| <i>Kenny</i>  | CLAYTON JACOBSON    |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Jindabyne</i>  | RAY LAWRENCE        |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Ten Canoes</i>   | ROLF DE HEER        |       | YES    |           | YES              |
| <i>Kokoda</i>   | ALISTAIR GRIERSON   |       |        | YES       |                  |
| <i>Boytown</i>  | KEVIN CARLIN        |       |        |           |                  |
| OF SIX, 4 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 3 are co-produced or produced by director        |                     |       |        |           |                  |



| FILM TITLE   | DIRECTOR           | STORY | WRITER | CO-WRITER | PRODUCER/CO-PROD |
|--|--------------------|-------|--------|-----------|------------------|
| <b>2005</b>  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Wolf Creek</i>  | GREG MCLEAN        |       | YES    |           | YES              |
| <i>Little Fish</i>   | ROWAN WOODS        |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Look Both Ways</i>  | SARAH WATT         |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>Oyster Farmer</i>   | ANNA REEVES        |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>The Proposition</i>   | JOHN HILLCOAT      |       |        |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 3 ARE WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 1 is co-produced or produced by director                 |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2004</b>  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Strange Bedfellows</i>  | DEAN MURPHY        |       |        | YES       |                  |
| <i>Somersault</i>  | CATE SHORTLAND     |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>One Perfect Day</i>   | PAUL CURRIE        |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Love's Brother</i>  | JAN SARDI          |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>Thunderstruck</i>   | DARREN ASHTON      |       |        | YES       |                  |
| OF FIVE, ALL ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 1 is co-produced or produced by director |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2003</b>  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Ned Kelly</i>   | GREGOR JORDAN      |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Japanese Story</i>  | SUE BROOKS         |       |        |           | YES              |
| <i>Fat Pizza</i>   | PAUL FENECH        |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Bad Eggs</i>  | TONY MARTIN        |       | YES    |           | YES              |
| <i>Gettin' Square</i>  | JONATHAN TEPLITZKY |       |        |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 2 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 3 are co-produced or produced by director  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2002</b>  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Crackerjack</i>   | PAUL MOLONEY       |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Rabbit-Proof Fence</i>  | PHILLIP NOYCE      |       |        |           | YES              |
| <i>Dirty Deeds</i>   | DAVID CAESAR       |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>Charlotte Gray</i>  | GILLIAN ARMSTRONG  |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>The Crocodile Hunter: Collision Course</i>  | JOHN STAINTON      | YES   |        |           | YES              |
| OF FIVE, 2 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 2 are co-produced or produced by director  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2001</b>  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Moulin Rouge</i>  | BAZ LUHRMANN       |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Lantana</i>   | RAY LAWRENCE       |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>The Man Who Sued God</i>  | MARK JOFFE         |       |        |           | YES              |
| <i>Crocodile Dundee in Los Angeles</i>   | SIMON WINCER       |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>The Bank</i>  | ROB CONNOLLY       |       | YES    |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 2 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 2 are co-produced or produced by director  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>2000</b>  |                    |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>The Dish</i>  | ROB SITCH          | YES   |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>The Wog Boy</i>   | ALEXIS VELLIS      |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Looking for Alibrandi</i>   | KATE WOODS         |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Chopper</i>   | ANDREW DOMINIK     |       | YES    |           |                  |

| FILM TITLE   | DIRECTOR          | STORY | WRITER | CO-WRITER | PRODUCER/CO-PROD |
|--|-------------------|-------|--------|-----------|------------------|
| <i>Me Myself I</i>   | PIP KARMEL        |       | YES    |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 3 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 1 is co-produced or produced by director |                   |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>1999</b>  |                   |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Two Hands</i>   | GREGOR JORDAN     |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>The Craic</i>   | TED EMERY         |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>Babe: Pig in the City</i>   | GEORGE MILLER     |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>Paperback Hero</i>  | ANTHONY BOWMAN    |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>Sally Marshall is not an Alien</i>  | MARIO ANDREACCHIO |       |        |           |                  |
| OF FIVE, 3 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 1 is CO-Produced or Produced             |                   |       |        |           |                  |
| <b>20 MOST SUCCESSFUL FILMS IN AUSTRALIA FOR ALL TIME</b>                                  |                   |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>CROCODILE DUNDEE</i>  | PETER FAIMAN      |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>BABE</i>  | CHRIS NOONAN      |       |        | YES       |                  |
| <i>HAPPY FEET</i>  | GEORGE MILLER     |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>MOULIN ROUGE</i>  | BAZ LUHRMANN      |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>CROCODILE DUNDEE 2</i>  | JOHN CORNELL      |       |        |           | YES              |
| <i>STRICTLY BALLROOM</i>   | BAZ LUHRMANN      |       |        | YES       |                  |
| <i>THE DISH</i>  | ROB SITCH         | YES   |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>THE ADVENTURES OF PRISCILLA, QUEEN OF THE DESERT</i>                                    | STEPHAN ELLIOTT   |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>MURIEL S WEDDING</i>  | P J HOGAN         |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>YOUNG EINSTEIN</i>  | YAHOO SERIOUS     |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>LANTANA</i>   | RAY LAWRENCE      |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>GALLIPOLI</i>   | PETER WEIR        |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>THE WOG BOY</i>   | ALEXIS VELLIS     |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>THE PIANO</i>   | JANE CAMPION      |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>MAD MAX 2</i>   | GEORGE MILLER     |       |        | YES       |                  |
| <i>GREEN CARD</i>  | PETER WEIR        |       | YES    |           |                  |
| <i>THE CASTLE</i>  | ROB SITCH         |       |        | YES       | YES              |
| <i>SHINE</i>   | SCOTT HICKS       |       |        |           |                  |
| <i>PHAR LAP</i>  | SIMON WINCER      |       |        |           |                  |
| OF 20, 12 ARE WRITTEN OR CO-WRITTEN BY DIRECTOR; 6 are Produced or co-produced by director |                   |       |        |           |                  |