

Scene Change: Modelling Innovative Practices for Screen Workforce Sustainability

Prepared by
Racheal Rauch

Budget Modelling by
Yvonne Collins

Edited by
Zaina Ahmed

Commissioned by
Rosie Lourde
Chair of the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce



Acknowledgements

Screen Australia acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we work and recognises their continuous connection to culture, community and Country. More specifically, the contents of this report were researched, drafted and edited on the Gadigal lands of the Eora Nation, the Cammeraygal lands north of the Harbour, Dharawal Country along the NSW South Coast, and on the lands of the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung people of the Kulin Nation in Naarm.

This report was commissioned by Screen Australia's Gender Matters Taskforce of 2023-2025. We would like to thank the Taskforce for your guidance and support for this project, as well as previous iterations of the Taskforce for their commitment to bettering gender parity in the screen industry.

We would also like to thank Nicky Ball from ScreenSkills UK, Amy Shaw of BECTU Vision, Michelle Reynolds and Dr. Rowan Aust from ReelTime Media for contributing their insight from their work in this space.

Thank you as well to Dr. Arlene Harvey who provided services as a proofreader and Steph Jowett who did the graphic design for the report.

The Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce

The Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce (“the Taskforce”) was a volunteer-based advisory body for Screen Australia composed of women and gender diverse screen practitioners working across the Australian screen sector across 2015-2025. The Taskforce proudly supported systemic change within the industry by creating opportunities and empowering women and gender diverse practitioners.

The Taskforce was established following Screen Australia’s historical, industry-wide data on the participation of women in the Australian production industry. Across the decade, the Taskforce spearheaded a number of policy and intervention initiatives aimed at increasing the participation of women and gender diverse practitioners in the Australian industry including Brilliant Stories, Brilliant Pitches, ElevateUs, Credit Maker, and Gender Matters Connect. It also provided programmatic, administrative, financial and in kind support on countless other initiatives and events in partnership with industry bodies, while also ensuring that gender equity was part of the conversation through its presence at key screen and games events.

Scene Change: Modelling Innovative Practices for Screen Workforce Sustainability marks the final deliverable for The Taskforce, as the Gender Matters mission is continued in-house at Screen Australia.

At the time of commissioning this report, the Taskforce comprised of:

- **Rosie Lourde** (Chair): Director, Producer / Executive Producer, Writer and Actor
- **Sacha Horler** (Board Representative): Award-winning actor in film, television, and theatre
- **Melissa Lee Speyer** (Strategy Manager): Writer for screen and theatre
- **Louise Smith** (Treasurer): Producer / Executive Producer at Songbird Studios
- **Zaina Ahmed** (Coordinator): Development Executive at the Special Broadcasting Service
- **Donna Chang**: Commissioning Editor at Stan
- **Chantal Chateaufneuf**: Field Marketing Manager at Epic Games
- **Sarah Christie**: Head of Australian Originals at Prime Video & Amazon MGM Studios
- **Tracey Corbin-Matchett**: CEO of Bus Stop Films
- **Martine Delaney**: Writer and producer for drama and documentary, social justice advocate
- **Joanne Donahoe-Beckwith**: Cinematographer working across film, television and documentary
- **Samantha Alexis Laughton**: Production professional and writer
- **Marissa McDowell**: Producer at Black & White Films
- **Nel Minchin**: Head of Factual at Easy Tiger
- **Emma Myers**: Writer, actor and Walkley Award nominated journalist
- **Deborah Peart ASE**: Award-winning editor
- **Frances Wallace**: CEO of the Sydney Film Festival

About Racheal Rauch

Racheal Rauch is a screen practitioner and leading consultant and advocate for flexible work structures in the screen industry. In 2023, she co-led Australia's first scripted television job-share pilot with Screen Well on a Matchbox Pictures production, funded by Screen Australia. As a sought-after speaker on sustainable and inclusive production models, she has presented at SXSW Sydney, CrewCon, and on the Screen Vixens podcast amongst others.

As a screen practitioner, Racheal has extensive experience across development, production, and acquisitions in Australia, London, and Dubai. Having worked with leading companies including the ABC, Wooden Horse, Flying Bark, Northern Pictures, Bankside Films, Channel Four, and the Seven Network, she brings a comprehensive understanding of the global screen industry. Her recent credits include *Austin* (ABC), and *The Jury* (SBS). In 2024, she was selected for the For Film's Sake Platform: Margins Development Lab, furthering integrating her development craft with her commitment to systemic change in the sector.

About Yvonne Collins

Yvonne Collins is a screen producer whose thirty-year career has spanned producing, line, production and production management for television, feature films, and documentaries. She recently produced the highly successful Netflix series *Apple Cider Vinegar* with See Saw Films and Season 1 of *Bay of Fires* for the ABC with Fremantle and Archipelago Productions.

From 2019 through to 2022 Yvonne worked with Elevate Production Finance as Head of Physical Production – developing and managing finance plans for several feature films. Since 2022 she has been engaged with Media Guarantors LLC as Australian Production Consultant overseeing larger budget films shooting in Australia on films such as *Road to Sky*, *Ice Road 2*, *Ricky Stanicky* and *Eden*; among others. Yvonne has also worked as a Budget Analyst for the Australian Film Commission and the Film Finance Corporation (now Screen Australia) as well as an Independent Film Assessor for various government funding agencies.

She continues to develop and produce a curated slate of feature films.

A Note from the Former Chair

To our colleagues and collaborators across the screen sector,

We're proud to share *Scene Change: Modelling Innovative Practices for Screen Workforce Sustainability* – a report commissioned by Screen Australia's Gender Matters Taskforce in collaboration with industry experts. This work reflects our commitment to structural change for a more inclusive, equitable, and sustainable screen industry, and our belief that real change lies in balancing passion with practical innovation.

This balance is something our entire sector continues to wrestle with. As working filmmakers, we know firsthand how relentless the demands are. Too often, the burden of 'making it work' falls on the generosity, passion, and stamina of workers, often at the cost of wellbeing, career longevity, and even creative execution. With commissions constricting, the pressure is only intensifying – especially for caregivers, people with access needs, and those already facing burnout.

This report shows that reimagining how we work is both possible and necessary. Through budget modelling and analysis undertaken in 2025, *Scene Change* explores three production alternatives: an 8-hour day, a 9-day fortnight, and job-sharing. The findings suggest these models do not significantly increase overall budgetary costs and will more than likely deliver long-term benefits improving much needed workforce retention, wellbeing, efficiency, and even creative output. The report also highlights the vital next step of testing these models on real-world productions, including across all episodic formats and feature film production.

To date, the majority of research globally into alternative production models has often focused on caregivers and people with disabilities. It is important to acknowledge, however, that long work hours and burnout impact the whole screen sector, and so we hope that the data and findings detailed in this report are useful for all workers across all community groups. There's more to learn, but the path is clear: if we want a thriving, future-ready industry, we must collectively rethink how we work.

I am grateful to Racheal Rauch for her exhaustive research and drafting, to producer Yvonne Collins for the detailed budget modelling, and to Taskforce Coordinator Zaina Ahmed for her meticulous project management and editing. We're also grateful for the candid insight from both domestic and international practitioners who shared their wisdom and experience on getting new ways of working off the ground.

Our thanks of course go to Screen Australia for its support, and to the producers and organisations – locally and globally – already experimenting with more sustainable production practices.

We are proud to offer *Scene Change* as the first of its kind report in the world. We encourage you to read it with openness and curiosity, both as analysis and invitation to help shape a screen sector built on care, creativity, and sustainability.

With thanks and solidarity,

Rosie Lourde

Former Chair, Screen Australia's Gender Matters Taskforce

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
The Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce	3
About Racheal Rauch	4
About Yvonne Collins	4
A Note from the Former Chair	5
Executive Summary	7
Introduction	9
The State of Work: Evidence of unsustainable practices and their impact on practitioners	9
The Solution: Exploring new ways of working	11
Findings from abroad	11
So, what are the alternatives?	12
Methodology	14
The Control Scenario	14
Model 1: 8 Hour Day	15
Model 2: 9 Day Fortnight	15
Model 3: Job-Sharing	16
Post-Production	16
Disclaimer	16
Findings	17
Discussion	18
Model 1: 8 Hour Day	18
Model 2: 9 Day Fortnight	19
Model 3: Job-Sharing	20
Conclusion & Recommendations	21
Considerations	22
Final Thoughts	23
References	24
Appendices	26
Appendix A – Evidence of shorter work days internationally	26
Appendix B – Budget Scenario Models	27
Appendix C – List of roles included in the job-sharing model	37
Appendix D – Two Approaches to the 8 Hour Day	38

Executive Summary

Long days form the bedrock of the standard approach to TV production. In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to the extensive hours worked by practitioners in the film and television industry, both domestically and abroad. It has been argued that such hours are behind many of the systemic and unsustainable issues in the industry such as poor work-life balance, skills shortages, a lack of inclusivity and inaccessible workplaces.

Recent international work suggest that alternative production models may be implementable and with only a minimal impact on budget. Yet, no such research has previously compared the impacts of three different alternative approaches, and none have been done in Australia to date.

To investigate the feasibility of alternative approaches to production in the Australian context, in 2025 Screen Australia's Gender Matters Taskforce commissioned a budget modelling exercise to assess the financial implications across three alternative approaches to production. For the purpose of this exploration, the models were applied to a theoretical high-end Australian 6 x 1hr scripted drama series.

The goal was to determine the immediate impact of these models on the drama production's budget, and to provide a resource for producers, production companies, commissioners, and funding agencies, who may wish to implement one or more of these models in future productions.

Our investigation found that implementing these alternative production models had less than a 2.5% impact on the budget; with job-sharing across identified roles as having the least financial impact:

Variation in cost on a scripted TV series budget following the implementation of three alternative production models	
Production Model	Variation in Cost (%)
Strict 8 hour days (8HD) (for all crew)	+2.30%
9 day fortnight (9DFN) (for all crew)	+1.23%
Job-sharing across identified roles (19% of crew)	+0.34%

This report provides a brief summary of the increasing calls from within the industry for a solution to practitioners' long working hours, and outlines existing research and initiatives in Australia and overseas. It then details the methodology used to create the budgets for the three alternative models. Finally, it discusses the impact of the three models on budgets and schedules, and discusses the benefits – improved working conditions, talent retention, and potential for increased efficiency and accessibility – afforded by each model.

Although the preliminary findings are promising, it is important to note that they are based on a single scenario under prescribed conditions. Real-world implementation is therefore necessary to assess the application of the three models across TV and feature film production in functional and adaptive environments. Addressing practitioners' long hours is essential in safeguarding existing talent and ensuring more accessible, inclusive and sustainable workplaces in the Australian screen industry.

“The unsustainable work model is a threat to sectoral sustainability and future growth. It is a crisis that has economic as well as wide-ranging social implications...”

A Wider Lens: Australian
Camera Workforce
Development and Diversity [1]

Introduction

As articulated in the 2021 UNI Global Union report: “Workers across the [screen] industry are highly vulnerable to mental and physical harm caused by excessive daily hours, excessive weekly hours and a lack of time off between workdays and on weekends”. [2] In Australia, the disadvantages of long working days in the film and TV industry are well documented in numerous reports from leading industry bodies. Research in this space has repeatedly highlighted the urgent need to address the problem of long hours due to evidence they negatively impact mental health, lower work-life balance, as well as create inaccessible workplaces and hostile work environments; all of which contributing to unsustainable working conditions. While nascent work has been done to explore alternative production methodologies overseas, there is little evidence for how these models can be applied in the Australian context.

“...MEAA members regularly work more than 50 hours per week on average in practice, despite the fact that the work week is limited by law to 38 hours”.

Demanding Dignity Behind the Scenes [2]

The State of Work: Evidence of unsustainable practices and their impact on practitioners

In Australia, 38 hours per week is the standard full-time workload set for the legal work week. The standard production model in the screen industry, however, currently involves 10 hour (minimum) work days; meaning the modus operandi is for crew to work for longer than is expected of the broader working population. During production, however, even longer hours are often the norm, with the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance (MEAA) finding that members “regularly work more than 50 hours per week on average in practice, despite the fact that the work week is limited by law to 38 hours”. [2]

Unfortunately, the situation has been compounded by constricted budgets, such that there is now an increasing expectation for crew to ‘do more with less’, in terms of both funding and time [4]. For many this model is unsustainable, taking a toll on their health, wellbeing, and perpetuates a lack of inclusive work environments; all culminating in a talent retention problem across the industry. [5]

Systematic fatigue is one of the key consequences of these hours. Recent research by Griffith University (2025), for example, has revealed that 57% of the over 1,300 industry respondents reported feeling worn out at the end of the working day, while 59% reported struggling with work / life balance. [5]

“36% of participants have considered quitting their job often or all the time in the past six months. 1/4 of the screen industry workforce are planning their exit within six months”

The Pressure Point Report [5]

As a result of this impact on welfare, a significant consequence of the standard production model is its impact on the attraction and retention of talent. MEAA's Entertainment, Crew, and Sport (ECS) Federal President, Fiona Donovan cautioned in 2023 that "if this culture of long hours and fatigue is not dealt with, the industry will be unable to attract and retain the qualified and experienced workforce that is needed...". [6] Research from Griffith University supports this concern, finding that a quarter of workers in the screen industry were planning their exit within six months. [5] In 2023, MEAA surveyed full-time crew working on *La Brea* (Season 2) and also found that "nearly one in four said they either could not see themselves continuing in the industry in five years, or would limit their availability to part-time, work from home or other restrictions". [7]

Recently, a 2026 report by strategic consultancy Olsberg SPI notes, "compressed schedules and long working days have become normalised, leading to fatigue, burnout, and an erosion of work-life balance. Major production markets have reported that these conditions are undermining the sustainability of careers in the sector." [24]

"Everybody knows it's a long hours culture and you either put up with it or leave. It's only now when we are so desperately trying to find crew that it's become clear that there are people who don't want to work in that way, for whatever reason, and that they are really experienced and really good at their job."

Media Work, Mothers and Motherhood [3]

Workplaces with overly demanding hours are also often inaccessible and unsustainable for women and those with caring responsibilities whose hours available to work are fewer and less flexible. As per the 2024 National Working Families Survey: "women continue to bear the majority of caring load as well as household duties – nearly double that of men – despite working similar hours to men". [8]

These issues related to inaccessibility and unsustainability also impact members of the disability community. According to the 2023 Disability and Screen Work in Australia report, 63% of workers without disability work full-time compared to only 34% of workers with disability. This report argued that "more flexible working hours and hiring practices would allow more [workers with disability] to gain experience and pursue careers in the industry". [10] Specifically, it drew attention to how:

the long hours, inflexible schedules, tight deadlines, and high stress levels are accepted as norms of screen work, but they make many roles inaccessible for a variety of workers, including [people with disability], parents and carers. Such conditions impede a sustainable work-life balance for all workers. [10]

The above evidence suggests that long hours lower the participation rates of groups and communities that are already underrepresented in the industry, thereby exacerbating issues around exclusion.

In addition, in 2022, the Australian Cinematographer Society (ACS) highlighted in *A Wider Lens* - which examined the workforce development and diversity in the Camera department - that "the work model, toxic work practices, and widespread bullying and harassment interact to create a system in need of urgent repair". [1] While no study has been published to comprehensively discuss the nature of this in the broader industry, it could be extrapolated that a similar dynamic between fatigue and high pressure environments could exacerbate bullying and harassment across other departments.

The Solution: Exploring new ways of working

In the Australian screen industry, many have been advocating for more sustainable and flexible working arrangements.

Australia's MEAA's "Priorities for Reform" for 2022 included:

- "Recognition that excessive hours are unacceptable and damaging and that every producer commits to changing the culture and eliminating the practices that drive excessive hours."
- "Develop a scheduling framework to ensure that schedules are realistic and properly managed for pre, production and post. Framework to prioritise the cost of hours on crew's families, physical and mental health, and safety alongside production needs." [11]

Further, *A Wider Lens* also recommended that "work-life balance policies must be implemented to promote better reconciliation of work and private life and include measures such as flexible working and job-sharing". [1] And, in 2018, Raising Films Australia – an advocacy body for parents and caregivers in the screen industry – reported that the most frequently noted workplace challenge from all respondents was: "long hours / weeks" while the second most common solution proposed was "greater availability of part-time / flexible roles". [12]

While 'Scene Change' is limited in scope to film and TV production, it is important to note that this discourse fits within a broader push for new approaches to work, with changes such as the four-day work week being implemented across some private and public sector organisations [13].

Findings from abroad

The state of the Australian landscape echoes similar studies from abroad. When the UK's ScreenSkills 2021 survey asked, "over the next five years, what are the most significant changes that you think will affect the screen industries?", 47% of respondents chose "more emphasis on work-life balance" while 40% selected "new working patterns e.g., staggered shifts or flexible working". [14] A 2022 report by Film & TV Charity (UK) emphasised that "the retention problem arises from long hours of work, high pressure and the difficulty of combining film and TV work with family life and work-life balance". [15] In the same year, the British Film Institute (BFI) Skills Review included a key finding that the "adoption of flexible ways of working, such as job-sharing, could help improve inclusivity, increase the talent pool, and retain skilled crew". [16]

With respect to flexible work for caregivers, a 2021 report from Raising Films UK found that "aspects of the screen industries that continue to exclude caregivers include: [...] a lack of truly flexible working and job-shares in both salaried and freelance roles," as well as "long hours and long weeks...". [17] In 2022, Raising Films Ireland examined issues affecting parents and carers and proposed "greater availability of part-time/flexible roles" as one of its top five solutions. [18] A 2023 Timewise & Broadcasting, Entertainment, Communications, and Theatre Union (BECTU) report recommended to "make it a requirement that productions which receive public funding undertake training in flexible working, and actively consider trialling job-share or job split opportunities where possible". [19] Timewise UK also published a report in 2024 summarising relevant work practices in France, Spain and Sweden, and provided evidence that shorter work days are a realistic industry standard [20] (Appendix A).

In the UK, the BFI fund a 'Good Work' programme as part of a nation-wide government agenda, to tackle the long hours and provide for a work/life balance [21]. This adds to the growing body of evidence globally interrogating new ways of working in the screen industry.

So, what are the alternatives?

The alternative production models explored here either reduce the hours in the current 50-hour week model, or provide flexible work arrangements that move away from the traditional approach to production.

Some models have already been trialled overseas examining their impact on production methodology. One approach that has been studied is the use of job-sharing, where the responsibilities of a role are shared between two or more people; decreasing the workload on the individuals involved. A number of job-sharing initiatives have already been successfully implemented in production. ReelTime Media (UK), for instance, have run high-end TV job-sharing programs with ScreenSkills since 2022, with their latest pilot running in association with Warner Brothers [22]. A similar pilot program was trialled by Screen Well in Australia in 2024, which paired job-sharers in roles on a Matchbox Pictures production. As the first program of its kind in Australia, it explored barriers to installing job-sharers on production and suggested potential solutions. It was a crucial first-step to modelling job-sharing as a viable employment method to producers, and the initiative found that demand for job-sharing was significant among crew across departments. [9]

“All departments and all levels saw some real value in a shorter working day, for the industry as well as for their own wellbeing. This applied even allowing for impact on the day rate, contradicting expectations that freelancers would resist any changes that reduced their short-term wage potential.”

Timewise Report Designing a Blueprint for a Shorter Working Day in Film & Scripted Drama [20]

Work has also been done to explore how changes in production schedules (i.e. enforcing an 'ordinary' work day on productions) impacted budgets. In 2023, the UK's Timewise and BECTU created two retrospective comparative budgets and schedules for an 8 hour working day for two separate productions, and found an overall cost increase of only 4% for both. Noting the slight cost margin, “both productions acknowledge that if they were scheduling in real time..., [with the 8 hour day in mind] there could be savings to offset some of the cost increase”. [20]

Implementing an alternative production model requires re-thinking the status quo, and entails an administrative effort at all levels of production. Given the contraction of budgets and increasing difficulty in financing productions, producers are understandably wary of deviating from the standard model due to a concern over potential increases in costs. [4] It would therefore be difficult for any producer to seriously consider an alternative production model without understanding how this might affect their bottom line.

Currently, the widespread assumption is that alternative approaches are either too expensive or unwieldy, despite no publicly available data existing to show how alternative models would impact budgets and schedules in the Australian context.

To present the case for alternative production models, in 2025, Screen Australia's Gender Matters Taskforce commissioned this report to apply three alternative models to an Australian television drama production scenario. The Taskforce engaged screen practitioner and production consultant Racheal Rauch and producer Yvonne Collins to analyse and assess the budget implications of these alternative models. This report presents modelling in the Australian context, aiming to present the case and provide guidance for producers and the wider industry to implement these models in their own productions.

“... it is budgets, rather than the craft of production, which inform many filming schedules. Long days are not inescapable, rather they are generated by the daily costs of locations, equipment and workers.”

Methodology

Three models were selected for this study:

<p>Model 1: 8 hour working days for all crew (8H)</p>	<p>Model 2: 9 day fortnight for all crew (9DFN)</p>	<p>Model 3: Job-sharing across selected roles (making up close to 20% of crew)</p>
--	--	---

The budget top sheets for the three alternative models, are presented in Appendix B. The following sections detail the approach taken in each scenario.

The Control Scenario

The control budget for this exercise was based on indicative rates for a 2025 metropolitan-based shoot in Victoria. Parameters are shown in Table 1 below, with production format, shooting days per episode, and location applied as consistent parameters across all scenarios.

Table 1: Base Budget Parameters	
Budget	\$17,229,435
Production Format	6 x 1 hour drama series
Shooting Days Per Episode	10 x 10 hour days per episode
Pre-Production Length	8 Weeks
Shoot Length	12 Weeks / 60 Days
Post-Production Length	16 Weeks
Location	Shot exclusively on metropolitan location (in this instance, Victoria), with no regional away days

Model 1: 8 Hour Day (8HD)

The 8-hour day is considered the standard work day in Australia in line with the National Employment Standard of a 38 hour week. [23] The following budget examines the impact of implementing this 'standard' work day in a production setting for all crew.

An 8 hour day would lose 2 working hours per day, i.e., 10 hours across a 5 day week.

The 8 hour rate for crew was calculated using the following methodology:

- 50 hour rate = $\$2,000/55 = \36.36 hourly rate
- $\$36.36 \times 40 = \$1,454.54$ for a 40 hour week
- 45 minutes for lunch (unpaid), as per the 10 hour day

Most rates have been rounded up to reach a reasonable market rate offer for crew for a 40-hour week at the time of drafting, an amount that was usually above the corresponding base band in the Motion Picture Production Certified Agreement (MPCCA). In practice, this would be discretionary for each production.

It is acknowledged that heads of departments (HOD's) (such as line producers, 1st assistant director and director of photography (DOP)) are often required to meet after daily production has wrapped; work that sits on top of their scheduled shoot day. HODs are typically engaged on flat rates to accommodate this element of their work. For this model to be effective - and noting that the legal right to disconnect has been fully in force since August 2025 - these practitioners would not be able to engage with crew who have already clocked off.

Model 2: 9 Day Fortnight (9DFN)

In the 9DFN model, all crew work 10 hour days but have one unpaid rostered day off per fortnight, usually every second Friday.

The impact of this is that within every fortnight, the first week is a standard 50 hour week, and this is followed by a 40 hour week. As a result, one pro-rata day from the 50 hour rate is deducted for each four-day week.

To maintain the integrity of this model, the 9DFN is applied to roles with preparation time of more than four weeks; crew with preparation of four weeks or less have been allocated standard five-day weeks.

Model 3: Job-Sharing

Job-sharing can be structured according to time, duties or location. [9] In this model, 17 of the 88 crew roles (19%) have been identified as jobs that could be shared by two people on productions. The full list of job-sharing roles modelled for this report can be found in Appendix C.

The job-sharing structure applied in this specific budget is job-sharing by time: a split of three days and two days. It is possible, however, that job-sharing could involve alternating weeks or blocks. The roles selected for job-sharing come from a variety of departments and different experience levels, and include both on-set and office-based roles. Roles that require the longest hours often stand to benefit the most from an alternative production model and some of these were included in the model. At the same time, the roles selected were not deemed 'high-risk' with respect to creative continuity.

Additional days are provided for crossovers between some of these job-share roles. For other roles, handovers can be conducted via email, shared documents, voice notes or phone calls.

These specific roles were selected in order to demonstrate the impact on budget where a significant number of roles were allocated job-shares. In practice, the number of job-sharing roles on any one production can be flexible, and need not be set at or limited to 19% of crew.

Post-Production

For post-production, only editorial staff fees are adjusted according to the alternative production model. Where additional days are necessary as a result of the reduced hours (e.g., in Models 1 and 2), any rentals are adjusted accordingly. All other post-production costs – such as sound, VFX and music – remain the same as they are generally outsourced. There is no overall extension to the post schedule as various post production processes occur concurrently.

Disclaimer

The figures presented here are not designed to be prescriptive. They are intended as a guide only to examine potential budget implications for these models, and were applied with a methodology identified as appropriate at the time of drafting the report. It is understood that each individual production will need to apply its own methodology according to what best suits the individual production, crew and stakeholders.

Findings

The budget analysis yielded the results shown in Table 2 below, and the schedule findings are shown in Table 3. A further breakdown of each budget is provided in the following section.

Production Model	Total Budget	Budget Variation (\$)	Budget Variation (%)
Control scenario	\$17,229,435	--	--
8 hour day (for all crew)	\$17,626,236	\$396,801	+2.3%
9 day fortnight (for all crew)	\$17,441,671	\$212,236	+1.23%
Job-sharing (for all crew)	\$17,288,260	\$58,825	+0.34%

Production Model	Pre-Production	Shoot	Post	Schedule Variation
Control scenario	8 weeks	12 weeks	16 weeks	--
8 hour day (for all crew)	10 weeks	14.4 weeks (72 days)	16 weeks	+4.4 weeks
9 day fortnight (for all crew)	9 weeks*	13.2 weeks**	16 weeks	+2.2 weeks
Job-sharing (for all crew)	8 weeks	12 weeks	16 weeks	Nil

*4 x 5 day weeks & 5 x 4 day weeks = 40 days

**7.2 x 5 day weeks & 6 x 4 day weeks = 60 days, 10 days per episode

Discussion

Model 1: 8 Hour Day (for all Crew)

Table 4: 8HD Budget Findings by Section

Budget Component	Control Budget	8HD Budget	Budget Variation (\$)	Budget Variation (%)
Above the Line Costs	\$3,014,376	\$2,961,045	-\$53,331	-1.77%
Crew Fees	\$5,401,287	\$5,387,969	-\$13,318	<1%
Cast Fees	\$1,384,135	\$1,331,215	-\$52,920	-3.82%
Production Costs	\$3,965,458	\$4,449,474	+\$484,016	+12.21%
Post Costs	\$1,174,765	\$1,165,390	-\$9,375	<1%

Of the three alternative models, the 8 hour day model had the greatest – albeit still modest – impact on the budget and schedule of our production scenario, with an increase to the total budget of 2.3% and a production schedule extended by 4.4 weeks. Crew fees were reduced by eliminating two hours from the standard 10 hour day, which are typically billed at time and a half. Some cast fees were also reduced by shorter work days although these were compensated by cast members working more weeks overall. For example, a weekly shoot rate of \$25k/week was reduced to \$20k/week, though it is acknowledged that this approach to fees is highly dependent on the agreement made with cast.

Due to the shorter working days, the number of filming days were extended, which in turn increased costs for items such as rentals (e.g., trucks and costume racks), kit hire (e.g., cameras), travel, location fees, as well as expendables and supplies such as makeup. The crew fees line item saw a decrease overall, although at times there was an increase in the breakdown. This can be attributed in part to rounding the figures to a realistic crew rate as well as to an increase in box rental and car allowances. Some other line items were budgeted as an increase, although the actual cost may differ. For example, in this scenario, dailies processing increased due to the additional days; at the same time, less material would have been shot each day so the processing for each day could theoretically require less time.

One question raised by this model is how much of the 8 hour day is 'shootable' after allowing for the necessary breaks, as well as time to bump in and bump out. Two example shoot schedule scenarios are presented in Appendix D, with both adding up to over 7.5 hours worked.

Looking at take-home pay, crew would not receive any overtime, but would be engaged to work for a longer period due to the increased pre-production and shoot time. As a result, roles with longer pre-production engagements may see an increase in overall pay, whereas roles purely engaged during production could see a slight decrease. Due to the varying degree of impact on different roles as a result of the methodology used, it is not feasible to offer a specific average of the impact on take-home pay.

Model 2: 9 Day Fortnight (9DFN) (for all Crew)

Table 5: 9DFN Budget Findings by Section

Budget Component	Control Budget	9DFN Day Budget	Budget Variation (\$)	Budget Variation (%)
Above the Line Costs	\$3,014,376	\$3,021,179	+\$6,803	+ <1%
Crew Fees	\$5,401,287	\$5,405,470	+\$4,183	+ <1%
Cast Fees	\$1,384,135	\$1,388,814	+\$4,679	+ <1%
Production Costs	\$3,965,458	\$4,137,296	+\$171,838	+4.33%
Post Costs	\$1,174,765	\$1,180,383	+\$5,619	+ <1%

The budget for the 9DFN option showed marginal increases across the board as a result of extending the number of weeks scheduled. The most significant increases were for departments with kit hire – such as camera, lighting and unit – as well as accommodation and travel.

There was also a significant increase for locations in this model. As productions are not likely to bump out and back in around the day off in the four day week, locations would need to be held over three-day weekends. The same applies to all hires within departments, such as costumes and art. The small overages on crew lines in this scenario are due to equipment rentals that need to be held over the extra time. Allowances for cars and computers were also adjusted for the four-day week.

Moreover, this model may prove challenging in pre-production as it entails losing a business day - where vendors are open to liaise with crew - during a crucial (and busy) stage of production. To resolve this problem, days off for departments and / or crew could be staggered, or determined on a case-by-case basis.

The overall take-home pay for crew in this model does not change, as the number of working days remains the same as in the control model. Although crew wouldn't lose or gain paid days, the overall length of engagement would extend by 2.2 weeks as per the increase to the schedule. In the long-run, it's worth considering that an extended length of production could mean the number of jobs worked per year (and thus cash-in-hand per year) could decrease for a practitioner. That said, the positive impact in decreased fatigue, could also mean that crew could more efficiently take on new work, with shorter breaks between contracts.

Model 3: Job-Sharing

Table 6: Job-Sharing Budget Findings by Section

Budget Component	Control Budget	Job-Sharing Budget	Budget Variation (\$)	Budget Variation (%)
Above the Line Costs	\$3,014,376	\$3,014,376	-	-
Crew Fees	\$5,401,287	\$5,453,480	+\$52,193	+1%
Cast Fees	\$1,384,135	\$1,384,135	-	-
Production Costs	\$3,965,458	\$3,965,458	-	-
Post Costs	\$1,174,765	\$1,175,928	+\$1,163	+ <1%

In this job-sharing model, roles were identified to be shared by two individuals, with job-sharing pairs splitting the time allocated for the role. These encompassed a range of jobs across all levels of seniority and allowed for at least one position from most departments. Job-shares in our scenario were applied to roles with a longer pre-production allocation of up to 8 weeks. 17 of the 88 full-time roles were allocated as job-shares (19% of crew).

The main increase to the budget in this model was from added handover time. In practice, there is flexibility as to how crossover time can be organised, e.g., as a full day or a minimum of 4 hours, as per the award. In some instances, roles could be split pro-rata, with no additional crossover time. Contracting on a casual rate could also be practical in a job-sharing scenario, as some job-sharers may prefer full flexibility over the role, and the power to adjust their hours according to their needs.

Some roles may also require brief periods of full-time work during prep, with these practitioners going on to job-share for the remainder of the production and shoot. For example, two job-sharers might need to attend the tech recce, or a short prep and wrap period for technical roles might need to be performed by one person.

The take-home pay for crew in a job-share role compared to a full-time role will vary greatly depending on the time structure between the job-share pair, the length of the handover period, and whether they are booked on a casual, daily, or a pro-rata weekly rate.

Conclusion & Recommendations

The findings of this report are comparable to similar analysis undertaken in the UK by Timewise and BECTU, which found a production increase of 4% for the 8 hour day model, compared to the 2.3% found for the 8 hour day model in this exercise. [20] Despite there being no comparable research for the other two models - 9DFN and job-sharing - at the time of writing, this modelling provides promising evidence that alternative production models need not necessarily lead to significant increases in production budgets or schedules.

The modest budget increases shown here also need to be weighed against the potential improvements in crew working conditions. The alternative production models offer a practical response to tackling the adverse effects of current work practices across the screen industry, and can play a critical role in fostering a more inclusive workforce. Central to this is the ability for crew to work more sustainable hours, have healthier working lives, and achieve a more tailored work / life balance. With greater flexibility, practitioners would be better able to manage their physical and mental health, maintain relationships, meet caring responsibilities, and pursue upskilling or other creative and business interests. This in turn can reduce burnout, support career sustainability, and increase the likelihood that practitioners, particularly those from underrepresented or marginalised groups, are able to enter, remain, and thrive in the industry over the long term.

Further, the three alternative models outlined here can be implemented either alone or in conjunction with each other. A key advantage of the 8HD and 9DFN models is that they benefit all crew. Job-sharing, meanwhile, is perhaps the most easily implementable of the three models, offering the greatest flexibility for crew, producers and HODs. It can accommodate both those who prefer to work longer hours as well as those who don't by being made available on a case-by-case basis, as requested, as required and as suitable. Crucially, job-sharing does not extend production schedules. It also helps counter the pervasive culture of 'staying until the job is done' by building in structured handovers between team members. This model therefore avoids the problem of 'presenteeism', where nobody wants to be the first to leave work [20], and enables a more sustainable working pattern while maintaining momentum. Additionally, job-sharing expands access to employment by simply employing a larger number of practitioners. To be most effective, job-sharing requires the sourcing and / or development of job-sharing 'pairs' or teams. The pilot trial outlined in the Screen Well *Breaking Down the Barriers to Job-Sharing* report offers a practical template for establishing a working partnership, as well as advice on approaching potential employers to job-share a role.

Fundamentally all three models offer more sustainable alternatives to the current system, the benefits of which extend beyond the gendered lens. Their benefits apply to all crew; offering meaningful solutions for anyone in the industry for whom long hours are prohibitive and potentially harmful.

Considerations

While the findings of the modelling presented in this report are promising, it is acknowledged that they have several limitations. Only one budget level has been analysed – a metro shoot, with no regional away days – and this obviously cannot address how budgets and schedules shift in different settings. Every production faces its own unique set of challenges and logistical scenarios, which means that the alternative model(s) employed would need to be bespoke to their respective productions. To achieve the best results with regards to financing and managing expectations around schedules, it is recommended that the preferred production approach would be discussed as early as possible with commissioners and stakeholders, and there would possibly need to be some level of flexibility required as production challenges arise.

To most effectively assess the viability of these alternative models, it is necessary they are put into practice. Seeing these models in real-world scenarios would allow the following questions and considerations to be explored: What are the unforeseen benefits of the alternative models? Do crew demonstrate potentially higher efficiency rates and quality of work? Do crew report the hours to be more sustainable? How do crew protect their hours off? Do the extended schedules impact talent availability? What would job-sharing look like in more senior or creative roles? Would reduced weekly hours or flexible work arrangements act as incentives for preferred HODs and crew? Would providing more flexible opportunities for practitioners help companies meet their diversity, equity and inclusion goals? What are the impacts on creative execution?

It should also be noted as well that this report does not examine the role of technology which is increasingly shaping the nature of work. Rapid advances in digital tools have allowed for new ways to share information more efficiently; the benefits of which would be better explored in practice. A key factor in this is the ease at which certain crew can work remotely; enabling continuity of information in job-share situations, and overall reduce travel time and cost as a barrier to access. However this increased connectivity, also mean that crew are more accessible out of working hours, so an application of these models would need to take into account a worker's right to disconnect.

On a policy level, there are also idiosyncrasies of the Australian workplace to consider. As an example, Australian crew work between different frameworks regularly due to the blend of domestic and international productions that take place in the country. Further work is required to understand how flexible working models can be incorporated into both frameworks. In a post-COVID world, there have also been several initiatives that seek to address the crew shortage that followed the pandemic. Such initiatives seek to encourage entry into the industry through training programs, but don't necessarily address the issue of retention. Trialling alternative models such as those outlined in this report, can help address factors influencing long-term workforce sustainability and, in doing so, bolster the outcomes of these existing initiatives.

These considerations point to a clear next step: real-world implementation. Only by testing these models can we gather the rich, qualitative data needed to understand the true implications of changing how we work – helping us to chart a more sustainable future for our industry.

Final Thoughts

Numerous reports in domestic and international settings have highlighted the long working hours in the film and television sector and have argued for the need for a more accessible and sustainable workplace. The type of change recommended in this report would encourage the career longevity of screen practitioners, preserving their health, and addressing issues related to talent attraction, access and retention. This report has demonstrated that such a change need not come with an exorbitant cost.

It's important to acknowledge that warnings of unsustainable practices are currently colliding with a rapidly shifting industry landscape. In Australia, as in many markets, the contraction in production activity is being felt acutely. For many practitioners, particularly caregivers, emerging talent, and those from underrepresented backgrounds, the industry is becoming harder to enter, and even more difficult to stay in.

The Australian screen sector has long been a globally recognised creative powerhouse, and a significant contributor to our national economy. But in this period of increasing uncertainty, if we want the industry not just to survive but to carry itself through, we must innovate.

In this context, change is no longer a matter of aspiration but of survival. Business as usual is simply not viable. If we want to safeguard the health of our workforce, retain experienced practitioners, attract new talent, and weather this global storm, we must embrace more sustainable and adaptable production practices.

References

- [1] A. Coles, J. Ferrer, V. Zemaityte and M. Banks, "A Wider Lens: Australian Camera Workforce Development and Diversity," Australian Cinematographers Society, 2022.
- [2] U. G. Union, "Demanding Dignity Behind the Scenes: Ending Long Hours Culture in the Global Film and TV Industry," 14 December 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://uniglobalunion.org/report/demanding-dignity-behind-the-scenes-ending-long-hours-culture-in-the-global-film-and-tv-industry/>.
- [3] P. Beedies, "Solutions for Better Futures: The Gendered Practice of the TV Opt-Out", Media Work, Mothers and Motherhood: Negotiating the International Audiovisual Industry, 2021.
- [4] Screen Australia, "Drama Report 2023/24: Film, TV and video-on-demand drama production in Australia".
- [5] P. Hegedus and B. Dionysisu, "The Pressure Point Report: Australian Screen Industry Mental Health & Wellbeing Survey Preliminary Survey Findings 2025", Griffith Film School, Griffith University, 2025.
- [6] S. Slatter, "Indie Producers Rethink The 50-Hour Work Week," 18 July 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://if.com.au/indie-producers-rethink-the-50-hour-work-week/>.
- [7] MEAA, "La Brea Season 2 Fatigue Survey Report", MEAA, 2023.
- [8] F. F. Workplaces, "National Working Families Survey - Executive Summary", Family Friendly Workplaces, Parents At Work, 2024.
- [9] J. Dutton, R. Rauch and B. Steel, "Breaking Down the Barriers to Job-Sharing," Screen Well, 2024.
- [10] R. O'Meara, L. Dunstan, A. Debinski and C. Ryan, "Disability and Screen Work in Australia: Report for Industry", Melbourne Disability Institute, 2023.
- [11] MEAA, "Priorities for Industry Reform", MEAA, 2022.
- [12] D. Verhoeven, M. Riakos, S. Gregory, E. Joly and M. McHugh, "Honey, I Hid the Kids! Experiences of Parents and Carers in the Australian Screen Industry Full Report", Raising Films Australia, 2018.
- [13] J. Hopkins, A. Bardoel and N. Djukovic, "Emerging Four Day Work Week Trends in Australia: New insights based on interviews with Australian firms who have already adopted 4DWW arrangements," [Online], <https://doi.org/10.26185/wm6x-tk60>, 2023.
- [14] C. Branzanti, L. Howe and J. Cortvriend, "ScreenSkills Assessment 2021", ScreenSkills, 2021.
- [15] D. Steele, "Absent Friends: Scaling the film and TV industry's retention problem," Film & TV Charity, 2022.
- [16] BFI, "BFI Skills Review 2022: Workforce Development in the Scripted Film and High-end Television Production Sector", 2022.
- [17] Raising Films, "How We Work Now: Learning from the Impact of COVID-19 to Build an Industry that Works for Parents and Carers", Raising Films, 2021.
- [18] Raising Films Ireland, "The Pursuit of Change: Issues Affecting Parents & Carers in Ireland's Screen Industries", Raising Films Ireland, 2022.
- [19] Timewise and BECTU, "How to Make Flexible Working Work Within the Film and Television Industry," Timewise, BECTU, 2023.

References

- [20] Timewise and BECTU, “Designing a Blueprint for a Shorter Working Day in Film & Scripted Drama”, Timewise, BECTU, 2024.
- [21] BFI, “Good Work Programme for Screen,” [Online]. Available: <https://www.bfi.org.uk/get-funding-support/progress-my-creative-career-grow-my-business/good-work-programme-screen>
- [22] Reel Time Media, “Programmes,” [Online]. Available: <https://www.reeltime.co.uk/programmes/>.
- [23] F. W. Ombudsman, “Maximum Weekly Hours,” [Online]. Available: <https://www.fairwork.gov.au/tools-and-resources/fact-sheets/minimum-workplace-entitlements/maximum-weekly-hours>.
- [24] O. SPI, “Production Infrastructure and Capacity Analysis for Australia’s Screen Production Sector: Recommendations and Future Trends”, Olsberg SPI, 2026.

DISCLAIMER: This report was commissioned by the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce, with support from Screen Australia. The views, findings, and recommendations contained are those of the author(s), and do not necessarily reflect those of Screen Australia. Screen Australia has not directed, influenced or reviewed the research methodology or conclusions. Screen Australia acknowledges and supports this work as a valuable contribution to the sector.

Appendices

Appendix A – Evidence of shorter work days internationally

Timewise undertook a study to identify whether there had been any successful implementation of a shorter filming day globally. [20] They found that “film industry hours in France are reported to be ten hours’ continuous working including prep and wrap” and “in Spain the TV industry has a limit of 40 - 43 working hours per week excluding prep and wrap”. [20]

The country with the most entrenched industry agreement was Sweden.

Schedulers in Sweden selected one of the following three options:

- Four day week with long days (10 hours + 1 hour unpaid lunch break)
- Five day week with eight hour days
- Five day week with a variable pattern (e.g., 10 – 8 – 9 – 7 – 6 = 40 hours)

Importantly, their study found that:

“...the collective industry agreement imposes a penalty fee for any late changes to schedule, with no exceptions for unforeseen events such as weather conditions or cast illness. The cost implications tend to ensure that productions stick to schedule by finding other solutions to unforeseen delays. While overtime can be worked in exceptional circumstances, it can’t be planned for in the schedule and it can’t become the norm. The collective agreement prevents this by ruling that overtime must be requested at no less than two hours’ advance notice, and that the working day must never be longer than 10 hours.” [20]

Attached in the Following Order:

1. Control Scenario
2. 8 Hour Day Model
3. 9 Day Fortnight Model
4. Job-Sharing Model

BASE BUDGET
6 x 1 hr Drama Series
Drafted by Yvonne Collins for the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce
Prepared May 2025

Location: Assumes Metro Victoria (shoot & post)
Prep: 8 weeks
Shoot: 12 weeks (10 days per ep)
Post: 16 weeks

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
A01	STORY DEVELOPMENT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
A02	SCRIPT/DEVELOPMENT	\$620,000	\$620,000	\$0
B01	PRODUCERS	\$754,000	\$754,000	\$0
B02	DIRECTORS	\$348,085	\$348,085	\$0
E01	ATL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$825,300	\$825,300	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$366,991	\$366,991	\$0
	TOTAL ABOVE THE LINE COSTS	\$3,014,376	\$3,014,376	\$0
C01	PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT	\$871,910	\$871,910	\$0
C02	PRODUCTION ACCOUNTANCY	\$193,300	\$193,300	\$0
C03	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS & CONTINUITY	\$257,910	\$257,910	\$0
C04	CAMERA CREW	\$377,280	\$377,280	\$0
C05	SOUND CREW	\$85,400	\$85,400	\$0
C06	LIGHTING CREW	\$157,480	\$157,480	\$0
C07	GRIPS CREW	\$156,960	\$156,960	\$0
C08	COSTUME CREW	\$316,100	\$316,100	\$0
C09	MAKE-UP & HAIR CREW	\$170,560	\$170,560	\$0
C10	SFX/PROSTHETICS CREW	\$0	\$0	\$0
C11	ART DEPARTMENT CREW	\$675,740	\$675,740	\$0
C12	ACTION VEHICLES CREW	\$84,200	\$84,200	\$0
C14	CONSTRUCTION CREW	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$0
C15	SPECIAL EFFECTS CREW	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
C16	ARMOURY CREW	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
C17	WORKPLACE HEALTH & SAFETY CREW	\$88,800	\$88,800	\$0
C18	TUITION & TECHNICAL ADVISERS	\$31,650	\$31,650	\$0
C21	CASTING FEES	\$146,000	\$146,000	\$0
C23	SECOND UNIT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
C24	OVERTIME & LOADINGS	\$470,000	\$470,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$1,067,997	\$1,067,997	\$0
	TOTAL CREW FEES	\$5,401,287	\$5,401,287	\$0
E02	BTL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$725,000	\$725,000	\$0
E03	SUPPORT CAST	\$168,000	\$168,000	\$0
E05	STUNT PERFORMERS	\$38,654	\$38,654	\$0
E06	BACKGROUND EXTRAS	\$135,166	\$135,166	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$317,315	\$317,315	\$0
	TOTAL CAST FEES	\$1,384,135	\$1,384,135	\$0
F01	COSTUMES	\$191,000	\$191,000	\$0
F02	MAKE-UP, HAIR	\$22,700	\$22,700	\$0
F03	SFX/PROSTHETICS MAKEUP	\$0	\$0	\$0
G01	LOCATIONS	\$551,000	\$551,000	\$0
G02	STAGE RENTALS	\$0	\$0	\$0
H01	CONSTRUCTION	\$149,500	\$149,500	\$0
H02	PROPS & SET DRESSING	\$418,900	\$418,900	\$0
H03	ACTION VEHICLES & ANIMALS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
H05	ARMOURY	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$0
H06	SPECIAL EFFECTS	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0
I01	IMAGE CAPTURE	\$78,720	\$78,720	\$0
K01	CAMERA EQUIPMENT	\$327,850	\$327,850	\$0
K02	SOUND EQUIPMENT	\$39,450	\$39,450	\$0
K03	LIGHTING EQUIPMENT	\$157,520	\$157,520	\$0
K04	GRIPS EQUIPMENT	\$150,400	\$150,400	\$0
K05	UNIT EQUIPMENT	\$240,900	\$240,900	\$0
K06	SAFETY /MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$6,960	\$6,960	\$0
L01	RENTALS & STORAGE	\$149,700	\$149,700	\$0
M01	TRAVEL & TRANSPORT	\$242,300	\$242,300	\$0
N01	ACCOMMODATION, LIVING & CATERING	\$654,500	\$654,500	\$0
O01	INSURANCE	\$272,000	\$272,000	\$0
P01	OFFICE EXPENSES	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$9,058	\$9,058	\$0
	TOTAL PRODUCTION COSTS	\$3,965,458	\$3,965,458	\$0
R01	POST-PRODUCTION CREW	\$275,440	\$275,440	\$0
S01	POST-PRODUCTION RENTALS & OFFICE EXPENSES	\$86,600	\$86,600	\$0
T01	POST-PRODUCTION TRAVEL & ACCOMMODATION	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0
U01	IMAGE POST-PRODUCTION	\$218,240	\$218,240	\$0
U02	DIGITAL VISUAL EFFECTS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
V01	SOUND POST-PRODUCTION	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$0

Base Budget Model

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
W01	MUSIC	\$165,500	\$165,500	\$0
X01	PUBLICITY & STILLS	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$93,985	\$93,985	\$0
	TOTAL POST COSTS	\$1,174,765	\$1,174,765	\$0
Y01	LEGAL & BUSINESS	\$699,500	\$699,500	\$0
Y03	OVERHEADS	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	\$999,500	\$999,500	\$0
Z01	SPA Levy: : 0.25% (\$999,500.00 excluded)	\$37,350	\$37,350	\$0
Z02	Contingency : 10% (\$3,413,876.30 excluded)	\$1,252,564	\$1,252,564	\$0
	Total Above-The-Line	\$3,014,376	\$3,014,376	\$0
	Total Below-The-Line	\$12,925,144	\$12,925,144	\$0
	Total Above and Below-The-Line	\$15,939,520	\$15,939,520	\$0
	Grand Total	\$17,229,435	\$17,229,435	\$0

8 Hour Day Budget
6 x 1 hr Drama Series
Drafted by Yvonne Collins for the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce
Prepared May 2025

Location: Assumes Metro Victoria (Shoot & Post)
Prep: 10 weeks
Shoot: 14.4 weeks (12 days per ep)
Post: 16 weeks

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
A01	STORY DEVELOPMENT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
A02	SCRIPT/DEVELOPMENT	\$620,000	\$620,000	\$0
B01	PRODUCERS	\$754,000	\$754,000	\$0
B02	DIRECTORS	\$348,085	\$317,413	(\$30,672)
E01	ATL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$825,300	\$813,780	(\$11,520)
	Total Fringes	\$366,991	\$355,852	(\$11,139)
	TOTAL ABOVE THE LINE COSTS	\$3,014,376	\$2,961,045	(\$53,331)
C01	PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT	\$871,910	\$874,810	\$2,900
C02	PRODUCTION ACCOUNTANCY	\$193,300	\$188,060	(\$5,240)
C03	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS & CONTINUITY	\$257,910	\$256,390	(\$1,520)
C04	CAMERA CREW	\$377,280	\$373,720	(\$3,560)
C05	SOUND CREW	\$85,400	\$84,740	(\$660)
C06	LIGHTING CREW	\$157,480	\$154,580	(\$2,900)
C07	GRIPS CREW	\$156,960	\$153,360	(\$3,600)
C08	COSTUME CREW	\$316,100	\$322,800	\$6,700
C09	MAKE-UP & HAIR CREW	\$170,560	\$169,820	(\$740)
C10	SFX/PROSTHETICS CREW	\$0	\$0	\$0
C11	ART DEPARTMENT CREW	\$675,740	\$672,760	(\$2,980)
C12	ACTION VEHICLES CREW	\$84,200	\$81,660	(\$2,540)
C14	CONSTRUCTION CREW	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$0
C15	SPECIAL EFFECTS CREW	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
C16	ARMOURY CREW	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
C17	WORKPLACE HEALTH & SAFETY CREW	\$88,800	\$91,120	\$2,320
C18	TUITION & TECHNICAL ADVISERS	\$31,650	\$30,410	(\$1,240)
C21	CASTING FEES	\$146,000	\$144,040	(\$1,960)
C23	SECOND UNIT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
C24	OVERTIME & LOADINGS	\$470,000	\$482,000	\$12,000
	Total Fringes	\$1,067,997	\$1,057,699	(\$10,298)
	TOTAL CREW FEES	\$5,401,287	\$5,387,969	(\$13,318)
E02	BTL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$725,000	\$720,200	(\$4,800)
E03	SUPPORT CAST	\$168,000	\$169,200	\$1,200
E05	STUNT PERFORMERS	\$38,654	\$33,302	(\$5,352)
E06	BACKGROUND EXTRAS	\$135,166	\$102,919	(\$32,247)
	Total Fringes	\$317,315	\$305,594	(\$11,721)
	TOTAL CAST FEES	\$1,384,135	\$1,331,215	(\$52,920)
F01	COSTUMES	\$191,000	\$195,400	\$4,400
F02	MAKE-UP, HAIR	\$22,700	\$24,140	\$1,440
F03	SFX/PROSTHETICS MAKEUP	\$0	\$0	\$0
G01	LOCATIONS	\$551,000	\$648,800	\$97,800
G02	STAGE RENTALS	\$0	\$0	\$0
H01	CONSTRUCTION	\$149,500	\$153,900	\$4,400
H02	PROPS & SET DRESSING	\$418,900	\$422,740	\$3,840
H03	ACTION VEHICLES & ANIMALS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
H05	ARMOURY	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$0
H06	SPECIAL EFFECTS	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0

8 Hour Day Model

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
I01	IMAGE CAPTURE	\$78,720	\$93,864	\$15,144
K01	CAMERA EQUIPMENT	\$327,850	\$385,330	\$57,480
K02	SOUND EQUIPMENT	\$39,450	\$47,250	\$7,800
K03	LIGHTING EQUIPMENT	\$157,520	\$198,400	\$40,880
K04	GRIPS EQUIPMENT	\$150,400	\$170,080	\$19,680
K05	UNIT EQUIPMENT	\$240,900	\$287,100	\$46,200
K06	SAFETY /MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$6,960	\$8,040	\$1,080
L01	RENTALS & STORAGE	\$149,700	\$179,300	\$29,600
M01	TRAVEL & TRANSPORT	\$242,300	\$270,400	\$28,100
N01	ACCOMMODATION, LIVING & CATERING	\$654,500	\$765,180	\$110,680
O01	INSURANCE	\$272,000	\$272,000	\$0
P01	OFFICE EXPENSES	\$84,000	\$98,520	\$14,520
	Total Fringes	\$9,058	\$10,030	\$972
	TOTAL PRODUCTION COSTS	\$3,965,458	\$4,449,474	\$484,016
R01	POST-PRODUCTION CREW	\$275,440	\$259,480	(\$15,960)
S01	POST-PRODUCTION RENTALS & OFFICE EXPENSES	\$86,600	\$94,760	\$8,160
T01	POST-PRODUCTION TRAVEL & ACCOMMODATION	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0
U01	IMAGE POST-PRODUCTION	\$218,240	\$218,240	\$0
U02	DIGITAL VISUAL EFFECTS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
V01	SOUND POST-PRODUCTION	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$0
W01	MUSIC	\$165,500	\$165,500	\$0
X01	PUBLICITY & STILLLS	\$100,000	\$102,400	\$2,400
	Total Fringes	\$93,985	\$90,010	(\$3,974)
	TOTAL POST COSTS	\$1,174,765	\$1,165,390	(\$9,374)
Y01	LEGAL & BUSINESS	\$699,500	\$699,500	\$0
Y03	OVERHEADS	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	\$999,500	\$999,500	\$0
Z01	SPA Levy: : 0.25% (\$999,500.00 excluded)	\$37,350	\$38,238	\$888
Z02	Contingency : 10% (\$3,360,545.48 excluded)	\$1,252,564	\$1,293,405	\$40,840
	Total Above-The-Line	\$3,014,376	\$2,961,045	(\$53,331)
	Total Below-The-Line	\$12,925,144	\$13,333,548	\$408,404
	Total Above and Below-The-Line	\$15,939,520	\$16,294,594	\$355,073
	Grand Total	\$17,229,435	\$17,626,236	\$396,801

9 DAY FORTNIGHT MODEL
6 x 1 hr Drama Series
Drafted by Yvonne Collins for the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce
Prepared May 2025

..

Location: Assumes Metro Victoria (shoot & post)
Prep: 9 weeks
(4 X 5 day weeks/5 X 4 day weeks = 40 days)
Shoot: 13.2 weeks (10 days per ep)
(7.2 X 5 day weeks/6 X 4 day weeks = 60 days)
Post: 16 weeks (currently 5 day weeks)

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
A01	STORY DEVELOPMENT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
A02	SCRIPT/DEVELOPMENT	\$620,000	\$620,000	\$0
B01	PRODUCERS	\$754,000	\$754,000	\$0
B02	DIRECTORS	\$348,085	\$349,870	\$1,785
E01	ATL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$825,300	\$827,940	\$2,640
	Total Fringes	\$366,991	\$369,369	\$2,378
	TOTAL ABOVE THE LINE COSTS	\$3,014,376	\$3,021,179	\$6,803
C01	PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT	\$871,910	\$872,110	\$200
C02	PRODUCTION ACCOUNTANCY	\$193,300	\$193,300	\$0
C03	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS & CONTINUITY	\$257,910	\$257,910	\$0
C04	CAMERA CREW	\$377,280	\$378,240	\$960
C05	SOUND CREW	\$85,400	\$85,640	\$240
C06	LIGHTING CREW	\$157,480	\$157,480	\$0
C07	GRIPS CREW	\$156,960	\$156,960	\$0
C08	COSTUME CREW	\$316,100	\$316,340	\$240
C09	MAKE-UP & HAIR CREW	\$170,560	\$171,760	\$1,200
C10	SFX/PROSTHETICS CREW	\$0	\$0	\$0
C11	ART DEPARTMENT CREW	\$675,740	\$676,940	\$1,200
C12	ACTION VEHICLES CREW	\$84,200	\$84,200	\$0
C14	CONSTRUCTION CREW	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$0
C15	SPECIAL EFFECTS CREW	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
C16	ARMOURY CREW	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
C17	WORKPLACE HEALTH & SAFETY CREW	\$88,800	\$88,800	\$0
C18	TUITION & TECHNICAL ADVISERS	\$31,650	\$31,650	\$0
C21	CASTING FEES	\$146,000	\$146,000	\$0
C23	SECOND UNIT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
C24	OVERTIME & LOADINGS	\$470,000	\$469,760	(\$240)
	Total Fringes	\$1,067,997	\$1,068,380	\$383

9 Day Fortnight Model

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
	TOTAL CREW FEES	\$5,401,287	\$5,405,470	\$4,183
E02	BTL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$725,000	\$727,400	\$2,400
E03	SUPPORT CAST	\$168,000	\$168,600	\$600
E05	STUNT PERFORMERS	\$38,654	\$38,654	\$0
E06	BACKGROUND EXTRAS	\$135,166	\$135,766	\$600
	Total Fringes	\$317,315	\$318,394	\$1,079
	TOTAL CAST FEES	\$1,384,135	\$1,388,814	\$4,679
F01	COSTUMES	\$191,000	\$193,200	\$2,200
F02	MAKE-UP, HAIR	\$22,700	\$23,420	\$720
F03	SFX/PROSTHETICS MAKEUP	\$0	\$0	\$0
G01	LOCATIONS	\$551,000	\$559,400	\$8,400
G02	STAGE RENTALS	\$0	\$0	\$0
H01	CONSTRUCTION	\$149,500	\$151,700	\$2,200
H02	PROPS & SET DRESSING	\$418,900	\$420,820	\$1,920
H03	ACTION VEHICLES & ANIMALS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
H05	ARMOURY	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$0
H06	SPECIAL EFFECTS	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0
I01	IMAGE CAPTURE	\$78,720	\$78,792	\$72
K01	CAMERA EQUIPMENT	\$327,850	\$356,590	\$28,740
K02	SOUND EQUIPMENT	\$39,450	\$43,350	\$3,900
K03	LIGHTING EQUIPMENT	\$157,520	\$177,960	\$20,440
K04	GRIPS EQUIPMENT	\$150,400	\$160,240	\$9,840
K05	UNIT EQUIPMENT	\$240,900	\$264,000	\$23,100
K06	SAFETY /MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$6,960	\$7,500	\$540
L01	RENTALS & STORAGE	\$149,700	\$164,500	\$14,800
M01	TRAVEL & TRANSPORT	\$242,300	\$255,930	\$13,630
N01	ACCOMMODATION, LIVING & CATERING	\$654,500	\$680,590	\$26,090
O01	INSURANCE	\$272,000	\$279,500	\$7,500
P01	OFFICE EXPENSES	\$84,000	\$91,260	\$7,260
	Total Fringes	\$9,058	\$9,544	\$486
	TOTAL PRODUCTION COSTS	\$3,965,458	\$4,137,296	\$171,838
R01	POST-PRODUCTION CREW	\$275,440	\$275,440	\$0
S01	POST-PRODUCTION RENTALS & OFFICE EXPENSES	\$86,600	\$90,680	\$4,080
T01	POST-PRODUCTION TRAVEL & ACCOMMODATION	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0
U01	IMAGE POST-PRODUCTION	\$218,240	\$218,240	\$0
U02	DIGITAL VISUAL EFFECTS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
V01	SOUND POST-PRODUCTION	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$0
W01	MUSIC	\$165,500	\$165,500	\$0

9 Day Fortnight Model

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
X01	PUBLICITY & STILLS	\$100,000	\$101,200	\$1,200
	Total Fringes	\$93,985	\$94,323	\$339
	TOTAL POST COSTS	\$1,174,765	\$1,180,383	\$5,619
Y01	LEGAL & BUSINESS	\$699,500	\$699,500	\$0
Y03	OVERHEADS	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	\$999,500	\$999,500	\$0
Z01	SPA Levy: : 0.25% (\$999,500.00 excluded)	\$37,350	\$37,833	\$483
Z02	Contingency : 10% (\$3,420,679.30 excluded)	\$1,252,564	\$1,271,196	\$18,632
	Total Above-The-Line	\$3,014,376	\$3,021,179	\$6,803
	Total Below-The-Line	\$12,925,144	\$13,111,463	\$186,319
	Total Above and Below-The-Line	\$15,939,520	\$16,132,642	\$193,122
	Grand Total	\$17,229,435	\$17,441,671	\$212,237

JOB SHARING MODEL
6 x 1 hr Drama Series
Drafted by Yvonne Collins for the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce
Prepared May 2025

..

Location: Assumes Metro Victoria (shoot & post)
Prep: 8 weeks
Shoot: 12 weeks (10 days per ep)
Post: 16 weeks

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
A01	STORY DEVELOPMENT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
A02	SCRIPT/DEVELOPMENT	\$620,000	\$620,000	\$0
B01	PRODUCERS	\$754,000	\$754,000	\$0
B02	DIRECTORS	\$348,085	\$348,085	\$0
E01	ATL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$825,300	\$825,300	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$366,991	\$366,991	\$0
	TOTAL ABOVE THE LINE COSTS	\$3,014,376	\$3,014,376	\$0
C01	PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT	\$871,910	\$907,030	\$35,120
C02	PRODUCTION ACCOUNTANCY	\$193,300	\$195,180	\$1,880
C03	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS & CONTINUITY	\$257,910	\$262,300	\$4,390
C04	CAMERA CREW	\$377,280	\$377,280	\$0
C05	SOUND CREW	\$85,400	\$85,400	\$0
C06	LIGHTING CREW	\$157,480	\$157,480	\$0
C07	GRIPS CREW	\$156,960	\$156,960	\$0
C08	COSTUME CREW	\$316,100	\$317,940	\$1,840
C09	MAKE-UP & HAIR CREW	\$170,560	\$170,560	\$0
C10	SFX/PROSTHETICS CREW	\$0	\$0	\$0
C11	ART DEPARTMENT CREW	\$675,740	\$678,380	\$2,640
C12	ACTION VEHICLES CREW	\$84,200	\$84,200	\$0
C14	CONSTRUCTION CREW	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$0
C15	SPECIAL EFFECTS CREW	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
C16	ARMOURY CREW	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
C17	WORKPLACE HEALTH & SAFETY CREW	\$88,800	\$88,800	\$0
C18	TUITION & TECHNICAL ADVISERS	\$31,650	\$31,650	\$0
C21	CASTING FEES	\$146,000	\$146,000	\$0
C23	SECOND UNIT	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
C24	OVERTIME & LOADINGS	\$470,000	\$470,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$1,067,997	\$1,074,320	\$6,323
	TOTAL CREW FEES	\$5,401,287	\$5,453,480	\$52,193
E02	BTL PRINCIPAL CAST	\$725,000	\$725,000	\$0
E03	SUPPORT CAST	\$168,000	\$168,000	\$0
E05	STUNT PERFORMERS	\$38,654	\$38,654	\$0
E06	BACKGROUND EXTRAS	\$135,166	\$135,166	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$317,315	\$317,315	\$0
	TOTAL CAST FEES	\$1,384,135	\$1,384,135	\$0
F01	COSTUMES	\$191,000	\$191,000	\$0
F02	MAKE-UP, HAIR	\$22,700	\$22,700	\$0
F03	SFX/PROSTHETICS MAKEUP	\$0	\$0	\$0
G01	LOCATIONS	\$551,000	\$551,000	\$0
G02	STAGE RENTALS	\$0	\$0	\$0
H01	CONSTRUCTION	\$149,500	\$149,500	\$0
H02	PROPS & SET DRESSING	\$418,900	\$418,900	\$0
H03	ACTION VEHICLES & ANIMALS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
H05	ARMOURY	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$0
H06	SPECIAL EFFECTS	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0

Job Sharing Model

Account	Description	Original	Total	Variance
I01	IMAGE CAPTURE	\$78,720	\$78,720	\$0
K01	CAMERA EQUIPMENT	\$327,850	\$327,850	\$0
K02	SOUND EQUIPMENT	\$39,450	\$39,450	\$0
K03	LIGHTING EQUIPMENT	\$157,520	\$157,520	\$0
K04	GRIPS EQUIPMENT	\$150,400	\$150,400	\$0
K05	UNIT EQUIPMENT	\$240,900	\$240,900	\$0
K06	SAFETY /MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$6,960	\$6,960	\$0
L01	RENTALS & STORAGE	\$149,700	\$149,700	\$0
M01	TRAVEL & TRANSPORT	\$242,300	\$242,300	\$0
N01	ACCOMMODATION, LIVING & CATERING	\$654,500	\$654,500	\$0
O01	INSURANCE	\$272,000	\$272,000	\$0
P01	OFFICE EXPENSES	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$9,058	\$9,058	\$0
	TOTAL PRODUCTION COSTS	\$3,965,458	\$3,965,458	\$0
R01	POST-PRODUCTION CREW	\$276,340	\$276,340	\$900
S01	POST-PRODUCTION RENTALS & OFFICE EXPENSES	\$86,600	\$86,600	\$0
T01	POST-PRODUCTION TRAVEL & ACCOMMODATION	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0
U01	IMAGE POST-PRODUCTION	\$218,240	\$218,240	\$0
U02	DIGITAL VISUAL EFFECTS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
V01	SOUND POST-PRODUCTION	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$0
W01	MUSIC	\$165,500	\$165,500	\$0
X01	PUBLICITY & STILLLS	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$93,985	\$94,248	\$263
	TOTAL POST COSTS	\$1,174,765	\$1,175,928	\$1,163
Y01	LEGAL & BUSINESS	\$699,500	\$699,500	\$0
Y03	OVERHEADS	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0
	Total Fringes	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	\$999,500	\$999,500	\$0
Z01	SPA Levy: : 0.25% (\$999,500.00 excluded)	\$37,350	\$37,483	\$133
Z02	Contingency : 10% (\$3,413,876.30 excluded)	\$1,252,564	\$1,257,900	\$5,336
	Total Above-The-Line	\$3,014,376	\$3,014,376	\$0
	Total Below-The-Line	\$12,925,144	\$12,978,501	\$53,357
	Total Above and Below-The-Line	\$15,939,520	\$15,992,877	\$53,357
	Grand Total	\$17,229,435	\$17,288,260	\$58,826

Appendix C – List of roles included in the job-sharing model

Production

Assistant production coordinator:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Allowed two additional days for crossover for prep and shoot

Production runner:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Schedules are set by duties, as directed by the production. During both prep and shoot, 1 x 1/2 day per runner per week crossover allocated for vehicle changeover

Locations

On-set locations:

- Both job-sharers attend the tech recce

Usually the first to arrive and the last to leave, this role involves some of the longest hours. In this model, shoot shifts are eight hours each with an adjustable one-hour daily crossover period as determined by the manager, where both job-sharers contribute to the production.

Unit

Assistant unit manager:

- As per on-set locations

Accounts

1st assistant accountant:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Allowed two additional days for crossover which could be worked in tandem

Assistant Directors

2nd assistant director:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Allowed additional days during prep for both to attend the tech recce
- Allowed two additional days during shoot for crossover
- Although this is a senior role, there is evidence from Europe regarding successful job-sharing of this role, given the hours can be extremely long for one person

Camera

B camera 1st assistant camera / focus puller:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Video split operator:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Sound

Boom operator:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Lighting

Lighting technician:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Grips

Best person grip:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Costume

Costume buyer:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Allowed two additional days for crossover for prep and shoot
- This role can be divided by time as well as by tasks per character

Make-up

Makeup / hair assistant:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Art

Assistant props master:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
 - Allowed two additional days for crossover for prep and shoot
- Buyer / dresser:
- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
 - Allowed one additional day for crossover during shoot

Health/ Safety

Unit nurse:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot period only
- No crossover

Editorial

Assistant editor:

- Two job-sharers working three days and two days, respectively
- Job-share shoot and post-production
- Allowed one additional day for crossover

Appendix D – Two Approaches to the 8 Hour Day

Scenario A

This scenario assumes:

- A catered breakfast on arrival
- ¾ hour lunch break
- Afternoon tea break (10 mins)

07:45	BREAKFAST STARTS	
08:00	CREW CALL	
08:15	ON SET	
	Hours worked: 08:15 - 12:30	4 hrs 15 mins
12:30 – 13:15	LUNCH BREAK (45 mins)	
	Hours worked: 13:15 - 15:15	2 hrs
15:15 – 15:25	AFTERNOON TEA BREAK (10 mins)	
	Hours worked: 15:25 - 16:45	1 hr 20 mins
16:45	WRAP	
	TOTAL HOURS WORKED	7 hrs 35 mins

Scenario B (as per award)

This scenario assumes:

- No breakfast
- Morning tea break provided
- ¾ hour lunch break
- Afternoon tea break provided

08:00	CREW CALL	
	Hours worked: 08:00 - 10:00	2 hrs
10:00 - 10:10	MORNING TEA BREAK (10 mins)	
	Hours worked: 10:10 - 12:30	2 hrs 20 mins
12:30 - 13:15	LUNCH BREAK (45 mins)	
	Hours worked: 13:15 - 15:15	2 hrs
15:15 - 15:25	AFTERNOON TEA BREAK (10 Mins)	
	Hours worked: 15:25 - 16:45	1 hr 20 mins
	TOTAL HOURS WORKED	7 hrs 40 mins

Prepared by
Racheal Rauch

Budget Modelling by
Yvonne Collins

Edited by
Zaina Ahmed

Commissioned by
Rosie Lourde
Chair of the Screen Australia Gender Matters Taskforce

