Submission to the National Cultural Policy Review

Submitted by: [redacted]

[redacted] June 2026

I am an independent screen producer and current Diversity Leadership Mentee on the [redacted] I am the Founder of [redacted] a production company in [redacted]. I have been working in the screen industry professionally since 2018. I make scripted and factual content, I have been developing projects internationally, and I am actively building in the creator economy space — which means I am navigating the gap between Australia's public funding infrastructure and the realities of digital-first production in real time.

I represent what I would describe as the 'middle majority' of our industry, early to mid-career practitioners, those with less than 2 long form credits, likely solo-preneurs doing everything by themselves collaborating with individual creatives, and have been working in the industry for 10 years or less.

I am writing this submission because I am burnt out, and I do not think I should be. I have done everything right. I have accessed the programs, built the networks, developed the projects, and put in the years. And the numbers still do not add up.

This is not a personal failure. It is a structural one. And it is one that is quietly losing the industry the exact kind of practitioners it most needs to retain.

Part One: The Creator Economy Gap

The creator economy — YouTube, TikTok, podcasting, Substack, and adjacent platforms — is the fastest-growing segment of the screen industry. Australian producers are in it right now, building IP, structuring co-productions, and negotiating deals that have no equivalent in traditional screen production. Yet the policy and funding frameworks that govern our industry were built for a world that no longer fully applies.

The result is a structural gap. Producers are solving the same novel problems independently, with no shared frameworks, no legal precedent, and no guidance from funding bodies or industry associations. Entertainment lawyers are being asked questions they have never encountered. Creators need speed, flexibility, and an iterative process. Traditional institutions are slow, inflexible, and speak a different language. Nobody is convening the conversation.

> *This submission calls for that conversation to be formally convened — and for the National Cultural Policy to create the conditions in which it can produce practical outcomes.*

Pillar 3 & 4 — Centrality of the Artist / Strong Cultural Infrastructure

RECOMMENDATION 1 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 4

Establish a Creator Economy Working Group

THE PROBLEM	There is no industry framework for digital-first co-productions, revenue-sharing structures, creator agreements, or platform-specific IP strategies. Producers, creators, lawyers, and funding bodies are each solving the same problems in isolation. The cost of this fragmentation is falling on the most under-resourced practitioners.
THE ASK	**Fund a time-limited, practitioner-led working group — hosted within Screen Australia or a peak body such as SPA — to develop model contract clauses, deal frameworks, and practical guidance for producers entering the creator economy. Modelled on the methodology of Screen Australia's private investment toolkit, which successfully bridged the language gap between investors and producers.**

RECOMMENDATION 2 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 4

Introduce Multi-Year, Performance-Linked Funding for Digital Channels

THE PROBLEM	Online production funding currently operates on a seasonal model — fund a slate of episodes, deliver, done. But platform algorithms reward consistent publishing over months and years. A channel that launches with four episodes and then goes quiet is algorithmically penalised regardless of quality. A one-off production grant produces a dead channel.
THE ASK	**Organise a review to consider including multi-year funding cycles (minimum 3 years) for digital-first projects, with performance-linked renewal criteria based on audience growth metrics. A review should also consider whether a growth-round mechanism — where channels that demonstrate traction can access follow-on investment without restarting the application process — could work within the Australian funding context, though this model carries trade-offs (fewer larger investments versus more smaller ones) that warrant careful examination.**

RECOMMENDATION 3 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 4

Make Funding Acknowledgement Obligations Flexible for Digital Content

THE PROBLEM	Screen Australia and state agency logo obligations typically require acknowledgement cards at the start of content. On digital platforms, this materially harms retention — the primary metric by which algorithms determine whether content is promoted or suppressed. A video that drops 40% of its audience in the first 30 seconds because of an obligation card is a video the algorithm will bury. The funding that was meant to support the project is actively harming its reach.
THE ASK	**No removal required — simply flexibility. Allow funded digital-first projects to place acknowledgements in end cards, video descriptions, or pinned comments rather than mandating opening placement. This is a minor administrative change with zero budget impact and a potentially significant effect on the reach of publicly funded content.**

RECOMMENDATION 4 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 4

Extend the Producer Offset to Digital-First Content

THE PROBLEM	The Producer Offset does not clearly accommodate digital-first content. Animated content especially is one of YouTube's highest-performing content categories — particularly in kids' and family — and one of the most capital-intensive formats to produce. It requires skilled artists, composers, voice talent, and post-production infrastructure. It generates long-tail revenue and builds internationally licensable IP. It is precisely what the offset was designed to support.
THE ASK	**Clarify and extend offset eligibility to include more digital-first projects. Additionally, develop a fast-track funding pathway for individual creator-animators who have demonstrated audience traction — removing the assumption that all eligible projects have a broadcaster, co-producer, or development history behind them.**

Case Study: Gecko's Garage is a children's animation channel with over four million YouTube subscribers and billions of views. It was built by a solo creator working a day job, animating in spare time, using freelance artists sourced on Fiverr. The IP was acquired by Moonbug Entertainment — the company behind Cocomelon — which was later acquired by Candle Media for approximately US$3 billion. This model — solo creator, no broadcaster, no co-producer, digital-only distribution — is the dominant origin story of the most valuable kids' IP being created right now. Australian public funding infrastructure is structurally unable to support a creator at this stage. The question is not whether Australian creators can build IP at this scale. The question is whether we are building the conditions for them to do it here.

RECOMMENDATION 5 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 4

Develop a Kids' Digital Content Strategy That Reflects Platform Reality

THE PROBLEM	Content designated 'Made for Kids' on YouTube operates under COPPA restrictions that disable targeted advertising, remove comments, and limit the engagement signals the algorithm uses for discovery. This dramatically reduces both monetisation and visibility. Australian funding bodies have historically prioritised kids' content — yet they are directing investment toward the platform where kids' content faces the greatest structural disadvantage. The ACTF and Screen Australia's IP incubator invests approximately $340,000 per channel — enough to produce roughly 30 minutes of content at modest scale. This limits participation to minimal-overhead operations and is insufficient for more ambitious concepts.
THE ASK	**Commission a dedicated kids' digital content strategy that honestly confronts platform constraints, investment levels, and what sustainable kids' channels actually require to grow. Explore whether alternative distribution strategies, hybrid models, or platform advocacy through YouTube Australia can improve commercial conditions for funded kids' content.**

RECOMMENDATION 6 · PILLAR 3

Updater Terms of Trade Between Producers and Broadcasters For Digital Rights Carve-Outs

THE PROBLEM	Broadcasters and streamers commissioning Australian content are increasingly acquiring all digital and platform rights — YouTube channels, TikTok presence, social audience, merchandise — as standard deal terms. These are not ancillary rights. They are where the primary long-term value of screen IP will be extracted over the next two decades. Producers who sign away digital rights today are making the same mistake musicians made with record labels in the 1990s — not because they are naive, but because there is no industry standard protecting them.
THE ASK	**The National Cultural Policy should direct peak bodies to develop formal positions and model deal terms protecting producers' digital rights in broadcaster negotiations. A producer who arrives at a commission with a full digital growth strategy — platform roadmap, audience development plan, revenue model — is delivering demonstrable commercial value beyond the broadcast window. That should be recognised as a negotiating position, not absorbed as a standard term.**

Part Two: Cultural Infrastructure

I want to speak plainly about my experience as an Australian cinema audience member, because I think it reflects something systemic. I am underwhelmed. I regularly feel like there is nothing I actually want to go and see. I do not watch free-to-air television, so I do not see film advertising there. I use ad blockers, so paid digital ads largely do not reach me. And when I want to give feedback to my local cinema — about what I want to see, what is not being programmed, what would bring me back more often — I do not know how. There is no obvious feedback form. Direct contact details are hard to find. I have almost never received a response.

Another thing that doesn't get enough attention in policy discussions is how consistently Australia has been treated as a dumping ground for international rights. We are a small population, yes — but population alone should not determine the value of a rights territory. Israel has a comparable population to Australia, and the value placed on rights sold into that market is significantly higher. Why is that?

Part of the answer is that Australia has historically accepted being undervalued because we haven't built the domestic infrastructure, the export relationships, or the negotiating leverage to push back. When you have no export body, no bilateral film agreements, and no systematic approach to reaching Australians overseas, you are not a market — you are a remainder. This policy review is an opportunity to change that.

The following recommendations echo and support the extensive analysis undertaken by Kate Separovich's Australia in Cinemas newsletter, which has produced the most thorough public examination of the structural challenges facing Australian cinema in recent years. I commend that body of work and her Submission to the National Cultural Policy Review to the Panel.

Pillar 4 — Strong Cultural Infrastructure

RECOMMENDATION 7 · PILLAR 4 · PILLAR 5

Treat Cinemas as Cultural Infrastructure, Not Commercial Venues

THE PROBLEM	Australian cinemas — particularly independent cinemas — are not simply commercial operations. They are the primary public venue through which Australian stories reach Australian audiences at scale. Yet they receive none of the infrastructure support, rates relief, or programming obligations that we extend to art galleries, libraries, or theatres. Two of Australia's three major cinema chains are foreign-owned and have no obligation to programme Australian content. 32 Australian fiction films were released in our cinemas last year out of 840 total releases.
THE ASK	**Introduce content obligations for exhibitors, capital investment support for independent cinemas, and tax and rates relief that recognises cinema's function as public cultural infrastructure. Explore guaranteed minimum screening periods for Australian films — Malaysia's Skim Wajib Tayang (Compulsory Screening Scheme) is a useful reference point: it mandates that approved local films receive at least 14 consecutive days in cinemas' main halls. Adapting a version of this model for Australia would give Australian films a fighting chance against the structural weight of foreign studio releases.**

RECOMMENDATION 8 · PILLAR 4 · PILLAR 5

Learn from China's Cultural Precinct Infrastructure Model

THE PROBLEM	China's urban planning policy requires every new township to include a cultural precinct — library, cinema, community spaces, art gallery. The result: in the first half of 2025 alone, China added 3,352 new cinema screens — roughly 18-19 per day. This is not a film industry policy. It is a planning and infrastructure policy that treats culture as a non-negotiable component of community development.
THE ASK	**Commission a feasibility review into cultural precinct requirements for new Australian urban developments, with particular attention to the viability of community cinema infrastructure. Even a modest version of this model — requiring cultural space in major new developments above a certain scale — would materially improve the distribution of screen cultural infrastructure across the country.**

RECOMMENDATION 9 · PILLAR 4 · PILLAR 5

Build a Significant Australian Content Market

THE PROBLEM	Australia has no content market of the scale of AFM, the European Film Market, or Cannes Marché du Film. Given the volume of production activity in Australia — amplified by the Location Offset attracting major international productions — the absence of a significant content marketplace represents a missed commercial and cultural opportunity. We are hosting the infrastructure for international production without capturing the market activity that should accompany it.

	There is an opportunity for the market to take place between November and April where there has historically been a 'dead zone' trade in the screen sector. American Film Market is in November, Cannes is in April, so what about Australian films that need to be financed for that 6 month gap under the strict application deadlines that Screen Australia now has?
THE ASK	**Invest in developing an Australian content market of genuine international scale — either as a standalone event or as an expansion of existing market activity at MIFF 37 South, Screen Forever or the Sydney Film Festival. Engage Screen Australia, state agencies, and AFIN to assess feasibility and identify the international partnerships that would give such a market immediate credibility.**

RECOMMENDATION 10 · PILLAR 4

Reinstate Community Television Broadcasting Licences in Queensland

THE PROBLEM	The loss of community television broadcasting licences in Queensland has removed an important entry point for emerging practitioners and a distinctive voice in the local media landscape. Community television has historically functioned as a training ground, a platform for underrepresented voices, and a genuine expression of local cultural identity — values that align directly with the pillars of this policy.
THE ASK	**Reinstate community television broadcasting licences in Queensland and review the national community television landscape with a view to supporting its long-term sustainability as part of Australia's cultural infrastructure.**

Part Three: Education, Access, and Application Timelines

Pillar 3 — Centrality of the Artist

RECOMMENDATION 11 · PILLAR 3

Require Publicly Funded Film Schools to Teach Industry Infrastructure

THE PROBLEM	Students graduating from publicly funded film schools — with the exception of AFTRS and a small number of prestigious metropolitan institutions — frequently have no working knowledge of Australia's public screen funding infrastructure. They enter the industry without understanding Screen Australia, state agency programs, offset mechanisms, or co-production treaties. Given that the Australian screen industry is structurally dependent on this public infrastructure, graduating practitioners who cannot navigate it is a significant and avoidable failure.
THE ASK	**Require all publicly funded tertiary film and screen programs to include a mandatory curriculum module covering Australia's public screen funding infrastructure — funding pathways, offset mechanisms, A-Z budgeting, finance plans, key agencies, and application processes. This is low-cost to implement, requires no new funding, and would significantly improve the pipeline of informed practitioners entering the industry.**

RECOMMENDATION 12 · PILLAR 3

Introduce Greater Private Sector Investment Incentives

THE PROBLEM	Australia's screen industry is heavily reliant on public funding. Private investment — outside of the offset — plays a marginal role compared to comparable markets. The 10BA tax concession era demonstrated that well-designed private investment incentives can generate significant volume and creative output. Since its removal, no equivalent mechanism has emerged. There are new financial models that make investing into the screen sector attractive such as investment funds that are put into a portfolio of projects rather than individual ones.
THE ASK	**Develop updated private sector investment incentives for Australian screen projects — potentially including co-investment matching programs, equity incentives, consider emerging forms of diversified investment, or a revived form of tax-advantaged investment — to diversify the funding base and reduce the industry's structural dependence on public funding.**

RECOMMENDATION 13 · PILLAR 3

Reduce Application Processing Timelines

THE PROBLEM	The current turnaround times for funding applications are not compatible with the commercial realities of independent production. I am ready to take a project into production right now — in June 2026 — and the next realistic production window I can access is around April 2027, once application, assessment, and contracting timelines are factored in. For a sole-operator production company, sustaining a viable business during that wait is not feasible. Projects are falling through not because they lack merit, but because time is killing them.
THE ASK	**Commission a review of application processing timelines across Screen Australia and state agencies, with a target of reducing average turnaround to 90 days for standard applications. Explore fast-track pathways for projects with prior funding histories, proven track records, or time-sensitive commercial opportunities.**

Part Four: Producer Sustainability

This section speaks plainly to something the industry rarely says plainly: the business logic of being an independent screen producer in Australia often does not add up. Talented people are quietly leaving. The ones who stay are frequently subsidising the industry with their own time, their own fees, and their own mental health.

This is not a personal complaint. It is a structural failure with measurable consequences for the quality and diversity of Australian storytelling. The following recommendations address it directly.

Pillar 3 — Centrality of the Artist

RECOMMENDATION 14 · PILLAR 3

Reform the Producer Offset to Reflect Its Original Purpose

THE PROBLEM	The Producer Offset was designed to enable producers to reinvest in their own projects and build sustainable businesses. In practice, the combination of offset recoupment, reinvestment obligations, and distribution costs means that producers take home a fraction of what the headline numbers suggest. I have spent six years developing and delivering a film and cleared approximately $75,000 after reinvestment. The offset is functioning as an industry subsidy mechanism — not as a producer sustainability tool. Something is wrong when the numbers do not add up after that amount of work.
THE ASK	**Review the Producer Offset with the explicit goal of restoring its function as a producer sustainability mechanism. This should include examining recoupment waterfall structures, reinvestment obligations, and whether the current design is inadvertently shifting financial risk onto the very practitioners it was meant to support.**

RECOMMENDATION 15 · PILLAR 3

Introduce a Development Living Stipend for Independent Producers

THE PROBLEM	Development is the highest-risk and lowest-compensated phase of production — and where the most important creative decisions are made. I have spent years in development on projects, frequently working without pay, subsidising the pipeline that the entire industry depends on. This is not unusual. It is the norm for independent producers in Australia, and it is quietly driving talented people out of the sector.
THE ASK	**Introduce a modest development living stipend for independent producers with demonstrated development activity — not a project grant, but a basic income support mechanism tied to active development work. Ireland's Basic Income for the Arts scheme — now made permanent as the first of its kind in the world — provides a clear evidence base: participants spent more time creating, produced more work, and reported significantly reduced financial stress. A screen-specific equivalent, even at modest scale, would be one of the highest-leverage investments the government could make in the long-term health of the Australian production pipeline.**

RECOMMENDATION 16 · PILLAR 3

Stop Requiring Producers to Compete Against Their Own Projects

THE PROBLEM	The current funding round structure can place a producer's multiple projects in direct competition with each other within the same assessment round. This is not a minor administrative inconvenience — it actively penalises prolific producers and distorts funding decisions. A producer with two strong projects should not have to choose which one to enter.
THE ASK	**Review Screen Australia funding round eligibility rules to ensure that a single producer's projects are not assessed in direct competition with each other. Where a producer has multiple eligible projects, assess each on its own merits or consider a per-producer cap that is applied fairly rather than forcing artificial competition between a practitioner's own work.**

RECOMMENDATION 17 · PILLAR 3

Create Fast-Track Pathways for Time-Critical Documentary Production

THE PROBLEM	Documentary production is uniquely time-sensitive. I have experienced firsthand how access to a subject, a moment, or an unfolding event cannot be deferred by ten weeks while an application is assessed. International co-productions are becoming more attractive given the contracting market landscape, as producers can share resources across borders, so greater investment should be directed at streamlining co-productions. Yet I was confused to see that multiple territories that Australia has signed treaties or MOUs with have not been triggered in multiple years. Malaysia being one of them. I set up multiple meetings with Screen Australia to acquire procedural information about Malaysia-Australia co-productions. I was given conflicting advice from the Producer Offset and Co-Production Unit and the Documentary Unit. A co-production I was developing with a Malaysian partner would have taken approximately 10 weeks simply to receive approval to proceed followed by a contracting process that has historically taken 2-3 months. This resulted in a $1.27M loss to the Australian economy. Australia was and continues to be, the slowest part of the process. These kinds of conditions destroy momentum, partner confidence, and sometimes the project entirely. Documentary is also frequently ineligible for PDV rebates as a footloose production, removing tools that fiction producers can access.
THE ASK	**Create a dedicated fast-track assessment pathway for documentary projects with demonstrated time-critical filming requirements. Target a maximum 3-week turnaround for preliminary go/no-go decisions, with full assessment to follow. Additionally, review PDV rebate eligibility for documentary to address the current gap that disadvantages factual producers. Finally, synergise the local production department and co-production unit guidelines with clear written timelines and explanation of steps required to fulfil eligibility and review the existing guidelines to streamline international co-productions to become more viable. Conduct a review of all Australian co-production treaties signed to assess what makes them prohibitive and make changes to make them more viable for greater cross-territory collaboration.**

RECOMMENDATION 18 · PILLAR 3

Invest in Wellbeing and Business Support Services for Screen Practitioners

THE PROBLEM	The mental health and business sustainability challenges facing independent screen producers are significant and under-acknowledged. Sole operators carry creative, commercial, legal, and administrative responsibilities simultaneously — often without the business literacy infrastructure that practitioners in other sectors take for granted. Programs like BeyondBlue's NewAccess Small Business Coaching provide evidence-based support that is directly relevant to this cohort.
THE ASK	**Provide subsidised access to business coaching and mental health support services for screen practitioners — either through direct investment in sector-specific programs or through Medicare-style rebates for CPD with accredited creative business coaches. Extend government rebates to enable qualified creative business coaches to deliver training at publicly funded film schools. This is low-cost, high-impact, and addresses a genuine gap that the industry rarely discusses publicly.**

RECOMMENDATION 19 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 4

Reinstate Merger and Consolidation Support Funding

THE PROBLEM	The merger of BearCage, WildFury, and ContentMint into Wildbear Entertainment through a Screen Australia Enterprise fund demonstrated the commercial and creative value of consolidation support — enabling the creation of a genuinely competitive factual production powerhouse. Mechanisms that supported this kind of strategic consolidation no longer exist in their previous form.
THE ASK	**Reinstate funding mechanisms that support strategic mergers and consolidations among independent production companies. The goal is not to reduce competition but to create companies of sufficient scale to compete internationally, absorb risk, and sustain the infrastructure needed to develop and produce ambitious projects.**

RECOMMENDATION 20 · PILLAR 3

Create Formal Pathways for Producers to Work with Brand Partners

THE PROBLEM	Brand partnership and branded content represents a significant and growing revenue stream for screen practitioners globally. In Australia, the lack of formal frameworks, training, or industry guidance around producer-brand collaboration means that practitioners are either leaving this revenue on the table or navigating it informally without the commercial and legal tools to do so effectively. As public funding becomes more competitive, diversified revenue — including brand partnership — is increasingly essential for producer sustainability.
THE ASK	**Invest in training, model agreements, and industry guidance that enables screen producers to engage with brand partners professionally and commercially. This could sit within the proposed Creator Economy Working Group or as a standalone program. The goal is to ensure that producers who want to access brand revenue have the tools to do so without requiring expensive specialist advice for every engagement.**

Part Five: Reaching Audiences in a Fragmented Landscape

Publicly funded Australian content that fails to reach an audience is a waste of public money. Yet we consistently underinvest in the audience development side of the equation — in marketing, in discovery, in digital distribution strategy, and in the training that would equip practitioners to build audiences directly.

Pillar 5 — Engaging the Audience

RECOMMENDATION 21 · PILLAR 5

Invest in Organic and Digital-First Marketing for Australian Screen

THE PROBLEM	A significant share of Australian cinema's potential audience — people who do not watch free-to-air television, who use ad blockers, who consume content primarily through streaming and social platforms — is effectively invisible to most Australian film marketing. I am one of those people. Paid advertising campaigns on traditional channels simply do not reach me or the people I know. The result is that Australians who would genuinely embrace Australian stories never know they exist.
THE ASK	**Invest in organic, digital-first marketing capability across the sector — training practitioners in social content, personal branding, working with influencers, short-form hooks, and platform-native audience development. Fund a sustained national awareness campaign for Australian screen content that operates natively on the platforms where audiences actually spend their time. Marketing investment should be treated as a production-equivalent line item, not an afterthought.**

RECOMMENDATION 22 · PILLAR 5 · PILLAR 4

Build Direct Feedback Channels Between Audiences and Cinemas

THE PROBLEM	I want to engage with my local cinema. I want to tell them what I would go and see, what is missing from their programming, what would bring me in more often. I cannot. There is no clear, consistent way to do this. Feedback forms are hard to find if they exist at all. When I have tried to make contact, I have rarely received a response. The relationship between cinema and community is almost entirely one-directional — and it does not need to be.
THE ASK	**Require publicly supported cinemas to implement and publicise direct audience feedback mechanisms — simple, actively monitored, and taken seriously. Invest in community engagement programs that involve local audiences in programming decisions. A cinema that listens to its community programmes differently, and programmes better.**

RECOMMENDATION 23 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 5

Train Traditional Producers and Filmmakers to Work in the Creator Economy	
THE PROBLEM	Traditional screen practitioners possess skills — long-form storytelling, research depth, production infrastructure, rights management — that the creator economy genuinely needs. Creator economy practitioners possess skills — audience development, platform fluency, iterative production, community engagement — that traditional producers genuinely need. These two groups are not competitors. They are natural collaborators who currently lack the structures and forums to work together. I see this gap constantly in my own practice.
THE ASK	**Invest in forums, workshops, and structured collaboration programs that bring traditional producers and filmmakers together with creator economy practitioners. Programs like those run at Screen Queensland and VicScreen have demonstrated this model works and should be expanded nationally. Additionally, invest in training for traditional producers in YouTube strategy, personal branding, short-form content, and repackaging existing libraries for platform distribution — the attention lives online now, and our practitioners need to know how to work there.**

RECOMMENDATION 24 · PILLAR 3 · PILLAR 5 Formally Recognise Creators as Screen Producers — and Build the Bridges	
THE PROBLEM	Content creators are screen producers. They pitch, develop, produce, distribute, and build audiences for screen content — often with lower budgets and higher efficiency than traditional production. Yet the institutional infrastructure of the Australian screen industry — peak bodies, funding agencies, industry events — largely treats the creator economy and the traditional screen sector as separate worlds. They are not. Create AU, Australia's leading creator conference, is now one of the most significant screen industry events in the country by audience size and commercial activity. SPA, AIDC, and Screen Forever largely operate in a parallel universe.
THE ASK	**Peak bodies and funding agencies should formalise their engagement with the creator economy — including representation of creators in industry bodies, partnerships with events like Create AU, and policy frameworks that explicitly recognise creator-producers as screen industry practitioners. The cultural and commercial future of Australian screen sits at this intersection. We should be building the bridge, not maintaining the divide.**

Closing

These recommendations are by no means prescriptive but I really do hope I have outlined a number of issues and conversations that are happening informally and expensively across the sector.

What my submission to the National Cultural Policy Review puts forward ultimately, is an invitation to convene a number of critical conversations and a willingness to look at the industry as it is.

The creator economy is not coming, it is here.

The cinema landscape is not declining, it is being structurally neglected.

Independent producers are not struggling because they lack talent, they are struggling because the frameworks meant to support them have not kept pace with the reality of their work.

I have experienced this firsthand. I am also optimistic that it is fixable.

The policy settings and ideas that have worked, some which have been named in this submission, demonstrate that targeted, well-designed support produces real outcomes.

We do not need to start from scratch. We need to be honest about what is broken and willing to fix it.

I remain available to discuss any of these recommendations further and welcome the opportunity to contribute to the ongoing policy development process.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

June 2026