Manatū Taonga
Ministry for Culture & Heritage

Film Co-production Agreements Review

Prepared by

Fiona Gregson, Media Sector Team
Ministry for Culture and Heritage

May 2012

Contents

Executive summary

New Zealand's co-production agreements serve both diplomatic as well as screen industry interests. The screen sector benefits from access to larger markets (for film and television distribution) and the ability to leverage foreign investment. However, legal and financial complexities limit the possible volume of activity.

In comparison with domestic feature films, official film co-productions have larger budgets (almost double those of domestic feature films); earn greater revenues (almost four times as much) and attract larger amounts of offshore funding (over four times as much). New Zealand does comparatively well with 54 percent of budget spend occurring in New Zealand.

However, official film co-productions are also complex legally and financially, are only worthwhile for budgets greater than $5 million, require skills and time to negotiate, and require shared stories and suitably experienced writers.

From a cultural perspective, co-production agreements operate on a 'principle of balance', which means that, while individual projects might not represent one of the partner countries; over the life of a treaty both countries will benefit from the use of their own cultural and creative output. In New Zealand's case this principle has generally proven to be correct.

New Zealand should continue to negotiate film co-production agreements, but seek to target countries that have more restrictive markets and/or the greatest scope for joint creative projects (in addition to other criteria). In addition, more information should be made available to producers through the New Zealand Film Commission's (NZFC) website on how to undertake co-productions, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade's (MFAT) posts should be used to promote the agreements, the screen industry should be informed earlier about co-production agreements under negotiation, and the 'double dipping' prohibition for accessing the Screen Production Incentive Fund (SPIF) and NZ On Air funding should be removed.

Introduction

Film co-production agreements are generally treaty-level documents[1] setting out two governments' desire to facilitate cooperation between their respective film and television industries and to assist those industries to grow. The idea of cultural exchange is also central to the agreements.

Film co-production agreements allow approved film and television projects to gain the status of "official co-productions". This status entitles a co-production film or television project to the benefits accorded to national films and television programmes in each of the co-producers' countries, for example access to funding and incentives within the existing legislation of each country. It is also common for the agreements to include provision for three way co-productions, if one of the countries entering the agreement has an existing treaty with the third country.

New Zealand first began negotiating film co-production agreements in the mid 1980s. Since then, New Zealand has enacted 13 bilateral agreements with Australia, Canada, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Singapore, Germany, Ireland, Spain, India, South

[1] A treaty is a legal instrument that is legally binding under international law. Arrangements are legal instruments that are of less-than-treaty status. Of New Zealand's 13 co-production agreements, 11 have treaty status and two are arrangements (Australia and France).

Africa, Korea (for feature films only), and China (for feature films only). New Zealand also has two non-binding co-operative arrangements for audio-visual industry co-operation, with the Republic of Korea and Hong Kong.

Twenty years on, it is timely for a review to be carried out of the economic and cultural value to New Zealand of the agreements. In undertaking a review, a number of questions arise, such as, how many films and television programmes have resulted from the agreements? Have these been mainly New Zealand stories, or stories from the partner country? What economic benefit has there been to New Zealand from activity under the agreements? What opportunities have there been for New Zealand cast and crew? And perhaps most importantly, how might New Zealand be more strategic in its approach to negotiating these agreements in the future?

This review of New Zealand's film co-production agreements seeks to answer these questions. It is one component of a joint Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH) / Ministry of Economic Development (MED) work programme examining government involvement in the screen sector in support of both cultural and economic outcomes. Other aspects of the work programme include the government response to the Jackson/Court review of the NZFC, and evaluations of the Large Budget Screen Production Grant and SPIF.

Methodology

The review has been led by MCH (Fiona Gregson), in conjunction with MED, assisted by the NZFC. Information collected to inform the review has included qualitative information in the form of interviews, and quantitative information in the form of data from NZFC, Screen Australia and Telefilm Canada, as well as internet-based research. Information was gathered over the period November 2011 to March 2012. A full list of interviewees is included as an Annex to the report.

Overview of film co-production agreements

Co-production agreements enable approved joint film or television projects to gain "official co-production" status. This status gives co-production film and television-makers access to funding and incentives in line with those available for 'national' films and television programmes in each country. They also make the process of production easier by facilitating temporary immigration and importation of equipment – within existing regulations.

In the case of New Zealand, official co-productions automatically meet the 'local content test' under the SPIF, which is aimed at supporting medium and larger scale New Zealand cultural screen content, and administered by the NZFC. In effect, a New Zealand co-production is a 'New Zealand film' or 'New Zealand television programme' as well as being an official film or television programme of the partner country. Should the project meet enough points under the remaining SPIF criteria, it can qualify for up to $6 million if a film, or $3 million if a television programme. In addition, film co-productions can qualify for investment from the NZFC.

Official co-production status also ensures the film or television programme qualifies for local content quotas – while New Zealand does not have quotas, many of New Zealand's treaty partners do, including Australia, Canada and China (thereby avoiding China's tight restrictions on levels of foreign content).

Other than providing access to financial incentives and market entry to other jurisdictions, co-production agreements facilitate both temporary immigration for cast and crew, and the importation of equipment.

The nature of co-production agreements as international treaties also means they have wider benefits for New Zealand's international relations. It will be significant, for example, if New Zealand concludes negotiations with China for a television co-production agreement in the near future, as that will make New Zealand the first country to enter into a co-production agreement with China covering television (New Zealand currently has a co-production agreement covering feature films only). This 'first country' status would provide New Zealand with diplomatic advantages with China in addition to access to the one of the world's largest markets.

In New Zealand the key agencies for film co-production agreements[2] are MCH, as lead policy agency, MFAT, as lead negotiations agency, and NZFC as the 'competent authority' – the formal term for the agency responsible for certifying official co-productions in a country.

Unofficial co-productions

It is important to note that there is another category of co-productions known as 'unofficial co-productions'. These are film or television productions made by two or more countries outside the auspices of a film co-production agreement. As such, the combination of creative and financial contribution is determined by the parties involved. Unofficial co-productions are not eligible for many of the benefits provided to official co-productions, including access to some financial incentives. Producers enter into unofficial co-productions when there is no treaty in place, or when it proves too difficult to get approval, or the required level of financing, for an official co-production.

The 2010/11 Screen Industry Survey, released in April 2012, collected data on international co-productions for the first time. The data captures both official and unofficial co-productions, and encompasses anything falling within the definition of a screen production, including television commercials. In 2011, New Zealand companies participated in 120 works with international partners. That activity was fairly evenly spilt between Asia, Australia and North America, followed by the United Kingdom and Europe.

It would be inaccurate to discount the number of official co-productions in 2011 (three) from the figure of 120 to get the level of unofficial co-productions, as production is defined in the survey as "all work leading up to and including filming; this includes development, pre-production and principal photography". Film and television projects are therefore counted by their component parts, rather than as whole productions.

What the data does show is that a considerable amount of unofficial co-production activity is occurring between New Zealand producers and their offshore counterparts in addition to the official co-production activity.

While this review is focused on official co-production agreements, a key aspect of considering the value of those is the extent to which official co-production activity might be offsetting activity that would otherwise occur on an unofficial basis. In that respect, the qualitative information drawn from interviews with film and television producers provides the best insights. This information shows some evidence of co-production

[2] New Zealand's uses the term 'film co-production agreement' to encompass both film and television, and negotiates agreements on this basis.

agreements being critical to film or television productions being made, with several producers saying that was the case for their projects (with these interviewees representing at least six feature films and four television series). However, other producers said co-production agreements were helpful but not critical and their projects would still have proceeded, albeit on a smaller budget or made in a different way.

This issue is further explored in the sections on economic value and barriers.

Activity under New Zealand's co-production agreements

New Zealand's first official co-production was the 1988 feature film *The Navigator*, co-produced with Australia, and directed by New Zealand director Vincent Ward. As at March 2012, there had been a total of 58 official co-productions, 21 of which were feature films, 34 television dramas and three television documentaries. Of the 58, 12 might be said to be portraying a New Zealand story; but they all involve New Zealand 'creatives', such as directors and producers, as well as New Zealand cast and crew.

New Zealand's preferred co-production partner thus far has been Canada – of the 58 co-productions, 24 have been with Canada. This is followed by the United Kingdom (19), Australia (10), France (5) and Germany (4). This can be partly explained by the availability of subsidies for co-productions in the partner countries with Canada, the United Kingdom and Germany particularly being known for their government incentives. In recent years, this has changed somewhat as factors such as the global financial crisis has led to the UK and Germany tightening their criteria for investing in film and television.

Another factor in the choice of co-production partners has been those countries with English as a shared language, and natural shared storytelling opportunities, which explains the higher number of co-productions with Canada and the United Kingdom, and the lack of activity under some of the European treaties, including Italy and Spain.

There is less activity under New Zealand's co-production agreement with Australia than might be expected, given the geographic proximity and close economic and trade relationship between the two countries. There have been 10 film and television co-productions between New Zealand and Australia (one of these being a three-way co-production with France) since the first New Zealand co-production in 1988, out of a total of 58 (or 17 percent of all New Zealand's co-productions).

Interview findings suggest a number of reasons for this. A number of interviewees noted the different cultures of Australia and New Zealand, as well as a lack of shared stories, and a lack of curiosity about each other's stories (demonstrated by general lack of popularity of New Zealand films in Australia, and, to a lesser degree, Australian films in New Zealand). The rivalry between the two countries was also mentioned, and the problem that joint co-productions can be seen as taking money away from each other. Finally, there were comments that while the treaty itself has not been used much, there is considerable movement of 'key creatives', cast and crew between the two countries, as well as a number of unofficial co-productions that occur.

International context

Notably, the home of the world's largest film and television industry, the United States, does not have any co-production agreements. This can be explained by the relative size and strength of its screen industry. In many ways film co-production agreements (alongside government subsidies) have been a means for the screen industries in the rest of the world to compete with the United States.

By way of contrast, the United States' closest neighbour, Canada, is widely considered to be the world leader in co-production agreements. Canada has also been one of New Zealand's main co-production partners (with 24 projects since 1988), alongside the United Kingdom, Australia and Germany.

Canada

Canada began negotiating film co-production agreements in 1963 and, with 49 treaties and memoranda of understanding with 53 partners[3], is known as the international leader in co-productions. This is perhaps not surprising given its close proximity to the United States; Canada has used treaties strategically as a means of helping its screen industry compete with the large budgets of the Hollywood studios.

A particular feature of the Canadian industry is the two screen industries that exist in the country – an English-language industry competing directly with the United States to sell content to its domestic audience, and the French-language industry based in Quebec. Of the two, the Quebec audience is interested in seeing Quebec content, whereas the wider English audience is less interested in seeing Canadian content over content from other countries, particularly the United States.

Quebec audiences for Quebec films have been compared to New Zealand audiences for New Zealand films – they are keen to see their films at the cinema.

Canadian Heritage, the government department in Canada with lead responsibility for film co-production agreements, has also embarked on a review of its treaty co-production programme. This review came about as Canadian Heritage identified a declining trend in activity under its treaties, which led to a need to assess how Canada might continue to position itself as a preferred co-production partner.

Canadian Heritage's initial work has found there have been significant economic benefits from its co-production treaties eg, Canada's co-productions have average budgets of (CAN$) $7 million, compared to (CAN$) $1.6 million for domestic productions; and in the 2000-2009 period 795 projects were made under Canada's co-production treaties, with total production budgets of around (CAN$) $5.5 billion. Also, it has found co-productions have brought important cultural benefits such as increased levels of Canadian content, and greater audience reach compared to domestic productions.

Canadian Heritage has identified three key factors which have contributed to a decline in its co-production activity. They are:

- an international trend of rising production costs, leading to increased competition for co-production opportunities in order to secure higher levels of financing

- changes in policy settings in competitor countries to favour domestic productions (eg changes to UK tax credit rules that are less favourable for co-productions); and

[3] Canada has 49 co-production agreements with 53 partners due to Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro and Slovenia being covered by the agreement originally negotiated with the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

- a rapidly changing environment whereby co-productions are competing against an increasing array of audio-visual content, including downloaded and streamed content and through devices such as tablets and mobile phones

Canadian Heritage has identified options for addressing these issues, including through a policy on audio-visual treaty co-production, in order to clarify the objectives for co-production agreements and make them more adaptive to the changing audio-visual environment. Canadian Heritage is currently evaluating responses to its consultation on the policy.

Australia

Screen Australia was formed in 2008 through the amalgamation of the Australian Film Commission, the Film Finance Corporation Australia and Film Australia Limited. It is the Federal Government body responsible for funding Australian content, including film and television, and is the competent authority for Australia's co-production agreements.

In its 2010 submission to the Australian Government's Review of the Independent Screen Production Sector, Screen Australia noted an increase in enquiries about co-productions since the introduction of the Producer Offset in 2007, but not an increase in the actual number of approved applications, and final co-productions. The Producer Offset is a refundable tax rebate provided to makers of Australian films and television programmes on which New Zealand's SPIF is based. Factors given for this were that co-productions generally require large budgets which were difficult to raise; the lack of international finance available following the global financial crisis; and the complex nature of co-productions requiring a balance of elements from both countries in order to qualify in each territory.

While New Zealand has more co-production agreements than Australia, with 13 compared to Australia's 11, there has been significantly less activity under New Zealand's treaties, 58 co-productions (since 1988) compared to 135 in Australia (since 1986).

Although Australia's population is five times bigger than New Zealand's (New Zealand's 4.4 million against Australia's 22.3 million), Australia's screen sector is only 43 percent larger. (This figure is based on comparing 2007 data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics – the most recent Australian data – with 2007 data from Statistics New Zealand) [4].

Australia's incentives are considerably more generous than New Zealand's. For example, the Producer Offset is uncapped, compared with a $6 million cap for New Zealand's SPIF. Also, due to the nature of Australia's Federal and State system, Australian producers can apply to State and territory funding agencies as well as Screen Australia.

Economic value

A treaty is the first port of call to having a discussion with someone. The world's television market completely revolves around co-production agreements.
(NZ television producer)

[4] Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Television Film and Video Production and Post-production Services, 2006/07*; Statistics New Zealand Screen Industry Survey 2006/07

In short, the economic value of the approximately 18 co-productions completed or receiving provisional approval during my time at the NZFC – the majority of which were shot in New Zealand – would not have happened without the co-production structure being in place, and bringing to the table investment and/or television licences from the co-producer's domestic market into the financing mix.
(Former Executive Director, NZFC)

While New Zealand's co-production agreements may have resulted in a certain level of activity in the screen sector, the question remains as to how important they are for New Zealand economically. For the purposes of the review, economic value includes the level of foreign investment in co-productions (and offshore direct investment, where applicable), and the total New Zealand spend (e.g. spend on crew, suppliers etc).

The key question to consider is whether the activity generated under the treaties is additional to the activity that would otherwise occur. Secondly, whether co-production agreements are critical to the development of New Zealand film and television, and if so, what is the value of that activity?

Table 1 below shows a range of economic measures of the value of ten New Zealand feature film co-productions. NB - All figures are 'nominal' rather than inflation adjusted.

Table 1: Economic Measures of 10 New Zealand Feature Film Co-productions

Film	**NZ ($)**	**New Zealand govt**	**New Zealand spend[5]**	**NZ revenue[6]**
Nemesis Game		820,000	1,141,707	-
In My Father's Den		3,024,412	4,957,995	150,000
Perfect Creature		4,900,000	9,746,505	75,000
River Queen		5,750,000	17,094,585	150,000
The Ferryman[7]		4,250,000	4,094,244	-
The Tattooist		3,995,000	5,366,981	21,000
The Strength of Water		4,973,214	4,685,556	15,000
The Vintner's Luck		7,326,775	6,091,272	17,000
Dean Spanley[8]		3,000,000	3,056,801	-
Tracker[6]		4,031,575	5,492,728	-
Total budget	**114,154,501**			
Total revenue [9]	**21,680,881**			
TOTAL		**42,070,976**	**61,728,374**	**495,881**

Quantitative analysis

An analysis of the economic measures above[10], comparing the results to those for 10 domestic productions from the same period, reveals the following:

[5] Includes withholding tax and some PAYE tax, but not GST incurred
[6] New Zealand revenue is cinema revenue minus exhibition and distribution costs
[7] The Ferryman was released directly onto DVD
[8] Dean Spanley and Tracker did not generate New Zealand revenue (after investors were paid out)
[9] Total revenue is New Zealand revenue plus international revenue from all sources including DVD, airlines and television (minus NZFC and other NZ government contribution)
[10] NB – this analysis has been limited to feature films, due to the difficulties of making direct comparisons between film and television co-productions

- Between 2002 and 2010, New Zealand participated in 10 official feature film co-productions, with total budgets of $114 million. This compares to total budgets of $45 million for the last 10 domestic feature films in the same period.

- The 10 co-productions attracted $68.6 million of offshore funding (comprising private investment and government subsidies from the partner country), and earned total revenue of $21.6 million. In comparison, the last 10 domestic feature films attracted $3.5 million of offshore funding, and earned total revenue of $5.5 million.

- Of the $114 million total budgets for the 10 co-productions, $61.7 million, or 54 percent, was spent in New Zealand.

- New Zealand government investment made up 37 percent of the total budgets of the 10 co-productions, compared to 87 percent of the total budgets of the 10 domestic feature films.

These results show that New Zealand's feature film co-productions compare favourably to New Zealand's domestic feature films. The average budgets of co-productions are larger (more than double that of domestic productions), and the total revenue earned is greater (almost four times as much). Feature film co-productions also attract higher amounts of offshore funding (over four times as much) than domestic feature films.

In addition, New Zealand has benefited slightly more that our co-production partner countries in relation to the amount spent in each country, with 54 percent of the budget spent in New Zealand.

Qualitative analysis

There is certainly evidence to suggest that a number of New Zealand's co-productions would not have been made without the existence of a treaty. Four New Zealand producers, responsible for six feature films and four television series between them, are certain that those projects would not have been made without the existence of treaties. In addition, a former Executive Director of NZFC, Judith McCann, suggests none of the co-productions approved by NZFC during her tenure would have been made as strictly domestic productions. In the case of European projects looking to film or carry out post-production work in New Zealand, the European producer required co-production status in order to secure investment and/or television licence fees from their domestic market. In the case of projects originating outside Europe, once again the co-production structure was a necessary component in financing the project.

Other producers take the view that co-production agreements are helpful but not critical to the development of projects, and their particular projects would still have occurred albeit on a smaller budget or as a different film with potentially different prospects. Many producers also say that pulling together a project is a numbers game, and while sometimes it makes financial sense to progress a project as a co-production, in other instances it is more viable to remain as a domestic production.

Judith McCann, says the very act of co-production results in increased business for the screen sector, as demonstrated by the recurring names of companies in the list of New Zealand's official co-productions (refer to Annex 2). She does note, however, that the post-production sector has generally not benefited from co-production agreements. As New Zealand's official co-productions are often filmed in New Zealand, the post-production work tends to be carried out in the partner country in order to achieve the required balance of expenditure in both countries.

In May 2002 the Government appointed a Screen Production Industry Taskforce to consider issues in relation to the economic value of the screen sector. In its 2003 report, the Screen Production Industry Taskforce identified co-productions “as a major growth area and a significant means of supplementing cultural funding”[11]. The Taskforce recommended that the Screen Council (a new body of industry practitioners) work with MCH and MFAT to facilitate the wider use and advantages of co-production treaties. Since then, New Zealand has increased its number of treaties from five to 13, and the number of official co-productions has increased from 32 to 58; an average of 2.8 per year compared to 2.3 per year prior to the Screen Production Industry Taskforce report.

Comparisons with Canada and Australia

While it has not been possible to get the same level of data for Canadian and Australian co-productions as is available from NZFC for New Zealand’s co-productions, there are some high level comparisons that can be made.

- Canada’s last 10 feature film co-productions had estimated total budgets of NZ$ 279.6 million, and Australia’s had estimated total budgets of NZ$ 146.7 million.

- This compares to total budgets of $114 million for New Zealand’s last 10 feature film co-productions.

- Between 2000 and 2009, Canada participated in 795 television and film co-productions, compared to 62 for Australia and 24 for New Zealand.

- Since Australia and New Zealand first became involved in co-productions (1986 for Australia, and 1988 for New Zealand), Australia has participated in 135 co-productions, and New Zealand has participated in 58.

Canada’s volume and level of co-production activity is of a much greater scale than a country such as New Zealand might be able to compare itself.

However, in comparison to Australia, New Zealand has produced less than half the number of official co-productions, 58 compared to 135 overall, and 62 compared to 24 during the 2000-2009 period. The total budgets of New Zealand’s last 10 feature film co-productions were also lower than Australia’s – a difference of $32.7 million.

Cultural value

Anything done as a co-production will limit the amount of cultural content. However, to suggest they don’t open up the cultural landscape is nonsense. The export of cultural content is a multi-faceted affair.
(NZ film producer)

The challenge is finding projects that contain creative elements and storylines that appeal to audiences in two distinct cultural environments.
(Former Executive Director, NZFC)

In addition to economic value, an equally important measure of the importance of co-production agreements is the cultural value they create. For the purposes of the review, cultural value is considered to include the cultural benefits arising from film co-production agreements including shared story telling (between the partner countries),

[11] *Taking on the World: the Report of the Screen Production Industry Taskforce*, March 2003

production of New Zealand content for New Zealanders and international audiences, and the development of the New Zealand screen industry including skills and talent.

Table 2 below shows a range of cultural measures of the value of ten New Zealand feature film co-productions.

Table 2: Cultural Measures of 10 New Zealand Feature Film Co-productions

Film	NZ cultural content	NZ content	NZ Box Office (NZ$)[12]	Awards[13]
Nemesis Game	No	Yes	13,200	1 NZ Film and TV Award
In My Father's Den	Yes	Yes	1,510,000	1 British Independent Film Award; 3 Dinard British Film Festival Awards; 10 New Zealand Screen Awards; 1 San Sebastian International Film Festival Award; 1 Seattle International Film Festival Award; 2 Shanghai International Film Festival Golden Goblet Awards; 1 Stony Brook Film Festival Award; 1 Toronto International Film Festival Award
Perfect Creature	No	Yes	220,000	1 NZ Film and TV Award
River Queen	Yes	Yes	1,036,000	1 NZ Screen Award; Shanghai International Film Festival Golden Goblet Award
The Ferryman	No	No	-	None
The Tattooist	No	No	575,000	None
The Strength of Water	Yes	Yes	222,000	None
The Vintner's Luck	No	Yes	195,000	3 Qantas Film and Television Awards; 2 Houston International Film Festival Awards; 1 Sedona International Film Festival Award
Dean Spanley	No	Yes	415,000	8 Qantas Film and Television Awards
Tracker	Yes	Yes	66,000	None

Quantitative analysis

An analysis of the cultural measures above, comparing the results to those for 10 domestic productions from the same period reveals the following:

[12] The Box Office data is GST inclusive.
[13] Does not include official selection at international film festivals, or nominations for awards.

- Between 2002 and 2010, New Zealand participated in 10 official feature film co-productions, which earned a total of $4.3 million at the New Zealand box office. This compares with New Zealand box office earnings of $16 million for 10 domestic productions[14] from the same period.

- Of the 10 co-productions, four could be said to be New Zealand cultural content, i.e. be a New Zealand story, compared to all 10 of the domestic productions being New Zealand cultural content.

- The 10 co-productions received a combined total of 37 awards, compared to 25 for the 10 domestic productions.

These results suggest that New Zealand's feature film co-productions are less popular at the New Zealand box office than domestic productions, and are less likely to fit the definition of New Zealand cultural content, but are more critically acclaimed in that they receive more awards than domestic productions.

Qualitative analysis

At a high level, co-production agreements present both opportunities and challenges to a screen industry seeking to utilise them, and a government interested in the development of cultural content. By collaborating on film and television projects with another country to make content that is appealing to an international audience, it becomes more difficult to both restrict that content to a purely 'New Zealand story' and to protect the creative vision of a particular New Zealand writer or director.

Co-production agreements operate on a 'principle of balance', which applies to all co-production agreements and means that, while individual projects might not represent one of the partner countries; over the life of a treaty both countries will benefit from the use of their own cultural and creative output.

Of New Zealand's 58 official co-productions, 12 would be considered to be 'New Zealand cultural content', i.e. be a New Zealand story. A much greater proportion could be classified as 'New Zealand content', i.e. involve a high number of New Zealand 'creatives' (producer, writer, director) cast and crew. The principle of balance has generally proven to be correct for New Zealand; although it is perhaps disappointing the treaties have not resulted in a greater level of cultural content.

The New Zealand cultural content films on the list are *Tracker*, *The Strength of Water*, *River Queen* and *In My Father's Den*. Two of these films were particularly well received at the New Zealand box office, with *In My Father's Den* generating $1.5 million of box office revenue, and *River Queen* $1 million.

The New Zealand content films include *The Vintner's Luck* which, while not a New Zealand story, was based on a novel written by New Zealander Elizabeth Knox, was co-written and directed by New Zealander Niki Caro and starred Keisha Castle-Hughes. Also included is *Dean Spanley*, as mentioned above, *Perfect Creature*, and *Nemesis Game*.

The New Zealand/United Kingdom co-production *Dean Spanley* was mentioned by a number of interviewees as an example of a film that would not meet a narrow definition of 'New Zealand cultural content' but featured the work of a New Zealand producer,

---

[14] The 10 domestic productions are *Topp Twins: Untouchable Girls*, *Second Hand Wedding*, *Under the Mountain*, *Separation City*, *Home by Christmas*, *Matariki*, *Boy*, *After the Waterfall*, *Predicament* and *My Wedding & Other Secrets*. NB - $9.3 million of the $16 million came from Boy.

director and cast and crew (including lead actor Sam Neill). It was well received by film critics, and won eight awards at the Qantas Film and Television Awards 2009. A film such as this was valuable for the learning opportunities it provided for the New Zealanders involved, and for the career opportunities arising from it. As such, there was strong support for retaining the provision for co-productions to automatically meet the ‘local content’ test in the criteria for SPIF.

Perhaps the ultimate test of the cultural value of a New Zealand co-production is when a film with New Zealand cultural content has generated high international box office receipts. For the purposes of this analysis, international revenue has been used in lieu of available international box office data for all of these films[15]. Against this test, River Queen, generating $1.7 million of international revenue (and $1.9 million of total revenue), is the most culturally successful of the 10 co-productions.

Television co-productions

Both the economic and cultural analysis sections above are focused on feature film co-productions, rather than television co-productions. The reason for this is that the different nature of feature films and television series (in relation to size of budgets and revenues, as well as creative process) make it difficult to compare them ‘as a block’ with other co-productions from other countries, and also with domestic productions.

However, television co-productions in fact make up the majority of all of New Zealand’s official co-productions; 37 of the 58 co-productions have been television productions, of which 34 were television dramas and three television documentaries. A complete list of New Zealand’s official co-productions is attached as Annex 2.

The benefits to the New Zealand screen industry from official television co-productions are the same as those from official film co-productions, i.e. the ability to access government incentives in two countries, the ability to attract foreign investment, the opportunities for the New Zealand producer, director, cast and crew to work on larger productions with overseas counterparts, and greater distribution opportunities in larger markets.

There are, however, some particular areas of concern to the television industry in relation to co-productions.

Television producers interviewed for this review expressed a desire for co-production agreements with China and Korea that cover television (New Zealand’s current co-production agreements with China and Korea are limited to feature films). They also emphasised the importance of co-production agreements for gaining access to quotas in partner countries such as Canada and Australia, as well as the higher licence fees available in some other countries. Finally, they expressed concern about the ‘double dipping’ prohibition that prevents television producers from accessing funding from SPIF and NZ On Air. This issue is addressed further in the section on SPIF below.

Screen Production Incentive Fund

In the course of the review, the use of SPIF for funding New Zealand co-productions was raised on a number of occasions. SPIF was introduced in 2008 to:

---

[15] International revenue does not include a large proportion of box office receipts such as distribution and exhibition fees

- support increased production of medium and larger scale New Zealand cultural screen content, for the benefit of audiences;

- support the retention of New Zealand screen talent, stories and infrastructure by maintaining New Zealand's international competitiveness; and

- incentivise the New Zealand screen production industry to develop closer market connections and private finance for larger screen productions.

SPIF provides a grant of 40 percent of the Qualifying New Zealand Production Expenditure (QNZPE) that an applicant has spent on an eligible feature film; or a grant of 20 percent of the QNZPE that an applicant has spent on an eligible television or other format screen production.

When SPIF was established, $68.5 million was allocated to the fund to be invested over a five year period. That period ends in 2013, and an evaluation of SPIF to inform decisions on the future of the fund is being carried out by MCH in parallel with this review as part of the wider screen sector work programme.

There was widespread support among interviewees, particularly film and television producers, for the ability to access SPIF for co-productions, and the continuation of the fund beyond its current term. While there was some suggestion that there should be a separate fund for co-productions, or that SPIF should be uncapped (like the Australian Producer Offset Scheme), there was consistent feedback on the importance of SPIF for ensuring New Zealand was attractive as a co-producing country, and New Zealand producers could leverage offshore funding.

Some concerns were raised about the lack of alignment between NZ On Air funding for co-productions, and SPIF. While SPIF, and equity investment by NZFC, was seen as being aligned with funding arrangements for co-productions, funding from broadcasters and NZ On Air was not.

The 'double dipping' prohibition for television co-productions was mentioned as one such example, whereby television producers cannot access SPIF if the television co-production has received funding from other New Zealand government agencies (e.g. NZ On Air, Te Mangai Paho, NZFC). Similarly, interviewees expressed concerns that both NZ On Air and the broadcasters were not interested in funding co-productions, despite having viable projects pitched to them. By way of contrast, film co-productions can access SPIF and NZ On Air, Te Mangai Paho or NZFC funding, provided the film will ultimately be broadcast on television.

Consistent feedback throughout the course of this review has been that official co-productions need to be supported by suitable funding mechanisms in both countries, and in New Zealand's case, SPIF is a particularly important component. The double dipping prohibition hinders the development of television co-productions, such as animation, but also other genres including drama and documentaries. Removing the prohibition would increase the potential for more television co-production activity, and its associated economic and cultural benefits.

Barriers to use of co-production agreements

There are language barriers, geographic distance barriers and there is the time difference. I would sleep on the couch with my Blackberry on alert mode [in order to

wake up when an email came through]. When you are trying to close [a film deal] you can have lawyers needing you at any moment.
(NZ film producer)

The disadvantage [of doing a co-production] is there are huge legal costs. I had a weekly conference call with 10 lawyers, and there were 70 documents. There is also the cost of financing; you need to cash flow the film for 6-12 months.
(NZ film producer)

Having established that co-production agreements provide a useful mechanism for creating economic and cultural value, and given that they provide a range of benefits including financial incentives and access to other markets, the question arises as to why the treaties are not used more by the New Zealand screen industry. Since New Zealand's first co-production, *The Navigator*, in 1988, there have been 58 co-productions, which equates to an average of just 2.4 per year.

In the course of interviewing film and television producers for this review, a number provided accounts of projects they had tried to make into co-productions without success. In some cases these had become unofficial co-productions or domestic productions. In other cases they had simply not progressed.

The key barriers can be broken down into the following areas:

- the small number of New Zealand producers with the entrepreneurial skills required to secure finance for co-productions
- lack of New Zealand writers experienced at writing television for a world audience
- legal and financial complexity (and associated costs) of arranging a co-production
- size of budget required to make a co-production worthwhile (minimum of $5 million)
- time constraints – deadlines require a project to proceed before approval from both countries can be gained; or no treaty currently in place
- a lack of shared stories with the partner country
- difficulty securing finance including: a lack of development finance and/or dedicated funding for co-productions; the capped nature of SPIF; a lack of NZ On Air funding for co-productions (including the double dipping prohibition); low licence fees from broadcasters

One of the key themes expressed in interviews was the requirement for entrepreneurial, business-minded producers in order to secure financing for co-producers, and the relatively small pool of producers in New Zealand who fall into this category. Secondly, the complex nature of the legal and financial arrangements for co-productions, exacerbated by having to meet the requirements of the competent authorities of two countries, made them expensive and difficult to do. Thirdly, the complexity and associated cost of arranging a co-production meant it was generally not worth pursuing for a budget of less than $5 million. (New Zealand's official co-productions to date have ranged in budget from $5.5 million to $29 million.)

Some of these barriers, and others identified in the list above, appear inherent to the nature of co-productions, and difficult to resolve. The need for an entrepreneurial producer to secure financing, the requirement for the competent authorities in both countries to approve the project (and requirements for associated documentation), and the resulting budgets of the projects appear difficult to avoid. Not only that, but some of these aspects were also mentioned by producers as advantages of co-productions, for example the larger budgets result in projects that are more ambitious in scope, with higher production values.

However, the legal and financial complexity does appear to be a significant area of concern for a number of producers seeking to make use of the treaties. On a number of occasions, the more streamlined arrangements for European co-productions were mentioned as an example for how New Zealand co-productions might be simplified[16]. Another suggestion was that a contractor might be commissioned to produce a standard set of templates that could be used. Such a suggestion is not without cost, as it appears that not only would a contractor be required to draft the templates, but also producers with recent co-production experience engaged to verify that the contents are valid. In addition, there are questions about whether templates would be required for each of the countries New Zealand currently has treaties with, in which case the work might be extensive. Such a proposal may have merit and warrants further investigation following this review.

Consultation with industry

There was considerable feedback from interviewees that the process of consulting with industry in relation to new co-production agreements (which involves industry only at the end of the process) was insufficient. In particular, a number of interviewees expressed concern that they had not known in advance about the co-production agreement with India, referring to recent issues experienced with Indian film crews operating in New Zealand without required approvals, and with New Zealand cast and crew not being paid.

Such experiences have not arisen in relation to any official co-productions, and indeed there have yet to be any official co-productions made under the India co-production agreement. However, the concern expressed nonetheless indicates that industry would feel more comfortable with co-production agreements if they knew earlier on that they were being negotiated. Interestingly, Screen Australia has taken the approach on its website of listing not just the co-production agreements Australia has signed with other countries, but also those countries with which it is currently negotiating agreements.

It is recommended that New Zealand take a similar approach to Screen Australia in informing industry earlier about co-production agreements in negotiation, as well as seeking the views of industry in relation to future co-production partners.

Selection of countries

There are currently no criteria for selection of New Zealand's future co-production partners. Rather, countries are proposed by Cabinet Ministers, often as a result of an approach of a counterpart on an overseas visit, or less frequently by officials as a result of approaches by industry.

[16] For example, one New Zealand film producer contrasted the size of the European financing agreement (12 pages) with New Zealand's (100 pages).

There were two streams of thought expressed by interviewees in relation to what New Zealand's approach should be in its selection of co-production partners. One view was that, given the relatively low cost involved in negotiating an agreement, the more co-production agreements New Zealand had the better. The alternative view expressed was that there were too many potential partner countries, and New Zealand would be better placed to prioritise and then target the countries it hoped to have treaties with in future.

Some interviewees expressed concern that while co-production agreements were generally advantageous to New Zealand, they could cause problems, such as diplomatic issues, if they were not used. New Zealand's most notable example of an unused co-production agreement is the treaty with Italy which was signed in 1997, revised in 2004, and has never resulted in an official co-production between the two countries.

There would appear to be merit in New Zealand having criteria for prioritising future co-production partners. While the benefits of continuing to add to the number of co-production partners are noted, there is merit in prioritising the available resources to undertake negotiations, as well as seeking to mitigate the risks around entering into agreements that do not result in official co-productions being made.

Proposed criteria for future co-production partners are attached as an Annex to this report (Annex 3). Applying these criteria would result in New Zealand prioritising future co-production agreements with Denmark, Korea (for television only) and, subject to engagement with Brazil's screen industry, Brazil.

The criteria themselves take account of the relative benefits the country might offer to New Zealand's screen sector, such as market access due to the country's size and also the level of restrictiveness of current market access without a treaty. Other criteria include the degree of potential for shared stories, the level of interest from the New Zealand screen industry and the partner country's screen industry, the availability of government subsidies in the partner country, and the level of support for an agreement from MFAT post in the partner country (i.e. based on its knowledge of the relevant institutions and the local screen industry).

Implementing these criteria is not considered to be difficult. Rather, it would require MCH, in conjunction with MFAT and NZFC, to undertake such analysis when a co-production partner is proposed, and also suggest Ministers take a more proactive approach to co-production agreements, including seeking to initiate agreements with the countries on the prioritised list.

In addition, MCH, MFAT and NZFC would need to take a more strategic approach to co-production agreements themselves – drawing on feedback from the New Zealand screen industry – to continue to prioritise further partner countries.

Promotion

In response to questions around whether co-production agreements needed to be better promoted to industry, there was widespread agreement that within New Zealand, producers who wanted to know about co-production agreements either already knew about them, or knew to go to NZFC for information. However, a range of views were expressed about the need to better promote the agreements offshore, with a general feeling that more could be done in this area. At the same time, some interviewees expressed caution that promotion should only be done by those with a degree of knowledge about the agreements themselves, so the right people would be targeted.

A variety of approaches were suggested, including increasing New Zealand's attendance at international film festivals (by producers as well as NZFC and Film New Zealand); holding offshore events where New Zealand industry representatives can meet industry representatives from that country; and investigating opportunities to promote New Zealand as a television destination, e.g. by being 'guest country of honour at MIPCOM'. APN was also mentioned as a good example of a forum where co-production opportunities are discussed by New Zealand and Asian producers.

In the process of being interviewed for this review, MFAT proposed that a questionnaire be sent to each of its offshore posts, asking the posts for their views on film co-production agreements. That process resulted in 18 responses, from as far afield as Vietnam, Chile, Italy and London. Overall, the responses indicated a high level of knowledge of film co-production agreements among MFAT staff, combined with considerable general knowledge about the particular country's screen industry. Such information has been used to inform New Zealand's approach to prioritising future co-production partners. It also indicates a valuable role that MFAT have been playing, and should continue to play, in promoting New Zealand's co-production agreements offshore.

Strategic issues and opportunities

Diplomatic reasons for signing a co-production agreement are probably valid though it then behoves the New Zealand Government to deliver on the agreement's intent.
(Former Executive Director, NZFC)

Co-productions are a fantastic vehicle. 'NZ Inc' needs them. Culturally we need them. The industry needs to recognise what they are for.
(Chief Executive, NZFC)

In the course of this review, a number of strategic issues have arisen in relation to New Zealand's approach to co-production agreements. It is apparent that co-production agreements are about considerably more than film and television. They are also about the diplomatic benefits for what gets referred to as 'NZ Inc' and means New Zealand having a co-ordinated approach across government to its key economic partners. Such benefits are generally related to trade, and associated with Free Trade Agreements (FTA), of which co-production agreements can sometimes be negotiated in parallel. These diplomatic benefits do not, of themselves, mean that co-production agreements are without tangible benefit to the New Zealand screen industry. What they do mean, however, is that they are best considered through a 'NZ Inc' lens by the screen industry, recognising that the countries selected may not be the ones they would have chosen, and the process for negotiating them may be driven by timelines resulting from quite different factors, such as an upcoming FTA.

A few interviewees described co-production agreements as a blunt instrument, which could benefit from having a more strategic focus, but seemed effective nonetheless. Based on the economic and cultural value identified in this review from New Zealand's co-production agreements, this seems a fair assumption.

There were two general perspectives on how New Zealand might take a more strategic approach to co-production agreements. One was to provide a greater level of financing for co-productions, such as the development of a dedicated co-production fund, ensuring long-term security of SPIF, or the opening up of access to NZ On Air funding. The other was to take a more pragmatic approach, recognising that the treaties were often negotiated for high level diplomatic reasons in the first instance (eg in conjunction with an FTA), but seeking to find ways to make the treaties work for the industry by providing forums for producers from co-production countries to discuss potential projects.

A number of suggestions were also made for how New Zealand might be more strategic in relation to its selection of countries for future co-production agreements. This included looking for evidence among the New Zealand screen industry for potential projects that could go into production should a treaty be in place, ensuring there is confidence that the proposed country's administration systems will be efficient and collaborative.

A further suggestion was that New Zealand should consider how digital media, including games, could be introduced into co-production agreements. New Zealand's current definition of "film", in New Zealand's co-production template, is quite broad, as follows:

- "film" means an aggregate of images, or of images and sounds, embodied in any material, and includes television and video recordings, animations and digital format productions

While digital media, including games, appear to be captured by such a definition, the government funding available for digital media is not aimed at co-productions. As such, while digital media may be covered by the scope of co-production agreements, in practice they are not being used in that way due to a lack of government incentives.

Such a situation is by no means unique to New Zealand. Both Canadian Heritage and Screen Australia have said they are considering whether or not co-production agreements should incorporate digital media and games, but have not formed any conclusions yet. New Zealand should continue to monitor developments in those and other countries in order to inform future direction on this issue. This issue of whether existing government grants should be extended to include digital media and games was also canvassed in the Large Budget Screen Production Grant and SPIF evaluations, which can be accessed at http://www.mch.govt.nz/screensector-review and http://www.med.govt.nz/sectors-industries/screen-industry.

Finally, it was recognised that New Zealand is usually the smaller partner when it comes to co-production agreements, and not generally in the driving seat when they accompany larger trade agreements. However, New Zealand does have the ability to set the agreements up with the right intent, and work alongside New Zealand producers and their offshore counterparts to ensure they properly understand each country's system and how to make the agreements work effectively.

Recommendations

A number of recommendations arising from this review can be made as follows.

1) Removal of double dipping prohibition

Official co-productions need to be supported by suitable funding mechanisms in both countries, and in New Zealand's case, SPIF is a particularly important component. The future of SPIF beyond 2013 is being considered in an evaluation being carried out by MCH in parallel with this review. Should the Government decide to continue SPIF, this review recommends that the double dipping prohibition that prevents television producers from accessing other forms of government funding, such as is available through NZ On Air and Te Māngai Pāho, be removed.

The double dipping prohibition hinders the development of television co-productions, such as animation, but also other genres including drama and documentaries. It is also considered inconsistent to have a double dipping prohibition that applies to television, but not to film provided the film will ultimately be shown on television. Removing the prohibition would increase the potential for more television co-production activity, and its associated economic and cultural benefits.

It is not proposed to make any changes to NZ On Air or Te Māngai Pāho funding criteria, including the requirement that projects receiving funding have the prior commitment of a broadcaster, as a result of removing the double dipping prohibition.

2) Use of NZFC website to promote co-productions

More information should be put onto the NZFC website on co-productions, possibly in the form of a dedicated co-production section. This could include, a list of New Zealand's official co-productions to date, a list of New Zealand producers who have been associated with each of the co-productions, a checklist of required information in order to apply to make a co-production, and a 'frequently asked questions' section. Official co-productions currently in negotiation should also be listed as soon as it is possible to do so. The option of producing templates that could be used by New Zealand producers should be further considered by MCH in conjunction with NZFC.

3) Earlier engagement with industry

The screen industry should be advised at an earlier stage of the co-production agreements that New Zealand is currently negotiating, including by listing the countries on the NZFC website, as Screen Australia does. The proposed criteria for the selection of future co-production partners have been drafted based on feedback provided in the course of this review. It should be discussed with MFAT and NZFC with a view to formalising it as a working model.

4) Use of MFAT offshore posts

Officials at MFAT's offshore posts appear to be the most knowledgeable about co-production agreements of any New Zealand officials based offshore. They should continue to be used to promote New Zealand's co-production agreements in their respective countries, and look for opportunities to connect screen industry representatives with their New Zealand counterparts.

5) Learn lessons from Canadian Heritage review

Finally, New Zealand should seek to learn from Canada, as the world leader in co-production agreements, and its agency Canadian Heritage as it continues its review into Canada’s co-production treaties. In particular, New Zealand may be able to learn from changes Canada is making through a proposed model treaty, once that is finalised, which could apply to the template New Zealand uses as its starting point for negotiations.

ANNEX 1

List of interviewees

Andrew Smith, Chief Executive, Pukeko Pictures
Trevor Haysom, Producer
Matthew Metcalfe, Producer
Richard Fletcher, Producer
Maile Daugherty, Producer
Alex Cole-Baker, Producer
Trevor Yaxley, Chief Executive, Huhu Studios
John Crawford, General Manager, NHNZ
Matt Emery, Entertainment Lawyer, Emery Legal

Mike Horgan, Gary Little, Michael Brook, Film Auckland
Sven Pannell and Delia Shanley, Grow Wellington
Kevin 'KJ' Jennings, Film Otago/Southland
Penelope Borland and Sandy Gildea, SPADA
Janette Howe, Dan Salmon, Screen Directors Guild

Judith McCann, ex NZFC and Film NZ
Kim Baker, NZ On Screen
Sue Thompson, Special Projects, Film New Zealand
Gisella Carr, Chief Executive, Film New Zealand
Glenn Usmar, Television Manager, NZ On Air
Mladen Ivancic, Deputy Chief Executive, NZFC
Graeme Mason, Chief Executive, NZFC

Mark Merwood, NZ Customs
Vince Costa, Jim Gordon, IRD
Graeme Howard, Tourism NZ
Chris Hubscher, Department of Labour
Matt Richie, NZTE
Peter Ferguson, Justine Arroll, MFAT

ANNEX 2

New Zealand's official co-productions

Year	Type	Title	Co-production partner	Production companies
1988	Film	The Navigator	Australia	Film Investment Co (NZ), Arenafilm Pty (Aus)
1988	TV	Family Drama series	Canada	SPP (NZ), Atlantis (Can)
1989	TV	Ray Bradbury Theatre (Eps 19-30)	Canada	G Mclean Assoc (NZ), Atlantis (Can)
1990	TV	Ray Bradbury Theatre (Eps 31-42)	Canada	Avalon (NZ), Atlantis (Can)
1991	TV	Ray Bradbury Theatre (Eps 43-65)	Canada	SPP (NZ), Atlantis (Can)
1991	TV	The Sound and the Silence	Canada	SPP (NZ), Screen Star (Canada), Regal Prdn (Ire)
1991	TV	Gold	Canada	SPP (NZ), Atlantis (Can)
1991	Film	Do You Want to Know a Secret	Australia	Avalon (NZ), Vic. Int'l Prods (Aus)
1992	TV	Kurt Vonnegut's Monkey House	Canada	SPP (NZ), Foursome Films/Atlantis (Can)
1992	Film	Alex	Australia	Isambard (NZ), total Ent (Aus)
1992	Film	Cops and Robbers	Australia	Isambard (NZ), total Ent (Aus)
1992	TV	The Adventures of the Black Stallion S3 (Eps 53-74)	Canada, France	Isambard (NZ), Alliance (Can), Atlantique (France)
1992	TV	Deepwater Haven	France, Australia	SPP (NZ), Beyond (Aus), F Prods SA (France)
1992	TV	White Fang	Canada, France	SPP (NZ), F Prods SA (France), Neverland (Can)
1993	TV	From Spirit to Spirit	Canada	Top Shelf (NZ), Great White Plains (Can)
1993	Film	Dating the Enemy	Australia	Avalon (NZ), Total Film and TV (Aus)
1993	Film	The Return of Tommy Tricker	Canada	Endeavour (NZ), Le Fete Prdns (Can)
1993	Film	Loaded (AKA Bloody Weekend)	UK	The Movie Partners (NZ), Strawberry Vale (UK)
1994	TV	Mirror Mirror	Australia	Gibson Group (NZ), Millenium Pics (Aus)
1994	Film	Bonjour Timothy	Canada	Tucker Films (NZ), Cinar Prdns (Can)
1994	TV	O Rugged Land of Gold	Canada	Gibson Group (NZ), Western Sky Prd (Can)
1994	TV	Mysterious Island	Canada	Tasman Films (NZ), Castaway Prdns (Can)
1995	Film	The Whole of the Moon	Canada	Tucker Films (NZ), Cinar (Can)

1996	Film	The Climb	France	Isambard (NZ), Elipse (France)
1996	TV	Punch Me in the Stomach	Canada	Zee Films (NZ), Cinethetics (Can)
1997	TV	The Nightmare Man	Canada	Isambard (NZ), Telescene (Can)
1997	TV	Mirror Mirror II	Australia	Gibson Group (NZ), Millenium Pics (Aus)
1999	TV	Fearless	Canada	Campic Prdns, SPP, Telescene Film Group Prdns
2000	TV	Dark Knight: series 1	UK	Palana Prdns (NZ)
2000	TV	The Tribe series II	UK	Cloud 9 Ltd (NZ)
2002	TV	Atlantis High	UK	Cloud 9 Ltd (NZ), Channel 5 Bdctg (UK)
2002	TV	The Tribe series III	UK	Cloud 9 Ltd (NZ)
2002	TV	The Tribe series IV	UK	Cloud 9 Ltd (NZ)
2002	Film	Nemesis Game	Canada, UK	Emily Gray Pdns (NZ), Paper Pics (Can), Scissor (UK)
2002	TV	Dark Knight series II	UK	Palana Prdns (NZ), Dark Knight Ltd (UK)
2003	TV	Revelations	UK	Cloud 9 (NZ)
2004	TV	Mercy Peak series II	Canada	SPP (NZ)
2004	TV	The Vanishing Tattoo	Canada	Natural History NZ Ltd
2004	TV	Treasure Island Trilogy	UK	Treasure Island Films NZ Ltd
2005	TV	Staines Down Drains	Australia	Traction Inc Ltd
2005	Film	In My Father's Den	UK	IMFD Ltd
2005	Film	Perfect Creature	UK	Crimbil Equities
2005	TV	Riverworld	UK, Canada	Tasman Riverworld Ltd
2005	Film	River Queen	UK	River Queen Productions Ltd
2007	Film	The Ferryman	UK	TF Productions Ltd
2008	Film	The Tattooist	Singapore	Eyeworks Touchdown Films Ltd
2008	Film	The Strength of Water	Germany	Filmwork (Strength of Water) Ltd
2009	Film	The Vintner's Luck	France	Ascension Film Ltd
2009	Film	Dean Spanley	UK	General Film Corporation (Two Dogs) Ltd
2009	TV	Time Trackers	Australia	Gibson Group
2009	TV	Emilie Richards: Tales of the South Pacific (series 1)	Germany	GFC Germany Ltd
2010	TV	Emilie Richards: Tales of the South Pacific (series 2)	Germany	GFC Germany Ltd
2010	TV	Emilie Richards: Tales of the South Pacific (series 3)	Germany	GFC Germany Ltd
2010	Film	Tracker	UK	Digit Films Ltd
2011	TV	Turbo Dogs	Canada	Racer Dogs (NZ) Productions Ltd
2011	Film	Ice	UK	Screentime (NZ), Power (UK)
2011	TV	Ice	UK	Screentime (NZ), Power (UK)

ANNEX 3: Proposed criteria for selection of future co-production partners

- Level of restrictiveness of market access without a treaty (i.e. a treaty would provide access to an otherwise restrictive market)
- Size of partner country (i.e. size of potential market/potential for private investment)
- Degree of potential for shared stories
- Level of interest from New Zealand screen industry (i.e. suggested by 2-3 industry people)
- Level of interest from partner country's screen industry (i.e. NZFC, or industry, has had contact from industry in partner country)
- Availability of government subsidies in partner country
- Degree to which MFAT post is supportive of an agreement (based on post's knowledge of institutions and screen industry)