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Abstract

This thesis presents a detailed analysis of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology during the period 2010 – 2013, focusing on innovation, change and the function(s) of documentary as a creative and cultural industry.

‘Ecology’ as a term in media and cultural studies scholarship is increasingly employed as a means of extending the scope of critical political economy beyond a critique of power dynamics in contemporary capitalist society to acknowledge the complex and multifaceted nature of relations between producers and audiences and the ways that media are produced, circulated and used. The use of the term ‘ecology’ in this context acknowledges the ways that our systems of communication, like those in nature, are not stable or fixed, but are interconnected, evolving and dynamic.

Drawing on interviews, observation, practice-led research and analysis of theatrical and television documentary output, the framework of ecology is used to examine the specific conditions of documentary production in New Zealand as a complex media system in relation to global shifts in media production, distribution and use, and aims to identify factors that support or inhibit innovation in the context of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology.
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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Maori Television Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZIFF</td>
<td>New Zealand International Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZFC</td>
<td>New Zealand Film Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ On Air</td>
<td>New Zealand On Air, sometimes referred to as NZOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNZ</td>
<td>Radio New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGNZ</td>
<td>Screen Director’s Guild New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPADA</td>
<td>Screen Producers and Directors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMP</td>
<td>Te Māngai Pāho (The Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT</td>
<td>Women in Film and Television</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background to the research

This thesis investigates innovation and change in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology, focusing specifically on the period 2010-2013 drawing on observation, practice-led research, interviews and analysis of output, discourse and cultural policy. As is often the case, the topic I originally proposed was somewhat different, but greatly informed the direction of the thesis. When I began my PhD studies at the University of Melbourne in March 2010 I was focused on the emergent field of ‘expanded documentary’, a topic that I had been interested in for some time. My interest in interactive media and documentary began with my MA studies (completed in 2002), which had explored interactivity and hypermedia in documentary using Chris Marker’s essay documentary Sans soleil as a kind of pre-digital prototype for post-linear, interactive forms of documentary. At that time, digital interactive forms of documentary such as Marker’s own Immemory CD-ROM signalled a new age for documentary for a digital, convergent, interactive age, but it would take some years for the technologies of production and distribution/circulation to support alternatives to television and theatrical forms of audio-visual documentary to develop. By 2009, the World Wide Web had become a viable and active distribution platform and although web-based documentaries (web docs or i-docs as they are increasingly called) were a nascent form\(^1\), multiplatform production (usually a web-based component in support of a television documentary) had become an established part of broadcasting practice (although not in New Zealand). Prior to commencing my PhD studies I had several experiences that reinforced my belief that a new wave of documentary was about to reach New Zealand’s shores. I had, for example, attended a seminar on multiplatform storytelling in Auckland and participated in the inaugural Doc Lab workshop (an intensive three day incubator for cross-media documentary projects run by Documentary Edge with the support of

\(^1\) See (Gaudenzi, n.d.) for a database of early i-docs.
Wendy Levy, then of the Bay Area Video Coalition (BAVC), AUT Colab, and a group of mentors with skills and experience in a range of areas such as storytelling, gaming, mobile technologies, animation, film and TV, design, and digital outreach). The initial focus of my PhD research was, therefore, the emergence of online, mobile and multiplatform documentary in Australia and New Zealand. Change was in the air and I was excited about the possibilities for documentary, and for academic research in this area.

Although New Zealand had been an early adopter of the Internet, broadband penetration was slow compared to many OECD countries. However, by 2009 New Zealanders were able to view video online through YouTube, download video (mainly illegally) through peer-to-peer networking, watch television on demand through TVNZ and TV3 and watch digital television through the free to air Freeview service and SkyTV pay TV service. 47% of the New Zealanders surveyed for the World Internet Project New Zealand in 2009 downloaded or streamed video online (up from 36% in 2007) (Crothers et al., 2014, p. 13). As was the case internationally, the media landscape seemed to be changing rapidly with the development and adoption of networked digital technologies of production and distribution. New Zealand was also undergoing political and economic changes, with a shift to a conservative centre-right National Party government in 2008 after nine years of a liberal centre-left Labour Party government, coinciding with the country entering into recession with the impact of the Global Financial Crisis.

However, at a very early stage of my research, prior to even beginning my provisional candidature, I came to realise that not everyone was as excited about the future as I was. I also began to see that the future I envisaged was probably still much further away than I had hoped. In my initial PhD research proposal (written late 2009), I relay observations made during a screen industry seminar on ‘multiplatform storytelling’ (hosted by Script to Screen in Auckland on 26 August 2009), which greatly informed my proposal. Looking back at the origins of this research project from what now feels like a considerable distance, I note that the challenges New Zealand’s documentary production ecology faced are quite accurately identified, although there is a degree of technological determinism in my assumptions about the directions that innovation
would take. Nonetheless, this initial proposal provides an insight into the core issues that have shaped my research:

The concerns of the seminar participants, (largely screen industry professionals), were primarily related to the new economy of transmedia production rather than aesthetic concerns. They were impressed by the budget allocated to the website component of an Australian transmedia production; eager to hear how global networks and online presence could be used to “outreach” for funding and publicity; sceptical as to how mobile platforms could deliver anything meaningful and fearful of perceived threats to their intellectual property in the digital domain. Participants wanting to ‘glimpse tomorrow before it was too late’ (Jenkins, 2006a, p. 6) wanted know how they, as media professionals, could utilise new media platforms and avoid being displaced by a new wave of You-Tubers with HD handycams and desktop studios.

In the midst of an economic downturn and the reshaping of media industries in a climate of convergence it is no wonder that the questions asked in an industry seminar focused more on questions of political economy than aesthetics. I had anticipated (but did not observe) lively discussions of how new screens (online and mobile) open up possibilities for new forms of documentary; opportunities to circumvent the limitations imposed by the “tyranny” of public funding bodies and commissioning editors and new ways to engage with audiences. And, in a country where access to broadband is limited, I was interested to find that video appears to hold primacy as the dominant mode of online storytelling. It seemed that producers were at once focused on the rear view mirror (substituting one screen for another) and the horizon point (the anticipated coming of widely accessible high speed broadband).

In the same week that in South Africa a carrier pigeon made headlines for delivering four gigabytes of data across 60 miles in less time than it took to send four per cent of the same information over ADSL (“SA pigeon ‘faster than broadband,’” 2009), in New Zealand the government announced a $300 million rescue package to assist in upgrading rural New Zealand from dial-up to broadband (NZPA, 2009). New Zealand, as with many other nations is on the wrong side of the digital divide. Given the limited
availability and affordability of high speed broadband there have been few incentives for mainstream broadcasters or media producers to utilise online platforms. However, while governmental policy has focused on addressing the technological infrastructure necessary to bridge this divide, setting targets for broadband speeds and penetration (Ministry of Economic Development, 2008), institutional strategies for fostering the creative and cultural growth of new media in New Zealand are less forthcoming.

In the case of New Zealand, the scale of the local market has always required that private commercial interests supplement the support given to creative industries by public non-commercial bodies, even more so since the radical deregulation of broadcasting begun in the mid 1980s (P. Smith, 1996). Documentary producers wanting to create works for cinematic release in New Zealand to some extent have always been engaged in a form of [multiplatform] production, as a theatrical release is generally a by-product enabled by a commission from a broadcast network but primarily funded by government bodies, (primarily NZ on Air). As a recent report on documentary production in New Zealand summarised, ‘Despite new media opportunities, New Zealand television is still the primary market for documentaries that tell local stories and deal with local issues. However, television has specific documentary content requirements and neither NZ on Air nor Te Mangai Paho will support a project without a broadcaster commitment to screen it’ (Creative New Zealand the New Zealand Film Commission, 2008). Consequently, whilst public funds are essential to the production of documentary, the end product is heavily shaped by commercial imperatives and primarily geared towards television broadcast. This policy has significant implications for the development of documentary (or any other sector of screen production) as a creative and social practice whether in cinema, television or new media.

A superficial comparison of the websites of the primary public service broadcast networks in New Zealand and Australia serves as a rudimentary demonstration of the potential merits of a closer comparative analysis of the political economy of emerging media. While the ABC site has a section devoted to new media content, just as it has a department devoted to digital innovation (“ABC Online: New Media Showcase,” 2009) TVNZ does not. Although NZ on Air’s 2008 report “The Digital Future and Public
Broadcasting” finds that ‘To try to take advantage of all digital platforms, TVNZ are pursuing a policy of 360 degree commissioning, looking for all the content opportunities of all production ideas’ (Norris & Pauling, 2008, p. 80) the TVNZ website itself shows little evidence of this. In contrast, ABC offers a wide array of content commissioned for the web dating back as far as 2001, encompassing music (The Pure Drop, 2007), online documentary (Black Friday, 2003; The Life Series, 2008) children’s programming (The Dog and Cat News, 2005, Winged Sandals, 2003) and indigenous and pacifika programming (UsMob, 2005, Pacific Stories, 2005). Whereas TVNZ’s digital strategy is centred almost entirely on the web as a platform for distribution (through the “On Demand” portal), the ABC demonstrates a clear commitment to the web as media; a site not just for distribution, but also for production.

Yet, despite the apparent comparative wealth of online media provided by the ABC, there are calls in Australia for a deeper commitment to developing online media within public service broadcasting networks, urging for greater emphasis on user-created content, thus signalling that though more established, online content in a public service broadcasting context is still emergent in Australia:

The ABC and SBS have long demonstrated their capacity to be social innovators in the provision of news, information and entertainment content to Australians. As public service media organisations, they are uniquely placed to enable new user-created content opportunities in the online media space while also managing such content sourcing strategies with their policy, legal, and Charter obligations. In enabling more user-created content they would play a pivotal role in international debates about the future of media and journalism in an environment where media consumers are participants and content co-creators. Not only this but they would also enhance the awareness of Australians of what is possible in the new media environment by drawing upon, and renewing, their sources of credibility and reputation in the community. (Flew, 2009)
What I have attempted to outline above is a field of tensions at play, between old and new, public and commercial interests, professionals and prosumers. Online and mobile technologies present both tremendous challenges and opportunities for creative industries and may be pivotal in reshaping current industry formations and practices.

In the field of documentary production, online and mobile technologies have the potential to remove the limits imposed by the political economy of broadcasting, allow documentary practitioners to produce cheaper forms of documentary and take more creative risks. Public service broadcasters can create a broader range of media that cater to the interests of specific audiences and expand the public service broadcasting mandate to inform, educate, entertain and innovate. Audiences can potentially have access to a broader range of media and have greater opportunities for participation and representation.

Concurrent with the liberating potential of new technologies, online and mobile media may also be restrictive in terms of access and availability (e.g. the availability of broadband) and the technical skills required for production and distribution. Producers working in film and television may need to learn to work in new ways in order to effectively incorporate new media into transmedia practice and must learn to view new media technologies as unique media forms. The accessibility of new media technologies for production and distribution, whilst making it easier for industry outsiders to create media, also poses a challenge to industry professionals seeking to maintain a viable production industry within a market economy. Ironically, the rise of prosumer, community or citizen documentary producers may challenge the need for a public service broadcast model. Finally, as an emerging practice, online and mobile forms of documentary give rise to questions of whether to situate documentary practice as art or industry, particularly as pioneers in this space are mostly likely to be positioned outside the locus of industry.

While new media technologies may present challenges within the political economy of documentary, (both positive and negative); aesthetically, online and mobile media offer
great possibilities for developing new forms of documentary beyond established cinematic and televisual modes.

The contingencies of the aesthetics and political economy of emergent media warrant a mode of enquiry that addresses both. It is important to consider not only what is being produced within a creative economy, but also by and for whom.

According to Scott McQuire “As well as the need to explore both the continuities and specificities of different platforms, there is an increasing need to recognize that globalization demands more situated analyses of specific audiences” (McQuire, 2008, p. 507).

Such an approach to studies of creative industries in a new economy has also been advocated by Henry Jenkins:

In an era of privatization, cultural policy is increasingly being set not by governmental bodies, but by media companies; we lose the ability to have any real influence over the directions that our culture takes if we do not find ways to engage in active dialogue with media industries. This is why discussions of creative industries need to take center stage as cultural studies enters the 21st century. We need to go into such collaborations and dialogues with our eyes wide open and, to do so, we need more nuanced models of the economic contexts within which culture gets produced and circulated. (Jenkins, 2004, p. 42)

Although the broader focus of this early proposal changed over time, key issues are identified that have remained as key points of enquiry such as: the attitudes of funders, broadcasters and producers to innovation and change; cultural policy regarding innovation; tensions between commercial and public service media interests; the impact of new technologies on production and distribution/circulation; and the role of public service media in the documentary production ecology.
While based in Melbourne, I had the opportunity to meet documentary practitioners engaged in multiplatform or transmedia production and I began to understand just how different the Australian and New Zealand media environments were. My appreciation of the importance of cultural policy, public service broadcasting and the social value of documentary grew. Whereas the ABC and SBS in Australia were actively commissioning online and multiplatform documentaries, and Screen Australia was at that time requiring all documentary submissions to have a crossplatform/digital component; New Zealand had no funding or commissioning policies to support crossplatform or online documentary, and there was almost no discernible production activity in this area. Furthermore, public service broadcasting in New Zealand seemed to be increasingly under threat, and with it, documentary. I realised that under these conditions there was little scope for the kind of innovation I had anticipated in New Zealand and the differences between the Australian and New Zealand production environments were too great to provide a basis for meaningful comparison. Indeed, my hypothesis was that under these conditions there was little chance that any multiplatform or online documentary would be produced in New Zealand during the period of my study. This concerned me a great deal, not just because of my interest in the emergence of new forms of documentary from a creative perspective, but because of the social and cultural importance of documentary innovation in a changing media ecology.

The adoption of new platforms and the emergence of new forms of documentary signify a redefining of public media in new public domains described by Patricia Zimmerman as a “new media ecology” that is,

layered, multiplatformed, swiftly changing, and reconfiguring audience and outreach [...] altering the relationships between production, distribution and exhibition with long tail marketing, niche markets, blurrings between professional and amateur, new economic models, and new emerging sectors of public media. (Zimmerman, 2008, p. 287)
Internationally public media institutions such as Australia’s ABC and Screen Australia, the UK’s BBC, Canada’s NFB and France’s CNC have played a critical role in redefining the role of public media in this new media ecology and documentary innovation has been a key element of this transformation. In New Zealand however, public media services have dwindled significantly. During the period of this study two state-owned commercial-free digital channels were closed down (TVNZ6&7), NZ On Air funded content on the Heartland and Kidzone channels were accessible only on the payTV Sky platform and the public service remit was removed from state-owned commercial television broadcaster TVNZ. All that is left of public service broadcasting in New Zealand is an independent funding body (NZ On Air), a state-supported commercial television broadcaster dedicated to supporting Maori language (MTS) and commercial-free radio network Radio New Zealand. Under these circumstances participants in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology are less concerned with innovation as with survival even if, in the context of significant change, innovation (new and creative approaches to production, the emergence of new practices and forms and new methods of funding and delivery) may in fact be necessary to ensure survival.

Recognising that New Zealand’s public media crisis was having an impact on documentary production and that this limited opportunities for creative innovation, I decided to focus my research entirely on New Zealand and examine innovation in the context of a changing local and global media ecology.

**Research Problem, Scope and Critical Framework**

This thesis presents a detailed analysis of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology during the period 2010 – 2013, focusing on innovation, change and the function(s) of documentary as a creative and cultural industry. Drawing on interviews, participant observation, practice-led research and analysis of theatrical and television documentary output, the framework of ecology is used to examine the specific conditions of documentary production in New Zealand as a complex media system in relation to global shifts in media production, distribution/circulation and use.
The study focuses on innovation and change in relation to documentary television and film, the spheres of production around which a cultural industry is based and which are most affected by technological (and to some degree economic and political) change. I have not addressed other areas of documentary practice such as photography, radio or experimental (art practice) documentary.

Before introducing the central research questions that have shaped this study, I wish to first explore the significance of ecology in the context of this research and outline the critical framework for this study. These critical frameworks will be discussed in more depth in the following chapter (literature review).

Ecology has become a commonplace term in media and cultural studies scholarship, often employed as a means of extending the scope of critical political economy beyond a critique of power dynamics in contemporary capitalist society to acknowledge the complex relations between producers/creators and consumers/audiences and to describe the systems in which media are produced, circulated and used. Ecology provides a useful model for close examination – not only of institutional structures – but also the complex relations between institutions and individuals in relation to a broader environment.

As John Tinnell observes, “arguably, two of the most important forces affecting contemporary global culture are the growing awareness of the ecological crisis and the proliferation of digital media” (2011 [Abstract]). Thinking transversally comes more readily in a network society where relationships between climate and economy, geography and politics, science and culture are equally contested and enmeshed. Multiplicity and assemblage, the rhizome and the network have been absorbed into the fabric of contemporary critical thought. Consequently, while ‘ecology’ applied to media or culture is likely to be informed by Ecosophy, Cybernetics, Systems Theory and variant approaches such as Actor Network Theory, Structuration Theory, Media
Ecology and New Materialism, the term has come to be more widely used in a conventional sense to indicate the complex dynamics of systems that are not stable or fixed, but are interconnected, evolving and dynamic.

Ecology is a term frequently employed in the discourses of Creative and Cultural Industries, Media and Cultural Studies, Production Studies, Media Industry Studies, Cultural Economics and Sociology. Specific variants of ecology in this context are ‘creative ecology’ (Howkins, 2010), ‘production ecology’ or ‘media production ecology’ (Cottle, 2004; Baltruschat, 2010; Steemers, 2010), ‘project ecologies’ (Grabher, 2002), ‘institutional ecology’ (Benkler, 2006) and ‘linked ecologies’ (Abbott, 2005) to name just a few.

My own use of the term ecology in the context of this research project has been influenced by the critical political economy frameworks associated with cultural and creative industries, production studies and media industries studies. I have deliberately avoided using the term ‘media ecology’ to avoid confusion with either the North American (Marshall McLuhan) or the European (Mathew Fuller) versions of media ecology. With so many uses of the term ‘ecology’ in current circulation I have chosen to use ‘documentary production ecology’. In doing so I am specifically aligning my approach with scholars who have used ecology within a critical political economy framework, particularly Simon Cottle and Jeanette Steemers, who both use the term ‘production ecology’ (Cottle, 2003, 2004; Steemers, 2010) and Doris Baltruschat and Georgina Born, who use the terms ‘media production ecology’ (Baltruschat, 2010) or ‘media ecology’ (Born, 2004), but in ways that refer specifically to the field of media production.

---

2 Abbott’s theory of ‘linked ecologies’ has also been described as closely aligned with Bourdieu’s ‘cultural field’, though Abbott has argued that there are key differences between ecology and field (Abbott, n.d.)
Simon Cottle’s notion of production ecology (which Steemers follows) is partly based on Bourdieu’s notion of a ‘cultural field’ (Cottle, 2004, p. 82) while also shaped by critical political economy:

Critical political economy is essential for understanding the general market dynamics of media organization and production, and it also needs to be deployed in respect of particular fields of cultural production. We also need to attend, however, to the organizational structuration of a particular field as well as the professional negotiation within it of wider forces if we want to understand the production and evolution of cultural forms. The concept of ‘production ecology’ helps here and brings into view the dynamic relationships between different media organizations that coexist and compete within particular arenas of cultural production and how they respond – both organizationally and professionally – to wider forces of change, and adapt and differentiate their particular cultural forms. (Cottle, 2004, pp. 82–83)

Cottle, Steemers, Baltruschat and Born share a common concern with the effects of changes in the broader media ecology (such as neoliberal cultural and economic policies and technological change) on public service media organisations and producers, which is also relevant to the issues explored in my own research.

The field of production studies has also shaped my research approach. Consistent with the framework of ecology, a production studies approach examines context, relations and multiple perspectives; and encourages a reflexive awareness of the researcher’s responsibilities and subjectivities. As Mayer, Banks and Caldwell, describing the concerns of production studies explain:

Production studies gather empirical data about production: the complexity of routines and rituals, the routines of seemingly complex processes, the economic and political forces that shape roles, technologies, and the distribution of
resources according to cultural and demographic differences [...] The crisis of representing producers, their locations, industries, and products is the burden of representation for production studies. Articulated from various disciplines as grounded theory, lay theory, action theory, and so on, production studies privilege but also interrogate research methodologies that place the researcher in dialogue with subjects usually charged with representing us. (Mayer, Banks, & Caldwell, 2009, p. 4).

Georgina Born’s study of the challenges faced by the BBC in ‘reinventing’ a public service media organisation is a production studies exemplar, an ethnographic study based on fieldwork conducted within the BBC over many years of study. Born’s critical reflections and transparency about her experiences as an embedded researcher have greatly informed my approach to researching a production ecology with which I became increasingly involved as both a researcher and producer during (and through) this study.

Key Areas of Enquiry

This research is centred on three key areas of enquiry: change, innovation and the functions of documentary as a creative and cultural industry.

1. Change

*How has New Zealand’s documentary production ecology been affected by global changes in media production, distribution and use, and local changes such as the decline of public service broadcasting services?*

Many of the issues faced by the New Zealand documentary production ecology are not unique, but are manifest in specific ways in this location. The study of how New Zealand’s documentary ecology has experience and responded to changes that are both indicative of global economic, political, technological and social forces and trends and
particular to the circumstances of the New Zealand context is, I believe, an important contribution to the study of media industries.

At present, there are a number of different factors in the global media environment that have significant implications for New Zealand’s documentary production ecology. Internationally, creative and cultural industries face similar challenges in a globalised networked economy, such as; changing models of production, distribution/circulation and consumption/use related to rapidly evolving technologies and platforms; tensions between cultural and economic values; and the precarity of creative work in flexible labour markets. These are representative of a triad that David Hesmondhalgh (summarising and adapting Graham Murdock) describes as the ‘convergence of cultural forms’, ‘convergence of corporate ownership’ and the ‘convergence of communication systems’ (Hesmondhalgh, 2007). Globalisation has brought about the relaxation and deregulation of media ownership restrictions and the easing of global trade tariffs and the emergence of networked communications. Digital television broadcast has brought about a proliferation of free to air TV channels in addition to cable or satellite subscription services. New platforms have emerged such as mobile and web content delivery, video on demand and IPTV creating an increased demand for content, access to niche markets, and opportunities for self-distribution. The introduction of cheaper, more accessible production equipment such as HD prosumer cameras and desktop editing software, has made the means of production more accessible and increased competition amongst independent documentary makers, amplifying tensions between ‘amateurs’ and ‘professionals’ within an industry where ‘creative labour’ is already precarious. Audiences are increasingly accessing and interacting with online and mobile content and engaging with social media. Content is increasingly pull rather than push, delivered on demand rather than on schedule, facilitating the Long Tail business model (Anderson, 2006), and the rise of crowdfunding and self-distribution. New technologies and new platforms also mean an increase in content that is hybrid, multimodal, multiplatform, participatory, user-generated, interactive and locative.

These shifts represent significant changes in media production, consumption and distribution (or use), providing new opportunities for the creation of new kinds of
content on a variety of platforms and the ability to reach wider audiences/markets on a global scale. Yet, the ‘new media ecology’ is also a highly competitive environment creating new challenges for local producers.

For the New Zealand documentary production ecology, the impact of these global forces is highly dependent on specific local conditions. Because of its small size and geographic isolation, New Zealand’s screen production ecology is vulnerable to external forces and subject to frequent upheaval (Horrocks, 2004a). The documentary production ecology is even more volatile; production is dependent on cultural subsidy and documentaries are notionally expected to both fulfil a public service function while also maintaining broad audience appeal in a competitive commercial media environment. During the period of this study many key policies and industry bodies were under review or in transition, the television broadcasting landscape was in constant flux and public service broadcasting entered into serious decline.

The changing nature of television production and consumption and the diversification and fragmentation of the broadcast television market have had a particular impact on documentary production ecologies all over the world and New Zealand is no exception. The competition for audience attention in the contemporary media ecology is fierce. This impacts not only on commercial broadcasters, but also public service media providers, which in turn impacts on producers and audiences.

During the period of the study I have taught media studies to many undergraduate students and I routinely ask each new group of students about their television viewing habits. Students who watch broadcast television regularly are increasingly in the minority when I conduct these informal polls. This is not to say that they do not watch television at all. Some of them watch OnDemand, but mostly they use P2P networks such as torrent sites, use Virtual Private Networks to connect to NetFlix or watch DVD box sets of TV shows. Current industry research on New Zealand audience behaviour is limited and findings vary. A 2007 study of regular Internet users commissioned by NZ On Air found that the television viewing of nearly three-quarters of those surveyed had
declined “with 90% of those saying they had put the additional free time into ‘general internet use’ Nearly all viewed internet video, in a wide range of settings” (Brown & Dubber, 2007, p. 1). Yet, more recent research commissioned by NZ On Air (2014) found that television and radio are still the most popular forms of media for New Zealand audiences, and that “83% of respondents watched live television daily, while 67% listened to live radio and both for a considerable amount of time each day” while only 12% of respondents watch New Zealand broadcasters’ OnDemand service and 6% use overseas online services such as Netflix, BBC iPlayer, and Hulu (Colmar Brunton, 2014). It is important to note, however, that this survey was based on 1000 interviews conducted by landline telephone and 400 by an online survey using Colmar Brunton’s Flybuys panel. I argue that this method of data collection would skew significantly towards audiences more inclined to traditional broadcast platforms. The affordability of mobile telephone and naked broadband plans (often linked through telecommunications providers such as Orcon) means that an increasing number of New Zealanders do not have a landline telephone. The Colmar Brunton Flybuys panel is a rewards-based consumer panel. This means that the online survey respondents would be limited to the consumer demographics that subscribe to the Flybuys rewards programme.

The difficulty of measuring contemporary audiences is acknowledged in the NZ On Air/Colmar Brunton report:

*As technology expands and evolves, and audiences fragment in the face of ever-widening choice, it becomes more difficult to measure consumer behaviour across all sources. For instance there is no single source measurement of on air and online behaviour, and such a development looks to be at least several years away in New Zealand. There is therefore no way to measure duplicated or exclusive reach across different platforms. There is also no accurate “people based” measure (ie. number of users) of online video viewing in New Zealand. (Colmar Brunton, 2014, slide 4)*
Recent independent research undertaken by Roy Morgan suggests that while TV and radio consumption is still currently strong (and buoyed in New Zealand by the unusually high percentages of pay TV subscriptions), concurrent use of online media alongside broadcasting services is a growing trend. Furthermore, the *Digital Universe* report anticipates a decline in traditional media consumption:

*The average daily time Kiwis spend online has shot up since 2009, while the time we spend watching TV has declined (despite our very healthy Pay TV subscription rate) and we expect that the internet will eventually take over as the media we spend most time with. With ever more television and radio available online, not to mention magazines and newspapers, the internet is fast becoming a one-stop media shop!* (Roy Morgan Research, 2013, p. 3)

Audiences have ‘gone multiplatform’, but during the period of this study, television broadcasters had not. I argue that the New Zealand media ecology is not well prepared for a shift in media consumption away from traditional broadcast. Neither New Zealand broadcasters nor media producers (including documentary makers) are providing the online and multiplatform that audiences are seeking. Online and multiplatform documentaries may be a niche form of content at present, but that may well not be the case in future. By the time broadcasters, funders and producers realise the need for innovation in this area, audiences may have already moved on. With the traditional broadcasting platforms for documentary resisting innovation and a decline public service media services, this research examines impact of change and at the ways that the documentary ecology has responded to the rapidly changing environment.

2. **Documentary as a creative practice and form of cultural production**

*What is the function of documentary as a form of cultural production and as a creative practice within the framework of creative and cultural industries, and how does documentary production in New Zealand fit within this framework?*
Tensions between commercial and cultural interests are a defining feature of New Zealand’s documentary ecology. Two schools of critical thought labelled Creative Industries and Cultural Industries in many ways mirror conflicting notions of cultural and economic value within New Zealand’s documentary production ecology. While both schools share common concerns and are not necessarily opposed in every respect, as David Hesmondalgh explains, the differences implied by the use of these terms are tied to diverging approaches to cultural policy (2007, pp. 144 - 145), and are to some degree underpinned by differing ideological positions. Creative Industries springs from the emergence the mid ‘90s of ‘new economy’ or ‘creative economy’ policies motivated by the belief that, “by linking arts to the cultural industries, even these most refined of activities could be made to seem part of economic development, the sine qua non of most government policy in the era of neo-liberalism” (Hesmondhalgh 2007, p. 144). Within this paradigm, innovation and creativity are treated as keys to unlocking economic success, and sustainability (meaning the ability to function without or with minimal public investment) is the Holy Grail. In New Zealand this kind of thinking is reflected in cultural policies that are often criticised for placing great weight on return for public investment in the form of ratings or box office sales than other measurements of value such as artistic or cultural merit. In the course of participant observation and interviews, the term innovation is frequently used, not to describe creative practices in documentary, but production practices that might lead to a more sustainable (less precarious) pathway both for practitioners and for the ‘industry’ itself.

The term industry, applied to documentary production in New Zealand (perhaps anywhere in the world) is, I suggest, contentious. If creative industries are, as Hesmondhalgh, (paraphrasing Nicholas Garnham) describes, “… the key new growth sector of the economy, both nationally and globally” and “the key source of future employment growth and export earnings” (p. 145, 2007), then documentary production fails to fit the bill. By its very nature, documentary is a form of cultural production that is intrinsically aligned with public service media values, which are frequently at odds with the commercial imperatives of a competitive media market. For this reason, broadcast commissioners increasingly favour half-hour series of documentary and popular factual television formats to the longer form one-off documentary that independent documentary makers would prefer to make. The local content funding body
New Zealand On Air (NZ On Air) allocates a broad range of factual content under the single category of documentary, which affords broadcasters a great deal of leeway. In the context of a highly commercial broadcasting system, the question of what documentary is, what it does, and how documentary should be valued and measured is important. In this thesis, I look at discourse around these issues within the ecology and contribute my own analysis.

The precarity of labour within Cultural and Creative Industries has been widely addressed as an issue of concern within the Creative Industries or Creative Economy paradigm (Ross, 2007) (McRobbie, 2007). With fewer one-offs being commissioned – and series being more suited to more business minded production companies rather than individuals – solo independent documentary makers are increasingly finding work for television to be increasingly scarce and budgets to be tighter. Few seem to be able to make a living from documentary production alone. However, many documentary makers (motivated by factors other than money) are opting out of television production altogether, producing films for festival and independent theatrical release, often with very limited or no public funding. The recent emergence of crowdfunding and crowdsourcing, new forms of philanthropy, and audience outreach via various platforms including social media have offered these filmmakers new opportunities; but the ease of access to production equipment and technologies has also increased competition, locally and internationally.

The Creative Industries approach is not without merit. Whereas Cultural Industries scholarship tends to focus more on “the importance of thinking about the cultural industries as producers of texts” (Hesmondhalgh, 2007), much of the current Creative Industries scholarship self-reflexively examines discourses around creativity and innovation and is itself innovative, exploring inter-disciplinary approaches and applied research. John Howkins, in his treatise on ‘creative ecology’, holds up the work of economists John Nightingale and Jason Potts as examples of researchers within this paradigm who "treat creative industries not as 'an industry per se, but rather as an element of the innovation system of the whole economy and see creative workers as specialists in conceptualising and enabling change" (Howkins, 2010, pp. 30–31).
Cultural Industries however, with its focus on political economy and cultural production offer a useful counterbalance to some of the ‘trendier’ concerns of Creative Industries. I will suggest then, that there is value in both perspectives and that each offer useful ways of thinking about the function of documentary as a creative and cultural form.

3. Innovation

*Within the unique conditions that define New Zealand’s documentary production ecology, what factors either support or inhibit innovation, and what does innovation really mean within this context?*

Innovation and creativity are two terms central to Creative Industries discourses, promoted (and contested) as key ingredients in the ‘special sauce’ that will enable creative industries to survive and thrive in an uncertain and challenging economic climate. Although creativity is to some degree implicit in the term ‘innovation’, this research project is less concerned with the aesthetic dimensions of creativity (except, for example, in Chapter Four where content analysis is a tool to examine what documentary is in relation to the NZ On Air funding category of documentary). I have therefore focused on innovation (and not, explicitly, on creativity) on the basis that there is an important creative dimension to innovation, but that innovation also encompasses the origination and applications of new technologies, novel approaches to production and circulation and ways of instigating and/or responding and adapting to change. In Chapter Two I review relevant literature on innovation in creative and cultural industry contexts and in Chapter Three I examine different approaches to innovation in other documentary production ecologies.

Recent research by social anthropologists Tiffany Rinne and John Fairweather proposes that, “while inventiveness is an important cultural trait, a trait based in New Zealand’s history as a pioneering nation, there are other cultural factors such as a ‘make do’ attitude, the tall poppy syndrome, and an emphasis on lifestyle which potentially limit the innovation performance of New Zealand” (Rinne & Fairweather, 2011, p. 77). Rinne and Fairweather find that despite rating well in cultural measures that indicate potential for innovation based on cultural values, New Zealand underperforms in measures of innovation achievement (such as the International Innovation Index, has a
GDP per capita below the OECD average and ranks 23rd out of 31 in the OECD, falling from the upper decile of OECD countries in less than four decades (p. 80). An important aspect of this study has been to examine attitudes to and perceptions of innovation, examining the “culture of production” as well as the production of culture (Mayer et al., 2009).

New Zealand’s cultural mythology is rich with allusions to innovation; one of the great cultural symbols is the Number 8 Wire, which represents the idea that anything can achieved with the help of a bit of fencing wire and kiwi ingenuity. In this ‘Do It Yourself’ culture inventors such as Ernest Rutherford, John Britten and Richard Pearce are regarded as heroes. ‘Kiwi innovation’ is as much a national slogan as ‘100% Pure New Zealand’… and perhaps as much of a myth. Tourism New Zealand’s website boasts, “creativity, versatility and innovation are credited with giving New Zealand film-making the leading edge and, in the words of the American Film Institute, the New Zealand film industry is ‘one of the wonders of the world - an unparalleled success story’” (Tourism New Zealand, n.d.). The screen sector has (at times) been one of New Zealand’s most profitable industries (PWC, 2012) thanks to blockbuster runaway productions like Peter Jackson’s Lord of the Rings and The Hobbit film trilogies or James Cameron’s Avatar, but due to international competition and the high New Zealand dollar, the local film industry reached crisis point in 2013 due to a decline in international productions that the domestic industry is reliant on (Editor, 2013).

The domestic sphere of screen production is arguably far less groundbreaking. In this thesis I will argue that television broadcasters — particularly in the current economic climate — are highly risk averse, as are funding bodies; it is no great leap to conclude that this is a significant barrier to innovation such as the expansion of documentary or other kinds of public service content beyond established forms of broadcast content that can be sure to deliver an audience. Yet, the landscape of broadcasting, theatrical and domestic distribution is changing rapidly. Within the Creative Industries field economists such as Hasan Bakhshi and David Throsby argue that new digital platforms and production technologies have the potential to expand creative and economic opportunities, to “overcome the traditional constraints imposed by physical location,
thereby expanding [...] audience reach” while also opening “new avenues for developing the art form, create new sources of economic and cultural value, and spur new business models” (Bakhshi & Throsby, 2010). However, in New Zealand there has been little strategic policy or industry support for innovation in new media technologies and platforms and little or no output in web, mobile or transmedia documentary.

Creative Industries proponents argue that creative innovation is essential to economic and social sustainability and growth in a knowledge based (or innovation-led) economy. According to Jason Potts and Stuart Cunningham, the role of creative industries in relation to the broader economy has evolved over time from a model based on market failure, to normalisation as “just another industry”, to a driver of growth as a supplier of novelty (requiring public investment) and finally (in the present day) a model of innovation that, “suggests that the creative industries be seen as a part of the innovation system of the broader economy, originating and coordinating change in the knowledge base of the economy, as much on the demand side as the supply side” (Cunningham, 2013, p. 31).

Cunningham proposes that public service media organisations play an important role as innovation drivers in changing media ecologies, as the public service media sector moves on “from Reithian justifications of normative market shaping to a more nimble, facilitative role of performing experimental R&D for the system” (Cunningham, 2013, p. 95). PSM innovation initiatives play an important role in identifying and capitalising on audience and technology trends, using online and multiplatform content and services to attract audiences that “may have been lost to the conventional broadcasting spheres” (Cunningham, 2013, p. 105).

*PSBs typically straddle the boundary between the market and the community or civic space. They have complex nation-building roles, delivering key information and news and current affairs unburdened by commercial interests and thus performing a key informal educative function (and, in so doing, maintaining a ‘trust’ relationship in a ‘risk’ society), but also providing experimental domains for new technology and creative R&D, while connecting with a broad-based audience.* (Cunningham, 2013, p. 93)
However, public service broadcasting entered into a period of significant decline rather than renewal in New Zealand during the period of this study. This has had a major impact on documentary production as commercial broadcasters favour factual entertainment (popular factual) genres over documentary. It has also meant there is no innovation driver in the New Zealand broadcasting ecology, which not only affects documentary – and the important role this cultural form plays in the support of a healthy public sphere – but has a broader impact on the local media ecology as competition intensifies and audience behaviour changes.

Outline of relevant research:

Although is the first study of documentary production in New Zealand to focus on issues relating to innovation and change, I have drawn on a range of research focused either on specific New Zealand production case studies or broader studies of screen industries that address aspects of practice, output, policy and public service. Although a more comprehensive review of relevant literature can be found in Chapter Two, I will briefly summarise the core body of work relating to New Zealand’s documentary production ecology to which I have aimed to contribute.

Jane Roscoe’s book *Documentary in New Zealand: an Immigrant Nation* (Roscoe, 1999) and Lisa Perrot’s PhD thesis *The New Zealand Wars Documentary Series: Discursive Struggle and Cultural Memory* (Perrett, 2007) are in-depth case studies of two documentary series produced in the late 90s, which offer useful points of comparison with the period covered in this study and share common concerns in terms of the cultural role of documentary and the competing interests of commercial television and public service broadcasting values. Geraldene Peters’ PhD thesis *Oppositional voices: radical left documentary in Aotearoa New Zealand* charts New Zealand’s alternative documentary tradition between 1949 and 1996 (Peters, 2005), and Lars Weckbecker’s PhD thesis *Governing Visions of the Real* draws on Foucault’s concepts of the dispositive and governmentality to examine the National Film Unit of New Zealand’s strategic use of documentary during the 1950s and 1950s (Weckbecker, 2012). Russell Campbell’s book *Observations: Studies in New Zealand Documentary
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(Campbell, 2011) is a collection of essays published over a period of twenty-five years, focusing on specific documentary texts. While Campbell does not claim to provide a comprehensive historical account of New Zealand documentary, *Observations* does to some extent map out the terrain of documentary, again shedding light on the role of documentary in New Zealand’s cultural life and identity.

Mary Debrett’s work on Public Service Broadcasting (Debrett, 2009, 2010) and on documentary funding (Debrett, 2004, 2006) explores the role of documentary as a social project, and in a broader industry context, situates New Zealand’s production ecology in a global setting. This work has been an invaluable resource, opening up many of the areas of discussion with which I have engaged.

Roger Horrocks has extensively mapped New Zealand’s television ecology and I have engaged closely with his work throughout this thesis, but particularly in Chapter Three ‘New Zealand Television Documentary in Context’ where I examine how the five phases of New Zealand broadcasting outlined by Horrocks have shaped New Zealand’s documentary ecology. In addition to being an eminent academic, Horrocks has had an active role in the growth of New Zealand’s screen industry, including having served as chair of NZ On Air and being one of the founders of the Auckland International Film Festival. Despite his significant involvement with industry, Horrocks has never shied away from the role of ‘critic and conscience’; setting a standard I hope to follow as I negotiate dual roles as researcher and producer.

Trisha Dunleavy and Hester Joyce’s book *New Zealand Film and Television: Institution, Industry and Cultural Change* (T. Dunleavy & Joyce, 2011) takes a critical approach that presents a cultural and creative industry analysis of New Zealand film and television ecology within a critical political economy framework, which, “rather than emphasising the analysis of the screen productions themselves or investigating their capacity to demonstrate their relationships to New Zealand culture, society or history … examines how the interplay of political, economic, industrial, and creative forces has shaped its domestic screen production” (p. 18). The focus spans five decades and
represents the most comprehensive study of New Zealand film and television production to date, but focuses solely on narrative feature film and television drama.

Although government agencies such as The Film Commission and New Zealand On Air have very limited funds for research, the discussion papers and reports generated by these funding bodies during the course of my research have also been extremely informative, in particular the New Zealand On Air publications; NZ On Air: An Evaluative Study 1989 – 2011 (Norris & Pauling, 2012), NZ On Air Documentary Funding Policy: Discussion Paper (NZ On Air, 2012b) and the subsequent Responses to TV Documentary funding policy: discussion paper (NZ On Air, 2012c), Digital Content Partnership Fund Review (Leeuwenberg, 2012) and Platinum Fund Review (Quirk, 2012). Also of great value is the Jackson and Court report commissioned by the Ministry for Arts, Culture and Heritage, ‘Review of the New Zealand Film Commission’ (P. Jackson & Court, 2010) and a report commissioned by the NZFC and Creative New Zealand several years prior to the period of my study, ‘Research into New Zealand's Independent Documentary Sector’ (Creative New Zealand the New Zealand Film Commission, 2008).

**Original contribution to knowledge**

This study’s original contribution to knowledge is the close study of how technological and institutional change is experienced and addressed within the specific conditions of New Zealand’s documentary ecology during the period 2010 – 2013. Through a conceptual framework that involves ethnographic methods (participant observation, interviews), analysis of output, policy, commissioning and scheduling and practice-led research I have been able to add to an understanding of the value and function of innovation within creative and cultural production, and more specifically, in the field of documentary. I have also made a distinctive contribution to the production ecology through the role that I have played in establishing the initiatives Transmedia NZ and Loading Docs, both of which demonstrate the value of collaborative networks.
Research design and methods

In keeping with the ecological framework of the study I employed a variety of ethnographic, qualitative methods (in-depth interviews and participant observation), analysed industry reports, gathered data on output and analysed content. I also engaged in practice-led research, becoming involved with a range of industry activities and initiatives (including Loading Docs and Transmedia NZ).

My initial research design was as follows:

This project will analyse the industry’s response to change and consequent challenges and opportunities, situated within a broader social, political and historical context. The project aims to present a range of perspectives from the industry drawn from face to face interviews and observation. Case studies will present a detailed analysis of industry output, industry initiatives towards innovation in cross-media production and examine current institutional and creative practice. The documentary production community will also be invited to participate in a project website which will, with the permission of participants, present research findings and excerpts from interviews with the aim of facilitating further discussion on key issues, promoting transparency, informed debate and acting as an additional research tool.

Ethnographic research will draw primarily on interviews, and, to a lesser degree, observation of key industry meetings, conferences and events, communications and publications. This will complement quantitative data with in-depth first-person knowledge on industry practice. A sample of approximately 20 – 25 documentary producers, broadcasters, funders, industry representatives and distributors/exhibitors will be interviewed.

A quantitative overview of industry output in the years 2010, 2011 and 2012 will analyse data on the forms of documentary produced, technologies used, sources of funding and platforms for broadcast, exhibition and distribution.
A case study of an industry innovation initiative, the DocEdge Lab, will correspond to the period of quantitative research. This research will explore the outcomes and impact of this initiative in relation to the development of transmedia documentary practice in New Zealand. Lab participants will be tracked via questionnaire from 2010-2012 and I will take part in the Lab as a participant observer.

Research findings and edited interview extracts will be presented in an online project website. This site will also be used as a research tool and will be a means of soliciting participation and feedback from within the documentary ecology.

On the whole, the research plan was followed as proposed, though with a few adjustments. A project website was set up as a blog (www.nzdocumentary.net), which proved to be a more effective means of keeping a record of activities within the production ecology rather than communicating with the documentary community. The blog became inactive from September 2012 as my attention shifted from gathering data to writing up and other demands such as teaching, blogging elsewhere, completing and transcribing interviews and so on demanded more of my time. My intention is to revive the blog and redevelop the website after submission in order to share research findings. Although I did film the majority of interviews, this approach was sometimes problematic, as I will discuss below.

I participated in the Doc Edge Lab (DOC Lab) in 2010, 2011 and 2012 (the first year as a participant, the second as participant observer, the third year as a mentor), however my proposal to formally track participants via questionnaire failed due to lack of participation. I have nonetheless examined DOC Lab from my perspective as participant observer in Chapter 7.

The inclusion of practice-led research came about as a result of my involvement in the documentary ecology through participant observation, my growing knowledge and
interest in expanded documentary and the desire to test the opportunities and challenges for innovation. In 2011 on returning to New Zealand after a year based in Melbourne I started Transmedia NZ (originally called Transmedia AM), a networking group for people interested in transmedia and other new cross-platform forms of content and innovative production practices. Working with co-director Fiona Milburn, Transmedia NZ has been a platform from which to advocate for innovation, to work with a range of industry organisations to hold transmedia events, to facilitate industry networking and to share knowledge. From 2010 – 2012 I was also involved in a creative collective called Virtuo experimenting with new and emerging technologies such as mobile interactive video and live-streamed participatory filmmaking. Throughout the period of the study I became involved in the development of a number of expanded documentary projects, which gave me first-hand experience of the funding process and the dynamics of the production ecology. Although I hadn’t initially intended to take a practice-led approach, I realised that my own creative involvement in these projects had significantly informed my research and provided a useful tool for reflective analysis of innovation and creativity as well as the practical challenges of exploring new forms of production. The most significant of these projects is an online short documentary initiative called Loading Docs (produced with Julia Parnell, Notable Pictures), which explores new avenues for funding, production and distribution. This initiative is discussed in detail in Chapter Seven, in a reflection on practice-led research.

**Interview participants**

The 22 participants interviewed were selected based on their positions within the documentary production industry either as employees or representatives of a government body, broadcaster, industry organization, or as an independent documentary maker. I interviewed 13 independent documentary makers (generally directing and/or producing one-off documentaries for film and/or television), three heads of production houses (generally producing factual series), two television commissioners, the heads of the funding bodies New Zealand on Air (television) and The New Zealand Film Commission, the director of the New Zealand International Film Festival and the director of New Zealand crowdfunding platform, PledgeMe.
As this project is focused on production within an industry context, with a particular emphasis on organisation, labour and creative practices, audience members were not interviewed. However, participants were asked questions about audiences in terms of engagement, the role of the audience in the production ecology and, in the context of notions of innovation and creativity, how the audience may be increasingly more actively involved in the production process.

**Independent Documentary Makers**

Costa Botes

Pietra Brettkelly

Sumner Burstyn

Anna Cottrell and Amy O’Connor

Annie Goldson

Paora Joseph

Briar March

Pamela Meekings-Stewart

Justin Pemberton

Leanne Pooley

Christopher Pryor and Miriam Smith

This is the largest sample size in the study as independent documentary makers, generally working alone or in collaborative pairings, represent a significant amount of activity within the documentary ecology, particularly in theatrical or one-off production. These directors and producers also typically make work that most faithfully conforms to standard critical definitions of documentary as a ‘creative treatment of factuality’. The
small sample of men is probably proportionate to an area of screen production where women seem to be well represented compared to other sectors of screen production. Many of the more experienced filmmakers interviewed have worked for or been board members of organisations such as New Zealand On Air, Creative New Zealand, Women in Film and Television (WIFT) or the Screen Directors Guild (SDGNZ) and were able to draw on these to give insights into aspects of funding or changes in the production ecology over time. The majority of these participants are directors, most also produce their own documentaries also. Anna Cottrell and Amy O’Connor were interviewed as a pair because at the time the interview was conducted they were working together in a producer/director partnership that had emerged from Cottrell’s mentorship of O’Connor. Christopher Pryor and Miriam Smith were also interviewed together as they work as a collaborative team under the banner of Deer Heart Films. Sumner Burstyn was interviewed alone but she also works in collaboration with her husband Thomas Burstyn. Both Christopher Pryor and Thomas Burstyn established themselves as cinematographers before moving into directing. Few of the participants in this group work solely in documentary production; most supplement their income with other work or have a dual career, (for example Annie Goldson as an academic and Paora Joseph as a clinical psychologist). The participants in this group are DIY filmmakers; jacks-of-all-trades who often perform multiple production roles such as sound, camera or editing in addition to directing and producing.

**Production House Founders**

Vincent Burke (Top Shelf Productions)

John Harris (Greenstone)

Julia Parnell (Notable Pictures)

Vincent Burke and John Harris are industry veterans whose companies represent a small handful of production houses that have managed to weather many seasons in an ever changing industry, while Julia Parnell is an up and coming producer and director who is striving to establish her fledgling company. Top Shelf Productions, established in 1988 has offices in Auckland and Wellington and has made over 600 hours of documentary
and factual programming as well as three one-off dramas, a mini-series and two features films. In 2012 Top Shelf launched a lifestyle TV channel Choice TV on the Freeview digital platform. Greenstone was founded in 1994 and produces a range of television shows (popular factual, entertainment, drama and documentary) and has produced approximately 100 documentaries. Though primarily based in Auckland, Greenstone also operates project offices when required in Wellington, Melbourne and Sydney. Greenstone is particularly well known as a producer of ‘obs doc’ popular factual series such as *Motorway Patrol*, *Renters* and *Neighbours at War*. Notable Pictures was established in 2010 and has produced two seasons of a 13-part sports entertainment show, two seasons of a 10 part documentary series, three one-off documentaries and four short films. For all of these producers, factual series are an important source of income that sustains their businesses while one-off productions are often labours of love.

**Television Commissioners**

Annie Murray, Head of External Programming, Māori Television Service

Kathy Wright, Channel Manager, Prime Television

Māori Television Service (MTS) and Prime TV are categorised by NZ On Air as Tier 2 broadcasters; these channels attract smaller audiences than Tier One broadcasters TVOne, TV2 (TVNZ) and TV3 but commission a significant number of local documentaries compared to the tier 1 broadcasters. MTS is currently the only broadcaster with a regular strand for New Zealand documentary (Pakipumeka). While Prime does not have a dedicated strand for New Zealand documentary, between 2010 and 2013 it had commissioned 10 factual series and 6 one-off documentaries. MTS is a State sector enterprise established by the Government in 2003 to promote Māori language under the Māori Television Service Act 2003. While MTS does generate income from advertising, unlike state owned broadcaster TVNZ, it is not required to return a profit to the government and is widely regarded as the last remnant of public service television in New Zealand (though with a specific mandate to promote Māori language and culture). Prime TV is a free to air channel currently owned by Pay TV.
broadcaster Sky Network Television that programmes a range of local and international content including news, sport, entertainment and factual programmes. My attempts to secure interviews with commissioners from the Tier 1 broadcasters TVNZ and TV3 were unsuccessful.

**Public Funding Body CEOs**

Graeme Mason, CEO, New Zealand Film Commission

Jane Wrightson, Chief Executive, New Zealand On Air

Both Mason and Wrightson were generous with their time and spoke candidly. Unfortunately I was unable to accurately transcribe Mason’s interview due to a technical problem with the recording (made via Skype), but our discussion was nonetheless informative.

**Other**

Bill Gosden, New Zealand International Film Festival Director

Anna Guenther, PledgeMe Co-Founder

Bill Gosden has been the director of the NZIFF since 1984, having previously worked for the Wellington Film Festival since 1979 and Gosden’s critical opinion and support is highly valued by filmmakers. The festival plays a vital role in New Zealand's documentary production ecology. Many theatrical documentaries will only screen at the festival, or success at the festival will lead to a wider theatrical release, and selection often unlocks finishing funds from the NZFC. I particularly wanted to talk to him in light of the record 10 New Zealand feature documentaries screened in the 2012 festival, discussed in Chapter 5.
Anna Guenther is the co-founder of New Zealand based crowd-funding platform PledgeMe, which grew out of Guenther’s thesis project for her Masters of Entrepreneurship at the University of Otago. Anna had generously shared her research with me and pointed me in the direction of useful resources on crowdfunding prior to our formal interview. The impact of PledgeMe and other crowdfunding platforms is discussed in some detail in Chapters 3 and 4.

**Interview Methods**

In the case of documentary makers, where there was a large pool of suitable candidates for participation, I made a shortlist based on my existing knowledge of active documentary makers with the aim to cover a range of age, gender and experience. Other participants were selected on the basis of their professional positions, such as funders and commissioners. In some cases I was introduced to an individual who was not known to me and who struck me as having a valuable perspective to offer, as was the case with Pamela Meekings-Stewart and Miriam Smith. I attended as many industry functions as I could and talked about my research with as many people as would listen to me. This was enormously helpful not only in terms of learning about the ecology and gaining feedback on my research, but making personal contact with participants in informal situations made it much easier to secure interviews with participants. Many of the prospective participants I contacted by cold calling or emailing did not respond to requests for interviews, whereas in face to face situations, where I could explain and discuss my research, most people were more than willing to agree to an interview. Securing and scheduling interviews with a group of people with erratic and often demanding schedules was a far more difficult task than I had imagined and ultimately, there were many people whom I would have liked to interview who were either unavailable or unresponsive and others who I simply could not fit in due to time and financial constraints.

My initial ethics application, the approval of which was also a length process due to the need to submit to two Universities, proposed to record all interviews on video so that, with the consent of participants, selected excerpts could be published on a project...
website that would eventually function as a public resource, a form of publication more accessible than journal articles or a thesis that would provide an audio visual document of the research. The estimated time commitment required of interviewees was 60 minutes, not to exceed 120 minutes at most. I began first by interviewing documentary makers, none of whom objected to being recorded, and I quickly found that a hazard of talking with professional storytellers is that I had to manage interviews carefully to keep the duration closer to one hour than two. I had promised to make a copy of the interview transcript available to participants so that they could verify that information was correct or identify statements that they would prefer to be anonymous or not used. Many participants spoke freely, perhaps reassured by this safety measure, but the presence of the camera and the knowledge that there was a possibility that interview material might have a public life clearly discouraged some participants from speaking openly, particularly on topics such as funding and commissioning. Given the size of the industry however, it is possible that even if I had proposed universal anonymity and had established relationship of trust with the participant, some people would withhold their most honest views as a matter of prudence. The first funder I interviewed did not want to be interviewed, nor did the commissioners I spoke to.

8 of the 22 participants were interviewed over the course of three trips to Wellington, two participants were interviewed on Waiheke Island (in Auckland’s Hauraki Gulf), one participant was interviewed via Skype (from Wellington) and the remaining 11 participants were interviewed in and around central Auckland.

Interviews covered defined topics, but took the form of a conversation. When participants raised an interesting and relevant topic of conversation I would follow and try to bring the conversation back to the predefined list of questions when necessary, aiming to respond to information and ideas initiated by the participant as much as possible. I transcribed all the interviews myself and sent a raw transcript to participants, asking them to identify any material that they wished to be made anonymous or to be treated as confidential. Interview material was then initially coded using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo, which helped me to organise interview content thematically for analysis.
Outline of the Thesis

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Building on the contextual framing of this introductory chapter, Chapter Two maps the terrain of study in greater depth, starting from the foundation of ecology that shapes this study’s conceptual approach and progressively working through the interrelated theoretical and discursive layers on which this research is based, detailing:

- An overview of the broader global factors that affect New Zealand’s documentary production ecology such as changes in media production, distribution and use and the forces of globalisation and neoliberalism;
- The place of documentary within competing yet overlapping critical discourses of creative and cultural industries, which influence both research and policy relating to innovation;
- New Zealand’s media ecology and the forces that have shaped it;
- New Zealand’s documentary ecology, as influenced by all of the above factors.

Chapter Three: New Zealand Television Documentary in Context

This chapter outlines both historical factors that have shaped television documentary production in New Zealand and the contemporary issues that affect the ecology today. Drawing on a range of participant perspectives on funding, commissioning and production, key changes observed during the period of the study are examined in relation to ongoing tensions between public service media values and commercial imperatives and competing notions of value within creative and cultural industry discourses.
Chapter Four: Defining Television Documentary: Analysis of Funding and Output

Furthering the institutional analysis presented in Chapter Three, this chapter looks more closely at the form, function and value of documentary in the New Zealand television-broadcasting context. Through analysis of documentary output, commissioning, scheduling and content, this chapter focuses on the definition of documentary as a funding category applied by NZ On Air and relates this analysis to a wider discourse about the status of television documentary in New Zealand as a practice and form in transition (and arguably, in decline).

Chapter Five: Theatrical Documentary in New Zealand

This chapter explores the institutional aspect of theatrical documentary in New Zealand, looking at innovation and change in relation to funding, production practices, distribution and exhibition and marketing, promotion and outreach. This chapter also explores the relationship between television and theatrical documentary production and the impact of new media technologies and platforms on theatrical documentary.

Chapter Six: Innovation and Digital Content: Towards a Multiplatform Future

While there has been little support for multiplatform and online documentary in New Zealand, various initiatives and activities within the documentary and broader media production ecology have explored new pathways and opportunities for innovation. This chapter outlines key initiatives documented and observed during the period of the study and examines the response of core government agencies NZ On Air and the NZFC to changes in the media ecology.

Chapter Seven: Reflection on Participation and Practice-Led Research

In conjunction with other research methods discussed, practice-led research has informed this study with a greater insight into the dynamics of the production ecology and an empirical understanding of the challenges and opportunities for innovation. This chapter presents a discussion of my experience as a researcher/practitioner and presents
a detailed case study of Loading Docs, a project that explores innovation in documentary funding, production and distribution.

**Chapter Eight: Conclusion**

This chapter presents and discusses the key findings of the thesis and outlines its original contribution to knowledge, addressing the role and value of innovation in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology and identifying factors that support and/or inhibit innovation.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Although the history of documentary production in New Zealand is characterised by change and uncertainty, the documentary production ecology is currently facing a period of turbulence like no other. Every aspect of the ecology is confronted with radical new challenges, but also new opportunities encompassing production, distribution and delivery, funding and policy and even form and style; and all of this is taking place in the midst of a sustained global economic downturn. The changes experienced in the New Zealand documentary production ecology are generally typical of global trends, uniquely manifested according to the specific conditions of New Zealand’s local production ecology. Similarly, this study is situated within a broader context of global research, and reflects to some degree various trends in contemporary media and cultural studies. As the chapters that follow present a detailed insight into the political, economic, social and cultural factors that shape New Zealand’s documentary production ecology (both contemporary and historical), this chapter aims to situate this study within a broader context and to highlight the original contribution this project will make to a wider discourse.

Technological Innovation

Disruptive technologies such as peer to peer distribution and the emergence of various forms of online video delivery have challenged the established industry models of both film and television while the increasing affordability of professional-quality production equipment has lowered barriers to entry for non-professional or independent producers. The impact of such disruptive technologies and the disintermediation of the

film industry has been well-explored in a volume edited by Iordanova & Cunningham in which Iordanova argues that, “traditional distribution – where studios control box office revenues by releasing films for coordinated showing in a system of theatres and then direct them through an inflexible succession of hierarchically ordered windows of exhibition and formats – is radically undermined by new technologies” (Iordanova & Cunningham, 2012a).

The significance of the reconfiguration of all creative industries due to digital disruption is so great that (Potts, Cunningham, Hartley, & Ormerod, 2008) propose that creative industries be understood not as industries in the traditional sense, but as ‘social network markets’. In this model the media studies terms audience/text (or content) and producer are reconfigured as agent/network/enterprise in which, “the interrelationship among agents, networks and enterprise is dynamic and productive; all are engaged in the mutual enterprise of creating values, both symbolic and economic” (p. 5).

The redefinition of traditional industry models in both film and television is explored throughout this thesis, with close attention given to crowdfunding in Chapter Five and additional developments in digital media production and distribution discussed in more detail in Chapter Six.

**Innovation in the Creative and Cultural Industries**

Documentary production is an activity that highlights critical tensions between art and commerce, the social and political, market and state, consumer and audience which, situated in the present era of media convergence and change, are exemplified in the contested discourses of the cultural and creative industries. As innovation is a core value and the subject of much contention within these competing discourses, an important starting point for this research has been to examine what innovation means in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology, particularly in relation to the Creative Industries paradigm, (itself a product of the same political and economic forces that have shaped the political economy of New Zealand’s contemporary media landscape).
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Creative Industries is a paradigm in which policy and theory intersect, combining and reconfiguring the terms creative arts and cultural industries, and emerging in the context of technological and economic change. The New Economy that emerged in the 1990s saw a global economy wind shift away from the value of things towards the value of information (Hartley, 2005, p. 19). Internationally, Creative Industries policies were introduced based on the twofold notion that “the creative industries are the key new growth sector of the economy, both nationally and globally, and thus, against a background of manufacturing sector decline, they are the key source of future employment growth and export earnings”. In Australia the 1994 Labour Government launched Creative Nation (Hesmondhalgh, 2007), in the UK the New Labour government of 1997 renamed the Department of National Heritage as the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and championed ‘Creative Britain’ (Ross, 2007) Garnham, 2005), and in New Zealand the Labour government’s 2002 ‘Growing an Innovative New Zealand’ policy framework focused on bio-technology, ICT and creative sectors (Ministry of Economic Development, 2010).

Creative Industries can be seen as a useful framework for analysing creative and cultural industries in the context of contemporary technological and cultural change. However, critics of the Creative Industries episteme claim that the historical complicity of policy, theory and market ideology embedded in Creative Industries warrants critical scrutiny. Hesmondhalgh, drawing extensively on Nicholas Garnham’s critical political economy analysis of the policy implications of the transition from Cultural to Creative Industries, sees Creative Industries as insufficiently broad in its definition of the activities which constitute Creative Industries and too bound up in the “political, cultural and technological landscape of globalisation, the new economy and the information society” (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 148).

Whereas Hesmondhalgh defines Cultural Industries as “centrally concerned with the industrial production and circulation of texts”, Creative Industries are more broadly inclusive and more focused on economic development generated by the ‘information’ or
‘knowledge economy’, now increasingly described as ‘the creative economy’. This is exemplified in John Howkins’ *The Creative Economy* (Howkins, 2010), which defines the Creative Industries and the Creative Economy as being constituted by four industries that each trade in some form of intellectual property (the copyright industries, the patent industries, the trademark and design industries). This is a position which seems to privilege the economic value of the arts, emphasising (post) industrial rather than cultural production; however in doing so creativity becomes a cultural value essential to economic success, thus shifting the creative sphere from a peripheral to a central position in contemporary culture. Creativity is not framed as the exclusive domain of artists however. Howkins claims that “Creativity flourishes equally in the sciences, especially in research and development (R&D). There is little difference between the creativity of the scientist and of the artist” (xi, 2001). Likewise, innovation concepts from the sciences are applied to cultural production in the creative industries model, through concepts such as ‘innovation R&D’. This broad inclusivity, which simultaneously privileges and marginalises the arts, and the commodification of cultural and creativity implicit in Creative Industries are key points of contention for critics of the paradigm.

In contemporary society, boundaries between categories such as art and science, work and leisure are less defined. Even the academic sphere is embracing interdisciplinary, often practice-based scholarship. Increasingly, media consumption is no longer confined to discrete media platforms, but is a multimodal multiplatform or transmedia experience.

Creative Industries usefully addresses the convergence of culture, arts, technology and economy in a contemporary globalised society, as originally described by Henry Jenkins, as a paradigm for understanding media change:

*Media convergence is more than simply a technological shift. Convergence alters the relationship between existing technologies, industries, markets, genres, and audiences. Convergence alters the logic by which media industries operate and by which media consumers process news and entertainment.*

*(Jenkins, 2006b, pp. 15–16)*
There are, however, ideological aspects of Creative Industries that warrant critical analysis and critics of the paradigm highlight issues pertaining to media production and consumption that are highly relevant to the ecology of documentary production in New Zealand.

Lovink and Rossiter in their introduction to *My Creativity Reader: A Critique of Creative Industries* (Lovink & Rossiter, 2007) describe Creative Industries as a “meme that mobilises expectations” and call for the critical examination and discussion of the fashionable hype that surrounds creative industries discourse. In particular, Lovink and Rossiter question the New Economy idealism of creative industries economic reform and call for closer examination of the implications of creative industries for the Creative Subject.

This call to analysis is taken up by critics such as Andrew Ross (Ross, 2007) and Angela McRobbie (McRobbie, 2007) who question the promotion of labour practices which, seen through one ideological lens appear to promote creative freedom, flexibility and autonomy and through another promote a temporary workforce of easily disposable labour. McRobbie describes this as model which “normalises precariousness and uncertainty and makes irrelevant formal social relations of working life including statutory obligations” (McRobbie, 2007). This gives rise to a culture in which workers, (to use the words of one of the most contentious figures in this area), “could never be forced to work, yet ... were never truly not at work” (Florida 2002, pp. 12-13 in Hartley, 2005, p.2). Because creativity is such a loose concept within this paradigm, the Creative Industries provide a model for a mode of work that might be extended to industries that have previously employed more regulated labour practices. There is a danger in glamourising a work ‘lifestyle’ in which workers have little job security, few perks such as healthcare or insurance, are sometimes required to work for free or little to maintain a competitive edge and it is debateable whether creative workers entirely choose to live in a state of permanent volatility. However, because Creative Industries are themselves volatile and often operate on a project basis, creative workers have adapted accordingly. Andrew Ross (2007) summarises the perils of promoting the Creative Industries labour model:
Wherever work has become more feelgood and free, it has also become less just, and this formula has perilous consequences for an industry that takes creativity as its watchword. Job gratification, for creatives, has always come at a sacrificial cost – longer hours in pursuit of the satisfying finish, price discounts in return for prestige, and disposability in exchange for mobility and autonomy (Ross, p39).

Ross’ description of the conditions of creative labour is highly applicable to the situation of documentary production in New Zealand. In my interviews with practitioners the sustainability and conditions of their work as media producers has consistently been raised and an issue. However, precarity and the dominance of a freelance ‘portfolio’ workforce is in fact no recent phenomenon in New Zealand but is a reflection of New Zealand’s pioneering neo-liberal reforms. In house-production was phased out in the early 1980’s (Goldson, 2004) and the scale of documentary production has favoured small scale teams and projects on a temporary/freelance basis and an active ‘favour’ and internship economy. In recent years, there has been an increase in competition and a decrease in opportunity.

There has been much discussion within the industry at meetings and in submissions to NZ On Air discussion papers about the volume of young graduates ejected from training institutions every year into a labour market that has extremely limited opportunities for employment and in which even highly experienced producers struggle to support themselves.

An advertisement placed on arts community website The Big Idea in 2012 demonstrates the commitment increasingly expected of those wishing to enter into ‘the industry’. The advertisement offers a place for an unpaid intern to work with a leading documentary director and producer on a “high end documentary theatrical release feature film”. The position entails providing “admin support to the director and assist in the research and
production of [the] documentary” and promises experience across all aspects of the project. In return for this experience, the intern would receive “a letter of appreciation, and if requested we are happy to work with your current training institute to track progress and provide feedback”. The commitment required from the intern in exchange was “6 hours per day/ 5 days a week for each week of a 8-12 month internship” (The Big Idea, 2012).

While such industry experience provides interns with valuable industry training, critics of the creative industries paradigm argue that creative occupations are greatly idealised, but creative labour in such fields is competitive to a level that does not equate with prospects for remuneration and that such industries are often fuelled by ‘hope labour’; “un- or under-compensated work carried out in the present, often for experience or exposure, in the hope that future employment opportunities may follow” (Kuehn & Corrigan, 2013).

Although much of the criticism of the ideological nature of Creative Industries is valid and highlights the need for critical analysis, Creative Industries is a paradigm that can offer reflexive interdisciplinary discourse, providing scope for critical dialogue between academy, industry and public policy. For example, at the Queensland based ARC Centre for Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation – home to many of the key figures in Creative Industries research such as Stuart Cunningham, John Hartley and Terry Flew – research projects involve close collaboration with industry and public policy and employ interdisciplinary research methods. In my own experience, as a participant in a winter school at the CCI in 2012, I found that the creative industries approach offered a useful emphasis on engagement and participation and was instrumental convincing me to incorporate practice-led research in this project.

In defence of Creative Industries Terry Flew claims that the neo-liberalist tag is frequently misused in its application to Creative Industries, as an ill-defined all-purpose dismissal. Flew proposes, “moving beyond the representation of neo-liberalism as an all-consuming zeitgeist whereby the innocent realm that is culture is rent asunder by the
sinister machinations of economists with ideology on their minds and evil intent in their hearts.” (Flew, 2009).

As Stuart Cunningham summarises, the key point of contention for critics of the creative industries framework is its economic drive:

The core criticism of the creative industries idea is that it is a kind of Trojan horse, suborning the integrity of the case for support for culture through an untoward economism. It could, however, be viewed as opening up the hitherto ossified relationship between economics and culture, a relationship no longer to be limited to questions of the arts and market failure (cultural economics), or of rationales for cultural regulation. Instead, there is a focus on the role of media, culture and communications in generating change and growth in what Schumpeter called the capitalist ‘engine’. Engaging with the heterodox school of evolutionary economics (the intellectual source of much innovation thinking) can, perhaps ironically, bring us back to many animating questions of our field: what are the genuine advances (including aesthetic advances) in the communications and media sectors, and how might their impact be measured? These are indeed questions of cultural value, away from which the debates have rarely veered. (Cunningham, 2013, p. 13)

The figure of creative industries as Trojan horse is apt, but may also be applied in the sense that it is a discourse that addresses the political and economic forces that have shaped the contemporary political economy of media industries in a common language, whereas the cultural industries position is situated outside this domain.

The Creative Industries emphasis on innovation and creativity as central to both economic development and cultural growth supports the argument that as a niche of the screen industries in New Zealand, documentary production needs to adopt a progressive approach to embracing new technologies and new forms in order to be competitive and
culturally relevant. Globalisation and the emergence of new platforms and distribution channels that are not geographically restricted and/or are significantly more accessible than traditional media present small, culturally specific industries such as New Zealand with new opportunities but also new challenges. Certainly, Chris Anderson’s Long Tail argument (Anderson, 2006) would suggest an almost unlimited open market for niche New Zealand content, and during the period of this study opportunities for self-distribution have increased markedly. (Further in-depth discussions on the economics of Creative Industries can also be found in (Caves, 2000) (Howkins, 2010)), (Pratt, 2004)), (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009).

This leaves the existing broadcast, theatrical and home market on which documentary producers rely for funding and development, exposed to seemingly limitless competition, and the market will almost certainly fail to provide for the production of uniquely New Zealand content as per the (now defunct) TVNZ Charter or the operational mandates of NZ on Air, Creative New Zealand and The New Zealand Film Commission. In a media ecology that is increasingly globalised, deregulated and post-broadcast Creative Industries provides a useful framework for holistic analysis, but the omission of the term ‘cultural’ threatens to undermine the importance of such questions about the cultural role of creative industries. This is an issue well addressed by Bakhshi and Throsby in Culture of Innovation: An economic analysis of innovation in arts and cultural organisations,

In most industries, innovation is a key to gaining competitive advantage and enhancing growth prospects in difficult times. But for cultural institutions, concepts like competitive advantage, product development and business models need a fresh interpretation. Indeed, there is no clear definition of innovation itself when applied to arts organisations. (Bakhshi & Throsby, 2010)

The divide between Creative Industries and Cultural Industries may be bridged, at least within the realm of governance and policy through the term Creative and Cultural Industries (CCI) which acknowledges discrete (though often intersecting) territories. A
recent European Commission green paper “Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries” follows this convention, distinguishing each term as follows:

"Cultural industries" are those industries producing and distributing goods or services which at the time they are developed are considered to have a specific attribute, use or purpose which embodies or conveys cultural expressions, irrespective of the commercial value they may have. Besides the traditional arts sectors (performing arts, visual arts, cultural heritage – including the public sector), they include film, DVD and video, television and radio, video games, new media, music, books and press.

... "Creative industries" are those industries which use culture as an input and have a cultural dimension, although their outputs are mainly functional. They include architecture and design, which integrate creative elements into wider processes, as well as subsectors such as graphic design, fashion design or advertising. (European Commission, 2010)

I use the term Creative and Cultural Industries in order to maintain a degree of objective critical awareness of the shortcomings of Creative Industries and to acknowledge the importance of Cultural Industries as distinct from the more general activities of Creative Industries.

Ecology

The word ‘ecology’ is invoked with some frequency in academic discourse on media production environments, for it implies an holistic approach to examining media not as an orderly hierarchical system but as a complex and dynamic field of relationships.
As discussed in chapter one, examples of ecological discourses within media and cultural contexts that I have found informative include from Doris Baltruschat, (2010), Simon Cottle (2003, 2004), Jon Dovey (2008), Roger Horrocks (2004b), John Howkins (Howkins, 2010) Patricia Steemers (2010) and Patricia Zimmerman (2008).

Within Creative Industry discourse John Howkins’ *Creative Ecology* (2009), provides a framework that allows for close examination of a dynamic system and its parts; not just institutional structures but the relationships and activities within a system.

*A creative ecology is a niche where diverse individuals express themselves in a systemic and adaptive way, using ideas to produce new ideas; and where others support this endeavour even if they don't understand it. These energy-expressive relationships are found in both physical places and intangible communities; it is the relationships and actions that count, not the infrastructure. The strength of a creative ecology can be measured by these flows of energy and the continual learning and creation of meaning. The quartet of diversity, change, learning and adaptation mutually enhance each other.* (Howkins, 2009, pp. 11-12)

Innovation and creativity are generally central foci for discussion within Creative Industries but creative ecology provides a particularly good framework for investigating the context of these values. Howkins focuses on "Four aspects of ecological thinking that are relevant to creativity and innovation: diversity, change, learning and adaptation" and identifies “imitation, communities, collaboration and competition” as key adaptive traits (p. 59).

Simon Cottle’s ‘Producing Nature(s): On the Changing Production Ecology of Natural History TV’ (Cottle, 2003), (Cottle, 2004) has greatly influenced my own research design, providing a basic template for the study of a production ecology. Cottle begins this article with a call for greater empirical investigation into “how and why television genres change and evolve through time and in response to changing production environments”, claiming that media researchers tend to critically focus on discourses
within texts, neglecting the importance of media forms and the significance of the conditions of production in shaping media representations. Cottle’s analysis of change in the production ecology of Natural History TV is therefore presented as a case study in the analysis of a “production ecology”, which Cottle introduces as follows:

The concept of ‘production ecology’, based in part on Bourdieu’s notion of a ‘cultural field’ (Bourdieu, 1993) [...] helps to signal the theoretical importance of attending to organizational relationships and dynamics that exist within a particular field of media production, as well as attending to individual media organizations or general marketplace dynamics. Studies of selected production domains and associated professional practices are invaluable for improved theoretical understanding of media output, but ‘production ecologies’ encompass and extend beyond the immediate sphere of production of any one organization within a particular cultural field. It is only by attending to the ‘production ecology’ within a cultural field that we can begin to better understand how the different organizations within it reproduce, adapt and differentiate their associated cultural forms through time. (p. 82)

Cottle points out that although critical political economy provides an essential framework for the analysis of the “general market dynamics of media organization and production”, the concept of production ecology looks at specific fields of cultural production, examining not only how the field (ecology) is structured, or the relational dynamics of organisations within the ecology, but more broadly, how these organisations and the ecology as a whole respond to wider forces of change (p. 83).

The forces of change that Cottle identifies in the production ecology of Natural History television are similar to those faced by the documentary production ecology in New Zealand, specifically, that; “new technologies of production and delivery, heightened competitiveness, industrial centralization, fragmenting audiences and internationalizing markets have all dramatically impacted on the ‘production ecology’ ” (p. 82).
The production ecology approach entails paying close attention to change in genre and form, observing and analysing key trends such as (in the case of Natural History television); ‘blue chip’ programmes, presenter-led formats and the use of emotional and dramatic narrative devices. In my own study of the New Zealand documentary production ecology I believe it is important to analyse not only the forms and modes of documentaries produced, but the technologies used in their production and the platforms used in their delivery. In the context of international trends in documentary production, such as the increasing adoption of convergent, 360 degree programming and a rise in online content delivery, the question of what is not produced in New Zealand (and why) is as significant as what is produced.

Cottle’s study is based on a small number of in-depth interviews with participants from a range of positions within the ecology (independent, commercial and public service natural history TV producers), materials published in the broadcasting trade press, in-house documents and a review of programmes produced and broadcast within a specific timeframe. I am following a similar methodology in my study of the NZ documentary production ecology, though somewhat more in-depth and expanded to include specific and comparative case studies addressing the question of innovation in the production ecology.

Patricia Steemers’ article ‘The BBC’s Role in the Changing Production Ecology of Preschool Televisions in Britain (Steemers, 2010) examines the BBC’s role in “the contemporary ecology of British preschool television, a complicated and highly competitive “ecosystem” (p. 38). Much like documentary production in New Zealand, Steemers finds that preschool television in the UK has undergone considerable change since the 1990s. Steemers examines these changes and the BBC’s role within a broader industry context in relation to “wider commercial, cultural, and technological forces that impact its strategies for preschool content” (p. 38). As with documentary production in New Zealand, UK preschool TV must meet demand for content that satisfies both commercial and public service prerogatives while funding sources are diminishing. Overall, as it to be expected given the global nature of technological and economic changes which impact on screen production, there are many parallels between
the changes examined in the ecology Steemers examines and those in the New Zealand documentary production ecology. Even resistance to technological change and the adoption of multiplatform content production models is noted by Steemers, who finds that the preschool sector is slow to adapt to new technological developments, only recently shifting from VHS to DVD, for example (p. 51). Steemers observes that independent producers are “often suspicious about rights retention and the additional costs incurred by multiplatform development” (p. 51). Overall, this study provides an additional excellent example of the broad insights into the impact of economic, cultural and technological change that can be gained from the in-depth examination of a specific production ecology.

Patricia Zimmerman takes media ecology into new territory, exploring the notion of public domains in the digital age as a space for “a new kind of documentary politics” (Zimmerman, 2008, p. 284). Commenting on a report 2004 report from NAMAC investigating the future of independent media in a changing media environment, Zimmerman describes a ‘new media ecology’ centred on collaborative and decentred practice, diversity of content and form, and “a plurality of strategies, interfaces, and public intersections” (p. 285), presenting a new way forward for documentary – beyond the paternalism of public service broadcasting and the commercialism of corporate media – towards an open source model of public media.

Ecology is also invoked in Jon Dovey’s call to media practice researchers to “see the new ecologies of media as an unprecedented opportunity for creating our own independent networks of research-based production and distribution” (Dovey, 2008, p. 243).

A precedent for the model of ecology in the study of media in New Zealand comes from Roger Horrocks in Television in New Zealand: Programming the Nation (2004), who writes,
New Zealand television is a small and vulnerable habitat with a number of endangered species. Broadcasters and production companies struggle to survive and grow in a challenging environment, sensitive to any new form of life introduced (such as pay television) or any change of temperature (such as a downtown in advertising revenue). A key aspect of ecology is the awareness that everything is interrelated so that any change has subtle flow-on effects. (Horrocks, 2004a, p. 18)

Of all the permutations of ecology available, I prefer the term Production Ecology’, partly because it situates this study within the field of media production aligned with work done by Cottle, Steemers, Baltruschat and Born, and partly for the sake of disambiguation particularly in regards to the two dominant uses of media ecology in current circulation. Media Ecology is a useful term as it implies a broader outlook than the term ‘production’ implies, however it is too easily confused with the branch of media studies known as Media Ecology. While Media Ecology (of the McLuhan / Innis variety) is relevant to my study as an approach to media that uses ecology as a model to understand how things relate to each other within media systems and which acknowledges media as evolutionary rather than revolutionary, my study is more focused on media ecology within the context of the creative and cultural industries; a more recent movement which is somewhat more concerned with media economics and institutional relations rather than focusing on the media itself, and with cultural anthropology. My approach is also quite different to Mathew Fuller’s Media Ecologies (Fuller, 2005), which has a different emphasis on media technologies again, although Fuller’s examination of post-industrial production does have some relevance, and, along with Bruno Latour’s Actor Network Theory (ANT), provides a good example of alternative methodologies for structural and relational aspects of media systems.

**Production studies and media industries ethnography**

Several works were influential in shaping my ideas about ethnographic approaches to studying a complex system of production:
Georgina Born’s study of the BBC, *Uncertain Vision, Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC* (Born, 2004) is a rich, complex and nuanced account of years of ethnographic research, during which Born was granted extraordinary access to the inner workings of the BBC. However, her study of the French cultural organisation IRCAM (Born, 1995) offers a much more realistic model for an ethnographic study over a shorter period of time and on a smaller scale.

Jeremy Tunstall’s *Television Producers* (Tunstall, 1993) offers an example of a study of a specific niche of a production ecology; television producers across the range of British television spanning seven programming categories (including documentary). Based on 254 interviews, again this is a work of significant scale, but provides insight into how a particular group of workers function within and influence a production ecology.

Useful examples of ethnographic approaches to the study of production on a smaller scale have been found in John T Caldwell’s *Production Culture: industrial reflectivity and critical practice in film and television* (Caldwell, 2008) and Mayer, Banks And Caldwell’s *Production Studies* (Mayer, Banks, & Caldwell, 2009). These texts suggest a framework for studying the culture of production situated within the contemporary global context of Creative and Cultural Industries, addressing many of the issues outlined at the beginning of this chapter section. In the introduction to *Production Studies* (Mayer et al., 2009) the authors present Production Studies as an interdisciplinary field in relation to other established approaches to studying the media:

*Production Studies scholars face challenges not frequently confronted in the study of media consumption and audiences. Whereas these forerunners frequently framed consumption in terms of the politics of pleasure, production studies need to conceptualize practices within the political economy of labor, markets, and policy. The convergence of media might open productive potential for users, but they also introduce anxiety and uncertainty into the work worlds of those charged with making those interactive and “empowering” media. (Mayer et al. p. 4)*
Documentary Theory

There is a rich, if relatively recent body of academic work that constitutes the foundation of documentary theory and critically informs this research project. Much of this critical canon of documentary theory is concerned with issues of representation and reality, subjectivity, ethics, genre and style. It would be redundant to attempt to outline the entire scope of documentary theory as it relates to this research. Rather, I shall focus on a few key works that have been most instrumental in the development of my own approach to documentary in the context of this study, particularly in regards to the definition and functions of documentary.

The essential question in documentary studies is ‘what is documentary’? Bill Nichols’ work on the modes of documentary film practice (Nichols, 1991) (Nichols, 2001) has arguably played a greater role in defining documentary than any other scholar. Any discussion of documentary form will inevitably refer back to Nichol’s modes, which is not to say that these modes are fixed – on the contrary, they are always subject to revision and may frequently be challenged – but these modes provide an important structural framework for the categorisation and understanding of documentary form. However, what I have found even more useful than the specific analysis of documentary modes in seeking a model for the study of documentary production in New Zealand is the broader framework for defining documentary that Nichols describes in Representing Reality (Nichols, 1991). According to Nichols, documentary should be considered from three perspectives; the filmmaker, the text and the viewer (p.12). Nichols goes on to describe documentary as a Community of Practitioners, as An Institutional Practice, A Corpus of Texts and A Constituency of Viewers. In a sense, this could be seen as merely another configuration of the classic media studies trinity of Production, Text and Reception, but Nichols suggests a more ecological way of perceiving documentary in a contextual and multidimensional manner. In outlining the value of understanding documentary as an institutional practice for example, Nichols explains,
What an institutional definition does is begin to hint at is the importance, for the filmmaker, of a shared sense of common purpose. Documentary filmmakers may shape and transform the traditions they inherit, but they do so precisely in dialogue with that tradition and with their cohorts (1991, p. 15).

Significant changes in broadcasting since the mid-1990s have not only pushed the boundaries of documentary form, but according to John Corner, challenge the very definition of documentary. In ‘Performing the Real: Documentary Diversions’ (Corner, 2002) John Corner addresses the limitations of the term documentary in the light of increasing variety of forms and practices that might be described as documentary, which he describes elsewhere (Corner, 2008, p. 11) as an ‘acceleration’ in the development of documentary, driven firstly by the emergence of the reality TV phenomenon in the mid-1990s and then the rise of the (commercially) successful feature documentary. In raising the question of a post-documentary culture Corner highlights the challenges of attempting to, “re-locate the rich, generically ambitious (in some versions, rather preposterous) idea of ‘documentary’ within the bewildering range of practices now available for depicting the real on screen, including the screen of the computer” (Corner, 2002, p. 258).

Whereas the cinematic documentary is easily defined in opposition to its fictive other according to Corner, in the context of television where schedules are filled with a variety of non-fiction content, documentary has become a problematic identifier.

Corner invites us to consider documentary in terms of production practices, forms and functions. Focusing on the latter, he outlines three classic functions of documentary (defined in depth in Corner, 2002) to which exposition, testimony and observation are variously tethered: The Project of Democratic Civics, Documentary as Journalistic Inquiry and Exposition, Documentary as Radical Interrogation and Alternative Perspective. More recently, according to Corner, a fourth function has emerged: Documentary as Diversion, which is a function ascribed to the forms of documentary known as ‘popular factual entertainment’. These forms of ‘post-documentary’ (Reality
TV and Docusoaps, for example) mimic elements of popular formats such as the narrative drama, the talk show and the game show.

Performing this function, documentary is a vehicle variously for the high-intensity incident (the reconstructed accident, the police raid), for anecdotal knowledge (gossipy first-person accounts) and snoopy sociability (as an amused bystander to the mixture of mess and routine in other people’s working lives). (2004, p. 3)

These new forms of post-documentary are designed for strategic competitive market value, geared entirely towards providing entertainment, marking a departure from the ‘sobriety’ of documentary (Nichols 1991). When the generic boundaries that have separated documentary from other forms of programme have become blurred, it becomes more difficult than ever to answer the question ‘what is a documentary?’ This shift towards Documentary as Diversion is underpinned by a movement of general social change over a period of two decades – “very much to do with the changing character of the national and international economy and the increasing emphasis on market systems, market values and the dynamics of production and consumption” (Corner, 2002, p. 265)– in which the very notion of ‘the Public’ has come into question. This in turn has resulted in the reconfiguration of the notion of Public Service Broadcasting, with which the fate of documentary would seem bound, given the extent to which documentary is founded (and largely dependent) on Public Service Broadcasting.

Despite this, Corner does not see the rise of post-documentary as the death of documentary. Rather, documentary must adapt to a changing environment in order to flourish, and new technologies and platforms provide documentarists with the tools for change and innovation:

If finding a popular audience for serious, thoughtful, inspiring and sometime discomforting encounters with reality is one of the core commitments of the
documentary project, then how will the present condition of the audiovisual economy and the performance requirements now becoming installed in its stylings of actuality affect this commitment? It may well provide the stimulus for innovation and an expanded sense of creative options. But it will certainly also present it with further strong, displacing, and reconfiguring challenges to both principles and practices, to the kind of social meanings that recorded images can carry and the social uses to which they can be put within the changing dynamics and circuits of popular knowledge. Trying to make the best sense of these transformations will continue to give international media scholars one of their most significant and lively topics of inquiry. (Corner, 2009, p. 63)

I have aimed to address these questions in relation to New Zealand’s documentary production ecology, particularly in Chapter Four, (where I examine the ‘crisis of documentary’ in the New Zealand context, the public service role of documentary, and present an analysis of documentary as a NZ On Air funding category) and Chapter Six (where I look more closely at the applications of new technologies and production practices).

**New Zealand Documentary**

A dominant theme in academic studies of New Zealand documentary is the relationship of documentary to national identity, which has not been a central concern of this research project. Identity is a central focus for Russell Campbell, for example, in his recent collection of essays on New Zealand documentary, which presents little discussion of the supporting structures that underpin the production and circulation of the texts discussed (Campbell, 2011). Three works that stand out as particularly relevant to the study of New Zealand’s documentary ecology are: ‘A Look In: Documentary on New Zealand Television’ by Annie Goldson (Goldson, 2004) *Documentary in New Zealand: an Immigrant Nation* by Jane Roscoe (1999) and ‘Branding Documentary: New Zealand’s Minimalist Solution to Cultural Subsidy’ by Mary Debrett, (2004). Additionally, a significant study of documentary production in New Zealand was commissioned by Creative New Zealand and The New Zealand Film Commission. This
report, *Research into New Zealand's Independent Documentary Sector (Creative New Zealand the New Zealand Film Commission, 2008)* has greatly informed the development of my research and indicates important directions for further investigation and analysis.

‘A Look In: Documentary on New Zealand Television’ (2004) presents a comprehensive overview of New Zealand television. As such, Goldson, while addressing the issue of national identity, also provides a good outline of the history of documentary in New Zealand, describing its lineage in relation to an international context, particularly the influence of British documentarian John Grierson.

The documentary series *An Immigrant Nation* is the subject of a study by Jane Roscoe (Documentary in New Zealand: An Immigrant Nation, 1999), one of the few books on documentary in New Zealand ever published. *An Immigrant Nation* could be classified as a ‘quality series’\(^4\), originally (and ambitiously) conceived as a twelve-by-one hour series (reduced to four) to screen monthly in TVOne’s Tuesday Documentary slot the only documentary prime-time slot on TVOne at the time (Roscoe, 2000, p. 247). Roscoe explores how the public service objectives of the series, devised to “present New Zealand as a multicultural society with a rich and diverse cultural heritage” and “a forum within which the basic concepts of New Zealand national identity [could] be explored and contested” conflicted with the economic imperatives of TVOne as State Owned Enterprise. Roscoe’s study is the only example I have found of an in-depth study of documentary production in New Zealand that uses ethnographic methods to examine the relationships between broadcasters and programme makers, (and also the programme subjects), in the context of a specific documentary production, in addition to analysis of the textual work itself. This study also documents a period of change within broadcasting in New Zealand and examines how the producers of *Immigrant Nation* negotiated various changes, tensions and challenges such as major internal restructuring at TVNZ which required on-going contract renegotiations for the programme makers, (p. 248), or the difficulties of trying to produce a ‘quality’ documentary on a fast-

\(^4\) Or at least it was intended to be a quality series. Roscoe’s analysis suggests that the commercial objectives of the broadcaster significantly undermined the ‘quality’ aims of the producers.
turnaround schedule and budget. Ultimately, Roscoe presents *Immigrant Nation* as a case study that demonstrates how difficult it is for documentary producers to meet the competing public service ideals of NZ On Air and the commercial interests of the broadcaster.

Roscoe describes *Immigrant Nation* as a “an exercise in public relations designed to give New Zealand an opportunity to present itself as a nation that welcomes and appreciates ethnic diversity” (p. 244). The use of documentary as a vehicle for the branding of national identity and as a cost-effective means of delivering local content is explored in detail in Mary Debrett’s 2004 article ‘Branding Documentary: New Zealand’s Minimalist Solution to Cultural Subsidy’.

*National branding constitutes a stage in the commodification of documentary, and the corporate take-over of public space. A unique aspect of this development in New Zealand is that the corporate take-over is a collaborative venture, a Faustian contract, between two commercial broadcasters, one state-owned, and the state funding agency NZOA (p. 10).*

Debrett finds that although the introduction of two dedicated documentary strands on TVNZ (*Documentary New Zealand*) and TV3 (*Inside New Zealand*) facilitated by the NZOA funding framework boosted documentary production in New Zealand in terms of quantity, the constraints imposed by the commercial system “virtually preclude the more demanding sub-genres – the essay form, experimental documentary and ‘high-culture’ subjects” (p.7). Like Roscoe, Debrett finds that long form documentary or subjects requiring a longer-time frame for production are unachievable due to low budgets and pressure for fast-turnaround production. Roscoe’s concerns that under this system the subjects or ‘social actors’ of documentary are inadequately dealt with are shared by Debrett who finds that under the “neoliberal ethos” of the new system (post-public service) ethical concern for the social actor is displaced by the assumption that “individuals invariably pursue their own self-interest”(Debrett, 2004).
Goldson offers a third ‘alternative tradition’ in New Zealand documentary, in addition to the ‘quality series’ and ‘fast-turnaround’ documentary, which Corner might describe as ‘Documentary as Radical Interrogation and Alternative Perspective’. Examples of this ‘alternative tradition’ provided by Goldson are the *Tangata Whenua* series of the 1970’s, which explored Māori identity from a Māori perspective, political documentaries such as *Patu!* (Awatea Film Productions 1982), and *Someone Else’s Country* (Vanguard Films 1995), and stories from a women’s or queer perspective such as *War Stories my Mother Never Told Me* (Gaylene Preston Productions 1995) and *The Mighty Civic* (James Wallace Productions 1989). Goldson finds that while these alternative documentaries may occasional make it to prime time TV, most are marginalised in ‘ethnic and ‘cultural slots or don’t make it to TV at all. According to Goldson, documentary makers working within the alternative tradition are in fact still far more aligned with the film tradition, rather than the conventions of television due to what Goldson describes as “an anachronism that has emerged from New Zealand Institutional history” (p. 250).

*An impediment to the development of an alternative moving image culture was New Zealand’s failure in the late 1970’s to make the transition from film to video that occurred in other countries. During this period the Sony Portapak, the first relatively portable video system, was seized upon by independent documentary makers within the larger metropolitan centres – London, New York, Berlin, San Francisco – and interestingly enough, by political and guerrilla movements in the Third World. The relative ease and cheapness of video made it a deeply attractive alternative to film, and it was embraced. [...] In New Zealand, video failed to take off this way. The country’s small population and its lack of alternative infrastructure made this mode of distribution difficult; the relative scarcity of video art and ‘independent video’ testifies to that. (p. 251).*

New Zealand’s unique funding structure and its implications for documentary makers is a key issue addressed in all the work discussed above. It is reasonable to put forward the hypothesis that documentary producers already working with meagre budgets and
significant time constraints may find it challenging to explore new technologies and platforms without additional financial support.

In addition to the sources of funding for documentary discussed in the works cited above, funding bodies Creative New Zealand and the New Zealand Film Commission (NZFC) also support documentary, but to a limited extent. Funding policies for both Creative New Zealand and the NZFC have been revised over the past few years, and these policies are discussed throughout the thesis. However, a report released by Creative New Zealand and the NZFC, ‘Research into New Zealand’s independent documentary sector’ *(Research into New Zealand’s independent documentary sector, 2008)* adds important context of this research project and will be briefly outlined here.

Generally, NZFC funds are reserved for fiction feature and short films, with some provision for development and post-production of documentary films. However, in partnership with Creative New Zealand the NZFC has provided some support for innovative low budget (non-broadcast) documentaries since 1984, initially through The Creative Film and Video Fund and since 1996 through the Screen Innovation Production Fund (SIPF), administered by Creative New Zealand (The Arts Council of New Zealand, CNZ) *(Creative New Zealand the New Zealand Film Commission, 2008, p. 6)*. This is the only significant source of funding for documentary makers as an alternative to NZOA funding. The use of the word significant here is somewhat misleading. In fact, the fund consisted of $600,000 of contestable funding per annum ($350,000 provided by NZFC) and each grant was capped at $25,000, not enough to support a commercial project, but deemed enough serve the fund’s aim to “provide grants to emerging and experimental moving-image makers for innovative and experimental moving-image productions”. The motivation for theFNZC and Creative New Zealand to commission a report into New Zealand’s Independent Documentary sector came from a concern that the SPIF was receiving an increasing number of documentary proposals every year, adding pressure to an already competitive fund and that, (alarmingly), an increased number of these proposals came from established documentary filmmakers. Additionally, many of the documentary projects submitted to the SPIF were not innovative or experimental but more suited to
mainstream/commercial television (Creative New Zealand the New Zealand Film Commission, 2008, p. 6). The aim of the research report produced by the NZFC and Creative New Zealand was therefore to understand the “barriers and opportunities” faced by documentary makers and to enable these agencies to reassess their current programmes and determine their future roles in relation to New Zealand documentary production.

Research was based on interviews with a range of documentary makers and industry representatives including funders, broadcasters and exhibitors/distributors. One-day seminars with documentary filmmakers held in Auckland, Wellington and Dunedin and a number of research reports and surveys (both local and international) also informed the research.

Filmmaker’s opinions in this report echo the concerns already outlined in this section by researchers such as Goldson, Debrett and Roscoe. Unsurprisingly, documentary makers were critical of funding and commissioning models and with the television environment. They felt that the documentaries produced were too homogenous and commercial. They felt constrained by the parameters of what constituted a ‘New Zealand story’. They felt experienced filmmakers were undervalued and underutilised while inexperienced filmmakers lacked opportunities for development. Overall, various factors make it very difficult for even experienced and well-regarded filmmakers to survive in the industry as documentary makers.

Based on analysis of the research and comparison with international models (Australia, Canada and Ireland) the report find that there is a need for “an agreed sector definition and guidelines for publically funded documentaries the longer-term need to foster and nurture careers support for talented documentary makers driven by non-commercial imperatives” (p. 41).
Various changes to funding and distribution are suggested, including the establishment of a fund for non-mainstream documentaries, a fund for feature documentaries and a pitching fund (p. 43). There was support for the establishment of an industry group (described as a documentary ‘shopfront’) to collectively provide services such as DVD production and distribution, festival co-ordination, cataloguing, online promotion.

Finally, the report identifies the potential opportunities of online distribution, DVDs and multiplatform delivery. To some extent the report takes a tentative position in relation to new technologies and platforms, generally acknowledging that opportunities exist but expressing uncertainty about how and to what extent filmmakers can take advantage of these; “the growing need to meet multi-platform delivery requirements, including online possibilities, is a new challenge for documentary makers. However, the potential for new revenue streams is still uncertain” (p. 15). However, the executive summary presents a slightly more decisive call for online and multiplatform opportunities to be embraced:

*Online opportunities cannot be ignored. Internationally, there is an emerging trend for filmmakers to go straight to the web for distribution (in the UK, cinema admissions have declined for the second year in a row). The need to reformat material to meet multi-platform requirements is rapidly becoming an essential part of the documentary maker’s business. (p. 8)*

This report provides the most up to date and comprehensive survey of the current state of documentary production in New Zealand, an indication of industry attitudes and beliefs and identifies some key weaknesses as well as opportunities.

Since this report was published, the Screen Production Innovation Fund was replaced with the Independent Filmmakers Fund in 2009. (“Creative New Zealand Independent Filmmakers Fund,” 2010) In early 2010 the NZFC withdrew from the fund. The 2010

---

5 It is revealing that the term ‘reformat’ rather than ‘create’ is used here. Multiplatform content tends to be seen as an afterthought rather than part of the production process.
funding round was continued by CNZ but disestablished in the latter part of 2010. The following statement appeared on the CNZ Independent Filmmakers Fund web page:

*Creative New Zealand has been researching alternative options, in consultation with the sector for supporting this artform in 2011. We are committed to supporting artists in creating excellent, innovative and distinctive work and have developed a new artform category ‘Media Arts’ to support a variety of artistic practices utilising digital or analogue technologies within screen-based, electronic, internet or mobile phone domains. Support will be offered to projects focused on research and development, experimentation, the creation of new work, critical dialogue and discourse.*

The Media Arts category did not support innovative work of a documentary nature, however, leaving a significant funding gap for documentary work of an experimental nature or in non-broadcast, non-cinematic forms.

Changes in the documentary production ecology such as the TVNZ Amendment Bill, the potential sale or restructuring of TVNZ’s digital channels TVNZ6 and TVNZ7 to fulfil a public service media function and the policy and operational changes to key industry bodies such as CNZ and the NZFC are discussed in depth in Chapters Three and Four and other policies and funding initiatives relating to emerging media forms and practices are discussed in Chapter Six.

**New Zealand television and public service broadcasting**

As has already been outlined, New Zealand television, historically, culturally and as a system in itself is central to this study of documentary production because it is the primary means by which documentaries are produced in New Zealand. Few documentaries are produced without the support of a broadcaster and NZ On Air.
A number of books have been published on television in New Zealand, the most recent of which is Trisha Dunleavy and Hester Joyce’s book *New Zealand Film and Television: Institution, Industry and Cultural Change* (T. Dunleavy & Joyce, 2011). This book presents an excellent institutional analysis New Zealand’s film and television ecology, but does not examine documentary.

*Television, Programming the Nation* (Horrocks & Perry, 2004), is a collection on New Zealand television that covers a wide breadth of perspectives. In the introductory chapter of this book, Roger Horrocks poses the question “Why study or analyse New Zealand television? The points that Horrocks outlines in response to this question are entirely pertinent to this study of documentary production and in fact correspond directly with my own rationale for the merits of a detailed study of documentary production using the model of ecology.

Firstly, Horrocks notes some of the unique facets of New Zealand television. Due to New Zealand’s small population size, the impact of globalisation and rapid technological change has a far greater impact than in larger territories. Horrocks also points out that despite New Zealand’s close proximity to Australia, television systems and cultural tastes differ and relatively few programmes are exchanged across the Tasman (in either direction). Horrocks goes on to outline important reasons for a case study of New Zealand television:

1) The possibility of studying television as a system

- The size of New Zealand’s television industry and its self-contained nature makes it possible to examine television as an overall system. “The system is still too complex to hope to grasp it fully, but we can observe its dynamics more clearly than we could in a larger country” (pp.8, 9, 2004).

2) Small country differences

- Established models of television theory based on large territories such as the U.S or Britain do not adequately translate to small systems such as New Zealand. “A closer look at New Zealand reveals the need for different forms of television theory that can
adequately describe the distinctive field of forces within a smaller television system” (p.9, 2004). Most significant to this study is Horrocks’ observation that New Zealand could serve as a useful “test culture for observing the impact of new trends or technologies”. A salient historical example of this provided by Horrocks is the effect of the introduction of sound on film, which decimated the fragile ecology of the film industry of the time. As with Goldson’s claim that New Zealand was slow to adopt video technology, this demonstrates an historical precedence for the difficulty in adopting new screen technologies in New Zealand.

Horrocks also describes New Zealand’s postcolonial history and unique cultural mix as factors that have shaped New Zealand’s broadcasting landscape, struggling to forge a sense of identity and often suffering from ‘cultural cringe’ when exposed to local programming rather than the more familiar foreign imports (p. 9). This is underpinned by the low level of local content produced and screened in New Zealand due to the economics of a small country with low levels of cultural subsidy. Horrocks points out that Māori culture has contributed a great deal to local production. At the time that Television in New Zealand was published the state-owned Māori broadcaster Māori Television Service (MTS) was not yet operational. Since its launch in 2004, MTS has made a significant impact on the broadcasting ecology, boosting local content, creating more opportunities for content producers and at least partly fulfilling the public service broadcasting role neglected by TVNZ.

Indeed, Horrock’s final point on the specificity of New Zealand and its significance as the subject of study is the ongoing local conflict over public service broadcasting, with New Zealand providing a powerful example of the struggle between “Reithian tradition” and “neo-liberal political thinking” (p.11). This is territory more recently explored by Mary Debrett (2010) who presents New Zealand as the final case study in Reinventing Public Service Television for the Digital Future, a book that explores the prospects for public service media in the digital age. Debrett presents a more recent overview of the New Zealand television broadcasting ecology, providing useful analysis of the public service broadcasting roles of the new digital channels TVNZ6 and TVNZ7 and the Māori Television service (MTS). Debrett finds that although these new channels
offer hope for the future of public service media in New Zealand, “a history as political football has left public service broadcasting in New Zealand without the cushioning of traditions or collective public memory to inspire public support” (Debrett, 2010, p.182). The New Zealand case study sits alongside five other studies of public service broadcasters, providing a comprehensive overview of the status of public service media internationally and useful examination of the role of multi-platform delivery in redefining and reinvigorated public service media.

**International trends/issues in documentary production**

As Debrett (2010) demonstrates, the specificity of a production ecology can be better understood in comparison with other ecologies and in the context of global trends and influences. This thesis began as a comparative study, with Australia as the subject of comparison in relation to New Zealand. However, it was soon apparent that despite their proximate and relative cultural similarities, the documentary production ecologies of New Zealand and Australia were simply too different to support a full comparative study, partly for the reasons that Horrocks (2004) outlines above, but also because multiplatform and online documentary are so much more established in Australia. The first year of research for this thesis was spent in Melbourne, where I had the opportunity to have some contact with the local filmmaking community, attend industry events and follow industry media. This has helped to inform my research, providing a broader context for my understanding of issues faced within a production ecology. Research and data published by Screen Australia (the equivalent of the New Zealand Film Commission) and the communications and publications of regional funding bodies such as Film Victoria have also been useful. Australia has also provided many excellent examples of multiplatform and online documentary, and models for the funding and delivery of these, illustrating what an alternative model for a television broadcasting ecology in the multiplatform era might look like. Despite the differences between the New Zealand and Australian production ecologies, there are many commonalities, particularly in regards to concerns about the decline of television documentary, as highlighted by (Fitzsimons, 2002) and (Fitzsimons, 2009). Useful research on documentary has been produced in Canada, where the NFB in particular is regarded as an innovation leader and I have drawn on research on innovation and public service

As this research project is itself interdisciplinary in nature and encompasses a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches, the aim of this chapter has been to provide an outline of the foundations of the research, identifying key themes and contexts that are explored in greater depth in the chapters that follow.
CHAPTER THREE

New Zealand Television Documentary in Context

This chapter outlines the contours that define both the historical and contemporary context of New Zealand television documentary, and identifies and discusses key events and forces that have shaped television documentary production between 2010 – 2013. While much of this discussion relates to the wider context of New Zealand television, I have endeavoured to show how the broader political economy of television has influenced the documentary production ecology during the period of this study.

The first section of this chapter outlines the historical events that have formed the basis of the contemporary production ecology. I then focus on the central issues that have defined the 2010-2013 period, and finally present an overview of the relative positions of three key groups in the documentary production ecology in relation to television; funders, broadcasters and producers.

New Zealand television documentary: the historical context

If the history of New Zealand television is characterised by turmoil and uncertainty, the present era is no exception. A combination of both global and local factors (political, technological, economic and cultural) influence the current period of constant change and limited innovation; a state of inertia in the midst of turbulence⁶.

---

⁶ Though significantly revised here, parts of this chapter began as a conference paper delivered at ANZCA 2011 and later published in Platform: Journal of Media and Communication (A. Jackson, 2012).
Roger Horrocks, (who has not only written extensively on New Zealand television as a researcher\textsuperscript{7}, but also played a significant role in its development through his involvement with New Zealand On Air) outlines five phases or models of broadcasting that chart the influence of political changes on New Zealand television:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Government broadcasting (1960 – 61)
  \item Public service diluted by commercialism (1961 – 88)
  \item TVNZ as a commercial broadcaster counter-balanced by NZOA (1989 - 95)
  \item Dominant commercialism (1995-99)
  \item Attempts to revive public service broadcasting [1999-2009].
\end{enumerate}

(Horrocks, 2004a, p. 26)

Drawing and expanding on Horrocks’ model, I examine below how each of these phases helped to shape the current documentary production ecology, ending the final phase of Horrock’s model in 2009.

\textbf{a. Government broadcasting (1960 – 61)}

The relatively late introduction of television in New Zealand is linked to the challenges of achieving national coverage in a country with difficult, often mountainous terrain and a small but widely dispersed population. Television was introduced as a state controlled monopoly modelled on the existing radio system of “strict regulation, and a vulnerability to political interference” (T. Dunleavy & Joyce, 2011, p. 36), and from the very beginning its trajectory was aligned with political objectives. The launch of television services in Auckland in 1960 was hastened by Labour Party Prime Minister

\textsuperscript{7} Horrocks in fact played a pivotal role in establishing film and media studies in New Zealand and established the Centre for Film, Television and Media Studies (now Media, Film and Television) at the University of Auckland (Horrocks, 2007).
John Nash’s pre-election promise that New Zealand would have a television service by the end of the year (Day, 1994, p. 28). As a result of the rush to start transmission prior to the election there had been little time for planning and the initial phase of television broadcasting was largely experimental, confined to Auckland and limited to broadcasts of 2 1/2 hours each evening (Boyd-Bell, 1985, p. 81). The non-commercial nature of the early phase of broadcasting was therefore not so much a matter of ideology as it was timing.

b. Public service diluted by commercialism (1961 – 88)

In 1961 the newly elected National Government set about establishing a public broadcasting service (as opposed to a state broadcasting service) under the 1961 Broadcasting Act (Day, 1994, p. 38). The New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation was to operate with both financial independence and programming freedom (though with some restrictions). New Zealand’s small population was not able to support the funding of a television broadcasting service from a public broadcasting fee alone, so from April 1961 the PBF was supplemented with advertising revenue (T. Dunleavy & Joyce, 2011, p. 38).

Local television documentary production evolved from long-form current affairs programming and was a “difficult area that was not approached with enthusiasm or confidence” (Day, 1994, p. 64). It is interesting to note that New Zealand’s first documentary television series was written, presented, directed and produced by a woman, Shirley Maddock; women still play a dominant role this sphere of production today, particularly as independent producer/directors. Maddock’s five-part, half hour series, Islands of the Gulf (1965) is remarkably similar to contemporary documentary series such as Coasters (2011, 2013) or New Zealand from Above (2013) which highlight New Zealand’s natural environment and the ‘down to earth’ characters who live in remote and scenic locations. Similarly, the presenter-led documentary series Country Calendar, which started screening on 6 March 1966, continues to be popular

---

8. Two of these episodes can be viewed online at NZOnscreen http://www.nzonscreen.com/title/islands-of-the-gulf-1965/series
today, giving New Zealand’s mostly urban population a window into the rural life that is central to the cultural mythology of New Zealand’s post-colonial (pākehā) identity. It is also the only remaining in-house documentary production for TVNZ.

Under the NZBC opportunities for independent producers were very limited, however from 1970 – 1974 limited outsourcing was introduced under NZBC Head of Documentaries, Michael Smith (T. Dunleavy & Joyce, 2011, p. 74). The independent documentary producers mainly came from a new wave of young filmmakers with artistic sensibilities who brought an innovative approach to television documentary. The Survey documentary slot, for example, housed experimental and creative documentaries by independent filmmakers such as Tony Williams, Roger Donaldson and John O’Shea. Tangata Whenua (Pacific Films, 1974) is one of the most significant and groundbreaking documentary series in New Zealand television history. The six part series screened in Primetime on Sunday evenings and attracted an estimated audience of one million viewers, which would still be recognised as an achievement by today’s standards (Diamond, 2009). The collaboration between veteran producer John O’Shea, writer and historian Michael King and director/writer Barry Barclay has been described as innovative in its camerawork and editing and helped to open the door for future Māori production (Horrocks, 2003). As Michael King reflected in Being Pākehā;

_Tangata Whenua broke the monocultural mould of New Zealand television. It gave Māori an opportunity to speak for themselves about their lives. It went some way to informing Pākehā New Zealanders about Māori attitudes and values, it whetted a Māori audience’s appetite for more documentaries reflecting Māori viewpoints, and it opened the way for later programmes, such as Koha and Te Karere, produced by Māori. (King, 1999, as cited in Diamond, 2009)_

1975 saw a change of government with the election of the third National Government (led by Robert Muldoon) and marked the beginning of another turbulent phase in television broadcasting. A second channel was introduced and the NZBC was dissolved, replaced with the separately operated Television One and TV2, which
introduced an era of competition, albeit between two state broadcasters. In 1976 TV2 became South Pacific Television, in 1977 in-house documentary production was extended with the introduction of the Natural History Unit and in 1978 the Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand (BCNZ) was established. In 1980 South Pacific Television reverted again to the name TV2 and the two channels were reunited under the new Television New Zealand, which operated as a division of BCNZ.

During this period there was a return to in-house production and, according to Roger Horrocks, the gap between in-house television producers and independent filmmakers widened:

*In the 1970s television tended to see the film-makers’ attitude as a case of sour grapes. Why should the NZBC feel any obligation to screen the work of directors - long-haired, dope-smoking hippies in some cases - who lacked the craft skills (particularly journalistic skills) that its own producers had carefully developed over the years? Meanwhile the film-makers tended to see the television documentary unit and the NFU as small elitist groups that held a monopoly on the genre. They saw documentaries being made by these institutions with resources, budgets, and time-spans that were almost obscene in comparison with the conditions of the independent industry. They also regarded the resulting documentaries as conservative and old-fashioned in style and subject matter.*

(Horrocks, 2003, p. 7)

c. TVNZ as a commercial broadcaster counter-balanced by NZOA (1989-95)

The Labour government elected in 1984 instigated “The New Zealand Experiment” (Kelsey, 1995), a wave of neoliberal economic reforms driven by Minister of Finance Roger Douglas, whose policies came to be known as ‘Rogernomics’. These reforms saw a dramatic shift in New Zealand broadcasting from “a highly protectionist economic structure based on tariffs, subsidies and a large public service” to “an extreme
monetarist regime, one that stressed individualism, competition and commercialisation” (Goldson, 2004, p. 243). The public broadcaster (TVNZ), became a State Owned Enterprise in 1988, which meant that would operate as a commercial broadcaster with the primary objective of making a profit.

The first privately owned television channel, TV3 was launched in 1989 and went into receivership within six months. This spurred further deregulation as restrictions on foreign media ownership were lifted from 15% in 1989, to 49.9% in 1990 and finally removed entirely in 1991. As a result, the Canadian company CanWest Global Communications gradually increased its stake in TV3 from 20% to 100% (Spicer, 1996, p. 152).

In this period TVNZ’s in-house documentary production unit was closed, completing the transition to a fully independent and highly competitive television documentary production industry.

Accompanying these radical structural reforms a new funding system was also established in 1989. The Broadcasting Commission, which soon became known as New Zealand on Air (now NZ On Air) was launched to administrate contestable funding for local content from the Public Broadcasting Fee. The Broadcasting Commission, New Zealand on Air (NZ On Air), was an innovation intended to ensure the provision of local content (if not a public broadcasting service) in an environment where the state owned broadcaster is required to perform commercially in a competitive market, by opening up public funds for local content to all broadcasters and producers on a contestable basis. Within this funding model, in order to receive funding from NZ On Air for a documentary, a producer must have a commitment from a broadcaster. This means that although NZ On Air has “a mandate to support various priorities within broadcasting – in summary ‘local content, coverage, Māori culture, children, and minority programmes’” (Horrocks, 1996a, p. 52) – from the broadcaster’s point of view programmes must also have the potential to attract good ratings. So, while documentary

9. Te Māngai Pāho (TMP), the Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency, was established later in 1993
is largely dependent on public subsidy and is often expected to deliver public service values, ultimately it is also required to be cost-effective and highly commercial.

Despite the challenges of the new contestable funding system in negotiating agreeable outcomes for all interested parties (the funding body, producers and broadcasters and ultimately the audience), the introduction of competition in New Zealand television and establishment of NZ On Air led to a boom in the production of local content, and documentary in particular. Between 1988 and 1995 total local production increased from 2,114 hours per year to 5,034 and documentary production increased from forty-three to 258 hours (Horrocks, 1996a, p. 52). During this period New Zealand documentary production seemed to be booming with the introduction of two documentary strands introduced by Geoff Steven, himself a former documentary maker (Inside New Zealand on TV3 in 1991 and later Documentary New Zealand on TV One). These documentary strands not only screened in primetime, (an unheard of feat internationally) but also delivered consistently strong ratings (Horrocks, 2003) (Debrett, 2004).

The election in 1990 of a National Party Government was by no means the end of “the New Zealand experiment”. In October 1990 the National Party released a broadcasting policy that proposed that Television One should become a public service broadcaster with an emphasis on ‘quality programming’ and the Channel 2 (now TV2) should be sold (Spicer, 1996, p. 142). Although these proposals never came to pass, throughout the 1990s the prospect of the sale of either TV2 or TVNZ in its entirety loomed large. As deregulation meant increased competition TVNZ was under pressure to maintain profitability and throughout the 1990s TVNZ focused on new business investment and diversification. Seeing pay TV as a potentially strong source of competition, TVNZ invested in a new company, Sky Network Television Limited, which officially launched in May 1990, taking a 35 percent stake and supplying transmission services through its subsidiary company, BCL (Spicer, 1996, pp. 85–86). TVNZ also invested in Asia’s first business Asia Business News and took a stake in telecommunications company CLEAR Communications (Spicer, 1996, p. 177). As an SOE, TVNZ had become not just a
broadcaster but “an outward looking electronic communications company” (Spicer, 1996, p. 178).

d. Dominant commercialism (1995-99)

According to Roger Horrocks’ analysis;

*The change of culture within TVNZ that began in the late 1980s had by 1995 developed so far that commercialism dominated every aspect of the organisation. Initially promoted in terms of economic and administrative efficiency, the new approach had far-reaching social and cultural implications, widening the gap between TVNZ and NZOA. With rare exceptions, attempts to expand and diversity local production became too difficult. (Horrocks, 2004a, pp. 33–34)*

As the dominant player in the market, TVNZ set the tone for television broadcasting, and the tone was commercialism. The market had also become increasingly competitive as more channels launched and Sky’s market share and content offering steadily increased. In 1995 TVNZ experimented with a regional network, Horizon Pacific, (but found the venture to be unprofitable and closed the service in 1997). TV3 added an addition channel 4 (later C4, now FOUR) in 1997. Prime, an Australian-owned network of regional stations was introduced in 1998 (and was later sold to Sky TV in 2006), and small regional TV networks such as CTV in the Canterbury region appeared.

During this period (the latter half of the 1990s), the tradition Annie Goldson describes as the ‘quality series’, typified by New Zealand documentaries such as *Landmarks, The New Zealand Wars* and *Our People, Our Century* struggled while ‘fast turnaround’ documentary flourished (Goldson, 2004). Goldson describes these ‘fast turnaround’ documentaries as a blend of expositional features with observational style, heavily reliant on narration and a sense of observing reality as it unfolds. During this same period reality television began to have a significant impact on New Zealand television,
just as it was internationally, giving rise to what John Corner has called the “postdocumentary culture of television” (Corner, 2002). The programmes Goldson identifies as ‘fast turnaround’ may have been little different to programmes that might otherwise been characterised as reality television had they not been placed in the established primetime documentary slots Documentary New Zealand and Inside New Zealand. The flexibility of documentary as a television genre in the postdocumentary era served to expand the quantity of locally produced factual content, but limited certain kinds of documentary (such as the social documentary), or certain functions of documentary, (such as, in John Corner’s typology, ‘Documentary as Radical Interrogation and Alternative Perspective’). The contestable funding model was, and continues to be, extremely successful in ensuring the provision of local content in a highly commercial market without the imposition of a local content quota, but it has been a far greater challenge to ensure that this content meets the objectives\(^{10}\) that the Broadcasting Commission (NZ On Air) was designed to uphold\(^{11}\).

Whereas a public service broadcaster might seek to commission challenging social documentaries or more experimental documentaries, NZ On Air’s influence has not always been strong enough to counter the extreme commercialism of the New Zealand market where ratings trump cultural value. As Mary Debrett argues in her comparative analysis of public service broadcasting systems,

\[
\text{The free market system has been characterised by adherence to proven formulas and formats, and programming that can be produced as long running series or on a fast turn-around basis. As a result, reality TV, soaps and sitcoms fare better than documentaries, and one-off dramas. The pursuit of ratings thus tends to discourage creative risk taking. (Debrett, 2010, p. 19)}
\]

\(^{10}\) As Dunleavy and Joyce note, “it was indicative of the neo-liberal ideology that [the 1989 Broadcasting Act] avoided using the term ‘public service’, referring instead to the ‘social objectives’ of broadcasting” (Dunleavy & Joyce, 2011, p. 111)

\(^{11}\) To reflect and develop the New Zealand identity and culture by obtaining, commissioning and broadcasting a range of programmes to inform, educate and entertain; “To ensure that the people of New Zealand have access to television and radio broadcasting services offering a range of programmes which will cater in a balanced way for varied interests of different sections of the community” (Norris, 2004, p. 4).
Debrett’s argument is supported by Roger Horrock’s description of his experience as a NZ On Air board member during this period;

In the genre of documentary, which had experienced a 500-percent growth, there was an increasing demand among broadcasters for what might be called the populist documentary with its emphasis on human interest over ideas, ordinary people over experts, familiar or “universal” topics over unfamiliar or minority topics, emotion (or melodrama) over reason, and a once-over-lightly approach over a slower, in-depth investigation. NZoA opposed this trend as a narrowing of the possibilities of local culture. My experience of television during these years was a matter of constant struggle. I developed a respect for the ability of commissioning editors to predict ratings but a frustration at television’s desire to play safe. (Horrocks, 2004c, p. 63)

e. Attempts to revive public service broadcasting (since 1999).

As the 1990s drew to a close, the commercialism of New Zealand television reached its zenith and in the lead-up to the 1999 general election the Labour Party campaigned with a cultural manifesto that promised a return to public service values. At the same time, the National government abolished the Public Broadcasting Fee that supported NZ On Air, gearing towards the sale of TVNZ. The Labour Party won the 1999 election (in coalition with the Alliance Party) and once again a change in government brought above a significant shift in the direction of broadcasting policy. Just as the Labour Government of 1984 brought about structural change led by a neo-liberal policy agenda, the return of Labour in 1999 resulted in structural change reflective of a Third Way ideology that aimed to reconcile the demands of a free market economy with social values.

In April 2000 work began on developing the broadcasting policy that would set the foundations for a TVNZ charter that would require TVNZ to meet public service
objectives; a slow process that allowed for drafting and public feedback and required the drafting of a bill to restructure TVNZ from a state owned enterprise (SOE) into a Crown-owned company (CROC), which would allow TVNZ to retain more of its profits. The TVNZ bill was contentious, meeting with fierce resistance from opposition parties and the TVNZ board itself. It was not until February 2003, in the second term of a Labour-led coalition that the TVNZ bill was finally passed. The Charter was officially implemented in March 2003 and $12 million was allocated directly to TVNZ to commission programming that would fulfil its Charter obligations (Comrie, 2005). The Charter laid out 9 public service objectives (such as to “feature programming across all genres that informs, entertains and educates New Zealand audiences” and 14 actions for TVNZ to follow in order to fulfil these objectives (such as to “feature programmes that reflect the regions to the nation as a whole”), tempered by the remit to also maintain commercial performance (TVNZ, 2003). The conflicting objectives of public service values and commercial profitability, inadequately supported by a modest public subsidy “set the network on course to fail in its charter delivery” (T. E. Dunleavy, 2012, p. 5). The Charter was generally regarded to be ineffectual, and even the CEO of TVNZ was critical of the “money-go-round” that saw the government give around $15 million of Charter funding on one hand and take a significantly larger dividend with the other.

At roughly the same time the TVNZ bill and charter was being developed, Parekura Horomia, the Minister of Māori Affairs introduced the Māori Television Service Bill with the objective of establishing a dedicated Māori television channel. The Māori Television Service Act (2003) declares overtly public service values but with a very specific cultural mandate:

*The principal function of Māori Television is to promote te reo Māori me ngā tikanga Māori [Māori language and customs] through the provision of a high quality, cost effective Māori television service, in both Māori and English, that informs, educates and entertains a broad viewing audience, and, in doing so, enriches New Zealand’s society, culture and heritage.* (Māori Television Service Act 2003 in J. Smith & Abel, 2007)
Unlike TVNZ, Māori Television has been widely regarded as a successful provider of public service content, and as will be discussed further, has come to play a significant role in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology.

**Digital Television**

In the second half of the 2000s New Zealand television began to embrace or at least confront the digital age and re-examine public broadcasting in this new era with the introduction of free to air digital television, online TV on demand services, Digital Video Recorders and funding support for digital content.

In anticipation of digital switchover and the increasing use of web and mobile platforms by broadcasters, it was announced in 2006 that free-to-air digital television would begin transmission the following year thanks to the Freeview service developed by a consortium of broadcasters including TVNZ, CanWest, Māori TV, Trackside and Radio New Zealand. The Government allocated up to $25 million to fund the establishment of the service with the bulk of costs to be met by the consortium (Maharey, 2006).

At the beginning of Labour’s fourth term proposals for the introduction of digital channels had been rejected but in November 2006 the government announced that it would provide funding of $79 million over a six year period to support the establishment of two new commercial-free digital channels. Describing the initiative as “a very substantial leap forward in our role as a public broadcaster”, TVNZ CEO Rick Ellis downplayed the suggestion that the new channels would allow TV One and TV2 to be even more commercially focused saying, “We will take every opportunity to develop our public broadcasting contribution on every channel. The New Zealand public own us. TVNZ will provide universal access to the public broadcasting value we provide” (TVNZ, 2006).
TVNZ6 launched on 30 September 2007 with children’s programming from 6am to 4pm (TVNZ Kidzone), family programming from 4pm to 8.30pm (TVNZ Family) and drama, arts and comedy from 8.30pm to midnight (TVNZ Showcase). TVNZ7 launched in March 2008 with an emphasis on news, documentary and factual programmes. Apart from mini-documentaries made in partnership with institutions such as Te Papa and the Department of Conservation, TVNZ 7 did not have sufficient funding to commission local one-off documentaries, but did commission factual series such as New Artland and The Sitting and regularly screened local and international documentaries.

The time-shifting of television via digital video recording and online TV on demand has dramatically changed the nature of television. In New Zealand Sky introduced its My Sky digital video recorder (DVR) in December 2005 while TVNZ acquired a 33% stake in the Australiasian licencee of TiVo, which partnered with Telecom to offer a pay-per-view download service, Caspa in November 2009.

As more New Zealanders had access to broadband, Internet video viewing rose significantly. A 2007 report on digital broadcasting in the public age (commissioned by NZ On Air) found that TV viewing had declined for most of the regular internet users surveyed, who were spending an increasing amount of time online and that a number of those surveyed admitted to watching programmes downloaded from the Internet. Responding to audience demand for online content, TVNZ launched the TVNZ OnDemand service in 2006, making broadcast content freely available online while at the same time Mediaworks offered online news videos via TV3’s website and significant online content for its youth-oriented music channel C4 (Brown & Dubber, 2007).

In 2007 the government released the Digital Content Strategy, which included actions such as re-examining the statutory definition and function of NZ On Air and Te Māngai Pāho in order to support digital content and reviewing regulatory policy for digital broadcasting (National Library of New Zealand, 2007). This strategy and the review of
NZ On Air’s statutory functions led to two important new digital initiatives; the Digital Content Partnership Fund (launched 2008), which encouraged the content for digital content beyond broadcast, and NZ On Screen (launched 2009), an archive of NZ television, film and music videos\(^\text{12}\).

**The end of the Charter and a return to commercialism**

By 2008 it was clear that the TVNZ Charter had made little impact and the Labour government decided to assign the management of the Charter funding to NZ On Air due to dissatisfaction with the way in which TVNZ had been spending the funds to support commercial programming (Norris & Pauling, 2012, p. 31). The National Party had announced their intention to go a step further and open the Charter funding to other broadcasters as a contestable fund. When National replaced Labour in November 2008 after three terms in power, this promise was set in action. In 2009 the government initiated the removal of the TVNZ charter under the TVNZ Amendment Bill, effectively returning TVNZ to a fully commercial broadcaster without any public service remit and the Charter funding became the contestable $15 Platinum Fund allocated for “high quality public broadcast content of wide appeal” (NZ On Air, 2009). 2009 therefore marks the end of the phase Horrocks identifies as ‘attempts to revive public service broadcasting’.

**2010 – 2013: post-broadcasting, post-public service?**

The period that this study examines is, I argue, distinctive in that it marks a point of transition – one of many, as this chapter has already demonstrated, but a significant turn nonetheless – away from universal public service television broadcasting and into an era of diversification where competition is intensified not only across broadcast networks but across media platforms. Ultimately, if there is one defining issue that can be identified at present it is the unique situation of a developed nation effectively lacking a

\(^{12}\) (These initiatives are discussed further in chapter 7).
dedicated public service broadcaster and operating with a contestible public funding system in lieu of a local content quota.

**Public Service Broadcasting without a Public Service Broadcaster**

The passing of the TVNZ Amendment Act in July 2011 merely formalised a paradigm shift that had been set in motion in 2009 when the bill was first proposed. TVNZ’s Charter funding allocation had already been reassigned to NZ On Air in the form of the contestable Platinum Fund. Freed at last of the Charter, the Government set its sights on TVNZ’s final remnants of public service broadcasting, the commercial-free digital channels TVNZ 6 and TVNZ 7. In March 2011 the family-oriented TVNZ6 was replaced by a commercial youth channel (U) and its children’s content was shifted to a new pay TV channel, TVNZ Kidzone24 on SKY (TVNZ, 2011b). In April 2011 the Government announced that funding for TVNZ7, which has supported a great deal of factual public service content, would not continue beyond June 2012 (TVNZ, 2011a). Poor ratings were given as a justification for the discontinuation of funding by the Broadcasting Minister of the time, Jonathan Coleman, who provided The New Zealand Herald with a figure of 207,000 viewers per week at a cost of $15 million per year; figures cited by The Herald in an editorial titled, ‘Poor TVNZ7 ratings justify pulling plug’ (“Editorial,” 2011). Nearly a year later it came to light that Coleman’s statistics were woefully inaccurate, as were comparisons between nightly ratings on TV One and weekly cumulatively ratings on TVNZ7 (Russell Brown, 2012). As a correction printed by The Herald later revealed, actual audience figures were much higher; a monthly cumulative audience of 1.1 million, peaking at 1.47 million in December 2010 (“Editorial,” 2011). For its parent organisation TVNZ7 represented unwanted competition and a drain on resources. It was the view of (then) Minister of Broadcasting Jonathan Coleman that, “sinking money into a public broadcasting infrastructure which continues to suck up money in the long-term doesn't make sense ... It's important to fund the content, not some monolithic public broadcaster”(Cheng, 2011).
The news of the pending demise of TVNZ 7 provoked tremendous public response and stimulated debate about the future of public service media in New Zealand. In June 2011 I attended the “Forum on the Future of Public Television in New Zealand”, held at Victoria University in Wellington where academics, industry representatives and interested members of the public gathered to discuss ways that the crisis in public television might be addressed. I had expected the discussion would be centred on how to rescue and retain TVNZ 7, but found that there was a great deal of uncertainty about whether the future of public television would lie with one ‘anchor’ channel, and a great deal of skepticism as to whether TVNZ, with its deeply ingrained culture of commercialism, could be trusted to maintain any kind of public broadcasting service.

A group called ‘Save TVNZ7’ formed and launched a campaign via Facebook that attracted over 9,000 page ‘likes’ (“Save TVNZ 7,” n.d.) and started an online petition that gathered more than 33,000 signatures. Meetings and protest marches were held throughout New Zealand, culminating in a ‘funeral procession’ through central Auckland on TVNZ7’s final day (Jones, 2012). This group has become absorbed into the Coalition for Better Broadcasting (CBB) and continues to actively campaign for improved public service broadcasting in New Zealand. In the end, the protests, the campaigning and political controversy had no bearing on the fate of TVNZ 7. There were rumours of TVNZ7 being replaced by a home shopping channel (Drinnan, 2011), but finally when the channel went off air at midnight on 30 July 2012 the vacant frequency was taken up by TV One + 1, a channel rebroadcasting TV One delayed by an hour.

Roger Horrock’s description of New Zealand television, written not long after the introduction of the TVNZ Charter and long before launch of TVNZ 6 and 7, uses the model of ecology to emphasise both the volatility and interdependence of New Zealand television as a complex system:

... New Zealand television is a small and vulnerable habitat with a number of endangered species. Broadcasters and production companies struggle to survive
and grow in a challenging environment, sensitive to any new form of life introduced (such as pay television) or any change of temperature (such as a downturn in advertising revenue). A key aspect of ecology is the awareness that everything is interrelated so that any change has subtle flow-on effects.

(Horrocks, 2004a, p. 18)

The demise of TVNZ’s commercial free digital channels and the repealing of the charter may have had little immediate effect on the documentary production ecology as TVNZ 6 & 7 did not commission documentaries\(^{13}\) and the Charter had little impact on TV One’s commercial sensibilities. Rather, the impact of its termination was broader and deeper, removing altogether the notion of a ‘home’ for public service content and reshaping the wider television landscape. As the Human Rights Commission noted in its report on Race Relations in 2011, “The repeal of the TVNZ charter could lead to fewer programmes reflecting New Zealand’s diverse society. With the charter gone, TVNZ no longer has a statutory requirement to reflect local culture, with its purpose confined to commercial performance” (Human Rights Commission | Te Kahui Tika Tangata, 2012, p. 89).

In keeping with the current National Government’s return to early New Zealand neoliberal policies such as asset sales, these reforms finally realised the 1985 recommendation of Treasury that,

\[
\text{It was unnecessary for the Government to operate publicly owned and operated stations to achieve the [social] objectives, and that, in the interests of efficiency, it would be preferable for the Government, perhaps through delegated bodies, to use funds from general taxation to buy non-commercial programmes for transmission by commercial broadcasting. (Treasury 1985: 44 in Norris & Pauling, 2012, p. 12)}
\]

\(^{13}\) Though TVNZ7 did commission some factual series with public service values such as the educational science series *Ever Wondered.*
For the architects of the radical broadcasting deregulation that led to the establishment of NZ On Air, the market could capably provide public broadcasting services without the need for a dedicated public service broadcaster. As one of these architects explained;

*If you had a social objective there was no inherent reason why other commercial players in the market place couldn’t utilise the public money and do just as good a job or at least contest that they could do just as good a job as a government enterprise and produce the social objective you were looking for.* (Stevenson 2010 in Norris & Pauling, 2012, p. 12)

The view that a fully contestable public funding model without a dedicated public broadcaster would create a level playing field and provide audiences (and citizens) with high public value has been widely criticised by local academics. According to Peter Thompson’s analysis:

... funding arrangements need to take account of the position of a channel in the wider media ecology; in some instances, private commercial media might provide more public value per dollar than a public channel. However, this is certainly not a justification for making all funding competitive and open to all operators. Contestable public funding among a small group of similar commercial operators will still tend to overproduce genres/formats with proven audience appeal that minimise their opportunity cost. To ensure competition for quality and diversity, a plurality of institutional models needs to be present in the media ecology. In other words, optimising public value per public dollar requires an environment where there are not-for-profit operators which can accept content with high public value but high opportunity costs that would normally deter commercial operators. (Thompson, 2011, pp. 6–7)

A further crisis in public broadcasting arose when privately owned free-to-air community broadcaster Stratos Television also closed down during this period, ceasing transmission on 23 December 2011. The channel had operated for four years on the digital Freeview platform, broadcasting regional and national community programmes
in addition to al-Jazeera and content from international networks such as DW-TV, France 24, Euro News in Europe, Voice of America, Bloomberg, Australia Network and CCTV, CQTV, NHK and YTN in Asia, which served minority ethnic communities in New Zealand (Freeview NZ, 2011). A statement released by Stratos CEO Jim Blackman said, “The transmission costs coupled with the economic environment and general lack of support at all levels has meant that [Stratos] simply could not survive” (Stratos, 2011). A year after its closure Stratos Television announced a deal to relaunch on the pay Sky TV platform. The new channel, Face TV launched in February 2013, modelled on Stratos’ Auckland based channel, Triangle TV. Unsurprisingly, Sky CEO John Fellet was reported as saying that the decision to give channel spectrum to Face TV was commercial, having “noticed a dip in Sky subscribers' overall viewership when Stratos went off the air” (Mace, 2012). While the continuation of the community programming offered by Stratos and Triangle Television was welcomed, the move of further ‘public service’ content behind the pay wall has deepened concerns about the state of public service media in New Zealand for academics and media commentators.

**Economic recession**

The global economic crisis provided a gloomy backdrop to this study, and impacted on every sector of the documentary production ecology. During the 2010 – 2013 period broadcasters lost valuable advertisers and fought harder for ratings and commission accordingly. In turn, bigger producers pitched more conservatively, chasing popular factual series commissions above less financially rewarding (and less commercially desirable) one-off documentaries. Smaller producers struggled to make ends meet as the side careers and odd-jobs that supplement their documentary making activities become harder to find, and some moved away from television altogether. Industry support organisations both intensified competition and cooperation in order to sustain their activities, and many scaled back on administration staff and increased their reliance on interns and volunteers. The recession has been particularly difficult for Mediaworks (TV3 and FOUR), which received a substantial government loan in 2011 and went into receivership (once again) in 2013.
The first newsletter of 2010 from NZ On Air CEO Jane Wrightson began:

Much thinking is going on right now about the level of local content investment that can be sustained this year: thinking by us, the broadcasters and the Government. While it’s clear the belt-tightening isn’t over yet, we’re still very positive that there will be many new and interesting projects supported in the coming months. (NZ On Air, 2010b)

The newsletters that followed throughout 2010, 2011 and 2012 continued to gently remind the reader of the climate of constraint while maintaining a tone of cautious optimism that belies the weight of the burden that NZ On Air has carried throughout this period. The task of NZ On Air has never been easy, but I argue that the economic and related political conditions of the 2010 – 2013 period have presented the greatest challenge yet of its 22 year existence as a unique “model of intervention in the commercial mediascape for public purposes” (Norris & Pauling, 2012, p. 09). While NZ On Air’s purpose is to serve audiences rather than industry (and the welfare of industry organisations, for example, are therefore outside its purview), it carries the burden of supporting the industry nonetheless; without its existence, or an alternative form of “intervention”, there would be little if any local television documentary production in New Zealand.

Post-broadcast television

The term ‘post-broadcast television’ has emerged in recent years to describe the changing nature of television in a multi-platform, networked (but not network) time-shifted, digital era (Turner & Tay, 2009; Bennett & Strange, 2011). Television’s many forms, uses and practices continue to be relevant and important, but the changing nature of television requires new ways of understanding production, distribution and use in a post-broadcast context. For broadcasters this has meant programming changes such as even greater emphasis on shorter blocks of content (half hour factual series rather than hour long one-offs) and more event television such as X-Factor or New Zealand’s Got Talent, which draw on social media buzz to hold audience interest and promote live viewing. As NZ On Air noted in 2012, “At the millennium an 8.30pm documentary
hour was the norm; in 2012 a 9.30pm slot is usually the earliest available for one-hour programmes and early evening half-hour programmes are often preferred by broadcasters” (NZ On Air, 2012). Competition with grey market use of video on demand services such as Netflix of Hulu, or illegal downloading of content via P2P networks by audiences hungry for the latest US TV shows has spurred broadcasters to offer ‘same day’ broadcasts for popular shows, allowing viewers to see programmes the same day they screen in the US. The introduction of time-shifted channels (TV One +1, TV3 + 1) allows networks to broaden their ratings net, while Neilson has introduced time-shifted ratings to measure viewing outside the broadcast schedule. On demand (online) viewing of television is increasing, but broadcasters and NZ On Air are coy about revealing exactly how popular these services are. Mobile viewing has also increased and both TVNZ and TV3 support ondemand viewing for mobile or tablet devices.

Social or second screen TV activity is apparently strong for ‘event’ television such as the talent competition *X Factor* or studio-based live current affairs programmes such as *The Vote*, which incorporate audience interaction via Facebook, Twitter and online forums into the format of the programme. In the case of documentary, promotion and audience engagement is largely left to the producer, and any costs are additional to the production budget. Broadcasters encourage producers to provide social media engagement or additional online content but provide little support beyond hosting material on the network website. Most producers interviewed seem to accept the additional cost of social media engagement or other forms of promotion to be a necessary business expense. As one producer I interviewed explained;

*It works in that where we are effective in getting more people to watch our shows we are more likely to get more commissions. It’s a budget item that didn't used to exist, and still doesn't really exist in any formal sense. It does sometimes. I just think it's part of how the world has changed; and the on demand screenings and the on-site blogs that broadcasters have now are a cost to them that never used to be there, and it's a cost to us that never used to be there, but it*
is of benefit to us both. It’s a different world. (V. Burke, personal communication, September 19, 2012)

While there has been some limited experimentation with multi-platform content in genres such as drama (mainly with the support of the Digital Content Partnership Fund), for commercial broadcasters there is no incentive to invest in anything other than basic broadcast content for documentaries;

If you are, say, A Current Affair, and you want to develop some audience engagement so that they stick with your series, on whatever platform, for the whole year (because you’re on for the whole year) then that’s kind of a marketing investment and you can justify it in that way. But for a one-off it’s really hard to justify saying okay, we’re going to have a day less editing so that we can put this thing online. (K. Wright, personal communication, January 23, 2013)

TV3’s website for the long-running Inside New Zealand strand is an example of how little promotion is given to one-off documentaries online. Although TV3 continued to occasionally broadcast documentaries under the Inside New Zealand banner in 2012 and 2013, the TV3 webpage for the strand was not kept up to date. New Zealand documentaries screened on TV3 are available on the TV3 On Demand website under the tag ‘documentary’ with no mention of the Inside New Zealand strand and there seems to be little or no information about recent or upcoming documentaries on the TV3 website, apart from brief listings on the TV3 On Demand page. In apparent contrast, in August 2013 TVNZ’s homepage (tvnz.co.nz) was skinned with a promo for the new Documentary NZ strand screening in the primetime slot of Wednesday 7.30pm on TVNZ Heartland. The entire page focuses all attention on Documentary NZ with animated advertisements prominently placed in the top banner position and right column, completely dominating all other content. There is a catch here, however. TVNZ Heartland is a subscriber-only channel on Sky TV. No such promotion is given to local documentary on TVNZ’s free to air channels and a dedicated documentary strand no longer exists. TVNZ On Demand has content categories for ‘factual’ and ‘New Zealand’
but not ‘documentary’. For the major (type 1) free to air broadcasters then, post-broadcast or multiplatform documentary does not enter into consideration because broadcast documentary itself is a low priority form of content.

For a more public service oriented broadcaster however, online or multiplatform content is more desirable, but still not affordable. Māori Television’s Head of External Programming Annie Murray sees online content as an important way of engaging with audiences and recognises that public broadcasters internationally are using additional platforms to connect with younger audiences in particular. In New Zealand however, funding for non-broadcast content is an issue:

> Our funders still are quite limited in what they are prepared to put in to a digital extension of a programme and even more than that, if you look at it digital RFPs that have come out from New Zealand On Air and soon to come out from TMP, they are quite specifically not about complementing and extending existing programs. TMP in particular have said that they don’t want to do that, they see the digital money as creating standalone projects. So with programme budgets that are about 60% of mainstream budgets it’s quite a big ask for a producer to have a digital extension to the programme within the existing programme budget. When the budget is already a squeezed, it’s kind of like the icing on the cake. And for some producers, they can see opportunities with partnering with other third parties who may have an interest in content as a way of funding digital content, but it's baby steps in that area at the moment. (A.Murray, personal communication, December 4, 2012).

**Overview of the Television Broadcast Ecology 2010-2013**

Finally, in order to anchor and complete this discussion of the forces that have shaped New Zealand television documentary in an historical and contemporary context, I have briefly defined the positions of three key groups in the documentary production ecology
in relation to television – funders, broadcasters and producers – during the period 2010-2013.

**Funders**

**NZ On Air | Irirangi Te Motu**

A key challenge for NZ On Air as a funding body during 2010-2013 has been to balance and maintain its three core values of diversity, innovation and value for money within an intensely competitive television market. NZ On Air’s total average budget during the period of this study was approximately $82 million per year, which includes an average of $15.6 million spent on 134.7 hours of documentary per year (NZ On Air, 2012b) representing 18% of total television funding (NZ On Air, 2013b, p. 2).

The changing role of NZ On Air in a constantly evolving and complex media environment was a concern for the agency itself during the period of the study. Digital strategies were reassessed and further defined and emerging issues such as online rights for NZ On Air funded content were examined (and opened to public consultation). Following on from the publication of its Digital Strategy in June 2012, NZ On Air released a discussion paper on Online Rights and Public Access in November 2012, proposing that “publicly funded content will have at least one permanent and accessible home online when initial rights expire (NZ On Air, 2012f).

NZ On Air also engaged in an extensive assessment of its documentary funding policies, involving both audience research and the publication of a discussion paper, which elicited over 2000 submissions. The majority of submissions were the result of a form letter published by The Coalition for Better Broadcasting (formerly Save TVNZ7), reflecting the public strength of feeling about the role of documentary in public broadcasting. NZ On Air published 28 responses from industry (including my own submission\(^{14}\)) and a summary of responses from the general public. The following

\(^{14}\) See Appendix I
chapter addresses some of the key concerns raised in these submissions and addressed by NZ On Air in its ‘Television Documentary Funding Strategy Review’ (NZ On Air, 2013b), focusing primarily on the definition of documentary.

**Te Māngai Pāho (TMP) and NZ On Air Māori programme funding**

Te Māngai Pāho (TMP), the Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency, was established in 1993. Its statutory role is “to promote Māori language and culture by making funds available, on such terms and conditions as Te Māngai Pāho thinks fit, for broadcasting and the production of programmes to be broadcast” (Te Māngai Pāho). Both NZ On Air and TMP fund Māori programmes, with separate but complementary objectives/programming strategies. As with NZ On Air, TMP requires a broadcaster commitment in order to be considered for funding. Although TMP issues Requests for Proposal (RFPs) for any national network (primarily TVNZ, TV3, Prime and Māori Television), it primarily funds programmes for Māori Television, a broadcaster that shares common objectives with TMP, having been established to support the revitalisation of te reo Māori.

During the period of this study, all state services came under increased pressure from the Government to cut costs, demonstrate greater value for money and ‘deliver results’, culminating in the launch of the Better Public Services Programme by Prime Minister John Key on 15 March 2012 (State Services Commission, 2012). In the future, this bid to streamline the public sector may mean full or partial consolidation of funding agencies. For now, NZ On Air, TMP and the NZFC have been working towards increased collaboration and cooperation. For NZ On Air and TMP this has meant working to coordinate and align programme purchasing decisions and funding policies (Te Mangai Paho, 2012, p. 25). NZ On Air and NZFC also extended the scope of their collaboration with the announcement of a joint documentary fund in 2013, “a new opportunity to make strong, appealing one-off documentaries of a quality likely to
delight New Zealand audiences, win awards, and secure festival invitations and broadcast sales” (NZ On Air & NZFC, 2013)\textsuperscript{15}.

**Broadcasters**

NZ On Air categorises broadcasters according to a three-tiered system:

*Type 1: free-to-air channels with large audiences (TV One, TV2, TV3)*

*Type 2: free-to-air broad-service channels with smaller audiences but national reach (eg. Prime, Māori Television, Four)*

*Type 3: free-to-air channels broadcasting regionally and/or to special interest audiences* (NZOA SOI 2013).

### Primary New Zealand Broadcasters by Market Share (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All viewers S+</th>
<th>Total TV</th>
<th>TV One</th>
<th>TV2</th>
<th>TV3</th>
<th>PRIME</th>
<th>FOUR</th>
<th>Maori TV</th>
<th>SKY Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Average</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© The Nielsen Company. All Rights Reserved. Data prior to the 15\textsuperscript{th} of January 2012 is based on live data. The latest available Consolidated data day is updated daily at 1pm and is 7 days behind the latest available Overnight data day.

Retrieved from RatingsPoint, August 2013 © The Nielsen Company.

**Tier 1 (TV One, TV2 and TV)**

NZ On Air prioritises funding for Tier 1 broadcasters in order to reach the largest possible audience. TV One, TV2 and TV3 combined comprise 54.2% of the total market share (based on 2012 average market share).

\textsuperscript{15} See chapter 5 for further discussion of NZ On Air/NZFC collaboration
TVOne and TV2 (TVNZ)

As described above, one of the most conspicuous changes in the television landscape in New Zealand during the period of the study has been the divestment of TVNZ’s nominal public service broadcasting role and the termination of the commercial-free digital channels TVNZ6 and 7. However, the views of interview subjects and my analysis of output during the study period suggest that the impact of legislative and structural changes has largely been sociocultural as industry and audience adapt to a more outwardly post-public service broadcasting environment. TVNZ’s average combined market share for 2012 was 41.5%, by far the most dominant broadcaster in New Zealand (including the Sky TV network).

TVOne

TV One’s average market share for 2012 was 24.8%. There has been a gradual increase in total hours of documentary funded for TV One during the period of the study, from 62 hours in 2010 to 68 hours in 2012. The channel offers a broad range of programming (news, current affairs, sport, drama, entertainment and documentary) and its target audience is All People aged 25-54 (TVNZ, n.d.).

TV2

TV2’s average market share for 2012 was 16.6%. TV2’s programming is generally aimed at a younger audience than TV One and mainly comprises drama, comedy, reality shows and other forms of light entertainment. The channel does not have a history of supporting documentary but in December 2012 a ten-part half-hour factual series called Street Hospital, which will follow a team of Wellington Free Ambulance paramedics on the streets of central Wellington. This commissioning and funding decision is a reflection of the popular appeal of ‘obs doc’ series and the value such programmes present to both broadcasters and funders.
TV3

TV3’s average market share for 2012 was 12.8%. TV3 has a history of financial strife and political intervention that even precedes its broadcasting debut and the period of this study saw a continuation of these themes. TV3’s parent company attracted great controversy in 2011 when it was revealed that the Government loaned the company $43.3 million to renew its radio broadcasting licences, despite a dispute with the Inland Revenue Department over a tax bill of $24.5 million allegedly owed by MediaWorks at the time (Drinnan & Scherer, 2011). MediaWorks went into receivership in June 2013, and it was widely speculated that the disputed tax bill (now cited as $22 million) was unlikely to be recovered due to a restructuring deal brokered by receivers KordaMenta (Drinnan, 2013).

Tier 2

Tier 2 broadcasters “provide [NZ On Air] with an opportunity to widen the diversity of programme types and subjects while maintaining the potential for respectable audience numbers” (NZ On Air, 2012a). In other words, the Tier 2 broadcasters have much lower audiences than TV One, TV2 and TV3 but are more willing to support programmes that the larger broadcasters will not. Combined market share for Prime, FOUR and Māori TV in 2012 was 10.8%. This means Tier 2 broadcasters, specifically Māori Television and Prime, ‘punch above their weight’ in terms of documentary.

Māori Television

Māori Television occupies a unique position in the documentary production ecology because profit-making is not its primary directive (although it is required to be cost effective and does operate as a commercial broadcaster). Its objectives are “To significantly contribute to the revitalisation of the Māori language [and] To be an
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independent Māori television service that is relevant, effective and widely accessible (Māori Television, n.d.). A second channel established in 2008, Te Reo, offers 100% Māori language programming and this channel also screens New Zealand documentary content (mainly funded by Te Māngai Pāho).

Much discussion in the public broadcasting debate in New Zealand is focused on whether or not Māori Television now carries the mantle of New Zealand’s public broadcaster. Although Māori Television certainly functions as a public broadcaster and is currently the only free to air national public broadcaster, the objectives above are fundamental and would be compromised if Māori Television sought to widen its remit.

For champions of public broadcasting in New Zealand, ratings for Māori Television are disappointingly low, despite high critical regard for its content and kaupapa (purpose). The average market share for Māori Television in 2012 was 0.5%; significantly lower than any other network including the Other Channels category.

Prime

Prime is a free to air broadcaster owned by SKY, which had an average market share of 6.1% in 2012. The channel has a strong skew towards males and factual programmes and documentaries feature prominently in the schedule. Prime has commissioned a number of Platinum Fund quality documentaries such as *Wild Coasts* and *The Hunt for the Pink and White Terraces* and (alongside Maori Television) is recognised by producers as a significant supporter of documentary content.
FOUR

FOUR is a youth channel that screens sitcoms and light entertainment shows and usually screens little factual content beyond scripted reality shows such as *The Real Housewives of Beverly Hills*. The theatrically released music documentary *Shihad: Beautiful Machine* received funding from NZ On Air to screen on FOUR but as of August 2013 no date had been set for broadcast, though the film screened on Sky TV’s Rialto Channel in June and July of 2013.

**Tier 3 broadcasters**

Tier three includes regional TV channels (such as Canterbury TV, Auckland’s Triangle TV, Television Hawkes Bay and many others). Nielsen has a ratings category ‘Other TV Channels’ which, during the period of this study included regional channels plus other marginal channels such as TVNZ6/TVNZU, and TVNZ 7. New Zealand TV blogger Regan Cunliffe, who runs the popular online TV community Throng has published an annual analysis of ratings for the ‘Other TV Channels’ category. In 2011 Cunliffe noted a significant growth in ratings for this category, which he speculated may have been attributable to the TVNZ digital channels (TVNZ 6 and 7). The category subsequently went into decline in 2012 and in 2013 fell below 2010 levels (Cunliffe, n.d.). Because more detailed ratings data for this category are not available it is not possible to say with certainty that the decline of the category directly correlates with the closure of TVNZ7 in July 2012. However, in 2013 a new channel, Choice TV, which launched in April 2012 became sufficiently popular to merit its own ratings category. In 2012 it would have been included in the Other TV Channels category. Given the information that came to light in 2013 about the erroneous under-reporting of TVNZ7’s popularity and based on an assumption that it would have taken some time for Choice TV to build its audience, (which is reflected in a rise in the Other TV Channels category from October to December 2012) it seems fair to argue that the drop in ratings for this category is closely related to the closure of TVNZ7.
The average market share for Choice TV for the year to August 2013 was 2.7%, which was .1% higher than the Other TV Channels category for the same period. The growing success of the channel marks the potential of niche programming. Choice TV exclusively screens factual entertainment content during weeknight prime time and each evening’s viewing is organised around lifestyle themes such as ‘Travel – Our World, Property and Design, Great Outdoors, Food, and Entertainment’.

**Pay TV (Sky)**

Sky is a problematic and controversial player in the documentary television ecology. It has no competition in the Pay TV market and (as at June 2012) has a residential household penetration of 49.4% and total audience market share of approximately 29.8%, making it New Zealand’s second largest television broadcaster (SKY TV). It programmes a diverse range of documentary content (demonstrating strong audience interest) and continues to screen one-off festival style documentaries that have largely been abandoned by free to air broadcasters. However, it is indirectly subsidised by NZ On Air and free to air broadcasters because it buys content that has been largely funded by NZ On Air investment and free to air broadcaster licence fees, yet Sky itself makes no contribution to the funding body.

Sky’s market dominance is the subject of much criticism from media commentators and academics and its close partnerships with TVNZ and internet service providers has brought its business practices into scrutiny. TVNZ has a close working relationship with Sky, which serves to reinforce Sky’s market dominance. In December 2011 Sky and TVNZ announced a new low-cost pay TV venture, Igloo which would offer a selection of Sky TV’s pay channels (including TVNZ Heartland and TVNZ Kidzone24) in addition to Freeview channels via the Igloo set top box. The venture was the subject of several complaints to the Commerce Commission on the grounds that the partnership would lessen competition in the pay TV market in break of sections 47 or 27 of the Commerce Act. In May 2013 The Commission found that the venture had no impact on the level of competition in the market but announced a separate investigation relating to
“concerns that access to content and Sky's contracts with internet service providers may be hindering competition” according to sections 27 and 36 of the Commerce Act\textsuperscript{16} (Commerce Commission New Zealand, 2012).

As I discuss in chapter 6, the dominance of Sky has been seen as one of the barriers to online distribution and video streaming, though the emergence in June 2013 of an online sports platform (owned by Coliseum Sport Media Management) that outbid Sky for the rights to screen football’s English Premier League has been welcomed by media commentators as a potential signal of disruption to Sky’s media monopoly that may extend into other content areas.

NZ On Air does not officially fund programmes for broadcast on Sky, however it sometimes happens that content originally funded by NZ On Air finds a resting place behind the pay wall (as is the case with Heartland or TVNZ6 Kidzone). Occasionally content funded by NZ On Air will debut on Sky TV, as was the case with the documentary feature \textit{Beautiful Machine}.

\section*{Producers}

\textbf{Independent (individual) producer/directors}

Prior to deregulation and the establishment of the NZ On Air contestable funding model, the independent television production sector was limited as documentaries were primarily made in-house by TVNZ’s documentary unit. Now, documentary is almost entirely produced by the independent sector,\textsuperscript{17} and solo producer/directors constitute a significant proportion of this sector. I interviewed 13 documentary makers who either work on their own or in producer/director partnerships, contracting individuals to

\textsuperscript{16} “\textit{Section 27} prohibits anyone from entering into, or implementing arrangements with the purpose, effect or likely effect of substantially lessening competition. Arrangements can include contracts, agreements or understandings. \textit{Section 47} makes it illegal for a business to acquire assets of a business or shares if the acquisition would have, or would be likely to have, the effect of substantially lessening competition in a market.” (Commerce Commission New Zealand, 2012)

\textsuperscript{17} The notable exception being \textit{Country Calendar}, a factual series that has been running since 1966
perform specific production roles (such as DOPs, sound recordists, production managers or assistants and editors) on a per-project basis. Although the majority of these producer/directors have at some time made documentaries for television, the majority expressed a preference to work outside the television broadcast sector. Consistent with the gender composition of this sector, most of the director/producers interviewed were female.

**Production Houses**

I interviewed the founders of two of New Zealand’s longest running production companies making documentary and factual content; John Harris from Greenstone TV and Vincent Burke from Top Shelf. I also interviewed Julia Parnell, the founder of a recently established production company, Notable Pictures. Documentary series tend to be made by larger production houses such as rather than individuals or smaller companies, meaning the decline in one-off production has had a major impact on independent (individual) producers.

**Conclusion**

While New Zealand, like the rest of the world, is rapidly moving towards a digital post-network, post-broadcast media environment, at present television still plays a central role in media and society. This makes the absence of a public service broadcaster an issue of grave concern. The crisis of public service broadcasting calls attention to the question of what public service media *is* in the digital age and what it *does*, and in New Zealand this puts considerable pressure on the NZ On Air contestable funding model. If documentary can be seen as a kind of mine canary for public service media, then the test for this funding model is whether documentary can survive and even flourish in a deregulated, highly commercial ecology without a dedicated public service media provider. Having outlined the conditions that shape television’s documentary production ecology, the following chapter will examine the shape of documentary itself.
within this environment, looking closely at the definition, content and function of documentary within the 2010-2013 period in New Zealand.
CHAPTER FOUR

An Analysis of Television Content Funded by NZ On Air Under the Category of ‘Documentary’, 2010 - 2012

Documentary is, as John Corner puts it “a loose and often highly contested label” (Corner, 1996, p. 2), a slippery term that can be variously applied to describe a set of practices, modes, tendencies, principles or functions. Corner has also acutely observed that, “the term documentary is always much safer when used as an adjective rather than a noun” (Corner, 2002, p. 258). While this research project has largely focused on documentary as an activity, this chapter ventures beyond the adjective to examine the label of ‘documentary’ in relation to contemporary debates about the status of television documentary in New Zealand as a practice and form in decline. For more than a decade claims have been made for the ‘decline of documentary’ in New Zealand, demonstrated in the dwindling number of documentary strands and the one-off documentaries that comprised them, the increasing assimilation of documentary and popular factual content and the dissolution of the public service media foundations that traditionally support television documentary. These claims are examined through analysis and discussion of the output labelled ‘Documentary’ within the New Zealand on Air funding categories of Documentary, Special Interest, Arts and Culture and The Platinum Fund during the funding period 2010-2012\(^\text{18}\).

In 2012 and 2013 NZ On Air undertook a review of its documentary funding strategy and engaged in a process of consultation with industry and to some extent, with the general public. This resulted in the publication of four key documents: a discussion paper in June 2012, (The NZ On Air Documentary Discussion Paper (NZ On Air, 2012b), responses to that paper in October 2012 (NZ On Air, 2012c), results of survey-

\(^{18}\) All dates cited in this chapter consequently refer to the date funded, not screened.
based audience research in June 2013 (NZ On Air & Colmar Brunton, 2013), and finally, the revised documentary funding strategy in August 2013 (NZ On Air, 2013b). Both in responses to the discussion paper and in the audience survey, the definition of documentary emerged as a key concern for industry stakeholders. From NZ On Air’s perspective however, a re-evaluation of the definition of documentary was deemed unnecessary:

... The debate around what constitutes a documentary has raged since the beginning of the moving image. And while we respect that debate, and respect the opinions around it, from a funding agency perspective it’s not always helpful. In other words, if we decide to delineate too finely or to start obsessing about whether we want a particular definition, then often it simply means things ground to a halt while we continue to argue. So we've never taken a particularly strong view around the definition in the agency, which always worked around the idea that it's the creative treatment of actuality, the fairly standard screen definition. But we've never found it particularly helpful to start to be more prescriptive or rigid than that. (J.Wrightson, personal communication, November 26, 2012)

Wrightson’s statements were reinforced in the finalised Television Documentary Funding Strategy Review, which maintained the position given in the 2012 discussion paper, that;

[Documentary] encompasses documentary and factual programming that is not regular news, current affairs or magazine-style programmes and which may include some dramatisation. This is a common approach internationally, where no universally agreed definition exists [...]. From NZ On Air’s perspective, a definition is less important than a clear-eyed focus on seeking diversity in programme subject and style (NZ On Air, 2013, p. 4).
In contrast to this view, based on my analysis of the output of content labelled as ‘documentary’ funded by NZ On Air in the Documentary funding category, (with reference also to documentaries funded from the Special Interest and Platinum Fund categories), this chapter argues that a clear definition of documentary is necessary to maintain the civic functions and social and cultural value of documentary and would better support diversity of subject, style and representation.

**Perspectives on the documentary label**

While NZ On Air’s Documentary Funding Policy Discussion Paper did not propose to implement a more precise definition for documentary, feedback was sought on a delineation of content into categories such as ‘blue chip’, ‘popular’ ‘special interest’ ‘experimental’ in order to ensure greater diversity. Although some welcomed this proposal, a common view was that the term that ‘factual’ would be a better descriptor for the overall funding category to “better reflect the range of programming funded within it” (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 45). The MediaWorks response strongly rejects NZ On Air’s view that a definitional debate is unnecessary and calls for further industry consultation to “seek to achieve a general consensus of what factual television (apart from news, sport, and daily current affairs) is and how it can best flourish” (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 47). In contrast to these views, TVNZ prefers that documentary should not be separated from factual, nor further delineated;

*Documentary is perceived by some industry practitioners to be a separate genre sitting outside the broad factual genre. This suggests a degree of “exclusivity” which can be negatively isolating. TVNZ prefers to see it very much more inclusively, as part of the factual continuum, sitting at the “full –cream” factual end of the scale as against the factual “lite” at the opposing end (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 102).*
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What TVNZ refers to as a ‘continuum’ could also be seen as homogenisation, with ‘full-cream’ documentary and factual ‘lite’ increasingly blending. This is not a phenomenon entirely unique to New Zealand; Trish Fitzsimmons, writing on Australian broadcasting cultures and documentary practice notes the tendency from the 2000s onwards for documentary to be, “folded back into a broader television programming category, now labelled ‘factual programming’ and ‘factual entertainment” (Fitzsimons, 2009, p. 4). What is perhaps unique is that in New Zealand the term documentary is used to encompass a much broader range of content forms, a synechdochal turn that, as television producer William Grieve cautions in his documentary discussion paper response, “masks the current paucity of documentaries on New Zealand television” (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 29).

As one senior documentary producer explained in an interview, the utilitarian ambiguity of the documentary category is largely due to the reluctance of tier one broadcasters to commission documentaries:

At the beginning of the recession [NZ On Air] were under real pressure by the industry – both production companies, but more particularly the broadcasters – to be more flexible with their funding categories. And that’s where you’ve got the situation now where they’re funding out of what was a documentary pool [...] what you wouldn’t consider in traditional terms to be documentary in any shape or form. But I think [...] the broadcasters do not want to utilise that traditional documentary money. [...] I would have thought that it probably would have been slightly more helpful for New Zealand On Air to actually take the money and re-categorise it and then just front up that the documentary money is just not being used. It’s been diminished; the amount has been cut back because there is no demand. I guess they are hoping the demand will return. And knowing the staff at NZ On Air I’m sure they would love to be able to be funding traditional documentaries in the way they used to, it’s just that the broadcasters aren’t asking for them. (Anonymous (producer), personal communication, 19 September 2012).
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The status of documentary as a site of contestation was demonstrated in 2012 when NZ On Air came under intense public scrutiny (and criticism) over a television series called The GC, funded by NZ On Air under the category of documentary. The version of The GC that went to air on TV3 in May 2012 was a scripted reality show or docusoap, similar in style and content to US docudrama The Jersey Shore or UK series Made in Chelsea. The GC website describes the show as follows:

*The GC follows the lives of a group of talented and attractive young Māori as they work hard and play even harder in Australia’s favourite playground, the glittering Gold Coast.*

*Talented and ambitious, the GC cast are chasing the good life on the Gold Coast. Some live together, some work together but they all play together. This series offers a fascinating insight into the lives of nine young and successful Māori.* [...](TV3, n.d.).

In contrast, the NZ On Air press release that announced the funding of The GC had described a very different kind of programme:

*A new documentary series, Golden Mozzies, looking at seven Māori families living on Australia’s Gold Coast, leads a wide range of New Zealand stories supported by NZ On Air in its latest funding round. The TV3 series will explore emigration from a Māori perspective and how Tikanga Māori\(^\text{19}\) supports them as they adapt to life in a new country (NZ On Air, 2011).*

The public outcry against NZ On Air’s funding of the show prompted the agency to take the unusual step of releasing the show’s original funding proposal, which outlines (as summarized above) a much more culturally focused programme; one that addresses social issues and explores cultural identity, rather than the drama and sensationalism that characterizes docusoap. Criticism by media commentators and reviewers and by the public in response to articles published by major newspapers such as The New Zealand...
Herald, the NBR and Stuff.co.nz focused both on the misrepresentation of the programme as documentary and on the failure of NZ On Air to act wisely as a cultural investor on behalf of its stakeholders.

One of the key foci of a documentary audience survey conducted in 2013 for NZ On Air by Colmar Brunton was how viewers perceive and define documentary. The most common themes for respondents (asked to define documentary in their own words) were:

— Documentaries are ‘non-fiction’ or ‘real-life’.
— Documentaries build knowledge and are informative.
— Documentaries should be on an interesting or relevant topic.
— People often associate documentaries with current issues or events, animals or nature, or history.

*(NZ On Air & Colmar Brunton, 2013, p. 2)*

In the 2013 Colmar Brunton documentary audience survey commissioned by NZ On Air, only 3% of respondents classified *The GC* as a documentary, slightly behind the 4% who considered competitive cooking show *Masterchef* to be a documentary. The rejection of *The GC* as documentary demonstrates what Roscoe and Hight describe as “the important role that the audience play in accepting and reinforcing documentary's privileged status” (Roscoe & Hight, 2001, p. 22). In this case, the public rejection of the programme’s categorisation as documentary demonstrates that documentary is not just a mode of representation or production but a socially constructed discursive form with distinctly perceived value within a media system.

*The GC* controversy must be seen in the context of a broader public debate about the waning of public service media in New Zealand. The large number of public responses to the discussion paper was due to the Save TVNZ7 campaign and illustrates how closely documentary is tied to public service media, embodying the public service media values ‘to inform, educate and entertain’. *The GC* debate had currency in the
media because of the heightened public awareness of public service broadcasting in light of the closure of TVNZ7, highlighting the critical failure of a contestable funding model that sees cultural and commercial values pitted against each other. Looking at *The GC* in a positive light, it is a high rating, popular television programme that shows young Māori youth with aspirations trying to make a life for themselves in Australia, which represents a significant Māori diaspora and captured the interest of a younger audience. However, in the translation of the original documentary proposed to the scripted reality format that went to air, the drama, voyeurism and diversion that characterises the docusoap genre negates the possibilities for the programme to facilitate serious public discourse.

The desire to see a more precise definition of documentary as a funding category is closely linked to documentary’s perceived value as “a discourse of sobriety”, which may be threatened if documentary is subsumed within a broader category of factual content where other values such as entertainment and diversion take precedence. While viewers, producers and indeed broadcasters and funders may all have different views on what documentary *is*, much of the discourse on documentary in New Zealand (in my observation) relates to what it *does*, the critical social function of documentary which,

> like other discourses of the real, retains a vestigial responsibility to describe and interpret the world of collective experience, a responsibility that is no small matter at all. But even more, it joins these other discourses (of law, family, education, economics, politics, state, and nation) in the actual construction of social reality. (Nichols, 1991, p. 10)

The analysis presented in this chapter gives careful consideration to the “construction of social reality” and “world of collective experience” that the output funded under the label of documentary by NZ On Air represents.
Indicative of the political climate in which NZ On Air operates is the response of Prime Minister John Key to the issue of NZ On Air’s funding of the show. In an interview on talkback radio network, Radio Live, Key commented, "Look, I don't know whether if it's a good show or not, but I've seen the controversy swirling around, and weren't they saying it was the highest-watch thing? I suppose if the test is whether people watch something, then they've probably done their job, haven't they?" (Radio Live, 2012).

While the agency is tasked to invest in local content that offers cultural value (such as creativity and technological innovation), its impact metrics are heavily weighted towards measurable return on investment (cost-effectiveness, audience size and popularity. In 2013 NZ On Air even began to publish weekly ratings data for the 20 highest rating funded television programmes on its website; a public display of accountability by an agency under intense public and political scrutiny. Norris and Pauling’s 2012 evaluative study of NZ On Air confirms that NZ On Air has become increasingly focused on ratings;

“It may be thought that NZ On Air has followed the broadcaster line and itself become more risk-averse. What can be said is that the funder has become more concerned with ratings, to the point where all funding applications ask for a projected rating for the proposed programme” (Norris & Pauling, 2012, p. 147).

The Documentary Funding Policy Discussion Paper in fact acknowledges the challenges that NZ On Air faces in delivering on values such as diversity and innovation and seeks ways to better address the challenges engendered by the competing tensions of New Zealand’s television environment.

20. Radio Live is owned by Media Works, the company that also owns TV3, the network that commissioned and broadcasts The GC.
Analysis of NZ On Air funded documentary output 2010-2012

In 1991, filmmaker Geoff Steven established the highly successful Inside NZ documentary strand on TV3, having approached the company after its first receivership with the novel proposal that they should make New Zealand programmes (NZ On Screen, 2008). Steven negotiated with NZ On Air and TV3 funding for 30 hours of documentary for the strand, which proved to be a commercial success. After building up the strand and increasing TV3’s market share over several years, Steven was poached by TVNZ, where he instigated the Documentary NZ strand for TV ONE, which also ran approximately 30 hours of documentary programming per year. According to Roger Horrocks, the documentary boom of the 1990s, which saw a remarkable number of high rating primetime documentaries on New Zealand television, was a unique phenomenon, running counter to international trends. Horrocks saw three reasons behind the documentary boom. First, New Zealand audiences had always responded more to local documentary than drama and there was a strong local documentary tradition. Second, a surge of nationalism in the 1990s and the emergence of ‘Kiwiana’, a nostalgic embrace of New Zealand iconography particularly associated with Pākehā identity and a sense of maturing nationhood. Third, the adoption of a ‘mainstream’ or ‘popular’ style of documentary that sought to appeal to a broad audience (Horrocks, 2003).

Although Steven himself had come from a background in experimental filmmaking and had himself made challenging documentaries such as the observational documentary Centrepoint: A Spiritual Growth Community (1980), as a commissioner he sought to deliver accessible programming with broad appeal; “The trouble is you see if you don’t make programmes that communicate well to the audience, the audience wont watch them. And if the audience wont watch them the broadcaster wont screen them and the funder wont fund them” (NZ On Screen, 2008).

The documentary boom and the appeal of mainstream documentaries did not last, however. By 2010 the Documentary New Zealand strand had disappeared and Inside NZ
had become nothing more than a tag for one-off New Zealand documentaries broadcast sporadically on TV3 and the documentary on New Zealand television was described by Roger Horrocks in an article on the decline of New Zealand television documentary as “an endangered species” (Horrocks, 2010). During the period of this study the only remaining New Zealand documentary strand was Māori Television’s Pakipūmeka, but even that strand took a yearlong hiatus in 2012.

Some of the participants interviewed for this research project felt that the decline of documentary over the past decade was simply cyclical, that documentary was as subject to trends as any other genre or format and that resurgence was inevitable. Several participants expressed the view that the boom of the 1990s exhausted audience interest in documentary and that both subject matter and form had become stale and repetitive. However, another common response is the central issue examined in this chapter; that the commercial environment of New Zealand television is hostile to documentary and that the broad range of factual content supported within the funding category of documentary obscures the true extent of documentary’s decline.

In a 2010 article in screen industry magazine OnFilm, Roger Horrocks examines this issue, drawing attention to the extent that the significant documentary output presented in NZ On Air’s Local Content Survey reflects a ‘bending’ of definitions:

*The most recent survey reports with satisfaction that the number of “documentary” hours has gone up from 621 in 2007 to 691 in 2008. Certainly there was a bright spot – Māori Television’s 191 hours of documentaries – but looking through the rest of the titles that NZ On Air counts as documentaries leaves no doubt that the character of the genre is not what it used to be (Horrocks, 2010).*
Horrocks goes on to list a large number of series included in the tally of documentary output that could be “more usefully defined as light entertainment, comedy, “reality” series, or infotainment”, and identifies “an emphasis on celebrity rather than ‘ordinary’ New Zealanders, and limited subject matter, focusing on “celebrities, disasters, crime, and a few emotive ‘personal journeys’”.

In response to the criticism of Horrocks and others cited in this chapter, I have examined the documentary output of the NZ On Air Documentary funding category over three years. My analysis focuses on documentaries funded in the years 2010, 2011 and 2012, organised as follows:

- NZ On Air Documentary Funding Category: 60-minute one-offs, 30-minute series and 60 minute series.
- Special Interest and Arts and Culture
- Platinum Fund programmes (one-offs, series and docudramas).

I have examined output by funding date, primarily because funding records published online by NZ On Air offer a more reliable record of output than my own collation of screening dates, which was reliant on various television listings accessible online and in print. From time to time the titles of projects funded change or broadcasters may hold programmes back for some time before a suitable slot is found for them. However, my collation of screening dates provides an informative overview of how documentary content is placed within the television schedule during this period and can be found in the appendices.

For the purposes of this analysis I have found it constructive to consider John Corner’s typology of documentary by function in which Corner outlines documentary as: the

---

21. This often happens when the programme does not meet the expectations of the commissioner.
I have also drawn on the categories presented by Roger Horrocks in his 2003 evaluation of the state of documentary in New Zealand in which Horrocks outlines the various motivations underlying different types of documentary (Horrocks, 2003).

These categories are:

1. **History and geography.** Documentaries that explore identity through an examination of the landscape and the people in it. Examples given by Horrocks are *The New Zealand Wars* (1998) and *Landmarks* (1981). This has been a popular focus during the 2010-2012 with a range of programmes such as *NZ Stories, Coasters* and *First Crossings* exploring New Zealand and its inhabitants, though with a strong emphasis on human interest.

2. **Journalism.** An extension of news and current affairs offering a greater depth of research and investigation. In the 2010-2012 period this is largely confined to the waning one-off format, particularly those screened on TV One and TV3.

3. **Politics.** Political documentaries “share some of the same concerns as journalism but reject the current affairs requirement of ‘balance’” (p. 3) and present a particular political perspective. Examples: Merata Mita’s *Patu* (1983), Alistair Barry’s *Someone Else’s Country* (1996). This is the rarest form on New Zealand television, exemplified in the 2010-2012 period by one-off documentaries *Inside Child Poverty* and *Mind the Gap*.

4. **Culture.** “Some documentaries have a strong cultural motivation in representing community traditions – Māoritanga, the cultures of other ethnic or national groups, and

5. **Science.** New Zealand has a strong natural history documentary tradition, and the former TVNZ department the Natural History Unit in Dunedin (now NHNZ) saw considerable success internationally after it became an independent company. Locally, natural history documentaries went into decline in mid-90s due to lack of broadcaster interest but the Platinum Fund has helped to fuel a local resurgence of this genre.

6. **The arts in general.** Horrocks refers here to the successful 1990s series *Work of Art* (1993-9), which documented the arts in depth and was a showcase for innovation. The TVNZ7 series *Artsville* similarly offered an innovative and detailed approach to the arts, but in the 2010-2012 period no such comprehensive arts series exists, with programmes focusing on a single art form such as dance, fashion or theatre and generally fitting within the obs doc format. Only a handful of documentary programmes have been funded in the Arts and Culture category, and these are generally screened in later primetime slots. The successful obs doc\(^{22}\) series *The Secret Lives of Dancers*, for example, screened in an 8pm Sunday slot on TV3 and received funding for a third series in 2012.

7. **The art of documentary.** Experimental and creative work that could be described as ‘festival’ documentaries. A small number of theatrical or festival documentaries have been funded during the 2010-2012 period such as *The Last Ocean, When a City Falls* and *Billy T – Te Movie*, but none of the documentaries funded during this period could be described as creative or experimental.

---

\(^{22}\) Obs Doc is a style of television documentary derived from the observational documentary mode
Overview of output by Broadcaster

All figures cited below (unless otherwise identified) are based on data published by NZ On Air. Information on screening dates and times is based on Television listings published by Throng and the New Zealand Listener. These are collated in Appendices A – H.

TV One

TV One terminated the long-running primetime Documentary New Zealand strand in 2005, and although NZ On Air continued to fund documentary strands for TV One, a single, regularly scheduled strand was not maintained. During the 2010 – 2012 period of the study TV One only supported two to six one-off documentaries per year (approximately three to nine per cent of the documentary funding total). In comparison, in 2000 NZ On Air funded 27 hour-long, one-off documentaries for TV One (41% of the 65.5 hours of documentary funded by NZ On Air for TV One).

In addition to one-off, hour-long documentaries, TV One commissioned five 90-minute one-off docudramas and three 120-minute one-off docudramas during 2010-2012.

Docudramas that have screened during the period of the study were scheduled in the 9.30pm timeslot usually reserved for the Sunday Theatre strand.

Half-hour long series were by far the most dominant form of documentary funded (at 29 to 39.5% of total hours of TV One documentary funding), followed by 60 minute long series (at 19 to 27% of total hours of TV One documentary funding).
TV3

TV3 has previously had a strong association with local documentary, having established the first (and highly successful) primetime documentary strand Inside New Zealand under the direction of Geoff Steven. TV3 maintained a much stronger commitment to one-off documentary in 2010 and 2011 but commissioning and funding of one-offs (along with documentary overall) fell dramatically in 2012. By 2013 Inside New Zealand still existed as a banner for New Zealand documentary attached to programmes broadcast sporadically on TV3.

The significant fall in documentary funding in 2012 may be attributed to either a withdrawal from investment in documentary due to TV3’s financial difficulties, a shift in commissioning priorities, or perhaps a combination of the two. The table below excludes two programmes funded by NZ On Air for TV3 in 2012, (The Nation and The Vote). These programmes received money from the Platinum Fund and were categorised by NZ On Air as documentary although they are studio-based current affairs programmes. If these programmes were included in the calculations below, the documentary funding total for TV3 in 2012 would be $4,019,382; a figure still lower than 2010 funding levels but less drastically so.

Māori Television

Māori Television broadcasts a high volume of both local and international documentary overall, with a regular primetime slot for festival documentaries (Tuesdays at 8.30pm), Pakipūmeka Aotearoa (New Zealand Documentary) on Sunday nights at 8.30pm and a range of New Zealand documentary series.
The Pakipūmeka strand is significant because it is now the last remaining regular strand for New Zealand documentary on free to air TV, and has been supported by NZ On Air to fill the gap left by TV One and TV3 moving away from one-off documentaries and maintaining a local documentary strand.

*In programming things are cyclical. So at the moment one-off documentary isn't particularly fashionable. . . . I don't think that will be the case forever, I just think it is at the moment. Having said that, the one-off is important. It clearly isn't attracting the numbers on a mainstream channel that makes it worthwhile for a channel most of the time, with a couple of exceptions. So creating (with Māori television) Pakipūmeka, was a response to that. (J.Wrightson, personal communication, November 26, 2012)*

The strand took a year’s hiatus in 2012 as the broadcaster decided to hold back programmes commissioned in 2011 to allow longer for development and production, but the output for the strand over the three year period 2010-2012 still averages out at 10 per year.

Only a portion of Māori Television funding comes from NZ On Air, and the network carries a high volume of locally produced factual content (much of it documentary) funded by Te Māngai Pāho. It should be noted that the analysis below is focused only on NZ On Air funded content.

**Prime Television**

Alongside Māori Television, as a tier 2 broadcaster Prime Television (a subsidiary of Sky TV) plays an increasingly important role in filling the gap left by TV One and TV3 for New Zealand documentary programming, particularly in commissioning one-offs.
and ‘traditional’ documentaries (as opposed to popular factual). Prime’s submission to the documentary policy review emphasises the value of ‘traditional documentaries’ and anticipates a resurgence of documentary, supporting its argument for the promotion of Prime to tier 1, which would increase the channel’s current level of NZ On Air funded content.

Prime has commissioned a number of Platinum Fund documentaries such as the Natural history series *Rivers with Craig Potton* and *Wild Coasts*, and the science/natural history one-off *The Hunt for the Pink and White Terraces*. Other Platinum Fund documentaries commissioned by Prime include the one-off historical docu-drama *The Forgotten General*, investigative environmental series *Keeping It Pure* and institutional series *Making New Zealand*.

Channel Manager Kathy Wright operates as both programmer and commissioner, responsible for selecting as well as scheduling content. For Wright, strands are a useful programming strategy, and the Prime submission to the documentary funding discussion expresses the network’s desire to work with NZ On Air to develop a strand or themed series of documentaries. While acknowledging an ‘oversupply’ of documentary in the 1990s had a negative effect on the popularity of the genre, Prime’s submission argues that the decline of documentary strands has also had an impact as “the ad hoc scheduling of documentaries in recent years has made it difficult for audiences to find some of these programmes” (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 59). According to Wright,

*One-offs are difficult to fit into a commercial environment, which means that an audience doesn't find them, so they get lost. That's why we build these ‘fake strands’ around them, so that an audience thinks that it's a series and comes back each week.*
An example of the kind of ‘fake strand’ that Wright describes is Prime Rocks, a weekly slot for music documentaries, which consists of one-offs that have not been commissioned or purchased by Prime as a series. The first local programme to screen in the slot was The Exponents, labelled in all publicity as ‘a Prime Rocks documentary’.

Wright suggests that an additional factor is the growing trend for both producers and broadcasters to favour series over one-offs in a difficult economic climate:

> From a commissioning perspective, everybody has downsized the commissioning departments to some extent over the years. [...] Say you're doing [a five hour series] versus five single one-hour documentaries. Five single one-hour documentaries are way more time and resource from our end in terms of applying [to NZ On Air], in terms of time with the producers and all of that [compared with] doing a series. (K.Wright, personal communication, January 23, 2013)

However, Prime’s documentary policy review submission makes it clear that the channel wishes to position itself at the ‘quality’ end of the documentary spectrum, favouring the “fewer hour/higher cost model that would allow a more ambitious and carefully researched series similar to the fondly remembered series of the 90’s such as The New Zealand Wars” (p. 60).

**Sky Television**

For fans of documentary, Sky TV offers a number of factual entertainment channels that screen documentaries such as BBC Knowledge, Discover Channel, National Geographic Channel, The History Channel, Arts Channel. The Rialto Channel, which
specialises in ‘film festival films, foreign films and independent film’, has a regular Thursday night primetime slot for documentary at 8.30pm.\(^2\)

From November 2006 to December 2010 Sky carried a dedicated documentary channel, started by local television producer Richard Driver. The channel, which screened some local but mostly international documentaries could be seen as either serving to expand interest in documentary and cater to a demand for content not met by free to air broadcasters, or to fragment the audience and devalue content. According to an experienced independent filmmaker interviewed, the market dominance of Sky contributed to a decline in local documentary and a fragmentation of the audience:

“I think it [the decline] was exacerbated when the Documentary Channel started in New Zealand ... the audience just fragmented. Documentaries had more of a life when there was less choice out there, and you start to think, ‘well obviously the audiences don't want them’. But they do, because if you talk to people there is an inherent interest” (Anonymous producer, personal communication, 3 October 2012).

Free to air broadcasters pay a significant licence fee (approximately 20% of total budgets of around $150k) for any documentaries commissioned that have NZ On Air support, but sales rate for content is dramatically lower (around $500). However, Driver started The Documentary Channel because he saw a business opportunity based on a demand that was not being met by free to air broadcasters; “Documentaries were always in the top 20 popular shows … Market research had shown there was an appetite for them and when I was considering the idea there was a perception that documentaries

\(^{23}\)During New Zealand film month in June and July 2013 Rialto Channel screened a number of recent New Zealand feature documentaries such as *How Far Is Heaven* and *Shihad: Beautiful Machine*. In addition to screening in the 8.30pm documentary slot each film had between 3 to 6 repeat screenings. (Rialto Channel, n.d.)
were not receiving as much interest from the networks commissioning shows … It became clear that there was a market there” (Drinnan, 2010).

The cannibalisation of documentary content and audiences by Pay TV broadcasters is an international phenomenon as Fitzsimmons (Fitzsimons, 2009) points out, drawing on critiques by veteran documentary distributor Jan Rofekamp, who has described the emergence of two markets for documentary. The first market is free to air broadcasters (usual public service) who commission and pay good license fees and the second market is content-hungry pay TV broadcasters who pay a low hourly rate for content, often demanding long contracts and unlimited pays and favour series over quality (one-off) content. The second market however, with its greater demand for content (and increasing share of audience) effectively shrinks the capacity of the first market to buy documentaries, increasing competition for first market programming slots (Rofekamp, 2001).

This is exactly what can be seen in New Zealand where Sky TV has an approximate 30% audience market share and offers multiple ad-free channels with content ranging from festival documentaries to popular factual series. For Sky, the opportunity cost of scheduling a season of inexpensive New Zealand festival documentaries as it did in June and July 2013 is negligible compared to a free to air broadcaster paying a significant license fee and facing the constraints of New Zealand’s 45 minute commercial hour, which best suits content that can be segmented between advertising breaks. Strands make content easier for audiences to find and recognise, but maintaining consistency and identity across a strand can be challenging, as evidenced by Māori Television’s recent re-evaluation of the Pakipūmeka strand and the rudderless drift of TV3’s Inside New Zealand strand. In the current commercial environment, factual series, particularly those with the narrative hooks of docusoaps and scripted reality television, seem to be the safest forms of factual content for broadcasters.
Overview of outputs by category

One-offs (excluding Platinum Fund one-offs and docudramas)

One-offs are generally hour-long programmes, which in style and content most closely conform to the description of documentary given by the participants I interviewed and the comments given by audience respondents to the NZ On Air/Colmar Brunton survey. These programmes largely conform to John Corner’s typology of the function of documentary “as Journalistic Inquiry and Exposition”, exemplifying documentary as a ‘discourse of sobriety’. Many of the topics these programmes cover could easily fit into the scope of a magazine-style current affairs programme (such as 20/20 or 60 Minutes), but are explored in greater depth or with a more pronounced viewpoint. Most one-off documentaries take a serious approach to a subject and very few are celebrity focused or presenter-driven.

Crime is a significant theme, with a number of documentaries exploring specific criminal cases: The Investigator Special: Who Killed the Crewes TV One, 2010), Who Killed Trent Keegan (TV One 2011), Siege: The Interviews (TV One, 2012), The Banker, The Escorts and the $18 Million (TV3, 2010), Inside Tattooing (TV3 2011).

Environmental issues are also well represented: Karli Thomas and Raiders of the Last Tuna (TV One 2011), Moko, A Dolphin in Danger (TV3, 2010), The Price of Fish (TV3, 2011), Saving Tuna, The Green Chain (MTS, 2011).

Health and social issues related to health (such as smoking, cannabis and alcohol abuse) are among the most dominant themes, particularly for TV3: The Day My Legs Stopped Working (TV One, 2011), High Time, Dying for a Smoke, A Drunken State, Is Your

There are very few documentaries on social and/or political issues exceptions being Inside Child Poverty (TV3, 2011) and Mind the Gap (TV3, 2012), companion documentaries by Bryan Bruce that explore poverty and inequality in New Zealand; He Toki Huna (MTS, 2011) a critical examination of New Zealand’s role in Afghanistan documentary by Annie Goldson; The Confessions of Prisoner T (MTS, 2011), an investigation into a high-profile case that explores the treatment of Māori in New Zealand’s criminal justice system; and Restoring Hope by Julia Parnell, a profile of New Zealand’s unique restorative justice programme (MTS, 2012).

A few programmes explore a ‘personal journey’ narrative, such as Alone Against the Tasman (TV One 2010) or offer a profile of a unique character such as Wildman (TV3, 2011). This approach is more common on Māori Television, which features many profiles such as Bring Back Buck, Māori Boy Genius, Chris Bailey A Carver’s Story (2010), Logan’s Run, Living in the Dreamtime, Charlie Shelford: Rebel Hero, Rhodes – Actor Singer, Allan Baldwin – In Frame, Henare O’Keefe: Te Tuatangata.

Explorations of cultural identity or diversity are given a light touch in three TV3 documentaries; One 16th, God Defend New Zealand (2011), and Year of the Dragon (2012) but are a central or underlying concern of most, if not all Māori Television documentaries.

90 minute and 120 minute one-offs
In addition to the hour-long 24 programmes discussed above, three two-part documentaries were funded: Helen Clark: The Road to Power (TV3), a biography of the former New Zealand Prime-Minister), Inside Reports (TV3), yet to be broadcast but likely to be investigative social documentaries as they will be produced by Red Sky Film and Television, the producers of Mind the Gap and Inside Child Poverty, and A Shocking Reminder (Prime), a documentary on the impact of the Christchurch earthquakes.

Four ‘festival style’ documentary features were also funded: Beautiful Machine (FOUR), Billy T – Te Movie (TV3), Blakey (TV One), When a City Falls (TV3) and The Last Ocean (Prime). Of these, Beautiful Machine, Billy T – Te Movie and When a City Falls received production funding from the NZFC (ranging between $281,000 for When a City Falls and $1,000,000 for Billy T). The Last Ocean received a $25,000 finishing grant from the NZFC. The relationship between theatrical and television documentaries and NZ On Air/NZFC cooperation will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

While three years of funding is not sufficient to identify any real trends or patterns, it should be noted that the low number of one-offs funded in 2012 on channels other than Maori Television was sustained in 2012. Two one-offs were funded for TV One in 2012 and the same number in 2013. On TV3, five hours of one-offs were funded in 2012 (including one two-part programme), but none were funded in 2013. Prime maintained three one-offs in both 2012 and 2013. To put these figures into context; in 1992 NZ On Air funded 29 one-hour one-offs for TV ONE and 27 for TV3 in the documentary category. In 2002 both TV One and TV2 were commissioning documentaries: 7 were funded for TV2, 30 for TV One, equating to 37 one-offs for TVNZ in total, while 20 one-offs were funded for TV3.

24 All durations are given as broadcast timings. A sixty minute programme broadcast in New Zealand contains approximately 14 minutes of advertising.
Series

Series funded under the documentary category fit into either a commercial half hour or full hour. Over the three-year period 2010-2012, half-hour series represented 48% of the total documentary output (as an average) and hour-long series represented 19%. With a combined average of 67% of total output (in total hours), not including the additional 44 hours of series from the Platinum Fund, factual series clearly dominate this funding category.

The vast majority of series in this category are popular factual entertainment, programmes characterised by John Corner as performing the function of “Documentary as Diversion” (2002, p. 260).

As Horrocks (2010) notes, themes are limited and programmes are largely celebrity-centred and presenter-led. Almost half of the series funded in this period are fronted by well known television personalities such as comedienne/TV presenter Jacqui Brown, Comedian/TV presenter Te Radar (who presents four of the series in this group), Psychologist Nigel Latta (who also presents four series), presenter Carolyn Robinson (two series) Chefs Al Brown, Simon Gault and Steve Logan) and musical entertainers The Topp Twins to name a few. A small handful of series rely on presenters who are not well known as television personalities but represent experts in their professional field such as Dr Francis Pitsilis, architect Ray Hoskins and Rev. Hirini Kaa.

Crime is the focus of Songs from the Inside (2010, 2012), Prison Families, NZ Detectives and Beyond the Darklands (2010, 2011), although it should be noted that Songs from the Inside has a strong focus on the rehabilitation process and Māori cultural values, whereas the other series in this group are more sensationalist.

An entertaining but informative/educational approach to parenting and family life is seen in Keep Calm and Carry On and The Politically Incorrect Guide to Grownups, The
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*Hard Stuff with Nigel Latta* while *Prison Families, Family Secret* and *Missing Pieces* take a more sensational approach.

Travel and food are combined in shows such as *Get Fresh with Al Brown, Coasters, Chef on a Mission* and *Topp Country*, all of which showcase New Zealand’s people and places as well as its food. Similarly, *Making Tracks* explores New Zealand by bicycle and *This Town* highlights a different New Zealand town every week.

Health and consumer issues are the focus of *Is Modern Medicine Killing You?, What’s Really in Our Food, Saving Gen Y* and to some extent, in *Chef on a Mission*.

Sustainability and environment issues are explored in *Global Radar (2010, 2011)*, and *Back to the Source*.

*First Crossings* (2010, 2011) explores New Zealand’s history through its landscape, re-enacting historic pioneering journeys while *History Under the Hammer* uses historical objects up for auction as the vehicle for delving into the past.

Rural New Zealand is represented in *Country Calendar* and *Shearing Gang*, and also in the many travel-focused series.

**Diversity: style, content and culture**

A large proportion of series conform to the docusoap subgenre of documentary, which Stella Bruzzi identifies as being characterised by an “emphasis on the entertainment as opposed to serious or instructive value of documentary, the importance of personalities who enjoy performing for the camera, soap-like fast editing, a prominent, guiding
voice-over, a focus on everyday live rather than underlying social issues” (Bruzzi, 2000, p. 76).

There is little discernable difference between series screened on TV One and TV3 and Prime has too few series to draw comparisons. Māori Television series are notably different however; Songs from the Inside, Whare Māori, The Prophets and Mana Wairua focus on social issues, culture, history and spirituality. Even Songs from the Inside, which could be described as a character-driven Obs Doc and features four well-known musicians, is markedly different to the Obs Doc series on other networks.

The narrative of Songs from the Inside focuses on the process of Māori prison inmates learning songwriting and in the process explores underlying social issues. The situation is contrived to the extent that the musicians teaching the inmates are in the prisons for the purpose of the documentary and a narrative is structured around the ‘journey’ of the songwriting course, culminating in the recording of the songs written by the inmates, who are always referred to by the more humanising term ‘students’. The narrative is structured by interviews with the songwriting teachers and their students, rather than a voiceover and observational footage follows their interactions. The first episode begins simply with the following text on screen:

“In 2011 four musicians travelled to wellington to teach songwriting. Their students were inmates from Arohata and Rimutaka Prisons. This is the story of their journey.”

From there the documentary introduces the musicians through interviews in which they describe their motivations for participating in the project, intercut with their professional performances.
TV3’s *Prison Families* also explores life in prison but takes a very different approach. The series follows the lives of ten New Zealand families who have a family member in prison, with each episode focusing on one family, filmed over a six-month period. The first episode was billed on the TV3 website as follows:

“Fierce matriarch Joanne fights to keep her notorious crime-boss family on the straight and narrow, as well as stick by her brother – NZ’s most notorious criminal.”

Any resemblance between the synopsis above and the plot of one of New Zealand’s most popular and long running drama series *Outrageous Fortune* which followed the life of a criminal family matriarch trying to go straight while her husband is in jail) is entirely intentional.

The first episode of *Prison Families* begins with the male narrator (familiar New Zealand actor Peter Hambleton) relating that New Zealand has one of the highest rates of imprisonment in the western world over fast-paced, dramatized shots representing crime such as a police on patrol, barbed prison fences, an inmate holding his head behind bars, a judge’s gabble, all underscored by the soundbed of a driving heavy metal guitar riff. The first shots of the family introduce the matriarch and her daughter in footage that has been highly colour graded to a golden palette more typical of drama than traditional documentary. Within the first 35 seconds of the programme, the voiceover connects the real Ashby-Taylor family to the fictional Wests: “For the Ashby-Taylors prison family life is normal. And they’ve been likened more than once to TV3’s hit drama, *Outrageous Fortune*”.

The scripted reality style of *The GC* attracted attention and controversy but it also attracted high ratings for TV3 (particularly among Māori viewers) and a large online audience. A second series of *The GC* was commissioned with funding by Te Māngai
Pāho. Following on from the success of *The GC*, a scripted reality series *The Life and Times of Temuera Morrison* follows Māori actor Temuera Morrison as he tries to revive his Hollywood career. The series has also performed well for TV One, achieving the second highest ratings for evening viewing in both its first and second weeks (Throng, 2013).

Apart from *The GC, The Life and Times of Temuera Morrison* and *Saving Gen Y* (a reality TV programme in which a group of young people are challenged to lose weight, made by the producers of *The GC*), Māori culture has little visibility in the series screened by broadcasters other than Māori Television. Overall, presenters and subjects featured in series on other networks are dominated by Pākehā. It is sobering to realise that the few programmes that represent Māori fall at the ‘low-fat’ entertainment end of the factual television spectrum (to use TVNZ’s analogy) and that significant ethnic minorities such as Asian and Pacific Island New Zealanders are largely unrepresented.

**Recruently funded series**

Of the 46 series funded in the Documentary category during the 2010-2012 period, almost half (22) were recurrently funded. Additionally, several series are variations on previous series; *Get Fresh with Al Brown* for example is similar to *Coasters* (series one) presented by Al Brown and *Coasters 2* (presented by Brown’s former business partner Steve Logan). *The Hard Stuff* with Nigel Latta is also likely to be similar to previous Latta series produced by Razor Films such as *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Grown Ups* (2011).

**The list of recurrently funded series is as follows:**


Many of the popular factual entertainment series funded by NZ On Air under the category of documentary have a generic flavour. These series eschew specific New Zealand stories in favour of universal subjects and themes, which either appeal to audiences because of their familiarity or can be on-sold internationally as either content or in the form of IP as a ‘format’. At least two recurrently funded factual series (Beyond the Darklands and What’s Really in Our Food) have delivered sales income to NZ on Air (which takes a 25% return on net sales of programs where its investment is $200,000 or more) (Murray, 2010).

The commercial and popular success of New Zealand factual entertainment formats could be seen as an indicator of the growing maturity of documentary production in New Zealand as a creative industry capable of delivering transnational content to the global market. Given the challenges facing New Zealand’s screen industry as a whole this is the kind of ‘IP generation’ this sector might be encouraged to pursue, but industry development is not part of NZ On Air’s mandate.
What the ongoing investment in such generic content formats does highlight is the complex mix of priorities faced by funders in what John Corner (2004) refers to as the ‘post-documentary’ age. For NZ On Air, ratings “provide a measure of value for public money” (Murray, 2010, p. 5) and support its objectives of reaching a sizeable audience where “programmes are valued by their target audience” (NZ On Air, 2011). The popularity of Popular Factual series therefore could be seen to justify recurrent investment from TVNZ. Furthermore, the success of such programmes by no means guarantees ongoing broadcaster support. In 1996 (during the height of documentary output) Roger Horrocks noted that broadcasters are fully prepared to reject even programmes that have been fully funded by NZ On Air because of the opportunity cost compared to the purchase of a high rating foreign programme (Horrocks, 1996, p. 57).

A recent review of NZ on Air’s recurrent funding of TV series confirms that the conservatism of recurrent funding of popular factual series is still necessary to ensure broadcasters choose local over imported:

*Popular Factual documentary series were consistently the highest rating genre of those recurrently funded, with almost all series far exceeding the ratings targets. With all genres, broadcasters have largely paid lower licence fees for these series in recent years, a factor that when combined with the demonstrated commercial success of these programmes could support an argument for lower public subsidies in the genre. One outcome of lowered public subsidies however is likely to be that despite receiving high rating for primetime local programmes, broadcasters would probably look to acquire more international product at a lower cost than locally commissioned programmes. The challenge for NZ on Air is to find a balance between the levels of public subsidy for series that prove to be commercially successful, while retaining (and growing) broadcasters’ support for locally commissioned programmes.* (Murray, 2010, p. 5)
Despite the challenges that New Zealand’s commercial broadcasting ecology presents to both NZ On Air and producers, a small handful of series funded during the three-year period rise above the diversionary popular factual hallmarks of celebrity and sentiment. All of the Māori Television series in this period fit within the documentary framework, exploring culture, history and contemporary social issues in depth. The series *NZ Story* and *This Town* offer a distinct turn away from the presenter-led/obs-doc style of popular factual television focusing on the direct address and focus on personal stories of ‘ordinary New Zealanders’ favoured by series in the Special Interest funding category. *This Town* covers familiar territory; small New Zealand towns and the people in them are covered exhaustively in other series in this period, but *This Town* is distinctive for its strong emphasis on creative visual style and unmediated personal narratives. Both programmes have rated well, screening in and around the long-running *Country Calendar* slot. The Prime series *Aftermath* is also noteworthy for taking an investigative approach to the impact of the Christchurch earthquakes of 2010 and 2011. *First Crossings* is an entertaining and informative insight into New Zealand’s history and natural environment, but once again the perspective on culture and history is a Pākehā one, largely ignoring the Māori ‘pioneers’ who predate colonial explorers.

**The Platinum Fund**

The $NZ15 million Platinum Fund was established in 2009 with funds previously allocated to TVNZ for the provision of public service content under the TVNZ Charter (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2011). The fund aims to support “quality content which may be currently difficult to find on our screens or which may require a high level of public investment to get made” (NZ On Air, 2010a). Documentaries that meet Platinum Fund criteria are “long-form appealing documentaries on subjects of cultural, historical or artistic importance” and “research-driven short documentary series on issues or topics important to New Zealand” (NZ On Air, 2010a). The Platinum Fund, which also supports quality drama and current affairs series, now plays a vital role in ensuring that some content with cultural as well as commercial value remains on New Zealand screens.
With its strong emphasis on history, natural history and New Zealand institutions, the Platinum Fund carries on a tradition of documentary as a vehicle for the branding of national identity, a process that Mary Debrett has argued “constitutes a stage in the commodification of documentary, and the corporate take-over of public space” (Debrett, 2004, p.10).25

The majority of Platinum fund projects are historical docudramas. In the 2010-2012 period one-off docudramas funded were:


The 6 part series *Descent from Disaster* also incorporates docudrama and yet to be screened 5 part series *War News* promises an innovative dramatic take on World War One, presenting each programme in a contemporary news format, while Prime series *Making New Zealand* (2012) presents the story of New Zealand’s major infrastructural projects (hydroelectric dams, railways, roads, tunnels etc).


---

25 See also Jane Roscoe’s study of the series *An Immigrant Nation* for an in-depth study of New Zealand documentary and national identity (Roscoe, 1999).

26 Later renamed *Our Big Blue Backyard*. 
Three one-off documentaries were commissioned through an RFP that sought to “provide insight into some of New Zealand's important institutions associated with health, welfare, education, and law and order”. The resulting programmes were *High School*, *Whanau Ora* and *The Health Story* for TV3 (2011).

TV One received the most Platinum funding with eight one-off platinum documentaries and three series. TV3 received funding for four one-offs (the three ‘The Story’ institutional documentaries and one historical docudrama). Prime is the only tier 2 broadcaster to receive platinum funding, with two one-offs and four series.

The Platinum Fund provides a much higher level of funding than the general Documentary category; funding for a Platinum Fund docudrama generally ranges between approximately $700,000 to $900,000 and *The Story* one-off documentaries each received approximately $275,000 compared to $100,000 to $150,000 for most standard Documentary one-offs.

There is no doubt that these documentaries play an important role in providing New Zealand audiences with quality television content, telling well-crafted New Zealand stories made by some of the country’s most experienced and talented documentary makers. Docudrama and blue-chip natural history programmes are expensive to produce and the Platinum Fund has therefore supported quality New Zealand content that otherwise would be unlikely to be seen on New Zealand television. However, as NZ On Air’s own review of the fund’s outputs suggests, the documentaries funded do not perform well in terms of innovation or risk (Quirk, 2012, p. 11)\(^\text{27}\).

As with the series funded from the general Documentary category, there is a lack of diversity in form and subject matter with the narrow focus on historical docudrama,

\(^{27}\) Based on the criteria “Innovative/Fresh” and “risky/provocative”, Fig.7 Performance Against Criteria, in Platinum Fund Review of Outputs (Quirk, 2012, p. 25).
natural history and a very limited number of social documentaries with an institutional focus. Culturally, the Platinum Fund was very lacking in diversity during the 2010-2012 funding period; *Whanau Ora* is the only programme to focus on subject matter directly affecting Māori and Asian and Pacific Island New Zealanders are not specifically represented. The historical docudramas, which dominate the fund, are particularly focused on Pākehā New Zealanders of European descent.

**Other funding categories for documentary**

**Special interest/Arts and Culture**

While great emphasis is placed on funding programmes that will reach broad audiences, NZ On Air’s commitment to diversity means that not all investment is ratings driven. Funding is not allocated evenly to networks in proportion with market share for example, with Tier 2 broadcasters Prime and Māori TV receiving a percentage of funding that reflects the role of these broadcasters in filling some programming gaps rather than the size of their audience. Additionally, some of the documentary programming funded by NZ On Air that might be considered more ‘public service’ in nature, or certainly less commercial is funded under the categories of ‘Special Interest’ and Arts/Culture. These funding categories serve to ensure the provision of content targeted at specific audiences or fulfilling a cultural function and as such these programmes are less ratings-driven. However, as the greater cultural value of such content also appears to correspond with a lesser commercial value, Special Interest programmes in particular are scheduled in the timeslots with the least commercial value and generally do not receive a license fee from broadcasters.

Roger Horrocks’ documentary funding policy paper response argues that, “Though NZOA’s definition of documentary may have “broadened” […] the range of ‘New Zealand identity and culture’ shown on television has shrunk” (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 37). It could be further argued that a diversity of documentary content on New Zealand
television exists, but it has been pushed out of the documentary funding category and further marginalised within the competitive framework of the commercial television schedule.

While documentaries funded under the Arts and Culture category generally screen during late primetime (though often on a weekend), Special Interest documentaries are consigned to Saturday and Sunday morning slots. The budgets for Special Interest programmes are much lower than the Documentary category, but this does not necessarily mean that the quality of style and content are correspondingly diminished. *Both Worlds* and *Neighbourhood* are distinctively different from their primetime documentary counterparts, relying extensively on the first person voice of their subjects rather than the mediation of an external presenter. Both programmes are creative and aesthetically appealing, telling stories through visual representation and ‘thought track’ narration rather than static interviews. Each episode of *Neighbourhood* focuses on a different New Zealand neighbourhood, with a strong focus on ethnic diversity. The half-hour programme is comprised of several segments centred on a different character, with a presenter (usually a well known public figure) from the neighbourhood providing continuity and cohesion for each episode. An episode on Auckland suburb Otara, for example is presented by Joe Naufahu, an actor of Samoan/Tongan heritage who introduces the neighbourhood, relating the community’s history, and describing his experience growing up in Otara. Featured in the episode are a young Samoan/Chinese architect and designer, a Māori/Cook Island artist exploring the craft of tivaevae, an Indian advocate for healthy eating, and a Scottish woman married to a Cook Islander whose children are part of the Systema music in schools initiative. *Both Worlds*, also a half-hour series, explores what it is like to be a young first or 1.5 generation migrant, caught between two cultures. Each episode focuses on a single individual, following them as they face a challenge or goal in their life, and uses no external presenter. Subjects are given cameras to capture their own experiences and rather than using interviews with an unseen director or presenter, the subject speaks directly to the camera. Unlike modes of participant cam such as the ‘diary cam’ or ‘confessional room’ associated with reality TV, *Both Worlds* aims to maintain direct address throughout each episode, so participant cam footage is integrated as seamlessly as possible with
footage shot by crew. Supplementing the participant cam are interactions with others that provide an external perspective, in place of a conventional mediated interview. The show has the narrative drive and immediacy associated with reality television but maintains an informative (rather than emotive) focus on subject and voice that anchors the programme to the sobriety of documentary.

The Special Interest documentary series Open Door and New Zealand Stories operate on a model of diversity that emphasises community participation. Open Door, which ran for 13 series and received its final funding round in 2010 was a community-based format that invited applications from groups or individuals to make a documentary on an issue that affects them, encompassing a range of health, social and cultural issues. New Zealand Stories was a 25-part series funded in 2010 that saw episodes split between three ‘pod’ production companies based in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch and a public RFP was issued for individual programme submissions. The aim of the series was to tell “people stories” with an emphasis on diversity, providing “an opportunity to explore, through individual stories, interesting lives featuring the different ethnicities, ages, gender specific issues, religious and philosophical beliefs, sexual orientation, and individual abilities that make up New Zealand's people”.

This Town and NZ Story, which screened on TV One on Saturday evenings from October 2013 during a Country Calendar hiatus have many of the hallmarks of Special Interest documentaries, but lack the diversity of the programmes discussed above. However, it may be that the scope that the non-commercial Special Interest programming slots offer to take some risks may have helped to facilitate some crossover into weekend primetime in terms of innovative style and content.

Conclusion
This chapter has primarily focused on how the institutional definition of documentary used by NZ On Air affects diversity in response to an issue already established as a matter of concern in public discourse and as a value that is to some extent readily quantifiable through analysis of output according to NZ On Air’s own definition of the scope of the term (“in projects, people and platforms). NZ On Air’s finalised documentary funding strategy proposes to ensure greater diversity by continuing to differentiate between tier/type 1 and 2 broadcasters, assess documentary diversity by channel, issue targeted RFPs where insufficient diversity is identified and promote NZ On Air funded programmes. These are all good measures, but not new ones and therefore, I argue, unlikely to have a significant impact on diversity in the current commercial environment as the breadth of the documentary category obscures the narrowness of content.

Innovation is also one of NZ On Air’s three core values, but it is one that is harder to identify and describe and is arguably a more subjective term than diversity, yet no less important, though to many the value of innovation may seem less clear. In the context of television documentary, innovation and diversity are complementary terms that go hand in hand. In some cases in the submissions to the documentary policy review, for example, the terms are used almost interchangeably (alongside the term ‘creativity’) to describe homogeneity of form and a lack of fresh approaches to storytelling. One of the most salient responses to the paper regarding innovation come from the industry guild SPADA (Screen Production and Development Association), which identifies innovation as essential to the sustainability of documentary within an industry context:

*The feedback SPADA received from producers was that innovation in the genre needs the most attention and focus in this conversation. Traditional documentaries are not cutting it in prime time in New Zealand to meet channels’ commercial expectations and SKY channels offer a rich diversity of international documentary viewing options. There is a particular irony in the fact that in New Zealand PAY TV does not contribute to the funding of domestic documentary or drama as in other countries, yet PAY TV documentary and other*
programming is a key driver of the increasing commercialization of free to air channels that has led to NZ documentaries becoming an endangered genre. Therefore documentary needs to innovate to survive here. (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 91)

Very few respondents identified innovation in terms that relate to the evolving uses of media technologies and platforms, and a large number of submissions actively rejected the proposal that NZ On Air should channel more support into online documentary. However, those who did respond positively to the support of documentary online point to the success of NZ On Screen as a model for innovation.

(My own submission to this paper is presented in Appendix I). In concurrence with the SPADA position, I propose that innovation is necessary for the longterm sustainability of the industry that supports documentary production, but I also suggest that innovation in terms of the exploration of content provision across multiple platforms is necessary to provide for the changing needs of the public as we move into a post-broadcast media future. Innovation is also contingent on risk, and New Zealand’s highly competitive, commercial television environment will not support risk without intervention.

NZ On Air’s final documentary funding strategy does not propose to take any radical steps towards a multiplatform future, or to further define what innovation looks like in documentary; but it does recognise the importance of risk and the need to provide audiences with non-broadcast options, supporting the goal to create opportunities for funding innovative projects with the statement, “we support documentaries that take risks. Audiences can find documentaries on a variety of platforms” (NZ On Air, 2013b). Three actions are proposed to realise this goal. These are:
Introduce retrospective funding of up to $75,000 per broadcast hour for unfinished self-funded programmes which have secured an adequate broadcaster commitment. Online projects not eligible. Other criteria will apply.

Funding maximum of four series for popular factual programmes continued.

Continue to pursue opportunities for collaboration with other government agencies.

The first action recognises that many filmmakers (as will be further discussed in the following chapter) are taking the initiative to self-fund documentaries, bypass the limitations of trying to conform to broadcaster requirements or (increasingly) and because there are simply fewer one-off documentaries being commissioned. *The Last Ocean*, is an example of a self-funded theatrical/festival documentary given retrospective funding and broadcast on Prime in 2012. This policy may, as NZ On Air intends, see increased innovation if broadcasters do commission self-funded films but it means that the burden of risk is carried by the filmmaker, who is likely to receive far less funding overall, particularly as (based on my research) broadcasters are also likely to offer a lower license fee for retrospectively funded/commissioned work. Consequently, this policy may benefit some filmmakers, particularly those who are already focused on funding and distribution opportunities outside the domestic television market, and may see more innovate work screened on television but may also have a detrimental impact on producers as a whole, lowering the value of their work.

The second action is a continuation of an existing policy and ensures that audiences continue to enjoy popular content while ensuring opportunities for new projects exist. The use of the term popular factual here is noteworthy, as it implicitly acknowledges a distinction between documentary and popular factual content that is otherwise left undefined.
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The third action is likely to complement the first, and may serve to counterbalance the potential lowering of funding levels that a retrospective funding policy could introduce. With funding from both NZ On Air and the NZFC producers would be able to initiate self-funded projects at a sustainable level of funding. Collaboration with the NZFC and other government agencies such as the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Education could expand opportunities for producers to reach wider audiences beyond the scope of broadcast, which might also enhance the social impact of documentary. However, the success of both actions one and three are likely to be impeded by the reluctance of broadcasters to support content where the opportunity cost outweighs even minimal investment. Without any real power to ensure that broadcasters commission innovative content, uptake from broadcasters is likely to be limited, as the response to the first joint (NZ On Air/NZFC) documentary fund RFP indicates.

A third goal for NZ On Air relates to value for money, with the aim that “funding is invested skilfully which leads to strong audience engagement”. As this chapter has established, value for money has often overshadowed the values of diversity and innovation, but the emphasis on audience engagement articulated in this statement goes some way towards framing value in cultural terms. With most broadcasters putting little effort into promoting New Zealand documentaries or making them more accessible online, audience interest in and awareness of documentary may be diminished. NZ On Air and broadcasters may argue that strands and one-offs have declined because of a lack of audience appeal, but the reverse may also be true. Therefore, NZ On Air can play a vital role in maintaining and even building audiences for documentary by helping to make content more visible, celebrate and promote success and ensure that documentary make be accessed on multiple platforms, as the actions that support this goal propose.

Documentary is an important form of content that contributes significant cultural value in terms of representation, public discourse and the provision of information. Without a

---

28 The new joint NZ On Air/NZFC joint fund will be discussed further in the following chapter.
dedicated public service broadcaster or media provider that is able to take risks and is unaffected by market pressures such as opportunity cost, documentary is an endangered content form. NZ On Air has taken steps to redress the imbalance of the market-driven broadcast environment to better support diversity and innovation while continuing to provide value for money, but realistically has little power to significantly counter the force of the market. Furthermore, the ambiguity around the definition of documentary obfuscates the true extent of documentary’s decline in New Zealand and the overweighting of popular factual entertainment forms within the documentary funding category.
CHAPTER FIVE

Theatrical Documentary in New Zealand

At least twenty documentary feature films were exhibited widely in cinemas throughout New Zealand in 2012, mostly in festival screenings, but also in general release (often following on from successful festival screenings). These include:

Two Films at the World Cinema Showcase (Auckland, Wellington, Dunedin, Christchurch)

Five films at the Documentary Edge Festival (Auckland and Wellington).


Three major documentary features with feature film investment from the New Zealand Film Commission released in cinemas nationwide.

For the purposes of this discussion, I have defined a documentary feature as a film of sufficient length to headline a festival session rather than screen alongside another film or selection of film shorts. I have also restricted my analysis to films that have screened either in multiple theatres or in other public venues throughout New Zealand and/or in one of the major New Zealand film festivals that screens in at least two centres. This chapter focuses on films that have been widely screened in New Zealand in 2012 rather than released in 2012, a distinction that is useful for the purpose of restricting analysis to the exhibition and distribution of films within a calendar year as films are not always widely exhibited or distributed in the year in which they are initially released. Therefore, this discussion includes several films that were initially released in 2011 (Brother Number One, Last Dogs of Winter, View from Olympus, When a City Falls) and excludes films that may have been released in 2012 but have

---

29 Based on analysis of New Zealand film festival programmes, the minimum duration of a documentary feature is usually no less than 50 minutes. A film of this length will often be screened with a short film, but will headline the session as a feature film.
had limited public screenings such as *Venus: A Quest* (Point of View Productions), which previewed to “participants, funders and guests” in six one-off screenings throughout New Zealand in November 2012 (“Venus,” n.d.), or *Men Like Us*, which had a premiere at Auckland’s Rialto cinema in August 2012 but has not had a general theatrical release (“MEN LIKE US | Gay men, depression, anxiety and the struggle for everyday happiness,” n.d.). The emphasis here is on the circulation of films in festivals, general theatrical release, television and DVD or VOD, the networks involved in this circulation and on the relationships and exchanges involved.

The majority of these films were seen only by enthusiastic but relatively small festival crowds, but many of the documentary features that proved popular at film festivals (particularly the NZIFF) have gone on to have limited national or regional cinema releases due to popular demand, and several have enjoyed critical (if not commercial success) at prestigious international festivals.

The remarkable number of feature length New Zealand documentaries screened in cinemas in 2012 is almost certainly a record for New Zealand. (2011, in comparison, saw 4 documentary features screen in the NZIFF, 1 in the World Cinema Showcase, 7 in the Documentary Edge Festival and a limited nationwide theatrical release for *There Once was an Island*). The high number of local feature documentaries screened in 2012 may to some extent reflect the lower barriers to production brought about by cheaper, more accessible production technologies such as HD cameras, sound equipment and desktop editing software. Certainly, the New Zealand International Film Festival, for example, has seen an overall increase in submissions in recent years (B. Gosden, personal communication, November 23, 2012). It would be premature to make claims for a watershed for New Zealand theatrical documentary, however. Many of the films released or screened in 2012 have been in production over a number of years and there is likely to be an element of serendipity resulting in the convergence of many films in one year.
A number of films screened in theatres have also been commissioned for television, and in many cases, this is the medium for which they have primarily been produced. Television broadcast still plays an important role in supporting New Zealand documentary but the volume of documentaries produced and exhibited in theatres may also be seen as a reflection, not only of a growing audience for theatrical documentaries, but of the decline of longer form television documentaries in favour of half-hour factual entertainment series.

The most significant changes in the ecology of theatrical documentary in New Zealand (consistent with global trends) relate to shifting dynamics between producers, audiences and intermediaries (distributors and exhibitors). Online and social media facilitate a more direct relationship between filmmakers and the audience as the film industry undergoes a process of disintermediation that increasingly requires the filmmaker to play a more active role in distribution and marketing (Iordanova & Cunningham, 2012b).

This chapter presents an overview of key trends and developments in funding, marketing and distribution of NZ documentary, focusing particularly on the impact of new technologies on New Zealand’s documentary production ecology and drawing on an analysis of a set of twenty films most widely exhibited in NZ in 2012.

The films

The films discussed in this chapter, with brief a synopsis are as follows: (See Appendix ‘Index of Documentary Feature Films 2012, p. 260’ for more detailed data on these films).

3 feature films funded by the New Zealand Film Commission screened in cinemas nationwide (but not at festival in 2012)

*Brother Number One* (2011) follows the journey of New Zealand athlete Rob Hamill to a war crimes tribunal in Cambodia where he confronts Comrade Duch, the man
responsible for his brother’s death under the Khmer Rouge regime. (Producer/Director Annie Goldson)

Beautiful Machine (2012) is a ‘rockumentary’ about Shihad, one of New Zealand’s most successful rock bands. (Producer Laurence Alexander, Grant Roa, David White /Director Sam Peacocke)

When a City Falls (2011) is an account of the earthquakes that shock the Christchurch in 2010 and 2011 and the aftermath, told firsthand by residents themselves. (Producer/Director Gerard Smyth)

2 Films at the World Cinema Showcase

Te Hono ki Aotearoa (2012) follows the creation and handover of a Māori waka taua (Māori ceremonial canoe) commissioned for the Dutch Museum Volkenkunde in Leiden. (Producer/Director Jan Bieringa)

Mental Notes (2012) exposes the historical failure of New Zealand’s mental health institutions and celebrates the resilience of the five survivors of ‘the Bins’ who share their stories and revisit their traumatic pasts. (Producer/Director Jim Marbrook)

5 films at the Documentary Edge Festival

Disappear into Light (2011) is an observational documentary that follows nine months in the life of acclaimed playwright Jo Randerson. (Producer/Director Leonie Reynolds)

Intersexion (2012) offers an insight into life as an intersex person through New Zealander Mani Bruce Mitchell’s conversations with fellow intersex people around the world. (Producer John Keir/Director Grant LaHood)

Yakel 3D (2011) is New Zealand’s first 3D documentary, which aims to capture life in a remote village in Vanuatu where a 108 year old chief is reaching the end of his life, presenting a challenge to the traditional way of life his people have preserved in isolation. (Producer/Director Rachel Wilson)
**View from Olympus** (2011) is a portrait of John Psathas, a composer born to Greek immigrants in New Zealand, which explores Psathas’ life, cultural identity and music. (Producer Richard Riddiford /Director Geoffrey Cawthorn)

**Nazi Hunter** (2012) documents ex-policeman Wayne Stringer’s secret investigation of 47 people suspected of being Nazi war criminals who sought refuge in New Zealand as “displaced persons” after World War Two. (Producer John Keir/Director Alexander Behse)

### 10 films at the NZIFF

**The Last Dogs of Winter** (2011) takes us to the remote and harsh terrain of Churchill, Manitoba where a grizzly Canadian and his young Kiwi assistant rear Eskimo dogs alongside Polar Bears in a bid to preserve the endangered species of indigenous dogs. (Producer/Director Costa Botes)

**How Far is Heaven** (2012) is an intimate observational study of life in the rural village Jerusalem/Hiruhama, where the Catholic order The Sisters of Compassion have lived alongside the Māori community for 120 years. (Producer Miriam Smith/Director Chris Pryor, Miriam Smith)

**Song of the Kauri** (2012) highlights issues of sustainability through the story of a master craftsman who uses Kauri timber to create guitars and violins. (Producer/Director Mathurin Molgat)

**Persuading the Baby to Float** (2012) captures the artistic collaboration between pianist Norman Meehan, poet Bill Manhire and singer Hannah Griffin. (Producer/Director Keith Hill)

**The Last Ocean** (2012) is an activist film produced as part of a campaign to end commercial fishing in the Ross Sea (Antarctica). (Producer/Director Peter Young)

**Tatarakihi: the Children of Parihaka** (2012) is a ‘journey of memory’ undertaken by a group of Parihaka children following in the footsteps of their ancestors, who were transported to the South Island and jailed after the Taranaki land confiscations of the
1860s. (Producer Paora Joseph and Gaylene Preston/Director Paora Joseph and Janine Martin)

**Maori Boy Genius** (2012) is a portrait of a talented and politically ambitious Māori teenager Ngaa Rauuira Pumanawawhiti, who travels to Yale for intensive studies at the age of 16, carrying with him the weight of family expectations and sacrifice. (Producer/Director Pietra Brettkelly)

**Pictures of Susan** (2012) is the story of outsider artist Susan Te Kahurangi King, who does not speak but expresses herself through thousands of detailed and colourful drawings. The film follows Susan’s artistic and personal rebirth as she resumes drawing after a silence of twenty years. (Producer Dan Salmon, Tash Christie/Director Dan Salmon)

**Tongan Ark** (2012) pays homage to Futa Helu, the founder of the Atenisi Institute, an independent Tongan educational institution based on the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers and a love of classical Italian opera. (Producer Echo Zeanah-Janman/Director Paul Janman)

**Village by the Sea** (2012) is a follow-up to an earlier documentary about the artist Edith Collier, centred on an Irish fishing village where Collier lived and painted for two summers during 2014–15. (Producer Bhim Singh, Krishna Chouhan/Director Michael Heath)

**Public Funding**

Funding for New Zealand documentary films comes from a variety of sources ranging from public investment, the support of community organisations, private philanthropic donations, to industry support in the form of free or discounted labour or goods. 2012 has seen the emergence of crowdfunding as a potentially significant new funding strategy, which two of the films in this group have used with some (modest) success.
The New Zealand Film Commission (NZFC) has gradually expanded its support for documentary features in recent years, where previously documentary was not recognised by the commission as a theatrical form.

Four films in general theatrical release in New Zealand in 2012 received Feature Film Investment from the NZFC; *When a City Falls*, *Brother Number One*, *Beautiful Machine* and *Last Dogs of Winter*. Smaller NZFC Feature Film Finishing Grants (generally between $10,000 to $25,000) were awarded to a number of feature documentaries in this group for post-production costs necessary to enable theatrical distribution.

Funding for *When a City Falls*, *Brother Number One* and *Beautiful Machine* was also augmented by NZ On Air, the government agency that supports free-to-air NZ broadcast content. An additional five films screening in New Zealand cinemas also received funding from NZ On Air; *Intersexion*, *View from Olympus*, *Nazi Hunter*, *The Last Ocean*, and *Maori Boy Genius*. As New Zealand’s commercial hour is short (approximately 43 minutes), these films are usually re-versioned for theatrical release, sometimes quite significantly, as was the case for *Maori Boy Genius*.

Two films (*How Far is Heaven* and *Tongan Ark*) received their primary funding from combined NZFC/Creative NZ funds that have since been discontinued (the Independent Filmmakers Fund and the Screen Production Innovation Fund).

Funding for the documentaries on this list vary greatly. At one extreme, *Beautiful Machine* received $813,900 from the NZFC and $160,068 from NZ On Air, bringing its total public funding to $973,968, a significant documentary budget even by international standards. NZ On Air funding for the films in this group ranged from $80,000 to $170,000. On the more modest end of the public funding scale, *Tongan Ark* received $15,000 from the Screen Innovation Production Fund (NZFC/Creative NZ).
One of the most important criteria that must be fulfilled in order to receive funding from either of the government organisations which provide the most support for New Zealand documentaries, (The New Zealand Film Commission and New Zealand on Air), is that films or television programmes must focus on ‘New Zealand stories’. This is a policy frequently bemoaned by filmmakers wishing to tackle broader subjects, yet most of the films listed below do contain international elements, and films shot solely in New Zealand are in fact in the minority. Films such as *Brother Number One*, *Last Dogs of Winter* and *Intersexion*, which all received significant public funding, are largely set outside New Zealand but present subjects framed from the perspective of a New Zealander as central protagonist. While these are distinctly New Zealand films, they represent a perspective on the world that is far from insular.

**Philanthropic Funding and Crowdfunding**

In addition to public funding, much of the support for documentary comes from goodwill in the form of labour, equipment and other resources donated or provided at significantly discounted rates. A number of films on the list above have been supported at least in part by various community and arts organisations with a special interest in the film’s subject matter. *Tatarakihi*, for example, was partially funded by a grant from the TSB Community Trust, *How Far is Heaven* was partly funded by the Wanganui District Council and *Mental Notes* received support of the Frozen Funds Trust and a one nk Grant from Mind and Body Consultants. As these films demonstrate, it is not uncommon for documentaries to receive some funding from philanthropic sources, but New Zealand has lacked formalised systems to widely promote or reward such investment, as is the case in the US and Australia, for example (Ministry for Arts, Culture and Heritage, 2010). This seems set to change, due in part to a shift in cultural policy and also to the growing influence of crowdfunding\(^{30}\).

---

\(^{30}\) The Arts Foundation's crowdfunding platform 'Boosted' is an example of a philanthropic initiative that emerged during the period of the study. (www.boosted.org.nz)
Crowdfunding is an extension of the concept of ‘crowdsourcing’, a term generally attributed as being coined by Jeff Howe in a Wired magazine article published in 2006 titled ‘The Rise of Crowdsourcing’. The term has been widely adopted to describe the emergence and increasing significance of the applied effort, skills and knowledge of a mass of individuals to achieve common goals, facilitated by networked communications technologies, as exemplified perhaps by Wikipedia, the “free encyclopedia that anyone can edit” (Wikipedia.org). A wave of both academic and popular books relating to this idea convey, even in their titles alone, a sense of the anticipation of the transformative and disruptive potential of crowdsourcing and associated concepts relating to a mode of collectivism specific to the conditions of the network society; *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations* (Shirky, 2009), *Infotopia* (Sunstein, 2006), *Wikinomics* (Tapscott & Williams, 2008), *The Wisdom of Crowds* (Surowiecki, 2004) and *The Wealth of Networks* (Benkler, 2006). It is useful to remember the roots of crowdfunding in this tradition of collective action in considering its growing significance in all creative and cultural spheres, and in particular to documentary filmmaking.

Belleflamme et al in their foundational econometric analysis of the mechanics of crowdfunding offer a refined technical definition of crowdfunding as involving “an open call, mostly through the Internet, for the provision of financial resources either in form of donation or in exchange for the future product or some form of reward and/or voting rights” (Paul Belleflamme, Lambert, & Schwienbacher, 2011). Although crowdfunding may be used to fund commercial projects or function as a form of pre-buying (Belleflamme), and there is growing interest in crowdfunding as a form of venture capital, it is perhaps more commonly associated with the funding of creative, cultural and philanthropic activities.

Crowdfunding appears to have first come the attention of the public in New Zealand in 2012 when local film director Taika Waititi successfully raised $US110,796 on the US crowdfunding website Kickstarter to facilitate the American release of the film, *Boy* (Kickstarter, 2012). Australian crowdfunding platform Pozible and the US-based Indiegogo have also proved popular with New Zealand filmmakers. New Zealand is a
relative latecomer to crowdfunding, (Indiegogo launched in 2008, Kickstarter in 2009), however the concept is rapidly gaining awareness in New Zealand with several local initiatives now established or soon to be launched.

New Zealand’s first local crowdfunding platform, PledgeMe, had its official launch in January 2012 (following a soft-launch in 2011), raising a total of $700,000 and successfully funding 159 projects by December 2012 (“10,000th pledger! | PledgeMe Blog,” n.d.). A local competitor to PledgeMe, Social Backing, launched in July 2012 and had some early success, with one of its first projects, *Under the Weather*, (a surfing film) raising NZ$18,115 and gaining some national media coverage. However, the Social Backing website now shows only a handful of projects, its blog has not been updated since September 2012 and Social Backing’s Facebook Page has not been updated since October 2012, suggesting Social Backing is no longer actively operating as a crowdfunding platform.

Due to the recent emergence of crowdfunding, academic research in this area is limited, but early studies suggest that geography does play a role in the success of crowdfunded projects, particularly in the early stages of fundraising where initial investors are likely to be drawn primarily from a pool of family and friends (Agrawal, Catalini, & Goldfarb, 2011). Although Agrawal et al’s findings primarily refer to the proximity between one and investor, the physical location, visibility and cultural relevance of the platform itself may also be valuable. This hypothesis is supported by PledgeMe founder Anna Guenther, who sees the local focus of PledgeMe as a competitive advantage:

"Our important point of difference is that fact that we’re local, so geographically it’s based around New Zealand and I think that helps build this offline community around the online platform. Social Backing is an interesting case because they’ve come out and said they’re a global site, so they’re not focusing on New Zealand... I think that’s removing a lot of value it could have. (A. Guenther, personal communication, September 19, 2012)"
In the philanthropic sector, The Arts Foundation’s launched an arts crowdfunding initiative in 2013 (Boosted) that enables donors to receive tax rebates of 33% on their donations to projects, rather than offering rewards as crowdfunding campaigns usually do ("About | Boosted," n.d.) Another local fundraising site, Givealittle (launched in 2008), was purchased in November 2012 by The Telecom Foundation, the charitable organisation that oversees Corporate Social Responsibility activities for major telecommunications provider, Telecom New Zealand. In a press release issued to announce the purchase of the site, The Telecom Foundation states that, “The online platform taps into a growing consumer appetite for “crowdfunding” internationally – where people are directly engaging with, and making an impact on, causes through peer-2-peer philanthropy and social media” (Givealittle, n.d.).

Competition for public funding is intense in the cultural sector, particularly in the midst of a sustained economic downturn, prompting the Minister for Arts, Culture and Heritage, Hon Christopher Finlayson, to establish a taskforce to explore ways to increase private investment in the arts (Ministry for Arts, Culture and Heritage, 2010). The primary outcome of the work of the taskforce has been the launch in 2012 of a matched funding scheme, administered by government organisation Creative New Zealand, called Creative Giving Matched Funding, which aims to aid arts organisations in attracting new sponsorship or donations which will “match the funds arts organisations raise through new sponsorships or donations between $5,000 and $20,000” (Creative New Zealand, n.d.-b). In Australia, the matched funding approach has been extended beyond public/corporate philanthropic partnerships and into the crowdfunding space with regional government agency ScreenWest’s ‘3 to 1’ matched funding initiative hosted on the Pozible crowdfunding platform, which will contribute “between $15,000 and $150,000 for each film that manages to successfully crowdfund a quarter of their total budget” (Pozible, 2012b). A positive view of this trend towards public/private and audience/community/consumer funding partnerships could be seen as an example of greater public involvement in public cultural spending, more democratic participation in the arts and a less elitist approach to cultural funding. Detractors may see it as a sign of a neoliberal ‘user pays’ mentality and the opting out of state support for culture. Concerns could be raised about the danger of culture increasingly funded on the basis of popularity rather than aesthetic or social value, or pandering to the ‘cult of
the amateur’ (Keen, 2007). No doubt both perspectives have some validity, but in the context of prolonged economic uncertainty, any initiative that maintains or increases current funding levels for creative and cultural projects has merit.

The combination of philanthropy and crowdfunding would appear to be inherently complimentary, but participation in crowdfunding seems to be neither entirely self-interested nor entirely altruistic. While investment is the term used to describe the act of giving money to a crowdfunding project, the ‘investment’ is more than financial. As Belleflamme et al (2012) observe, crowdfunding is “a broader concept than purely raising funds” (p. 28); crowdfunders generally seem willing to pay more than normal investors would and enjoy “community benefits” such as input into the project or access to exclusive content. As a result, “crowdfunders enjoy an increase in utility because they value the feeling of belonging to a group of “special” or “privileged” individuals (those individuals who contributed to the very existence of the product!” (Belleflamme, Lambert, & Schwienbacher, 2012).

For filmmakers, crowdfunding offers an additional or alternative avenue for funding, enabling them to reach a large pool of potential supporters. At a minimum, it can be a more effective and less intrusive way to ‘pass the hat’ around a small crowd of friends and family, in extreme cases it can be a wildly successful means of fundraising and overall it provides an excellent means of establishing an interested (invested) audience base in anticipation of a film’s release.

Two of the films in this group, Maori Boy Genius and Tatarakihi: the Children of Parihaka have used crowdfunding campaigns with some success.

Maori Boy Genius was initially funded by NZ On Air and broadcast on Māori Television in the hour-long Pakipumeka Aotearoa New Zealand Documentary slot. The director, Pietra Brettkelly, wanted to re-cut and extend the television documentary as a theatrical work and was invited to screen the film in competition at the prestigious
Berlin Film Festival in 2012. Brettkelly used Indiegogo to raise funds for a final edit, sound design and mix, music rights, film finishing costs and marketing. While Indiegogo is an international platform (unlike high profile platform Kickstarter, which is limited to US and UK residents), the support of non-profit partner, From the Heart Productions, meant that donations were tax-deductible in the US.

As is the norm for crowdfunding campaigns, incentives or rewards were offered in return for financial contributions, ranging from a signed DVD of the completed film for $30 to an Associate Producer credit for $5,000. Funding came from 62 funders, most of whom contributed either $30 or $65, with seven people contributing $250 for a DVD set of films by Brettkelly. The campaign raised only $5,900 of its US$10,000 goal but was able to keep this money (less the Indiegogo commission) as the campaign was run on a Flexible Funding basis, (the project gets to keep all the funds raised but Indiegogo charges a higher commission for unsuccessful Flexible Funding campaigns) (Indiegogo, n.d.). Most other crowdfunding sites run campaigns on a fixed funding (all or nothing) basis, meaning that pledges are only processed when the funding goal is reached and campaigns that fail to reach their goal by the set deadline do not receive any of the money raised. The rationale for this mode of funding is that there is less risk for both creators and funders and that funders are more motivated to actively support a project when the stakes are higher (Kickstarter, n.d.).

*Tatarakihi: the Children of Parihaka* ran two crowdfunding campaigns on Australian-based crowdfunding site Pozible on a fixed funding basis, raising A$8,494 in the first campaign (exceeding the $7,500 goal) and A$1,750 in the second campaign (meeting the goal exactly). As with *Maori Boy Genius*, the *Tatarakihi* campaign was focused specifically on the request for funds needed to finish the film for a cinema release. *Tatarakihi* offered a broader range of rewards; from $1 for the opportunity to be an ‘outreach partner’, $10 for a signed postcard, $20 for a CD of the film’s soundtrack, and $100 for a limited edition DVD through to $500 for an overnight stay at Parihaka, $5,000 for a contributor credit and $10,000 for an associate producer credit. The highest value reward chosen was $500.
Neither crowdfunding campaign made a significant amount of money as a percentage of overall costs, but provided the filmmakers with a small amount of much needed cash when it was most needed, and within a short space of time. Average pledges for both campaigns were slightly higher than average pledges for crowdfunding sites – A$80 for Pozible (Pozible, 2012a), US$74 for Indiegogo (Baddour, 2012) and NZ$70 for PledgeMe (PledgeMe, 2012) – but in principle the success of a crowdfunding campaign ultimately depends not on the size of individual donations, but on the size of the crowd. A strong campaign supported by social media, grassroots outreach and traditional forms of media publicity can garner a much wider crowd beyond the immediate social networks of the filmmaker. As the success of Taika Waititi’s Kickstarter campaign for Boy demonstrates, traditional media ‘gatekeepers’ still influence the chances of crowdfunding success (Sørensen, 2012) as projects with a high profile figure such as Waititi attached are able to generate greater publicity through traditional media channels, effectively reaching a much bigger ‘crowd’.

In practice, most campaigns primarily depend on the support of their immediate networks. PledgeMe founder Anna Guenther warns that there is a misconception associated with crowdfunding that, “there’s this crowd out in the ether that really wants to give you money”:

*There are people that want to give you money, but it’s about tapping into your networks as well and getting them involved, because people you know are more likely to participate than people you don’t. So it is normally your crowd. Or your crowd’s crowd. There are people that are just on [Pledgeme] pledging and we do see that, people just being on Twitter (or whatever), saying that they gave money to a project that they never heard of, but mostly it’s people you know.* (A. Guenther, personal communication, September 19, 2012)
There are likely to be many factors contributing to the greater success of *Tatarakihi* in reaching its funding goal, such as a lower target goal or the number of people actively involved in the fundraising effort. However, one possible factor is that, as discussed above, Pozible’s greater local ‘visibility’ may have been an asset to the *Tatarakihi* campaigns. Although based in Australia, Pozible has actively marketed itself in New Zealand, accepts New Zealand currency and visitors to the site from New Zealand are targeted with New Zealand projects. Australia is also home to a significant network of expat New Zealanders. PledgeMe has found that 15% of people pledging on its site are based outside New Zealand, which PledgeMe cofounder Anna Guenther speculates is due to the strength of New Zealand expat networks. (A. Guenther, personal communication, September 19, 2012).

The directors of both *Tatarakihi* and *Maori Boy Genius* were overwhelmingly positive about their experiences with crowdfunding when interviewed. For Paora Joseph, the director of *Tatarakihi*, crowdfunding was highly appropriate and a natural fit for a film that was made with a great deal of community participation:

> We had $10,000 through crowd funding, and that’s through the Pozible website ... It’s funny how films get made sometimes. I don’t think it’s a negative thing that we had to crowdfund. I think it requires effort. But why I say it’s not such a negative thing is because what it does is it gives people an opportunity to invest, it takes it back to the grassroots level. In saying that, I don’t expect other organisations that are set up to actually fund us – like The Film Commission and Creative New Zealand, TV, – I don’t think it lets them off the hook. ... I just think that it has a really positive angle. It strengthens your networks before you begin, and also when it comes to distribution many people already know about the film. So, I think it’s a natural progression of the times that we’re in. So the fact that we got $10,000 through crowdfunding, I think, is fabulous. Now we have this huge network of people who are totally committed to investing in the film. And they’ve told their friends, so that’s great. (P.Joseph, personal communication, October 3, 2012).

Pietra Brettkelly, director of Maori Boy Genius also emphasised the value of crowdfunding in providing not only financial, but also moral support:
Indiegogo was great. It was a lot of work to get the money and here in New Zealand I think more and more people will understand crowdfunding, but there’s a lot of education [to be done]. . . . In the US, they get it, and overseas, in Europe, in the UK they understand and are more familiar with it. So, I think those opportunities will increase in New Zealand because people will understand it more. It was fabulous because it was a particularly tough time for me and it is a pretty solitary profession being an independent filmmaker so it was wonderful for that, that I thought ‘oh thank God there are other people who don’t think that I crazy’.” (P.Brettkelly, personal communication, August 13, 2012)

For most filmmakers, crowdfunding will supplement rather than replace traditional funding sources; but it serves an additional purpose as a valuable marketing and distribution tool, enabling filmmakers to build an actively supportive audience base prior to a film’s release. Neither *Tatarakihi* nor *Maori Boy Genius* had a dedicated website at the time that their campaigns were running (though both had Facebook pages), so their campaign pages helped to increase their online presence, functioning as temporary promotional sites (featuring trailers, film descriptions and production information, and providing the filmmakers with a mechanism for communicating with supporters via the site, social networks and email). Social media sharing buttons on each project’s campaign site enabled site visitors to easily share links to campaigns with their social networks. In the case of *Tatarakihi* for example, 735 people posted a link to the Pozible campaign as a Facebook status update.

*Maori Boy Genius* did not go on to have a general theatrical release in New Zealand after screening in the New Zealand International Film Festival, but has screened at premiere film festivals all over the world and has been seen by audiences in Berlin, Sydney, Melbourne, Copenhagen, Toronto, Warsaw and New York. The film also won the Moa award for Best Documentary at the ‘Sorta Unofficial New Zealand Film Awards’ in 2012, (which despite its name was in fact the only film awards held in New Zealand).
Zealand in 2012 and was well-supported by the film industry). The film is now being self-distributed on DVD via the Maori Boy Genius website (www.maoriboygenius.com).

Following sell-out screenings at the New Zealand International Film festival, Tatarakihi has had a wide self-distributed general release, screening throughout New Zealand from September 2012 at a variety of venues ranging from large cinemas to community venues such as marae, churches, school halls and museums. The film currently has screenings scheduled through to March 2013. Many requests for screenings can be seen on the film’s Facebook page. The distribution strategy for this film is unusual as public screenings are not only managed by the filmmakers but also by the community of Parihaka, which retains the rights to the film and because of the cultural and personal significance of this film to the people of Parihaka, it is unlikely to be made widely available on DVD or VOD.

**Distribution and marketing**

The growing need for direct audience engagement via social media channels is one dimension of a shift in the role of the independent filmmaker to encompass a range of activities that previously would have been undertaken by a number of individuals. Not only are filmmakers increasingly performing a range of production tasks single-handedly – such as operating a camera and sound equipment while also producing, directing and editing – but they are also increasingly managing their own distribution and marketing.

**Festivals**

Festivals play a vital role in the circulation of these films, providing opportunities for limited exhibition across the breadth of New Zealand, from large cities to small towns,
that otherwise wouldn’t be possible. With the exception of *Shihad: Beautiful Machine*, all of these films have screened in New Zealand film festivals: two films screened at the World Cinema Showcase (*Te Hono ki Aotearoa* and *Mental Notes*), five films screened at the Documentary Edge Festival (*Disappear into Light, Intersexion, Yakel 3D, View From Olympus, Nazi Hunter*) and eleven films screened at the New Zealand International Film Festival (NZIFF) (*The Last Dogs of Winter, How Far is Heaven, Song of the Kauri, Persuading the Baby to Float, The Last Ocean, Tatarakihi: the Children of Parihaka, Maori Boy Genius, Pictures of Susan, Tongan Ark, Village by the Sea, and Brother Number One*).

International festivals are also responsible for the wider circulation of these films and several have had considerable critical success at high profile international festivals including *Maori Boy Genius* (Berlin International Film Festival, Sheffield DocFest and Sydney International Film Festival), *Last Dogs of Winter* (Toronto International Film Festival 2011, IDFA – International Documentary Film Festival Amsterdam), and *Brother Number One* (Melbourne International Film Festival, IDFA).

The New Zealand International Film Festival, being the most established and far-reaching festival arguably has the greatest impact on the ecology of New Zealand theatrical documentary. This year the festival had approximately 35,000 admissions for NZ documentaries and screened in 11 centres throughout the country:

*The standard line enunciated in our objectives is to increase the options for New Zealand filmgoers and New Zealand filmmakers, and that is what I think we do ... Just getting into that programme, which is read by tens of thousands of people, obtains some attention for your film that would be rather difficult to get otherwise. So we provide that, we provide publicity services for the filmmakers whose work that we show, and we pay them film hire. So they get 25% of the box office from the screenings. People who don’t know the business think that 25%*

---

31 *Brother Number One* premiered at the NZIFF in 2011, prior to its 2012 general theatrical release.
doesn’t sound like much but we just scrape through ourselves; we’ve got a lot of bills to pay out of that remaining 75%. And hopefully anybody who places their film with us hopes that ours will be the first of many screenings, so we’re providing a kind of platform from which they can make their presence in the world known and felt. And I really pleased when I do see films that go on to have some theatrical life beyond the film festival, and then for most of them there’s going to be some life in the home entertainment and education areas. (B. Gosden, personal communication, November 23, 2012)

Certainly, the majority of films that screened in the NZIFF in 2012 did go on to have a theatrical life beyond the festival, and many are now (or will soon) also be available on DVD for home and educational distribution. Acceptance into the NZIFF not only assists filmmakers in accessing finishing funds from the NZFC, but can also attract distributors, who work closely with the festival once they become involved with a film:

If we’ve taken on a film and then a distributor comes on board then the distributor is going to participate with the filmmaker in the decisions about the festival play, and they might decide they only want the film to show in Auckland and Wellington and that they want to be able to pursue cinema releases in all the other centres, which is not of course a line of action that I would recommend to any documentary filmmaker. It’s very hard work to get films screened outside Auckland and Wellington, particularly now that Christchurch is so lacking in screens these days ... there are many conversations to be had once that situation arises. And if a distributor’s taken on a film, then that 25%’s going to be going to the distributor and the distributor will want to participate and at least be across what publicity is going on around the film and the distributor’s always going to want to hold back on certain areas of publicity. There’s a lot of negotiation around that because they need to have a few cards up their sleeve for the eventual release of the film. (B. Gosden, personal communication, November 23, 2012)
At the time of writing, a number of the films discussed in this chapter were available for purchase from directly from filmmakers on DVD (examples). Only one film, *Shihad: Beautiful Machine*, appears to be available for download or VOD streaming, although the film’s availability on iTunes and Quickflix is not advertised on the official *Beautiful Machine* website (www.shihadmovie.com/) or on the site of the film’s distributor (http://au.rialtodistribution.com/shihadbeautifulmachine.html).

While VOD sales would undoubtedly open up access to a global market for New Zealand documentary, the local market for VOD is limited as most international VOD services (such as Hulu, Netflix and Amazon Prime) are not legally available in New Zealand and broadband data caps imposed by local ISPs are prohibitive. Although iTunes VOD is available in New Zealand, it carries little New Zealand content and a narrower range of international content (Keall, 2012). New Zealand’s first subscription streaming service, Quickflix, which launched in March 2012 offers content on a range of devices and will also launch a Freeview TV channel service in 2013, but it also carries a limited range of New Zealand content and currently *Shihad: Beautiful Machine* is the only New Zealand documentary available on Quickflix. The Australian company has struggled financially and has suffered from a lack of access to popular HBO content due to Sky TV’s exclusive rights in New Zealand (Keall, 2012b). (See (Thompson, 2011). Video on Demand is also seen by many of the film industry members interviewed as operating on a long-tail business model in which content aggregators rely on the acquisition and provision of a wide variety of content in order to make a profit. Although in theory this may offer filmmakers the potential greater access to international audiences, the concern is that obscure filmmakers from a small country such as New Zealand do not have sufficient exposure and therefore the capability to sell VOD titles at the volume required to deliver an adequate return to the filmmaker:

*Getting your work into some pay on-demand situation just isn’t really feasible here. That whole business is dominated by volume and you just can’t do the volume on a New Zealand documentary, which is largely of interest [only] to New Zealanders. The whole corporate domination of that area means that the consumers are used to paying absurdly little, if at all for the experience, so I*
think that in a small market it’s hard to see it as being particularly supportive of creative endeavour. It’s just yet another kind of unfortunate outcome for a small place like New Zealand of global tendencies (B. Gosden, personal communication, November 23, 2012).

Where films have been commissioned for television and received funding from NZ On Air, television commissioners also play a role in the distribution cycle, generally taking priority in determining whether a film will be seen first in cinemas or on television. In the case of *Brother Number One*, the film premiered at the NZIFF in 2011, and had a general release in March 2012 before screening on TV3 in July 2012 in a 44 minute broadcast version. Pietra Brettkelly was unable to negotiate with Maori Television to hold back the television screening of *Maori Boy Genius* however, which meant the film was ineligible for NZFC film finishing funds (P.Brettkelly, personal communication, August 13, 2012). The tension between theatrical release and broadcast timings is described by Bill Gosden as unique to New Zealand and another example of the challenges of a small and isolated market:

*Everywhere else in the world television commissioners are absolutely delighted if a local film festival wants to showcase their work. I’ve never spoken to a film festival programmer from everywhere else who has had the problem that we’ve had from time to time with broadcasters who want to deny the filmmakers the opportunity to premiere their work with a live audience and celebrate their achievement in a public way and even celebrate the broadcaster. I mean we’re quite happy to give credit where it’s due ... we don’t pretend that we fund these documentaries ourselves ... I think that it’s a small pond problem actually ... a kind of jealousy of territory, which is a bit inappropriate and unfortunate and counterproductive. I don’t think it helps anybody.* (B. Gosden, personal communication, November 23, 2012)

In 2013 NZ On Air and the NZFC announced a joint documentary fund of $2.5 million ($1.75m from NZ On Air and $0.75m from the NZFC). The intention of the fund was
“to provide a new opportunity to make strong, appealing one-off documentaries of a quality likely to delight New Zealand audiences, win awards, and secure festival invitations and broadcast sales” (NZ On Air & NZFC, 2013). The initiative was not met with enthusiasm from broadcasters however, and to date no documentaries have received funding through this scheme.

Although at least three films (*When a City Falls, Brother Number One* and *Beautiful Machine*) have agreements with local distributors such as Metropolis Film and Rialto Distribution, most films are self-distributed by the filmmakers, who are often also managing their own marketing and publicity. This is consistent with international trends where disintermediation has seen the rise of a cohort of experts offering advice and services for DIY/Indie film distribution, notable figures in this movement being; Jon Reiss (http://www.thinkoutsidetheboxoffice.com/), Peter Broderick (http://www.peterbroderick.com/), Stacey Parks (http://www.filmspecific.com/), Sherri Candler (www.sherricandler.com) Ted Hope (hopeforfilm.com) and Lance Weiler (lanceweiler.com). Exponents of DIY film distribution advocate that filmmakers adjust their distribution of time and resources to dedicate more of the working lives to distribution and marketing under a new paradigm of independent film production. Jon Reiss, for example advises filmmakers that, “50 percent of your time and resources should be devoted to creating the film. 50 percent of your time and resources should be devoted to getting the film out to its audience, aka distribution and marketing” (Reiss, 2009).

While many filmmakers struggle with the demands of increased dedication to audience building, an online presence and use of some form of social media to promote and engage with audiences is now widely regarded as an essential aspect of filmmaking. Pietra Brettkelly’s description of her use of websites and social media is representative of the demands that filmmakers face in juggling film production with promotion and distribution:
I’ve got three websites and two Facebook pages at the moment. The first one was *The Art Star and the Sudanese Twins* and then we did Pietrabrettkelly.com and then *Maori Boy Genius* … I’ve got this lovely company called Bunker Media and they create them for me and then they make them easy enough that then I can do most of the maintenance and the updating on it. It’s all about the money; you just have to find the time to do things like that. I have a Twitter account and I’ve done one Tweet, and I know it’s really important but I just can’t get that. I’ve had a blog that I think I’ve had three postings on. I’d love to have enough money that I just hand that all on to somebody because I know it’s so important, especially once you’re in production to start tweeting. And that’s not [happening] here in New Zealand, I don’t think it’s taken on here to the same degree. But internationally, friends of mine are like, ‘I’ve got 7,000 followers that have been following me since I started my last production’, and automatically you’ve got the potential of 7,000 DVDs. Add that up and you’ve all of a sudden made $70,000. So it’s things like that that I could be a bit more clever with. (P.Brettkelly, personal communication, August 13, 2012)

Most of the 20 films discussed in this chapter have some kind of stand-alone website that serves to promote the film, though some have a dedicated page as part of a production company website, and a few simply have Facebook Pages. Film websites typically feature a film trailer, reviews, an EPK (Electronic Press Kit) for media, a list of screenings, a mailing list sign-up, links to Facebook and Twitter accounts, a blog, contact form and a shopping cart for DVD sales. For films that are connected with a broader social campaign or project such as *The Last Ocean* or *Tatarakihi*, a donate button is also a feature of the website. The website for *Brother Number One* offers a detailed study guide aimed at high school students; a novelty in New Zealand, but a standard feature for documentaries produced in Australia where Screen Australia funds study guides as part of a programme, coordinated with ATOM (Australian Teachers of Media) and Screenrights, which assists filmmakers in increasing revenue from the educational market.
Facebook pages serve as a useful interface between filmmaker and audience, where regular updates and discussion can help fuel audience interest in a film over time. This is often a space where not just the filmmaker, but the ‘stars’ or protagonists of films may directly engage with the audience, as is the case with, for example, *The Last Dogs of Winter* (www.facebook.com/Dogsofwinter) and *Brother Number One* (http://www.facebook.com/BrotherNumberOne.film).

**Conclusion**

In contrast to television, New Zealand’s theatrical documentary ecology appears to be thriving and innovation can be seen in the increasing adoption of digital tools to support the funding, outreach, marketing and distribution of theatrical documentaries. However, this sector of documentary production is not without its challenges as theatrical filmmakers struggle to sustain themselves financially. New methods for engaging and maintaining audiences and greater access to online VOD services may increase opportunities for revenue in time, but at present the DIY film distribution and marketing movement is in its infancy in New Zealand.
CHAPTER SIX

Innovation and Digital Content: Towards a Multiplatform Future

The impetus for this research project was the observation that New Zealand’s documentary production ecology was comparatively slow to adopt new models of production and distribution facilitated by new technologies and that innovation was lacking; both creatively and in the use of emerging media technologies. My specific focus was on the emergence of online and multiplatform documentary, exemplified by Australia’s public service broadcasters ABC and SBS, the NFB in Canada and the BBC in the UK. In a rapidly changing, globalised and convergent media environment, a multiplatform approach to production and distribution seemed to be not just a future possibility or even inevitability but a tangible present day reality. Internationally, the investment in multiplatform content by public media institutions is not just the shouldering of the public burden of risk that the commercial broadcaster is unable to carry but a recognition that, in what Mary Debrett (2009) describes as ‘the multi-platform era,’ a single platform can no longer adequately serve the needs of a diverse and dispersed public:

*In the social context of the digital era, when media services and the media habits of the fragmented audience are so diverse, access is no longer about scarcity, and universality needs to be addressed across the full range of media platforms in order to aggregate sufficient fragments to reach a general public. The flexible access of on-demand media offers a reinvented form of universality, one that caters for contemporary lifestyles. It can also be argued that, by distributing re-versioned content, such services extend the shelf-life and reach of publicly funded productions, building on word-of-mouth publicity, and thereby help to maximize the value of public investment. (Debrett, 2009, p. 810)*
Australia’s public broadcaster, the ABC, with the assistance of the Australian Film Commission (now Screen Australia), first launched the Documentary Online Initiative in 2001 “to encourage exciting and adventurous projects that exploit the possibilities of the Internet and challenge conventional documentary forms (Screen Australia, 2001).”

Today, the ABC continues to have a clear multiplatform commissioning strategy in place for documentary. As the ABC’s 2011 commissioning guidelines indicate, multiplatform content entails more than video clips online, it requires a multifaceted approach to storytelling and interactive engagement across all platforms used:

*TV Documentaries is actively seeking television ideas for all of the above genres that can translate onto other platforms across the ABC – ABC Online, mobile and gaming. We encourage you to think of ideas that can run in parallel (rather than competition) with the programme itself, and give audiences the chance to experience and engage more fully in your idea and subject. “DVD extras” material is already accommodated by current web-support for programmes (e.g. Gallipoli Submarine, Australia: Land of Parrots) therefore these bigger multiplatform projects need a more ambitious sense of scale and level of interactivity. We are also looking for content where the online experience becomes intrinsic to the program i.e. a necessary part of content creation. (ABCTelevision, 2011)*

As Debrett (2009) has argued, such multiplatform services extend the shelf life of broadcast content and expand its uses (and arguably its wider marketability).

In New Zealand, several factors have impeded the development of online and multiplatform documentary content: New Zealand’s small but highly competitive media market and limited broadband capacity (with significant monopolies held both in broadcasting and telecommunications sectors); a significant decline in public media
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32. See [http://www.abc.net.au/tv/documentaries/online/](http://www.abc.net.au/tv/documentaries/online/) for an archive of ABC Online Documentaries.
services; and public funding structures and policies with limited value assigned to technological innovation.

New Zealand’s complex television broadcasting ecology (as has been discussed at length in chapters three and four) is a highly commercial environment with limited remaining public media services. Public media service providers such as Maori Television (MTS) do not, on the whole, have the resources to support online or multiplatform content, although MTS does aim to offer supplementary or complementary online content for programmes where possible, such as news or language (educational) programmes such as Tōku Reo (Kura Productions, n.d.). The digital, commercial free public broadcaster TVNZ7 launched an educational multiplatform initiative, Learning Hub, in 2011 on the same day that Broadcasting Minister Jonathan Coleman confirmed that funding for the channel would not continue beyond June 2012 (TVNZ, 2011a). TVNZ 7 Learning Hub offered interactive educational resources that extended broadcast content and offered viewers an opportunity to explore topics in greater depth (similar, though on a more modest scale, to the services provided by BBC Learning in the UK).

Commercial broadcasters have no incentive or obligation to develop additional online or multiplatform content for documentary or special interest programmes, leaving the onus on producers to finance and produce extra-broadcast content (such as web pages or social media accounts).

Access to high speed broadband services in New Zealand have been limited and the market is dominated by a small number of telecommunications providers. There has been much discussion and speculation in New Zealand media on the relationships between Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and broadcasters; Sky TV in particular. A 2012 article in New Zealand’s Computerworld publication, for example, proposes that

---

33 A recent Radio New Zealand online initiative, The Wireless is also discussed further in this chapter.
Sky TV has exclusive distribution rights agreements with New Zealand ISPs that would prevent ISPs from entering into content partnerships with providers other than Sky (effectively blocking third-parties such as Netflix or Hulu) (“Sky TV and the telcos,” n.d.). Such business arrangements were the subject of an 18-month investigation by New Zealand’s Commerce Commission, which resulted in the Commission issuing Sky TV with a warning letter that finds Sky’s key commitment provisions in its agreements with New Zealand’s four major ISPs (referred to by the Commerce Commission below as retail service providers (RSPs) may pose a threat to competition in the pay TV market in the following ways:

18.1 by Sky leveraging its market power to prevent or hinder RSPs from assisting or developing rival pay TV productions that may have in time become an effective competitor to Sky;

18.2 by denying rival pay TV wholesalers to Sky viable scale in New Zealand by limiting access to RSPs; and

18.3 by Sky paying RSPs not to enter into the pay TV market and/or not to support a new entrant into that market.

(Commerce Commission New Zealand, 2013, p. 3)

Despite the points outlined above and the finding that Sky TV operates as a “near monopoly in the supply of pay TV in New Zealand” (p. 4), no further action was taken by the Commission.

In light of these circumstances, government intervention would seem to be an obvious way to promote innovation in order to support the development of public media content (such as documentary). This is particularly valuable where market monopolisation may impede free public access to content and services that facilitate media participation and support civic engagement. New Zealand has two separate Government bodies dedicated to film and television (NZ On Air and the NZFC), with differing mandates and
objectives. In a convergent media environment this has perhaps made it difficult to devise and implement policy that maximises opportunities for multiplatform or crossplatform funding, production and delivery, but the two agencies are increasingly working together and both are starting to explore ways to offset the limitations of New Zealand’s commercial media environment and cater for the needs of local media producers and audiences.

A recent study by Canada’s Documentary Network presents “a snapshot of the reaction, production and distribution of documentaries in a rapidly-changing digital environment” (Observatoire du Documentaire | Documentary Network, 2011, p. 2). The study finds that new platforms are not detrimental to the television documentary ecology. On the contrary, it finds that the number of hours viewers spend watching television increases every year, as does their interest in documentaries and that, “online distribution platforms and broadcaster portals serve as audience-multipliers [increasing] the influence of documentaries” (p. 2). However, while the delivery of content on multiple platforms is emerging as an effective and strategic way of reaching audiences that are dispersed, mobile and ‘platform agnostic’, this study finds that it is not yet clear how the multiplatform approach to documentary can be monetised:

For the most part, the platforms that disseminate documentaries on the Internet are not profitable. New ways of managing rights need to be found which can boost the public profile of works, and can also be a real source of revenue for the creators and producers. (Observatoire du Documentaire | Documentary Network, 2011, p. 2)

In a media environment as deregulated and commercially competitive as New Zealand, the uncertainty of the potential for new media platforms to offer a return on investment makes significant innovation largely unsupportable in the absence of a public service broadcaster or public funding body truly mandated to risk ventures in new media spaces. Yet, despite the many challenges faced, tentative steps have been taken in the exploration of online and multiplatform documentary, both by government agencies and
other actants within the documentary production ecology. This chapter examines some of the pathways towards content production for new platforms that have been explored in New Zealand, identifies key barriers and limitations and suggests some broad measures that need to be taken to open up opportunities for innovation.

**NZ digital initiatives**

**Entrepreneurial initiatives in online and multiplatform environments**

Interactive web-based documentary has gained significant momentum as a recognisable movement or set of modes, particularly with the institutional support of the NFB in Canada and Arte in France, which have created online portals or platforms for major interactive documentary works or ‘i-docs’. According to Aston and Gaudenzi:

*Any project that starts with an intention to document the ‘real’ and that uses digital interactive technology to realize this intention can be considered an interactive documentary ... interactivity is seen as a means through which the viewer is positioned within the artefact itself, demanding him, or her, to play an active role in the negotiation of the ‘reality’ being conveyed through the i-doc. This view of interactivity requires a physical action to take place between the user/participant and the digital artefact. It involves a human computer interface, going beyond the act of interpretation to create feedback loops with the digital system itself.* (Aston & Gaudenzi, 2012, p. 126)

The only New Zealand project of this nature that I have encountered did not originate from a traditional television or film environment, has no association with a New Zealand TV broadcaster and received no public funding. *Down to the Wire* (http://downtothewire.co.nz) is an online project conceived and produced by
Wellington-based digital agency, Heyday (Heyday, 2010). Appropriately, the project tells a story of innovation; the history of New Zealand’s Internet. While not overtly labelled as documentary, in subject matter, form and content it is consistent with web documentaries, using the interactive properties of the web as a medium incorporating text, music, videos, an interactive timeline-based navigation device. The project was updated monthly during 2010 with a new instalment, used social networks extensively and provided opportunities for users to contribute. It has even adapted some of the documentary conventions of the most popular New Zealand TV documentary formats, such as the use of a high profile personality (actress Madeline Sami) as series narrator. For Heyday the project was conceived as a means of demonstrating not only technical and creative capability but the potential of new forms of media communication to engage and connect with the audience/user. Down to the Wire shows that innovation can be seen not as commercial risk but as commercial investment.

As discussed in Chapter 5, during the period of this study crowdfunding platforms have been introduced in New Zealand that have made an impact on the funding landscape for creative projects such as filmmaking. Two local crowdfunding platforms, PledgeMe and Boosted have made a significant impact in terms of providing small amounts of funding for largely self-funded projects and therefore supported innovation and diversity through enabling the production of work that may be experimental, of interest to niche audiences or made by less experienced practitioners. These platforms have also been useful in encouraging filmmakers to develop promotional and marketing skills and to establish an online presence and an audience following.

Another significant local entrant to the new marketplace of independent film distribution and marketing has been New Zealand startup Indie Reign, a distribution platform for independent filmmakers based in Hamilton, New Zealand. IndieReign offers filmmakers non-exclusive online distribution; films are uploaded by filmmakers to the IndieReign site where they can be streamed or downloaded by audiences. IndieReign take 30% of each sale in addition to a 3% transaction fee from PayPal. Founded in 2011 by New Zealander David White (who had previously established
ReelClever, a company that provides filmmakers with online tools for project management and promotion), IndieReign was a participant in a programme that provides New Zealand entrepreneurs and technology start ups with the opportunity to spend a month at the Kiwi Landing Pad in San Francisco. The Kiwi Landing Pad is an initiative supported by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and private New Zealand technology investors that aims to help New Zealand technology companies to establish and grow their businesses in the USA and provides them with access to business networks and expertise. IndieReign now has a staff of fifteen with offices in San Francisco and Noida, India in addition to Hamilton, New Zealand and has formed a partnership with major international crowdfunding platform Indiegogo, which creates a direct connection between funding and distribution for independent filmmakers.

Another local technology start up in this area is Wipster, an online service that enables video content makers to share work-in-progress video with clients and team members online. Viewers can add time-coded comments to the viewers and these comments generate a to-do list, which simplifies and speeds up workflow. Founded by filmmaker Rollo Wenlock, Wipster emerged from a business accelerator programme called Lightning Lab, based in Wellington, New Zealand. Lightning Lab is a partnership between the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, Creative HQ and a group of private investors. Start ups that are accepted into Lightning Lab undergo an intensive 12 week business incubator programme, which culminates in a ‘demo day’ where the start up companies pitch to potential investors and market partners. Through this programme Wipster attracted $600,000 in seed capital from 28 investors (Chapman-Smith, 2013) and like IndieReign the company lists an address at StartUp HQ, the home of the Kiwi Landing Pad in San Francisco.

With the increasing need for filmmakers to have an online presence – particularly to support online self-distribution and marketing – Assemble is an online service that provides filmmakers with tools to create their own film website that integrates with tools for promotion and distribution. The founder of Assemble, James Franklin is based in New Zealand and has a long association with documentary (he is also the Creative
Director of UK foundation, BRITDOC). Assemble has worked with a number of New Zealand documentary filmmakers and films such as *Brother Number One* and *How Far is Heaven* and new documentary initiative Loading Docs.\(^{34}\)

Although no longer a New Zealand-owned company, NHNZ is arguably one of New Zealand’s most successful producers of factual content and began its existence as the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation’s Natural History Unit (NHU), which later became part of TVNZ. The NHU produced many successful natural history documentaries including series such as Wild South, but when TVNZ became a State Owned Enterprise The NHU was sold to Fox International Channels, which owns the National Geographic Channel (among other international television channels). The company has since become one of the world’s leading producers of natural history content and has diversified into 3D production, archive footage sales and started a gaming division, Runaway in 2009, which specialises in natural history focused mobile games.

All of these entrepreneurial initiatives contribute to an emerging sphere of innovation in New Zealand’s screen sector that enhance opportunities for all New Zealand content producers (including documentary makers) to participate in an emerging global market for independent film and video content.

**Initiatives supported by organisations**

Another independent initiative – the first of its kind in New Zealand – is Doc Lab, a three-day intensive cross-media incubator designed to encourage filmmakers currently working on projects to actively develop a cross-media/multiplatform approach. Doc Lab was established in 2010 by Documentary Edge, an organisation run by The Documentary New Zealand Trust (a non-profit organisation promoting documentary filmmaking and advocating opportunities for New Zealand documentary filmmakers).

\(^{34}\) See chapter 7
Multiplatform production intrinsically requires a collaborative approach, as the skill set required to work across multiple platforms encompasses a tremendous depth and breadth of technical and creative knowledge. It is an approach to production that necessitates a fluency in the languages of TV, web, mobile and gaming whilst still maintaining the focus on content and not platform. This is not a task for a single individual, but a collaborative effort to be made by a team, pooling resources and skills. Doc Lab aims to provide content producers from ‘old media’ backgrounds with a greater insight into new production methods and increased awareness of new media technologies and platforms.

Doc Lab was facilitated in 2010 and 2011 by Wendy Levy, then Director of the Producers Institute for New Media Technologies at the Bay Area Video Coalition in San Francisco (BAVC). Teams of filmmakers workshop projects with the assistance of both local and international mentors with a range of expertise in the development of multiplatform content. Having participated in the Lab in 2010 as part of a filmmaking team, and in 2011 as a mentor and participant/observer, I have been able to see how the Lab functions both to expand filmmakers’ understanding of working with new media technologies and platforms and to develop a multiplatform or transmedia approach to storytelling.

While the aims of the Lab are commendable and content is excellent, this program does have its weaknesses and limitations, the most significant of which is that the Lab works in isolation, unconnected to a broader public funding program and unsupported by a broadcaster or alternative distribution platform. As the projects developed do not fit with existing public funding criteria or public media policies and lack commercial viability, the Lab is a theoretical exercise, though one generally applied to existing projects that the producers have a genuine (and often heartfelt) investment in. Consequently, my observation of Doc Lab has been that while some filmmakers have drawn some inspiration from the experience, perhaps applying their energies to the production of a complementary website that they may or may not have otherwise invested in developing, on the whole Doc Lab projects have failed to get off the ground.
and many participants seemed to express disillusionment with the limited opportunities for actual production.

**CoLab**

Doc Lab is an example of one of the many activities supported by CoLab, a “collaboratory” at Auckland University of Technology (AUT) that promotes interdisciplinary creative and research activities between researchers, industry and organisational bodies. Colab supports activities such as the Interactive Practitioners Meetup, hosts the Transmedia NZ meetup, runs the Digital Art Live programme in partnership with THE EDGE, supports various forms of innovation research and runs public workshops and events.

**Transmedia NZ**

CoLab played a pivotal role in the establishment of Transmedia NZ, an initiative that I instigated in 2011 to promote awareness of transmedia production and promote the development of a community of interest to support interdisciplinary, crossmedia/multiplatform production in New Zealand. In 2010, the first year of my PhD candidature, I was based in Melbourne where I had met many documentary makers who were interested in and engaged with multiplatform or transmedia production. I attended several events relating to transmedia and cross-platform production such as X Media Lab and Transmedia Victoria, an event organised by Australian transmedia academic and practitioner Christy Dena. On returning to New Zealand in 2011 there seemed to be comparatively little enthusiasm for or awareness of the possibilities of documentary production beyond the traditional spheres of television and film. However, at an industry event I was introduced to Frances Joseph, Co-Director of CoLab, who invited me to present alongside Gary Hayes and Fiona Milburn on Transmedia production at Envisage, a monthly Colab event. I had brought along a blank piece of paper and invited anyone interested in a regular gathering to discuss transmedia to sign up. At the end of the evening there were enough names on the sheet to make me feel that it was worth starting an informal meetup group. I bought the domain name transmedia_am (the
original name Transmedia AM was intended to reflect the morning scheduling of the meetings), put up a website and organised the first meeting at 8am on a Friday morning at a central Auckland cafe. The gathering was small and mainly consisted of documentary makers, but it was the beginning of a network that I hoped would grow to encompass practitioners from a more diverse range of creative fields. Fiona Milburn, who I had met at Envisage, became the co-director of Transmedia NZ and played a vital role in establishing and developing the organisation.

The morning meetings were soon supplemented by occasional evening events (Transmedia PM), hosted by co-working space Biz Dojo, which were more formally organised around presentations and discussion. Transmedia NZ and Virtuo NZ, a creative collective in which was a partner at the time, were asked to participate in an event called Project Connect, which was held at The Biz Dojo in August 2011. Transmedia NZ organised a ‘documentary challenge’ as part of this event and collaborated with Virtuo and MINA (Mobile Innovation Network Aotearoa) on a mobile filmmaking workshop to support the challenge. At the end of December 2011 with Virtuo I co-produced a live mobile filmmaking event Shoot Me Now, which brought together mobile filmmakers from New Zealand, France and the UK in a project for French festival le jour le plus court using a mobile livestreaming app (Qik) and a simple Wordpress website. These collaborative experimental projects and events were productive and I felt were useful in terms of exploring documentary innovation on a small scale, but my research needed more attention. In February 2012 I suffered a serious illness, which required me to cut back on some of my activities while recuperating. The community aspect of what was now known as Transmedia NZ had lost momentum and needed time and effort to become more diverse and dynamic. Fiona Milburn and I, as co-directors, decided to focus mainly on the online presence of Transmedia NZ (the website, Facebook page and Twitter account) and a fortnightly blog for online creative community The Big Idea. Rather than become formalised as an organisation, which would have had many ramifications including becoming a competitor for resources to the many existing (and struggling) media industry organizations we decided to operate as an informal network. In support of these activities we set about meeting with various media industry organisations and guilds as a form of outreach and advocacy with the aim to encourage these groups to increase
local awareness of new production, marketing and distribution practices which transmedia as a term (arguably a movement or paradigm) highlighted. Curating an ‘all media’ programme at the screen edge forum under the Transmedia NZ banner helped to foster a wider discussion of the creative and industrial opportunities of transmedia and multiplatform production, which included a masterclass with Canadian academic and practitioner Siobhan O’Flynn. Throughout 2012 and 2013 Transmedia NZ helped to organise or speak at events and run workshops in partnership with a range of organisations, culminating in a two-day transmedia conference (hosted by WIFT NZ and Unitec) featuring international guests, including Transmedia expert Jeff Gomez. Due to growing interest in transmedia, in September 2013 we reinstated a monthly event using the web platform MeetUp.com which opened up the group to more members from a range of professional backgrounds such as web or games development, digital publishing, theatre, design, advertising, education and film and television.

In the two and a half years since establishing Transmedia NZ, awareness of transmedia and other emerging media production practices beyond traditional film and broadcast models has grown significantly in New Zealand. Transmedia NZ is by no means responsible for that increased awareness, but has made an important contribution through advocacy and outreach particularly through the organisation of events that have facilitated public discussion of media innovation. Alongside other initiatives led by industry organisations that foster professional development and knowledge transfer such as Doc Lab, the Screen Edge Forum and Script to Screen’s Big Screen Symposium event, these activities all help to foster an innovation-friendly environment within a creative community of practice.

Creative New Zealand

Until 2009 the primary funding source for innovative documentary film projects was the Screen Production Innovation Fund, administered by New Zealand Film Commission and Creative New Zealand to “provide grants to emerging and experimental moving-
image makers for innovative and experimental moving-image productions” (Creative New Zealand the New Zealand Film Commission, 2008). Due to a lack of alternative funds for documentary at that time, the fund was receiving an increasing number of proposals from established documentary filmmakers for films that were not innovative or experimental but more suited to mainstream/commercial television. Consequently, the two funding bodies jointly commissioned a report in 2008, Research into New Zealand's Independent Documentary Sector, to understand the “barriers and opportunities” faced by documentary makers, and to enable these agencies to reassess their current programs and determine their future roles in relation to New Zealand documentary production. The report found that documentary makers were critical of funding and commissioning models as well as with the television environment. They felt that the documentaries produced were too homogenous and commercial, and constrained by the parameters of what constituted a ‘New Zealand story’. They also identified that experienced filmmakers were undervalued and under-utilised while inexperienced filmmakers lacked opportunities for development, with various factors making it very difficult for even experienced and well-regarded filmmakers to survive in the industry as documentary makers. The report also highlights a critical challenge for New Zealand’s documentary production ecology; a “growing need to meet multi-platform delivery requirements, including online possibilities” but emphasises that, “the potential for new revenue streams is still uncertain” (p. 15). Since this report was published, opportunities for the funding of innovative and experimental documentary works diminished even further. The Screen Production Innovation Fund was replaced with the Independent Filmmakers Fund in 2009 and was continued by CNZ until late 2010 after the withdrawal of the NZFC in late 2009. Since the disestablishment of this fund the policy has been that Creative New Zealand will only support “documentaries that focus on a particular artform or artist, to a maximum of $30,000” (Creative New Zealand, n.d.-a).

The funding category of Media Arts was introduced by CNZ in 2010,

to support a variety of artistic practices that use digital or analogue technologies within a screen-based, electronic, internet or mobile phone domain. The term “media arts” was used to include animation, experimental or
dance films, experimental sound/audio, moving image arts projects, network cultures and/or web-based arts projects. To receive funding support a media arts project must be focused on achieving arts outcomes, rather than being focused on the technology or on commercial research and development. (Creative New Zealand, 2011, p. 20)

Activities excluded from this category are Creative New Zealand included projects already supported through other government agencies or public broadcasters or the development, production or distribution of content for television or radio.

A discussion paper released by Creative New Zealand in 2011, ‘Do my arts look good on this? Media Arts and Digital Platforms’ sought feedback on how to “support and develop New Zealand media arts and the arts community’s use of digital platforms” (Creative New Zealand, 2011, p. 4). It is not clear what the outcome of the discussion paper was, but as of 2013 the category of Media Arts no longer exists, possibly incorporated within the category of Inter-Arts, which describes “projects integrate existing art forms and/or cultural arts practices into their own distinct art form with a singular artistic vision. An inter-arts project is likely to include experimental and hybrid practices, and exploratory or integrative processes” (“Artforms | Creative New Zealand,” n.d.). According to the 2013 CNZ Annual Report, Interarts accounted for only 1% of CNZ funding in the 2012/13 year and Media Arts a further 1% (Creative New Zealand, 2013, p. 17)

Considering the funding constraints relating to screen-based works and the small percentage of funding that Media Arts/ Inter-arts projects have received and the lack of clarity around strategies for digital innovation, while there is in theory some potential for innovative digital forms of documentary to receive funding from CNZ, it would not seem to be a priority. This may be especially true for work that might be perceived as fitting into NZ On Air’s Digital Fund, which has emerged as the primary funding mechanism for the development and production of public digital content.
Digital NZ

DigitalNZ is a government initiative run by the National Library of New Zealand launched in 2008 that aims to “make New Zealand digital content easier to find, share and use”. Activities undertaken by DigitalNZ include support for the creation and digitisation of New Zealand content through the Make It Digital helpdesk, which assists individuals and organisations in planning and executing digitisation projects; the DigitalNZ Search service which connects connections from over 140 partners from government, community, educational, broadcasting and cultural sectors. To support the use of public digital content, DigitalNZ runs the Mix and Mash initiative, which invites people to use New Zealand digital content and data through ‘mashups’ and remixing and takes the form of a competition. In 2013 Mix and Mash has had a greater emphasis on storytelling and as such is a unique initiative in New Zealand in facilitating online digital storytelling in forms other than web-based video. A winning entry from 2013 for example was Mihimihi by Graham Jenson, an interactive timeline that tells the story of his family’s history (Jenson, 2013). The works produced for Mix and Mash are small in scale and the initiative is mainly targetted at young people, but entries such as Mihimihi demonstrate a broader interest in the possibilities of digital storytelling that intersect with emerging trends in expanded documentary.

NZFC

In 2013 the NZFC launched a new website, which provides a comprehensive index of all NZFC films with information about each film and additional materials such as image galleries, links to production sites, press kits and study guides (where available). Additionally, The NZFC announced in its 2013 Statement of Intent that it aimed to provide a VOD player on its website in 2013/14 “so that New Zealanders can buy or rent New Zealand films online”. Although the service was yet to launch at the time of writing, terms and conditions for use of the NZ Film VOD service on the NZFC website indicated that the service would be available in New Zealand, Australia and a range of
Pacific Island territories and that the service will be available for streaming only within a 48 hour period (NZFC, n.d.).

Further to this initiative, in November 2013 the NZFC announced a digitisation project that would aim to “provide digital access to New Zealand short and feature films through newer technologies including digital theatrical formats (DCP) and also High Definition (HD) files streaming via Video on Demand (VOD) platforms” (NZFC, 2013).

The NZFC and NZ On Air have jointly supported two online film initiatives that aim to explore new modes of funding and distribution. The first project is Make My Movie, an online project that invited participants to submit a concept for a movie with a short synopsis and poster and upload it to the Make My Movie website. Participants were then urged to utilise social networks to generate public support for their film concept. An industry panel selected a shortlist of 12 concepts from the 757 entries received and the shortlisted teams were given one week to submit video pitches. A panel of four experts made a final list of four films and the public was given a casting vote of 20%. The four finalists were given two months to complete a feature film script and the winning team (announced in January 2012) had just three months to produce their film. The winning film, How to Meet Girls From a Distance, premiered at the New Zealand International Film Festival to sold-out audiences and went on to screen at a number of international film festivals and was picked up for distribution by Madman Entertainment. The film is now available on DVD and iTunes (Make My Movie, n.d.)

A second version of the project, Make My Horror Movie, was announced in May 19, 2013. Focusing on the horror genre, Make My Horror Movie is being produced in partnership with Dark Sky Films, a subsidiary of The MPI Media Group, an independent international distributor, with the aim for the project to reach an international audience (NZFC, 2013).
In 2013 The NZFC also jointly supported Loading Docs, an online initiative to support three-minute documentary shorts (co-produced by myself and Julia Parnell under the banner of Notable Pictures). This project is discussed at length in Chapter Seven.

**NZ On Air digital funding**

**The Digital Content Partnership Fund**

NZ On Air took its first cautious steps towards the exploration of ‘digital content’ beyond television broadcast in December 2007 with the establishment of The Digital Content Partnership Fund. The fund, which provided up to one million dollars in contestable funding per year over a four-year period, was experimental in the sense that few guidelines or restrictions were given to applicants. The brief for applicants was as follows:

> To encourage the widest range of innovative proposals NZ On Air is not limiting ideas to a particular target audience or genre. We are seeking genuinely original online audio/visual content that can attract and engage new audiences in significant numbers, preferably on more than one platform. The content must reflect and develop New Zealand identity and culture, and a clear understanding of and focus on a particular audience is key. While leaving the style and target audience of projects open NZ On Air is likely to favour those projects that augment our current work in the television, radio and NZ music areas. Archival, Sports or News related projects are not a priority for this fund. (NZ on Air, 2010)
As Jane Wrightson acknowledged during an interview I conducted in November 2012, the openness of the fund was to a large extent due to a lack of in-house expertise in the digital arena and uncertainty as to the fund’s purpose:

The government had made available $1 million for digital content, we thought it was a bit unclear what the money was for ... We have a great horror here, particularly in a very difficult funding environment and a very difficult economic environment, of wasting money, because it brings the whole system under a kind of microscope that isn't helpful. So for us to go into a green fields area like that we have to be quite cautious. We certainly looked overseas. There was nothing that was particularly helpful available at the time that we could just cut and paste. And to be honest every time we look overseas there isn't. And it's because the New Zealand On Air model is pretty unique. So we so we thought, in house, we’re not particularly expert in new media at all, certainly not. We looked at what Creative New Zealand On Air was up to and the answer was a little bit. But they’ve got smaller amounts of money to spend. We had discussions with the broadcasters who had said, ‘fund my website’. We said, ‘not sure that that's what it's for’. ‘Fund content on my website then’; ‘We’ll have a think about that too’... and then we thought, we actually don't know. (J.Wrightson, personal communication, November 26, 2012)

Neither decision makers nor content makers had a clear sense of what the fund was for, and the lack of strategic direction and absence of specific objectives also meant there were no clear measures for success (or failure) and little emphasis on innovation. The fund was also administered in much the same way as a standard television RFP, with timeframes and budgets that did not necessarily translate well to other media and platforms. As one submitter from a ‘new media’ background states in feedback cited in NZ On Air’s own review of the fund at the conclusion of its four-year term:
Overall the New Media Fund [sic] has been a frustration to those who work in the area. It has basically been unobtainable. It has been geared towards old media practitioners and it seems most of the awards have been to the old school. In general the fund system works too slowly and is too unwieldy... [for smaller scale projects]. (Richard Naylor cited in Leeuwenberg, 2012, p. 9)

Despite its limitations, The Digital Content Partnership Fund did support a few outstanding projects, the most notable of which is Reservoir Hill (KHF Media, n.d.), a highly immersive interactive multiplatform teen drama series (using mobile as well as television broadcast and online platforms and incorporating social media and participatory elements). Reservoir Hill was highly acclaimed internationally for its cutting-edge innovation, and in 2010 was awarded an International Digital Emmy and the Telecommunications Users Association of New Zealand (TUANZ) Innovation Award for best mobile application of the year. TUANZ judges described Reservoir Hill as "A highly interactive multi-platform product with significant export potential and a high level of telecommunication input" ("Textual healing," n.d.), and indeed in 2013 it was announced that Sweden’s biggest broadcasting network, SVT had acquired the rights to remake Reservoir Hill ("Reservoir Hill gets ground-breaking remake deal in Sweden," n.d.). Yet, the project stands apart as the most developed multiplatform content venture in New Zealand, unparalleled since. In the first year of the Digital Content Partnership Fund’s existence NZ On Air was not yet able to fund non-broadcast content,35 therefore projects funded in the first year of the fund required a broadcast partnership but in subsequent years the broadcaster-commitment requirement was lifted (Leeuwenberg, 2012). The removal of the broadcast partnership requirement facilitated a critical turning point for the direction of digital content development in New Zealand, away from the broadcaster-centred multiplatform public media model adopted in countries such as Australia, the UK and Canada and towards what I describe as a post-broadcast multiplatform model.

35. This required an amendment to the Broadcasting Act
After its initial four-year trial period NZ On Air commissioned Brenda Leeuwenberg, an experienced digital consultant, to conduct a review of Digital Content Partnership Fund in 2012. Leeuwenberg’s report evaluated the outcomes of strengths and weaknesses of the fund to date and outlined the pros and cons of either discontinuing or continuing the fund. While Leeuwenberg identified some points in favour of discontinuation — such as a savings on money and resources for NZ On Air, and the potential for the integration of digital initiatives into standard content proposals — overall the report found the alternative far more beneficial. Leeuwenberg identified the fund as being one of the few opportunities in New Zealand to support innovation and new ideas and that the fund provided “a creative and non-mainstream outlet” that counterbalanced the increasingly mainstream nature of the content supported by NZ On Air. The critical success that could result from such innovation (as has been the case with Reservoir Hill) was also identified as an important benefit, alongside the development of New Zealand content creation expertise and the importance for NZ On Air of staying current and catering to the increasing numbers of people not watching live television. (Leeuwenberg, 2012, pp. 15-16).

The Digital Media Fund

Brenda Leeuwenberg, who had previously been the Project Director for NZ On Screen and had been involved in Internet-based projects for many years, subsequently took on a part-time role with NZ On Air as Digital Advisor. The appointment of Leeuwenberg as Digital Advisor meant that NZ On Air finally had the in-house resources to dedicate to more project management and mentoring for digital projects, thus ensuring a better chance of success and value for money. Based on Leeuwenberg’s evaluation of the Digital Content Partnership Fund and research into comparable international initiatives, a new fund, the Digital Media Fund (DMF) was launched in 2012. The new fund was comprised (in 2012 and 2013) of two strands, DMF Kickstart, a $1,000,000 fund for “larger projects to support new content that pushes the envelope of creative storytelling, and explores options such as transmedia or multichannel approaches” and DMF Ignite, a $200,000 fast turnaround small project fund [for projects of up to $45,000] to support digital initiatives for niche audiences or small scale projects and app development” (NZ On Air, 2012). The revised fund has a clearer focus and more defined criteria, aims and
deliverables with a particular emphasis on reaching niche target audiences or communities.

Projects funded by the Digital Media Fund in 2012 and 2013 are as follows:

**Kickstart 2012**

2012 - *The Factory* - a 20-part musical web series set in South Auckland, $600,000

2012 - *Coconet.TV* - an online Pacific community, $499,272

**Kickstart 2013**

*Road Trip* - interactive docu-drama, KHF Media, $300,000

*Sign Ninja* - web-based interactive game, Deaf Aotearoa, $122,000

*Yeti* - comedy webseries, Semi-Professional, $100,000

*Flat3 Series 3* - comedy webseries, Flat3 Productions, $100,000

*High Road Series 2* - comedy webseries, Tomorrowland, $100,000

*Outward Bound* - comedy webseries, Longline Productions, $100,000

**Ignite 2012**

*Woodville* online comedy series, $44,819

*Let's Get Inventin' iPad app*, $45,000

*The Big Sing 2012* competition finale, 18,000

*HookUps* in The NZ Herald and the app store, $44,950

*KiwiABC* - iPhone app - coming soon, $34,500

**Ignite 2013**

*HEART* - Heritage Education Augmented Reality Tours, tablet and smart phone app, Kiwi AR, $45,000
If These Walls Could Talk, mini-documentary webseries, Trustme Ltd, $42,523

Little Legends, app development, Luke Nola & Friends, $44,080

Nia's Extra Ordinary Life, 12 x 3.5 min webisodes, Brown Sugar Apple Grunt Productions, $45,000

The Pantograph Punch, multimedia content stream, The Pantograph Punch Trust, $30,715

Loading Docs, online short documentary initiative, Notable Pictures, $45,000

(NZ On Air, n.d.).

In 2012 the Kickstart fund was focused on Pacific Audiences with just two large-scale projects funded and Kickstart in 2013 funded a broader range of projects at a reduced funding level. The Ignite fund has supported a broader range of content, facilitating content diversity and innovation research and development. Funding for apps such as the Let’s Get Inventin’ app and Little Legends have supported the development of multiplatform extensions for children’s content that would be otherwise be unlikely to be supported by a broadcaster, but which offer significant value for audiences.

Whereas the Digital Content Partnership Fund did not support any documentary projects, the DMF has supported several: Interactive docu-drama The Road Trip (Kickstart 2013), mini-documentary webseries If These Walls Could Talk (Ignite 2013) and short online documentary initiative Loading Docs (Ignite 2013). In addition to these projects the DMF has supported comedy, arts and culture and children’s projects, all of which serve to broaden the range of local content available to New Zealand audiences.

With the Kickstart fund’s The Factory and Ignite’s Woodville and HookUps achieving some popular and critical success in 2012 and 2013 (in addition to self-funded project Flat3), the 2013 Kickstart funding round focused more on webseries. In 2014 the DMF will have a separate call for proposals for webseries in addition to the two existing
funding strands and Kickstart will have a more specific Transmedia focus. While NZ On Air’s digital content funding strategy had a slow gestation, the increasingly focused approach of the DMF sets a clear agenda for producers to follow while allowing some room for experimentation.

Although NZ On Air’s Digital Strategy states that the new Digital Media Fund will “base criteria on support for smart, innovative, experimental or educational projects that embrace the special opportunities offered by digital media, including transmedia or multi-channel projects” it also states that the fund is “not be used for basic digital media projects that augment broadcast content, or to create platforms; it will be used to create new digital content”. These stated actions suggest that NZ On Air’s approach to the funding of digital media content is not tied to the television broadcast-centred partnerships that have characterised the development of multiplatform public service content elsewhere, but at the same time it does not propose to invest boldly in technology itself:

> Where technology is an issue we tend to follow, not lead, so the market bears the primary risk and public funding is not wasted on unsuccessful platforms or technology approaches.

> But we should also foster creative innovation and experimentation. This is getting more difficult in the mainstream broadcast world – a challenging economic climate can lead to risk aversion 1 so the online world can provide new opportunities.

> Above all, we follow the audience. The internet can help us to reach previously hard to access audiences. The audience is increasingly online. (NZ On Air, 2012d, p. 3).

Herein lies a fundamental tension between the priorities of platform (or delivery) and content that may seriously undermine the efficacy of NZ On Air’s digital strategy in offsetting the limitations of the commercial broadcasting environment. As the statement
above declares, NZ On Air acknowledges both the risk-averse nature of mainstream broadcasters and the shifting of audience attention to the online environment, but does not seek to position itself as a market leader. Such a role is a statutory responsibility for many public service broadcasters, particularly in addressing the changing needs of audiences in the transition from broadcasting to ‘post-broadcasting’ media environments (Bennett & Strange, 2011) (Cunningham, 2013) (Flew, 2011).

While the DMF is fulfilling an important public service media role in delivering content that is diverse, innovative and offers cultural value, the development of multiplatform content that is supported by broadcasters should still be encouraged or else an alternative public service platform for delivery should be developed. NZ On Air’s power to exert influence over broadcasters to take risks and consider other platforms is limited, but the apps produced by Luke Nola and Friends funded by Ignite are examples of how the fund might be used to encourage broadcasters to support multiplatform innovation. The funding of webseries and other online content provides possibilities for both diversity and innovation that are lacking in the commercial broadcasting environment, but the challenge for these projects is in connecting audiences to content without the direct delivery channels in the way that a broadcaster can provide.

Annie Murray, Head of External Programming at Maori Television describes standalone digital content that is not connected to a broadcaster or other distribution channel with an established audience as “tropical islands without an airport or a bridge”:

You’ve got no way of pushing the audience [there] in the way you have with a TV programme or a newspaper or magazine that has a website or some kind of app or whatever it is, where you will continually reminded that you need to use that thing online, because you've got the biggest thing in front of you. When you don’t have the biggest thing in front of you — the programme, the newspaper, the magazine — it sits out there in front of you like a tropical island. And who goes there? (A.Murray, personal communication, December 4, 2012).
NZ On Screen

Alongside the establishment of the Digital Partnership Innovation Fund in 2007 NZ On Air established NZ On Screen, a new initiative to make an archive of New Zealand television, film and music video content accessible to the public. The NZ On Screen website launched in October 2008 and is completely funded by NZ On Air at approximately $1million per year without any commercial advertising or sponsorship. The site is now an extensive archive of content, supported by a rich database of information including production synopses and credits, interviews and links to external sites. The interviews filmed by NZ On Screen for the ScreenTalk section of the site are a significant resource, offering information about individuals as well as projects that, in many cases, cannot be found anywhere else. The site was extremely useful to me as a researcher, allowing ready access to a range of New Zealand documentary content from the early days of local television onwards as well as information about key figures in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology. NZ On Screen is an initiative that is especially valuable in the emerging context of New Zealand’s post-public service broadcasting landscape and provides the public with a platform that ensures local content may be freely accessed. A sister project, AudioCulture was launched in May 2013 to offer a similar/complementary online resource for New Zealand music.

In 2013, in partnership with the NZFC and DigitalNZ, NZ On Screen produced Reel Choice, an iPhone app that showcases NZ On Screen content. When I last accessed the app (on an iPhone 4s) in January 2014 it was slow to load, the sound did not work and it lacked a search function, thus making it a service with limited value for the user. While NZ On Screen website does not currently have a mobile site, its player does function on mobile devices.

The Wireless

The Wireless is a Radio New Zealand initiative supported by NZ On Air that launched in 2013 to “produce inspiring, insightful and entertaining stories for New Zealanders
who have grown up in the digital age” (The Wireless, n.d.). According to Marcus Stickley, The Wireless’ Project Leader and Editor, the initiative offers young people a public media platform for the digital age that encompasses multiple media forms:

*Our work was born out of idea of a youth radio network, which has been kicked around in New Zealand for the past 20 years. But the time for a radio network has passed. We live in an age where you can tell a story anyway you want on one platform – the internet. You’re going to find stories told in video, photos, audio and text. Some will be told in two types of media, some will be told in all four, or maybe even more depending on where technology takes us.* (Stickley, 2013)

However, despite the promise of The Wireless as a multimedia, let alone multiplatform initiative, most of the content seems to be blog-based text and photos, with very little video and surprisingly (for a Radio New Zealand initiative) no original audio. The Radio New Zealand site itself is far more multiplatform in nature, extending or complementing broadcast content with online audio, podcasts, and online news in text form (as well as audio). As an innovation initiative then, The Wireless has been somewhat disappointing, but the project was in its infancy at the time of writing and will hopefully grow into its potential.

**Online Rights and Public Access**

Following the publication of the Digital Strategy (2012) NZ On Air issued a discussion paper November 2012 seeking feedback on changes to online rights policies for NZ On Air funded content (NZ On Air, 2012f). The paper proposed that content fully funded by NZ On Air should be made available to NZ On Screen or an alternative site indefinitely (p. 6) and that for other levels of investment programmes should be freely available on demand on the commissioning broadcaster website during the license period or “for a reasonable period of time” (according to the level of NZ On Air investment) and that a permanent online home for content should be secured within a set number of years of first broadcast. (P.7). Various options for an online home for

---
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content are explored in the paper, including broadcaster sites, NZ On Screen, global video upload sites such as Vimeo or YouTube, producer sites (i.e. production companies), The Film Archive and Archives New Zealand/The National Library and other commercial content platforms such as Ziln and Quickflix. Responses to the paper were published in May 2013 in a document in which NZ On Air summarised and commented on responses and further outlined developments regarding proposed policy changes. This document highlights the key question that NZ On Air is addressing through the consultation process: “in a digital era, what rights are secured for the public by the investment of public funding?” Predictably, while the discussion paper elicited positive responses from the two non-industry organisations that submitted (Creative Commons and the University of Otago), the eight industry organisations that responded to the paper were concerned about the impact that changes to online rights would have on producers. As an appendix to this document, two related Government activity streams are identified: The development of the NZ Government Open Access and Licensing Framework (NZGOAL), which “seeks to standardise the licensing of government copyright works for re-use using Creative Commons NZ Law licences” and the ‘Building Innovation and IP’ stream of the Government’s Business Growth Agenda, which “aims to grow New Zealand’s economy by encouraging and enabling investment in research and development, and lifting the value of public investments in science and research”. These activities put NZ On Air’s reevaluation and development of policy for online rights management into a broader context of a digital strategy for New Zealand across government agencies that emphasises the accessibility, usability and re-usability of public digital content. Internationally, governments have been forced to re-examine policies relating to content, information and intellectual property rights in accordance with the radically changing dynamics of media ecologies in a post-networked era, resulting in such innovations as Open Data that operate on a commons-based approach to media. Similarly, the very notion of Public Service Broadcasting is undergoing a significant revolution (and arguably a resurgence) as in a post-broadcasting era the transition is made from Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media.

*While much of the literature of the 1980s and 1990s was pessimistic about the future of public service broadcasting, viewing it as irrevocably caught in the forces of dissolution such as channel proliferation, tightened public funding, and...*
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the loss of a once-clear sense of mission...the 2000s have seen many public service broadcasters around the world identify opportunities for reinvention in the context of media convergence and multiplatform content delivery (Flew, 2011, p. 215)

Just as NZ On Air provided a unique form of public service intervention in New Zealand’s highly commercial environment when it was established in 1989, the agency now stands to play an important role in ensuring that local content remains accessible as content increasingly becomes paywalled, or worse, simply disappears from view. As the Creative Commons submission to the Online Rights Discussion Paper argues:

Currently, most of New Zealand’s publicly funded or publicly housed cultural heritage is unavailable for reuse by New Zealanders. Despite ongoing digitisation projects, these works are neither commercially available nor publicly reusable. This means that creators who want to build on the works of the past — from student filmmakers to non-profit documentary producers — are either forced to reinvent the wheel or go through a difficult process of asking permission, even when the original works are publicly funded and publicly housed and its creators are long deceased. (NZ On Air, 2012c, p. 8)

For producers however, the proposals outlined in NZ On Air’s discussion paper posed a significant threat to the rights and sustainability of producers within the screen industry. The response from The Gibson Group, for example (one of New Zealand’s most prominent production companies), claims that producers must forego income in order to relinquish rights to NZ On Air, no matter how long a programme has been in circulation. It also argues that producers will be disincentivised to invest in innovation or risk because of the removal of the long tail earning potential of projects where innovation is subsidised by producer investment, not broadcaster or NZ On Air

37. A key example of this is the NZ documentary strand on TVNZ’s Heartland channel on Sky, as discussed in Chapter 3
investment (p.3). Greenstone’s submission similarly argues that “taxpayers” (NZ On Air) do not fund “creation” of content:

NZOA funding enables programmes to be made. But it is the ideas and energy of producers and their creative teams which generate these ideas and bring them to life - at their own expense.

Producers are generally not able to recoup the huge costs of developing programme ideas. The work is carried out ‘on spec’, and most ideas are never funded.

Producers need to retain and control their IP, because this is the only way to recoup expenses and/or make a profit. (p. 19).

A third document relating to online rights was published by NZ On Air in October 2013 further articulates the need for a policy shift, specifically identifying two reasons why the securing of public access to content in return for public investment is in the public interest:

The rise of online viewing options, new infrastructure, and changing audience behaviour means that content funding policy needs to be carefully considered against significant environmental change.

Second, the rise of viewing options where content can be locked behind a paywall, either broadcast (e.g. Sky’s Heartland channel) or online (e.g. aggregator services), means a further public policy issues arises around access for publicly funded content. (NZ On Air, 2013c, p. 1).

For producers, the potential loss of income that an extension of online viewing opportunities might entail remains a valid concern and NZ On Air must balance the interests of audience/taxpayers, producers and broadcasters. Data analysis presented by
NZ On Air in the October 2013 paper finds that, “over 70% of content funded by NZ On Air may not earn any revenue at all and less than 10% of funded projects earn revenue around seven years after being funded” (p. 6), but also notes that “the online long tail for television sales is no yet well documented” and “online aggregators will provide new opportunities”, anticipating that “the real growth potential is not in New Zealand’s small domestic marketplace but in access to global audiences”. NZ On Air’s revised proposed framework for the online availability of content is therefore scaled according to investment and aims to allow rights holders the opportunity to fully exploit revenue opportunities during a five to eight year window. Content fully funded by NZ On Air would be freely available on the commissioning broadcaster’s website on-demand for at least a month after first broadcast and a non-exclusive online home (most likely NZ On Screen) would be secured after five years of first broadcast and online access may be geoblocked where the programme has been sold internationally (P. 7). Content with significant partial funding from NZ On Air (50% - 90%) and minority funding (less than 50% of the production budget) would adhere to a sliding scale of accessibility with the minimum requirement for content with minority funding being a minimum of one month free availability on the broadcaster’s on-demand site and “a free-access online home … secured within ten years from first broadcast” (p. 8).

While the shift to greater accessibility and the concept of a permanent online home for local content is of great cultural importance, the implications for producers and licence-holders are significant and the issues entailed in such a transition are highly complex. NZ On Air has approached the situation with according caution, allowing time for public consultation. According to the paper published in October 2013, a forum will be held in early 2014 to facilitate further discussion with stakeholders.

**Conclusion**

Although audiences increasingly engage in time-shifting and screen-shifting practices that disrupt the one to many flow of television, broadcasting will continue to dominate our media ecology for some time. However, the increasing role of new platforms in our
media consumption should be recognised as we re-evaluate current funding, production and distribution models. While the adoption of a multiplatform approach to media production and delivery has been hindered by the intensely competitive broadcasting framework and the lack of a moderating or market-leading influence of a public service media provider, post-broadcast possibilities for public media (including documentary) are being explored. New Zealand’s media ecology presents many challenges for innovation, but also opportunities. Due to New Zealand’s small size, closely connected networks and growing support for entrepreneurial innovation (through tech incubators and accelerators such as Lightning Lab and the Kiwi Launchpad for example), change can occur relatively quickly. Even government agencies, such as NZ On Air can prove to be responsive in certain circumstances, as can be seen in the development of the Digital Media Fund. New Zealand’s documentary production ecology is not entirely lacking in innovation – as I believed at an earlier point in this study – but innovation looks very different compared to environments where a significant public service media provider acts as a market-leader with an emphasis on innovation research and development, such as the NFB, BBC or ABC and SBS. In New Zealand, innovation is a far more rhizomatic and dispersed, coming from a groundswell of producer-led and audience-fuelled alternatives to traditional funding and distribution models such as crowdfunding and the use of social media and online distribution; the emergence of entrepreneurial intermediaries such as IndieReign, Wipster and Assemble who support the ‘DIY’ film distribution movement; the network of industry organisations lobbying for policy change and sharing knowledge; and the work by government agencies such as NZ On Air and NZFC to support the transition to an accessible and universal multiplatform media environment.
As I have described in the introductory chapter, the initial provocation for this research project was my perception of a comparative lack of innovation in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology. Having already had some involvement in New Zealand documentary production prior to commencing my PhD candidature (in research, production management and outreach) and having experimented with digital interactive documentary (through my MA studies and an applied graduate diploma in digital media production), I naturally approached this research from a position of some personal investment. While striving to be objective in the analysis of the dynamics of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology and keeping an open mind about the value of innovation and the different forms that innovation might take as appropriate to a specific environment, I also had a subjective interest in the development of documentary as a researcher, practitioner, audience member and citizen. This chapter presents a discussion of practice-led research and the benefits and pitfalls herein, outlines my experiences in engaging in participant observation and the development of documentary innovation projects. The central focus of this chapter is a case study of Loading Docs, a project that has been successful in gaining funding and which I am currently co-producing. While Transmedia NZ, the organisation I founded and co-direct (with Fiona Milburn), also constitutes an important dimension of practice-led research, this initiative has been discussed in some detail in Chapter Six and will not be revisited here.

While my original intention had been to immerse myself in and engage with New Zealand’s documentary ecology as much as possible through interviews, participation in
industry events, a research blog and Twitter account, I found it increasingly different to draw a line between my own creative practice and industry involvement and my research. I began to devote a significant amount of time to developing non-traditional documentary projects and became an active advocate for the development of transmedia production practices in New Zealand as the founder and co-director of Transmedia NZ. I became increasingly involved in the development of initiatives to further innovation in documentary in New Zealand, such as mentoring at Documentary Edge’s Doc Lab, curating the All Media programme and assisting with the organisation and planning of the Screen Edge Forum, speaking on the future of distribution at the Big Screen Symposium industry event as well as developing (in collaboration with others) a number of documentary projects that will be discussed further in this chapter.

Although I had initial reservations about the blurring of boundaries between research and practice and the positions of objective researcher and subjective participant and advocate, I came to see practice-based research as a constructive approach to exploring the research problem that I had identified (the lack of innovation in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology). As a participant in the CCI Winter School at QUT in 2012 I had the opportunity to discuss my increasing level of participation in the New Zealand documentary production ecology and received strong support and encouragement for my practice-based approach to research. I was also challenged (particularly by Jason Potts) to consider projects such as Transmedia NZ and Loading Docs as innovation experiments. Given the success of both of these initiatives as interventions and enquiries into the documentary production ecology, I see great value in future practice-led research projects (ideally in partnership with public funders or industry) that would act as innovation experiments integrating research aims and methodologies into project design and planning from the development stage.

My involvement in the development of documentary projects during the course of my PhD research has been invaluable in examining the challenges that New Zealand faces in producing new forms of documentary currently being explored elsewhere (such as online, mobile or multiplatform documentary). My experience of collaborating with documentary makers and other creative practitioners, working through development and
funding processes and embarking on the production of a publicly funded project has greatly enriched my understanding of the dynamics of the documentary production ecology. I have aimed to be as open and transparent as possible about the subjectivity of my position as a participant researcher/practitioner and to respect the privileged position I have had in terms of access to information. Consequently, I have not discussed every project I have worked on in detail in this chapter or elsewhere in this thesis because of the need to respect the intellectual property rights of my collaborators. Similarly, I have not cited or discussed in depth some of the interview material gathered in my research where the candid nature of disclosure might be taken out of context. As a researcher, I have found myself in a position of analysing and critiquing the funding bodies that, as a practitioner, I (and my collaborators) rely on to support current and future projects. I do, however have confidence in the objectivity of NZ On Air and the NZFC and, as I will discuss further in this chapter, I have had some (positive) experience of NZ On Air engaging with and responding to a paper that I published during my candidature that was relatively critical of some aspects of funding policy. Therefore, while the role of researcher/practitioner presents unique critical, ethical and career challenges, it is my view that these may be successfully navigated provided the researcher/practitioner maintains a consistent position of open disclosure of professional and personal interests in all interactions and activities.

**Participation**

I originally proposed to create a research website as a way to engage publicly with the wider documentary production community in New Zealand and to communicate my research aims, methods and progress. I had also planned to develop this research website into a form of publication and had been granted ethics approval to record participant interviews on video and publish excerpts on the website. My objective was that the audiovisual record of my research would be more accessible to the documentary production community and a wider audience and I felt this reflexive and open approach reflected the nature of my research with its emphasis on innovation and practice-led research.
I set up a website (www.documentarynz.net) and a twitter account (@nzdocumentary) and maintained a blog on the site from February 2011 to August 2012. By September 2012 I had too many other commitments to give adequate time to the blog, which had mainly proved effective as an online research journal for my own reference, serving as a document of events as they occurred. As I moved into the final writing up stage of my thesis and also needed to put more time into other projects and teaching work I decided to let the blog rest. By this time I also had reservations about publishing my interview material, even with the full permission of participants for several reasons. Firstly, although the interviews proved to be extremely useful in gaining direct insights into perceptions of innovation and change within the documentary production ecology and to identify issues that merited further enquiry, these insights may have been deeper had participants not been filmed. Even though participants had final approval of any footage that would be published online, in most cases the presence of the camera made interviewees more conscious of what was being said and limited the degree of candour that might have existed otherwise. None of the documentary makers interviewed expressed a preference not to be filmed, however, but this was not the case for members of other groups. In the end, the video interview archive was limited primarily to documentary makers, meaning that any audio visual product of the research would be one-dimensional and not reflective of the ecological focus of my thesis. Also, conscious that the interview process was time-consuming for the participant, I would try to take as little time as possible to set up, and although I recorded on a high definition camera with a tripod and good quality microphone I did not use external lighting or take great care with locations or framing; my first priority was the research interview and I wanted to the camera to be as unobtrusive as possible. On the whole I felt the resulting interviews were not of sufficient quality to make public, and having chosen to prioritise the interviews as primary research material first and foremost, publication in another form would be taking the interviews out of context, despite my open intention to create a public audio visual record. The process of filming was valuable in many respects however, such as helping to capture nuances that may be missed with an audio recording. The interviews also helped me to identify a topic for further exploration. One of the most interesting aspects of the interviews with documentary makers were their views on the craft of documentary making, which is not a topic that I have been able to cover directly in this thesis. My intention, therefore, is to return to this subject as a
postdoctoral project and to re-film interviews specifically with this purpose with a professional crew.

In addition to using the blog and twitter account to maintain as a means of publicly communicating my research activities I endeavoured to be present at as many industry meetings, conferences, symposia and events as possible and presented my research in 2012 at DOC2DOC, a work in progress event for documentary makers run by the Screen Directors Guild of New Zealand. Having been involved in Documentary Edge’s Doc Lab in 2010 as a participant (as discussed in the previous chapter) I continued to be involved in the Lab in 2011 and 2012 as a mentor and played an active curatorial role in the organisation of the Screen Edge Forum in 2012, an annual industry conference that runs alongside the Documentary Edge Film Festival. I also participated in a panel at the first Big Screen Symposium in 2012, presenting on the topic of distribution in the digital age. While time consuming, these activities allowed me to be fully immersed in the subject of my research and to be exposed to a broad range of views within industry that would not have been possible otherwise.

In 2012 the first paper from my PhD research was published in the online journal in Platform: Journal of Media and Communication (A. Jackson, 2012); I experienced a moment of great foreboding when I was informed (having announcing the publication on Twitter and my research blog) that the paper had been forwarded to staff at NZ On Air, as the paper’s release coincided with a review of the Digital Content Partnership Fund and the early stages of the review of documentary funding policy. The paper was, I thought, highly critical of a lack of innovation in New Zealand television and identified key weaknesses in funding policy and the Digital Content Partnership Fund. I expected the worst, but was surprised to find that NZ On Air quoted from that paper and also from a blog post I had written on Transmedia published on The Big Idea website in guidelines for applicants to the Digital Content Fund (NZ On Air, 2012e).

In the latter part of 2012 I also participated in an industry discussion facilitated by Documentary Edge which resulted in a combined submission to the NZ On Air
Documentary Funding Policy Discussion Paper, and also contributed my own independent submission, which focused on innovation (see appendix page 253).

While academic activities such as the annual ANZCA conference, the CCI Winter School and University of Auckland and University of Melbourne Work in Progress days and seminars exposed me to new ideas and provided a valuable sounding board for my research, the industry and community activities described above provided me with opportunities to engage with and learn from the documentary production community in ways that were equally valuable.

**Practice-led research**

I have found much value in McIntyre and Kerrigan’s work on practice-led research drawing on Csikszentmihaly’s systems model of creativity, (Kerrigan, 2013), (McIntyre, 2001)(Kerrigan & McIntyre, 2010), which offers a critical approach to the examination of creative practice within a systems model akin to ecology that examines internal and external creative forces. I have not formally adopted the methodology of practitioner-based enquiry that Kerrigan and McIntyre have explored in depth, but have drawn on the notion that through self-reflexivity the researcher is able to offer an insider’s view of the creative and social processes of practice as a unique contribution to knowledge.

Jon Dovey has similarly argued for a more holistic approach to Media Studies that embraces the role of researcher as participant, able to experiment, observe and document new approaches to media practice, thereby contributing to media knowledge in significant and meaningful ways:

*In the Long Tail all kinds of media texts are finding their own audiences. The Screen Media market place is opening up on an unprecedented scale. In this context then it could be argued that knowledge exchange becomes a matter of*
promoting diversity, fostering experiment, looking for novel ways in which producers and audiences can take advantage of the new market opportunities. If such a strategy were able to succeed it would be because it put creative risk, experiment and networked collaboration at its heart. In this light, the prescription for screen media practice is clear. Producers in the academy will continue to insist on the research value of their work and develop peer networks that can guarantee such claims. A body of work will gradually accumulate over the next ten years in which the ‘what if ’questions and creative processes are made as transparent as possible. Before too long this body of work will be available online in its entirety; in the Long Tail of the media marketplace it will become a site for researchers, students, teachers and industry people to go to think about contemporary moving image culture. It will become a resource, a place that is guaranteed to be provocative and articulate. As such, the work will be making a knowledge exchange contribution by becoming a powerful advocate of clearly explained and well-grounded experimentation that plays a significant role in an ecology of media knowledge. (Dovey, 2008, p. 255)

My role and aims as a researcher motivated me to be involved in projects that explored new forms of documentary innovation in the context of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology and facilitated a degree of creative risk-taking and experimentation that I may not have pursued otherwise. In this sense I see great value in the role of participant researcher/practitioner in the generation, support and critical reflection of creative practice.

Development

During the period of my candidature I was involved in the development of a number of online/interactive documentary projects. Most of these projects did not make it past the proposal stage, but two projects have received funding and are currently in production.
BNO Digital (Occasional Productions)

In 2010 I assisted with the development of a funding application for a crossplatform extension of the documentary film Brother Number One, submitted to the NZ On Air Digital Content Partnership Fund by the film’s producer and director Annie Goldson with the support of James Franklin, then creative director at Pixeco, and myself as outreach director. ‘BNO Digital’ proposed to be the first cross-platform documentary project in New Zealand, extending the television and film versions of Brother Number One with a website that would support the films release and would also feature three standalone interactive extensions: An interactive ‘story map’ that would bring to life the film’s complex historical and political themes; an online ‘testimony room’ that would house an archive of testimonies of Khmer Rouge survivors (including interviews with local survivors I had filmed during a summer research scholarship); and an interactive study guide that would use the above media elements as a resource for students, developed in accordance with local curriculum guidelines. To support the online and film elements of the film we also proposed to stage a public exhibition timed to coincide with the film’s theatrical release and television broadcast that would feature a video installation of testimonies alongside an exhibition of Tuol Sleng photographs and artworks.

Although our application argued that the project would provide and innovative and pioneering model for other New Zealand filmmakers and pointed out that a 360-degree approach to documentary production was considered almost mandatory in the UK, US and Australia, the project was not successful in gaining funding. However, with assistance from the University of Auckland, producer/director Annie Goldson was able to develop the proposed interactive study guide as part of a website built on a new film promotion and distribution platform, Assemble (formerly Pixeco).

In 2012 I worked on two (unsuccessful) interactive documentary proposals with Notable Pictures for the newly introduced Kickstart Digital Media Fund (which replaced the Digital Partnership Fund).  In 2012 DMF Kickstart was a $1,000,000 fund to be spent
on more two or three “multi-channel or transmedia projects” with a focus on Pacific audiences. I had previously been working with a documentary producer on a proposal to develop an historical documentary commissioned for television into a transmedia project to submit to the Kickstart fund, but the announcement that the fund would target Pacific audiences meant that project was not relevant to Kickstarter’s aims and the project was shelved. However, as Notable Pictures specialises in creating factual content for special interest audiences the Pacific focus presented an excellent opportunity to explore interactive and online content production and in 2012 I collaborated on the development of two proposals for the NZ On Air Kickstart fund:

Words from the Wise (Notable Pictures)

*Words from the Wise* was a proposal for an online project to be made in collaboration with the New Zealand Federation of Multicultural Councils (and with design and technical support from Wellington organisation, Enspiral), which aimed to bridge gaps between generations and cultures by exploring the life stories and wisdom of a group of ethic elders. The proposed *Words from the Wise* website would be a visually rich and immersive experience combining photography, animation, live action video and an evocative soundscape to create a ‘world’ for each elder that could be explored in a non-linear, user-defined way. The site would also function as a community hub, where individuals could seek advice about their own personal difficulties and dilemmas, drawing on the wisdom and experience of elders.

The aims of the project were:

1. **To provide migrant communities with a space where their cultures and identity are visible; where they can share their values and experiences with their community and others, promoting greater understanding and communication across cultures and between generations.**

2. **To record the stories and wisdom of an older generation in a digital format as an accessible, living archive.**
3. To function as an intra-cultural conversation via the community forum where each migrant community will manage their own space and community members can anonymously seek advice or assistance that it may be difficult for them to access in their physical communities.

4. Bringing older computer-illiterate people online in an engaging and personally relevant way.

Polyswag Nation (Notable Pictures)

Polyswag Nation was a proposal for a serious game/documentary, which we described as a ‘docu-game’ which would feature internationally renowned New Zealand hip hop dancer and Choreographer Parris Goebel and the dancers from her Auckland-based studio. The technical partner for the project was the Auckland-based games agency InGame. Capitalising on the popularity of hip hop and street dance, particularly within the Pasifika community, Polyswagg Nation would be a multiplatform experience consisting of an online docu-game in which players would choreograph live action hip hop avatars, online video dance tutorials with Parris Goebel, a series of documentary shorts on the dancers from The Palace Studio and an open-call dance competition via Facebook and YouTube. The project aimed to promote dance as a healthy lifestyle activity and highlight the dancers as role models for Pasifika youth. As players worked through levels of the choreography game in which they would learn more about the dancer’s personal stories and have the opportunity to participate through the online dance tutorials and Facebook challenge.

While it is impossible to second guess the reasons for the success or failure of any kind of proposal without drawing on specific feedback, in retrospect I can identify some reasons why, in my opinion, these three proposals may have been unsuccessful. All three were complex multiplatform projects of significant scale and there has been no precedence for the funding and production of work with similar levels of multiplatform or transmedia execution in New Zealand. Most projects funded have focused on one key platform with, perhaps with a social media extension or a complementary app such as the web series The Factory or HookUps. Given the failures of some of the projects in
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the early days of the Digital Media Partnership Fund it may seem prudent to take a more conservative approach to funding larger budget digital projects, focusing on targeted projects with a higher certainty of delivery. Projects that require significant original technical development such as interactive game elements and involve the coordination of production and delivery across multiple platforms carry a much greater risk of failure and could be difficult to manage within a limited budget. Of the three projects BNO Digital would have carried the least risk with the greatest certainty of delivery, but at the time the proposal was submitted (in 2010) the project would still have seemed ambitious and perhaps there was reluctance to contribute additional funding to a project that had already received support from both NZ On Air and the NZFC.

NOP.doc/Joystick Orchestra (Interactive Documentary)

http://www.joystickorchestra.com

Collaboration with DOP director Nolwenn Hugain Lacire, web developer/interactive designer Jeff Nusz and video editor Blandine Massit du Biest

In 2011 I began to film the rehearsals and performances of NOP (New Orchestra Practices), a small community orchestra in Auckland which is open to people of all ages and musical abilities, in which the instruments are joysticks which control both sound and image. The orchestra had already been working with a documentary photographer, and the initial idea was to create a short documentary. However, over time the idea of creating an interactive project developed in order to reflect the nature of the orchestra itself. The following is an excerpt from one of two proposals submitted to Creative New Zealand for funding as a digital project:

Who is NOP?

Nolwenn Lacire Hugain, is the charismatic leader of NOP, an energetic young French woman who conducts the orchestra using ‘sound painting’, a visual language that enables Nolwenn to direct both experienced musicians and complete amateurs (include
Anyone can join the joystick orchestra. Unlike traditional orchestras, players don’t need to be able to read music or even play an instrument. The players come from a wide range of backgrounds and they’re an eclectic and somewhat quirky group that includes more than one crazy French woman, a mild mannered children’s librarian, a suburban mum and her energetic 6 year old daughter, a shy and intense electro-acoustic music student and a British experimental composer. The only thing this group has in common is the joystick orchestra, and yet they’ve become as close as a family (arguments and all).

JOYSTICK ORCHESTRA: SYNOPSIS

There are two versions of NOP, both of which can be accessed from the NOP doc website. Visitors to the site may choose whether to watch the video short or explore the interactive web documentary.

Short documentary video version

The linear video version of NOP doc interweaves a NOP performance with interviews, rehearsal footage and photographs of the orchestra. Interviews with members will be filmed in their work/home environments to capture the diverse backgrounds and personalities of the group. The orchestra has been filmed and photographed over a period of a year, so there is a rich archive of NOP material to draw on.

The film begins and ends with a NOP performance. As the camera focuses on each member, we cut to an interview sequence that explores their background, and their involvement in NOP. The duration of the documentary is one performance piece.

Nolwenn: explains how the joystick orchestra works (the meta mallette software, how the joysticks work, soundpainting the history/philosophy of NOP and the challenges of working with joysticks and non-professional musicians).

NOP Players: Sean, Barnaby, Charlotte, Bianca, Tasman, Stuart:
Each interview shows us something about the personalities of the players and covers a different aspect of NOP from the perspective of the orchestra members: playing with a group, experimenting with sound and image, mastering the joysticks, forming friendships with other members, working with Nolwenn.

Interactive web documentary version
The interactive web documentary has the same structure and much of the same content as the linear film version, but presents this material in a more playful and interactive way.

The main interface for the web documentary is a tableau of the joystick orchestra in their rehearsal space. Users can click on Nolwenn and the orchestra members to see video interviews, explore an archive of performance and rehearsal footage and access the NOP blog. An additional interactive element of the web documentary is a game that allows users to play along with NOP using their keyboards as joysticks.

As both funding proposals were unsuccessful we became more focused on ways to develop the project without funding using free online tools such as Wordpress, a web platform and content management system that is open source and requires limited coding ability except for template customisation, and Zeega, an interactive storytelling tool that is similarly accessible. However, while the alpha version of Zeega that we began experimenting with offered a drag and drop interface for constructing interactive narratives that incorporated a variety of media (including video) Zeega evolved into a more simplified short-form interactive video format similar to GIF animations or the mobile video formats Vine and Instavideo, which did not fit with our vision for the project.

With limited time and money to spend on the project we decided to focus less on an interactive framework for the documentary and more on presenting video content in short thematic webisodes that would act as an archive of NOP’s activities during 2011 and 2012. Complementing this video content and acting as a practical expression of NOP’s philosophy of participation and interactive play would be a web-based musical
game. In late 2012 we received a small grant ($5,250) from the Auckland Council Creative Communities Scheme to produce the online game and run associated community workshops in Auckland. Jeff Nusz, in collaboration with interactive artist Kim Newall and orchestra member Barnaby Flavell-Chitty has developed an online game that allows the user to experiment with creating sounds and images in a way that is reminiscent of the NOP orchestra experience, which we aim to launch at the beginning of 2014 on a website that will be extended with an tagged archive of short NOP Orchestra video clips. For the project members the project is envisaged as a site of experimentation that with change over time in keeping with NOP’s evolution, with older material being retained as an archive.

The project has been a valuable collaborative exercise and the lack of time and budget has resulted in the project taking unexpected but interesting turns. Besides financial and time constraints, a key lesson in regards to interactive documentary has been the difficulty of trying to work retrospectively with media content, hence the decision to use footage as an archive.

### Loading Docs

#### Background and development

*Loading Docs* (Online platform for short-form NZ documentary – development and distribution initiative). Produced in collaboration with Julia Parnell, Notable Pictures

I first met with producer Julia Parnell in 2010 to offer feedback on a proposal for an online platform for documentary shorts that she was developing for the NZ On Air Digital Content Partnership Fund. The concept for Loading Docs was that an online platform for short form New Zealand documentaries that would give filmmakers an opportunity to make more creative documentaries, expand audiences for local documentary and develop the profiles of filmmakers. The proposal was unsuccessful.

---

38 This game can be accessed at [http://www.joystickorchestra.com/play/](http://www.joystickorchestra.com/play/)
that year, but after meeting again in 2011 Julia and I began to discuss the project further and decided to continue to develop and seek funding.

A key advancement came in 2012 when Julia Parnell discussed the Loading Docs concept with NZFC Short Film Manager Lisa Chatfield. Lisa was enthusiastic about the concept, but Loading Docs did not fit with the criteria for any of the NZFC’s existing funds and the online aspect of the project in particular was beyond the Commission’s scope. However, with Chatfield’s encouragement in April 2012 we submitted a tender to the NZFC to executive produce Loading Docs as a Premiere Shorts Pod.

Premiere Shorts is one of two short film funding schemes that seek to identify and develop filmmaking talent through funds that are administered by Executive Producer groups (EPs). Filmmakers apply (usually as a team made up of a director, producer and writer) directly to EPs who select teams and develop film projects, overseeing the films throughout the production process.

Our proposal was that the Loading Docs Premiere Shorts Pod would constitute the first stage in a three-stage cross-platform strategy. In keeping with NZFC objectives, this proposal offered a more traditional approach to distribution, with an emphasis on film festivals and DVD sales, but explored audience engagement at the funding and selection stages. The core of the proposal was as follows:

*Stage One:* 3 Premier documentary shorts made by top up and coming New Zealand directors are produced and promoted. Our aim is to get these shorts into the world’s most prestigious film festivals and achieve international recognition and exposure.

*Stage Two:* LOADINGDOCS online launches with a call for proposals for 10 quality New Zealand documentary shorts. LOADINGDOCS EPs will consult with a high-profile curatorial team to select 20 finalists. The ten documentary shorts produced will be of a similar calibre to Fresh Shorts projects.
These proposals will be presented online in a format similar to crowdfunding websites such as PledgeMe or Kickstarter. Publicity generated by the success of our Stage One Premier documentary shorts combined with media partnerships and a social media strategy will drive audiences to the site to vote for their favourite projects. The best of these will be selected for international festival promotion.

Stage Three: After an initial period blocked out for festival release, Stage One and Two films will have a television broadcast premiere and will be released on the LOADING DOCS website and will be available for purchase (either to the public as a DVD compilation or as content).

Ultimately LOADINGDOCS Premier Pod is the start of the renaissance of New Zealand documentary, each phase of the project feeds into the next, creating audience interest, raising the profile of short form New Zealand documentary films, developing talent, and maximising overall investment.

We did not have high expectations for the tender, but saw it as an opportunity to formally present Loading Docs to the NZFC and begin discussions regarding further opportunities. As anticipated, the tender was unsuccessful, but a dialogue with the NZFC had begun.

In 2012 NZ On Air launched the new Digital Media Fund, which replaced the Digital Content Partnership Fund. As the 2010 proposal to the Digital Content Partnership Fund had been unsuccessful we dramatically cut down the scale and budget of the project to meet the requirements of the Ignite fund, “a fast turnaround small project fund to support digital initiatives for niche audiences or small scale projects and app development” which offered funding of up to $45,000.

LOADINGDOCS: HOME is a project designed to encourage, create and distribute short-form New Zealand documentaries.
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With the support of NZ On Air and the NZ Film Commission, LOADINGDOCS will fund, produce and distribute online 10 quality New Zealand documentary shorts that capture what it means to be Kiwi and what identifies our HOME, Aotearoa, connecting with both local and international audiences.

The project begins with a competitive crowdfunding campaign, followed by the launch of a series of highly-innovative shorts on the LOADINGDOCS website and ends with the films distributed through a partnership with [an international content syndicator], connecting into their [...] distribution pathways.

LOADINGDOCS aims to raise the profile of documentary in New Zealand and promote New Zealand stories internationally, offer opportunities for Kiwi filmmakers to further their skills, experiment in style, form and storytelling POV, and serve as a springboard for feature documentary film development.

HOW IT WORKS

The project has five stages implemented over 12 months.

1: DEVELOPMENT. Designing and building the website, honing the promotional strategy, defining and confirming the distribution plan, securing additional partners and resources and working on outreach to build a strong network of support locally.

2: SUBMISSIONS. LOADINGDOCS will put a call out to the filmmaking community – acclaimed and emerging - asking them to submit ideas for edgy, creative and inspiring 3-5 minute documentary projects. The LOADINGDOCS team will then select the 15 best pitches to go through to the next phase, the crowdfunding campaign.

3: CROWDFUNDING CAMPAIGN. The 15 teams will take part in a workshop, ‘Honing the Pitch’. This workshop will focus on perfecting the pitch, defining the documentary story and engaging the audience via crowd funding.

The video pitches will then be uploaded to a crowdfunding site. Participants will have a month to rally their friends, family and wider New Zealand to help them reach the
funding target of $2,000. This crowdfunding component aims not just to boost funding, but also to kick-start the process of audience outreach.

4: PRODUCTION. The 10 films that secure the $2,000 funding target will be provided with $3,000 in additional production funds from the LOADINGDOCS budget. The LOADINGDOCS team will then provide production support in the form of equipment, industry connections, feedback and access to the expert knowledge and guidance to ensure that all of the funded films reach a successful completion.

Throughout this period the LOADINGDOCS team and the documentary makers will tweet, Facebook and blog about their progress to keep momentum going and to maintain an online presence.

5: DISTRIBUTION. The documentaries will be loaded on to loadingdocs.co.nz, which will offer a wealth of additional information and content about the projects funded and people that created them.

The documentaries will then be branded NZOA, NZFC and LOADINGDOCS and then ‘super-syndicated’, made available to watch across our partners’ platforms and via YouTube, Vimeo, Facebook, Twitter and any other platform where there’s an audience for short docs.

A partnership with [an international content syndicator]39 will take this ‘super-syndication’ to a level never seen before with NZ content, as we tap into their existing network of distribution pathways [edited].

OUTCOMES

LOADINGDOCS: HOME is a cost-effective initiative that promotes innovation and creativity in New Zealand documentary; professional development for documentary filmmakers, with a strong focus on story, authorial voice and style; professional development of key creatives, Julia Parnell and Anna Jackson; and exploration of new markets and distribution methods for documentary content, both locally and internationally.

39 For reasons of commercial sensitivity and confidentiality the name of this syndicator has been withheld.
LOADING DOCS will break new ground in three key areas:

FOR DOCUMENTARY LOADINGDOCS aims to:

Create and deliver ten high quality short documentaries telling unique Kiwi stories that would otherwise not have been made.

Gain international exposure and promotion of NZ documentary, adding to the reputation New Zealand already has with dramatic shorts.

Foster greater innovation in documentary filmmaking to capture both local and international attention and showcase the creativity of New Zealand talent.

Explore online opportunities and expand the use of the web as a platform for New Zealand documentary.

FOR THE FILM MAKERS LOADINGDOCS aims to:

Offer development opportunities for the authorial voice of documentary makers, experimenting in style, form and storytelling POV.

Provide a springboard for feature documentary film development.

Form connections with an international company [anonymised], whose filmmakers are some of the most successful in the world, increasing not only viewer exposure but also focused industry exposure by putting their films in front of world-class documentary makers.

FOR THE INDUSTRY LOADINGDOCS aims to:

Develop social media and crowdfunding strategies and test the commercial potential for new forms of content in order to promote the sustainability of New Zealand documentary filmmaking.

Develop the skills of Anna Jackson and Julia Parnell as Executive Producers thereby contributing to the breadth of leadership within the industry.
Through a proposed mentorship between Anna, Julia and [anonymised], upskill a team to have tangible knowledge of international digital distribution, new forms of funding and sponsorship.

Once again the funding proposal was unsuccessful, largely due to the unrealistically low budget, which had no provision for producer fees, very little staffing costs and a smaller budget allocated to each film. However, the manager of the Digital Media Fund, Brenda Leeuwenberg was otherwise supportive of the project. After further discussions with Lisa Chatfield we approached the head of the NZFC, Graeme Mason, with the proposal that Loading Docs be jointly supported by the NZFC and NZ On Air. This revised proposal placed greater emphasis on the value of the project in providing professional development both to the filmmakers (through the project itself and participation in a development and crowdfunding workshop) as well as for Julia and myself as producers in a largely unexplored field of film funding, production, distribution and marketing. Following further discussion between Leeuwenberg and representatives of the NZFC we were asked to address some questions regarding the Ignite proposal and present a more realistic budget.

Discussions continued between all three parties (NZFC, NZ On Air and Loading Docs) well into 2013, while we also entered into discussions with the international content syndicator described in the proposal above. Due to the financial commitment that a formal partnership with the content syndicator would have required, we were unable to secure a relationship and therefore needed to scale down objectives for international exposure as it would be unlikely that Loading Docs would be able to achieve the same results as an international content syndicator with a minimal budget and limited access to international networks.

Finally, in June 2013 the NZFC committed $61,000 to funding Loading Docs through a budget allocation for a Short Film Community Initiative in addition to a commitment
from NZ On Air of $45,000 and the funding decision was publicly announced in July 2013.

**Outline of project development**

Having persisted with attempts to obtain funding for Loading Docs for a period of several years, once funding had finally been secured we were eager to initiate the project as soon as possible. The project plan has remained consisted with the NZ On Air Ignite Digital Media Fund proposal referred to above, with the addition of a two day workshop for filmmakers prior to the crowdfunding campaign. The timeframe for execution and delivery was tight however, with a seven week development phase from September to mid-October 2013, a submissions phase from mid-October to mid-December and preparation time in January for a one-month crowdfunding campaign phase in February. Eight weeks were allocated for production from March to April with May 2014 set as the target for the launch and distribution phase.

**Phase One: Development (September - mid-October 2013)**

The seven-week development phase of Loading Docs began in September 2013, during which time we created a strategic plan for outreach, public relations and marketing, commissioned a brand and website design, developed sponsorship materials and engaged in industry outreach. This period was particularly important in terms of developing partnerships that would support the two-person production team of Julia Parnell and myself.

Outreach and publicity are essential to Loading Docs’ success as one of the most important aspects of the project is to promote New Zealand documentary filmmakers and to reach and cultivate a wider local and international audience for New Zealand documentary. Having some professional experience in public relations and film outreach was advantageous as I was able to develop a marketing, outreach and PR plan, manage social media accounts and write media releases without the expense of hiring an
external consultant. However, we decided to contract Trigger Marketing and Publicity, a small local agency specialising in the entertainment field, to provide additional support such as offering feedback on strategy and media releases and handling the distribution of releases and subsequent media relations. Hiring a team with good working relationships with media and an understanding of the film industry in New Zealand would ensure our publicity efforts had greater impact and additionally Trigger was supportive of the project and willing to work with our limited budget.

Finding a designer to create a visual identity for Loading Docs and create the website that would act as the project’s online platform was an important task. We needed a logo for Loading Docs that would be distinctive and recognisable and convey a sense of professionalism, freshness and innovation. For our website we needed a look and feel suggested a documentary film look and feel as well as a sense of ‘New Zealandness’. Visually, we wanted to distinguish Loading Docs from low-budget filmmaker competitions and initiatives aimed at supporting young filmmakers in order to attract the interest of more established filmmakers, so aimed for an aesthetic with a sense of some maturity. Relative to our budget, our needs for the site were demanding as we required changes to the site structure and content across the project’s various phases and we wanted to provide each filmmaker with their own presence on the site. We spoke to several designers, but ultimately chose James Franklin and his company Assemble, which specialises in creating web-presences for filmmakers that can support self distribution options as well as promotion. As Assemble is a custom Content Management System (CMS) designed for filmmakers, content on the site can be easily updated with limited support from Assemble, and each filmmaker will be able to manage their own microsite, which will have all of the standard features for a promotional film site such as an EPK, blog, links to social media, promotion for the crowdfunding campaign during that phase and finally, a branded embed of the 3-minute documentary that will integrate with social media and a mailing list.

As one of the aims for Loading Docs is to explore funding opportunities and business models for filmmakers in the emerging online marketplace with the goal to achieve a sustainable level of ongoing funding with little or no dependence on public funding, one
of the key tasks during this phase was the development of partnership and sponsorship proposals in order to seek financial or in-kind support. A primary commercial sponsorship would be one of the most desirable ways to secure financial support for the project, but such agreements usually take a long time to secure and require demonstrable business value to the sponsor. If Loading Docs is successful in attracting audiences and gaining critical attention for the films produced under the Loading Docs banner, the chances of securing sponsorship by 2015 would be much greater, though by no means assured in the current business climate. Partnerships on a smaller scale are also vital in ensuring the feasibility of the project, such as arrangements with equipment suppliers and post production facilities to provide filmmakers with assistance. These commercial arrangements also contribute to the creation of a production community in which filmmakers are able to develop and strengthen mutually beneficial relationships with industry service providers that are an essential part of the economy of film production. Media partnerships are also vital, particularly in the online environment where a media partner with significant reach can deliver content to a wide audience. The securing of a relationship with The New Zealand Herald online during the development stage provides Loading Docs with a potential audience of approximately 835,000 readers per day (“NZ Herald readership on the rise,” 2013).

Outreach to local filmmakers, industry organisations and other community stakeholders was also a key focus of the development period as support for and awareness of these projects within these groups would be crucial to ensure that Loading Docs would attract submissions from filmmakers of good calibre and that the aims of the project were aligned with filmmakers’ interests. A documentary work in progress event for DOC2DOC, facilitated by The Screen Directors Guild (SDGNZ) in late September 2013 provided an opportunity to present Loading Docs to a community of filmmakers for the first time and the project was very well received. Wanting to ensure that our community outreach efforts were not limited to Auckland, we sought an opportunity to present to filmmakers in Wellington and WIFTNZ provided us with a short slot at an NZFC-hosted lunchtime event in October 2013, where again the response to Loading Docs was overwhelmingly positive.
Phase Two: Submissions

A call for proposals was issued on 21 October 2013 and promoted through industry networks and the circulation of a media release. At the same time the Loading Docs website (www.loadingdocs.net) was made public and social media accounts on Twitter and Facebook were activated. A Loading Docs branded channel featuring curated three minute documentary content was launched on Vimeo (where the films will ultimately be hosted) to provide inspiration for filmmakers and to demonstrate the possibilities of the three minute format for online documentary. A promotional video was released a week later to support the call for proposals, which significantly boosted the number of shares the CFP received via social media. The video was also a means of demonstrating that we, as producers, were willing to personally front an outreach campaign in the same way that Loading Docs filmmakers would be during their crowdfunding campaigns. By the deadline for submissions on 25 November, 67 proposals had been received. Given that Loading Docs was an entirely new initiative with no similar precedent and the requirements for filmmakers were very specific — such as the expectation to participate in a two day workshop in January 2014, commitment to a one-month crowdfunding campaign and delivery by mid-April, a small production budget and a set theme — the response was a gratifying indication of the level of interest from filmmakers in the aims of Loading Docs as a project. Filmmakers were required to submit a production plan, synopsis, treatment and identify potential audiences and communities of interest. Many of the submissions received were highly detailed and thorough, and from filmmakers with significant experience. In selecting the ten films we used the following criteria:

*Originality, creativity and innovation: unique stories or a fresh approach to telling a story.*

*Concepts and treatments that will work successfully in a three-minute format.*

*Achievability: with a short timeframe for production we need to be sure that proposals can be realised, that access has been secured, there are no issues with rights and that budgets are realistic.*

*Diversity: we want to have a range of films with different subjects, styles, tone, people and places.*
Coherency: we want each documentary to be different, but we will also consider how well the selected films work together as a group.

Having submitted many project proposals myself during the period of my PhD research and having given much thought to funding policies and selection criteria, the opportunity to be on the other side of the selection process provided me with a great insight into the challenging role of funders or commissioners. Julia Parnell and myself made an initial shortlist of fifteen films, which was then presented to our advisory team and to representatives from NZ On Air and the NZFC. With a short period for development and production many good submissions were rejected because of our uncertainty, as executive producers, about the feasibility of proposals with variables that might make it difficult to deliver a film by the mid-April deadline, such as projects that were heavily reliant on access to people or places that had not yet been fully secured at the time of submission or had a narrative heavily contingent on events that could not be controlled, or most commonly, where the film treatment needed further development or detail. As much of the future survival of Loading Docs depends on the success of the initial round of projects, we also gave a good deal of consideration to the experience of each film’s production team, and for this reason some very interesting proposals from young filmmakers were rejected as we lacked the resources to provide them with sufficient support as producers. However, a few projects selected have come from less experienced filmmakers who will work more closely with Julia Parnell and David White and with the support of seasoned DOPs and editors.

Loading Docs 2014 Synopses

The final ten films selected represent a range of subjects that all, in some way, relate to the theme of home. We aimed to select films that together comprise a diverse range of styles and subject matter:

---

40 These details were correct as of mid-January 2014 and may have since changed. To view the completed films see http://loadingdocs.net/2014films/
A Bird in the Hand Director Andrew Farrant, Producer Lissandra Liet

Extinction is forever, but one New Zealand bird has a second chance. Lost for over 100 years, the New Zealand Storm Petrel has been found. Chris Gaskin and his team face the challenging task to unravel the mysteries of Aotearoa’s most elusive bird. Will they find hatchlings, new life to help secure the birds’ future?

Dans  Director Joel Kefali, Producer Amber Easby

Dans (Turkish for ‘dance’) is an animated documentary based around the storytelling of Sol, an elderly Turkish migrant now living in New Zealand. In this colourful short Sol recounts a treasured memory from his early days as a refugee spent at “The Orange” - a popular dance hall in Auckland.

Home Base  Director Andrew Scott

In one elegant shot this short documentary takes the viewer on an unusual journey through a New Zealand home on a summers day. A peaceful work that initiates contemplation on what humans choose to have in their homes, and the natural and man-made symphony that surrounds us all.

Kāinga  Producer/Director Tim Worrall and Aaron Smart

A Tūhoe kaumatua sings his family back to their kāinga in the Urewera ranges.

Ko “Kāinga” he kiriata aroha mō tetahi kaumatua o Ngai Tūhoe, ko Beam Titoko. I rō kiriata, nāna I karanga atu a-wairua, a-waiata ngahau, ki tōna whānau kia hoki mai ki Whakarae, noho-tahi, kai-tahi, waiata-tahi, ai.

Kāinga is an affectionate portrait of Tūhoe kaumatua, Beam Titoko, as he uses the power of an old party waiata, to call his whānau back home to their shack deep in the Urewera ranges.
Voices  Director Robyn Paterson, Producer Paula Boock

Coming out is one thing, coming home another. Home is a complex concept to anyone of an 'alternative' sexuality, with its connotations of place, identity and security. In this film, a diverse range of the queer community talk to a self-operated camera about their personal experiences; sharing stories which are moving, humorous and compelling.

Wayne’s World Directors Kirsty Griffin and Vivienne Kernick

For Wayne, a profoundly intellectually disabled man with microcephaly, living with others has always been fraught with conflict, but at 44 he has finally been given a home of his own. With this space Wayne is now ready to begin the rest of his life.

Living like a King Director Zoe McIntosh

The disaster of the Christchurch Earthquake left the majority of its population devastated but for a small group of homeless people, the earthquake meant new and luxurious living opportunities. Living like a King is an intimate portrait of one of Christchurch's oldest Streeties (Aka Cowboy) and his unexpected taste of what it's like to live like a King.

Minimum Wage with Million Dollar Views  Director Greg Jennings, Producer Jack Nicol

Be it in scorching sunlight or sideways snowfall, the workers behind the stop/go signs on our roads gain a unique insight into our home, Aotearoa. Using the natural beauty of New Zealand as the backdrop, Minimum Wage with Million Dollar Views shares an untold kiwi story of identity and earning an honest day’s pay.
Today  Producer/Director Prisca Bouchet & Nick Mayow

From the last resident going to bed to the first person rising, Today follows the passing of time for residents and workers of a South Auckland rest home and offers an evocative insight into a place many New Zealanders call 'home'.

The Jump  Director Alex Sutherland, Producer Rebekah Kelly

With a healthy mix of imagination, balls and roughly remembered Newtonian physics, a kiwi bloke jumped off a bridge in 1979 attached to a rubber bungee. This never before seen footage tells the untold story of Chris Sigglekow, the man who invented and took the world’s first Bungee jump.

At the time of writing, preparations were being made for a two-day workshop to be held mid-January 2014 during which filmmakers will hone their crowdfunding pitches and campaign strategies, spend time with Loading Docs producers and advisors developing and troubleshooting production plans and treatments, preparing their micro-sites for launch in February and contributing to outreach and distribution planning. As planned, the project is on target to launch crowdfunding campaigns for each film in February on the New Zealand crowdfunding site PledgeMe (with a $2,000 target), and the films will have a staggered release from mid-January (most likely at a rate of two films per week). The films will be featured on the NZ Herald Online website as well as on Loading Docs, but may be shared and embedded on any website. It is likely that the films will also screen in the Documentary Edge Film Festival, which will also be held in May 2014. Outreach efforts are currently underway to ensure that the films will be seen internationally on popular and influential sites where a broad film audience may be reached as well as niche sites with audiences specific to each film. As an initiative, the response to Loading Docs has been overwhelmingly positive, and we are currently in discussions to extend the project to Australia, as well as continuing to explore possibilities to work with the US-based content syndicator referred to in our Ignite Fund proposal.
The greatest challenge the project faces is the uncertainty of recurrent funding and the need to raise current funding levels to make the project sustainable and I currently find myself in the same situation as the majority of the independent documentary filmmakers I interviewed in the course of my research, of needing to find alternative employment to support my involvement in the project on an ongoing basis.

Conclusion

While Loading Docs has been a fulfilling realisation of many ideas that have gestated during the period of this research project, all of the creative projects that I have been involved with during this time have contributed greatly to my understanding of innovation as a process and as a value that drives creative effort. My involvement with Transmedia NZ has also enhanced my appreciation of the important role of community and networking in a creative ecology. Through my interactions with producers, funders, supporters and observers — with participants of all kinds — I have observed the many small but meaningful ways that systems and practices are responsive to and productive of change and innovation. A chance meeting, a single conversation, an introduction can spark action that develops into something new; the birth of a creative relationship, a shift in thinking, an expansion of knowledge. This perspective on the social dynamics of the production ecology of documentary is mirrored with great clarity in Kerrigan and McIntyre’s observation that:

... documentary filmmaker’s practice is simultaneously enabled and constrained by the documentary production and distribution contexts they work in. Individual and collaborative choices made in these contexts are the result of the possibilities on offer to them. Furthermore their actions, conditioned by the structures they necessarily engage with, bring into being documentary products and processes which are built on the creative collaborations and actions of all preceding documentary practitioners and filmmakers. This set of creative actions take place in social and cultural environments that have profound effects on the work itself (Kerrigan & McIntyre, 2010, p. 126).
Through collaboration I have learned that creative networks are re/generative; each unrealised project eventually has its own afterlife either through the transfer of skills and ideas that come from working with others or through the iterative process of development that sees new and improved ideas sprout modestly from the ashes of ‘failure’. If the driving question for the practice-led dimension of my research has been to ask what facilitates innovation, the answer is the capacity to risk failure, to bet on the uncertain. In the unknown territory beyond television broadcast and established film production and distribution models there is, I believe, the possibility to take some (calculated) risks and there is great potential for innovation and positive change in this new frontier.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion

During the period of this study New Zealand’s documentary production ecology and the broader media environment have indeed seen considerable change encompassing dramatic, almost seismic shifts, as well as a series of subtle but nonetheless significant tremors. It is almost impossible to undertake comprehensive analysis while events are unfolding, just as it is to predict the future; and thus much of the focus of my research has been to simply observe, participate and document the workings of the production ecology. Now, looking back on the past four years I am able to reflect on this work, place events in a wider global context of shifts in media production, distribution and use and draw some initial conclusions. My perspective is still one of close proximity however, and therefore there is a speculative aspect to many of the key findings. Studying the present is like trying to describe what a mountain looks like while standing at the summit; it is impossible to see ‘the mountain’ itself with distanced objectivity, but this perspective offers a unique outlook on the surrounding terrain and a sense of detailed immediacy. Working in this way forces the researcher to admit subjectivity while at the same time requiring a focus on objective observation. The greater significance of this research may only be apparent in time when a case study that documents changes in a specific production ecology during a defined timeframe and examines the role of innovation in relation to such change can be viewed from a critical distance. The value of initiatives such as Transmedia NZ and Loading Docs will be more clearly seen in time and in the context of concurrent activities within the wider creative ecology, some of which may not have been visible to me from my limited viewpoint at the time of writing.

On reflecting on what has been observed and examining key findings I have come to recognise that the disparity between the project I initially proposed at the beginning of this journey and the project that has been realised is not as great as I had once thought.
As I outlined in the introduction to this thesis, my original intention was to study the emergence of online, mobile and multiplatform documentary in Australia and New Zealand. Realising that New Zealand’s documentary ecology seemed set on a very different course to Australia’s and that a multiplatform future was far from certain, I shifted focus to examine the underlying factors that support or inhibit innovation and change using New Zealand as a specific case study of a creative and cultural industry in transition. In doing so I have come to understand much about the nature and value of innovation. While my early focus on specific technologies relating to new forms of documentary practice was perhaps misplaced and narrow, even deterministic, I was correct in identifying the significance of their emergence as representative of widespread changes in media production, circulation and use.

**Original contribution to knowledge**

The changes in New Zealand’s television broadcasting environment are the most dramatic of any segment of the production ecology during the period of the study, with a major transition away from public service broadcasting services. I have aimed to outline these changes within the historical context of New Zealand’s turbulent television industry and the broader context of global shifts as the medium of television undergoes a transitional movement towards a post-broadcast, multiplatform era. The impact of these changes, and of broadcasting policy are examined, with a particular emphasis on innovation, diversity and cultural value. The critical examination of the funding category of documentary as applied by New Zealand On Air and the analysis of output during a three-year period offers an original contribution to knowledge in the form of a unique evaluation of the impact of an erosion of public service values and the pressures of intense commercialisation on the output of content labelled documentary. Most significant of the findings in this area are the identification of a distinctive lack of diversity in form, content and representation and the expedient ambiguity of the ‘documentary’ label as currently applied.
In contrast to the limited opportunities for innovation and a general narrowing of form, subject matter and diversity of voice/representation and the functions of documentary within the television broadcasting sector of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology, my analysis of the film/theatrical sector of documentary shows an opening out of possibilities for innovation (primarily in funding, marketing and distribution). While public funding opportunities for more experimental documentary works have decreased (with the demise of the Screen Innovation Production Fund/Independent Filmmaker’s Fund), the New Zealand Film Commission has increased its support for documentary film and is also working more closely with New Zealand On Air to support joint documentary initiatives. While lower barriers to entry in production and increased competition has impacted on sales revenue in international markets and locally in ‘second markets’ such as pay TV (Rofekamp, 2001) disintermediation in the film industry offers new opportunities to fund, market and distribute films directly to audiences, both locally and internationally. The new paradigm of ‘Do It Yourself’ filmmaking (particularly in marketing and distribution) is challenging and requires filmmakers to take on multiple roles and learn new skills in addition to the producer/director role commonly held by independent documentary filmmakers, but with few distributors and sales agents willing to take on New Zealand documentaries, for many filmmakers a diversification of roles is increasingly a necessity. My interviews with filmmakers and analysis of output (films released theatrically) during 2012 demonstrates how New Zealand documentary makers are using crowdfunding and social media to connect with audiences directly to support funding and distribution efforts. While few filmmakers during the period studied were using VOD services to distribute content (relying mainly on DVD sales), with the introduction of self-distribution platforms such as IndieReign and Vimeo VOD which offer filmmakers greater control of direct sales, it is anticipated that the uptake of such services will increase. Intermediaries such as film festivals and industry organisations still play an important role in supporting the production ecology however, and there remains a significant overlap between television and film documentary production.

While other researchers have previously examined New Zealand film and television documentary, my examination of emerging practices and initiatives beyond traditional content forms and platforms presents a unique and original case study that explores how
innovation is expressed in the New Zealand documentary context. A key finding is that innovation in this context is network based, and largely grassroots driven rather than focused on the efforts of a public service media provider with a market-leader role that contributes to the wider media ecology in the form of ‘innovation R&D’ (as is the case with ABC in Australia, BBC in the UK and the NFB in Canada). Broadcaster-led multiplatform innovation is extremely limited in New Zealand, also largely due to the limited public service media provisions in New Zealand’s highly competitive, deregulated media environment. In this context, innovation is supported on a smaller scale through both independent and public-supported initiatives that focus on the web as the central delivery platform where web-series and online community content portals may be seen as a limited, targeted stopgap for the lack of diversity and content innovation in television broadcasting. While valid concerns may be raised about the use of niche platforms to serve minority audiences and the dispersal of the public sphere that this tendency may represent, NZ On Air’s support for innovation through the Digital Media Fund offers documentary makers new opportunities to produce content not supported elsewhere, thus (on a small scale) serving an innovation research and development function. Proposed policy measures to ensure the longterm accessibility of publicly funded content online also serve a public service function and opens up discussion about the evolving role of NZ On Air as an intervention in the New Zealand media ecology in a post-broadcast, multiplatform era.

The practice-led dimension of this research has provided a means of exploring firsthand both the opportunities for and barriers to innovation. This work has informed the research project as a whole, enriching my knowledge and understanding of funding systems and policies, and industry networks and production practices. The case study of Loading Docs, in particular, offers an original contribution to knowledge as a form of innovation experiment. Although the project was still in progress at the time of submission, my experiences with Loading Docs has demonstrated the importance of providing filmmakers with skills and resources in audience outreach and the value of crowdfunding as a networking-building exercise that also serves to promote the activities of filmmakers and engage public interest with the view to developing and enhancing both immediate and longterm distribution opportunities. The practice-led
component of this research helped me to maintain a multi-perspective approach as I approached the research from a position of both researcher and participant/practitioner.

Key findings

In Chapter One I identify three key areas of enquiry relating to change, the functions of documentary as a creative practice and form of cultural production, and innovation. I will briefly revisit these:

1. Change

*How has New Zealand’s documentary production ecology been affected by global changes in media production, distribution and use, and local changes such as the decline of public service broadcasting services?*

Regrettably, much of this study presents an account and analysis of the negative impact of changes in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology. The decline of public broadcasting services and the changing wants and needs of the commercial broadcasting market has largely displaced documentary and documentary makers. The emergence of crowdfunding and direct online distribution is one bright spot in an otherwise dim situation, but documentary makers need to acquire new skills and embrace new practices to reach and engage audiences in a competitive and fragmented global market.

Many of the problems faced within New Zealand’s documentary production ecology are either caused or exacerbated/accelerated by significant change driven by external forces. However, systems, organisations and individuals within the ecology do have the capability to respond to and drive change within the ecology in ways that are not predetermined by external forces. For example, the kind of content that is produced may be significantly determined by funding criteria set in accordance with cultural policy or by the demands of the market, but individuals, groups and networks, however, do have some ability to influence and shape policy. During the period of this study I have observed and participated in many meetings in which constituents of the documentary community have discussed and debated issues with broadcasters and funders, and I have participated in public consultative processes and seen genuine changes (such as an increase in support from the NZFC for documentary and the attempt of the NZFC and
NZ On Air to create a joint fund to (amongst other things) help address the demise of the one-off documentary. Perhaps it cannot be said that any such degree of influence over market forces has been observed, except to the extent that many documentary makers are simply choosing not to participate in the television industry and to seek other opportunities and platforms for production and distribution.

In time it may be seen that the greatest influence on shaping the changing media landscape and directing innovation and change will come from the audience. As I discuss in Chapter One, audience preferences, behaviours and expectations are changing. For a younger generation of viewers (and for many of the not so young), broadcast television is, if not a thing of the past, then certainly just one portion of their media diet. For broadcasters, producers and funders and indeed for the audience this is one of the key reasons why innovation matters. Established and conventional approaches to funding, producing and delivering content are no longer guaranteed to deliver either commercial or cultural returns. When audiences are no longer engaged, when a system can no longer support cultural values such as diversity or when precarity of labour means the established careers of professional producers are unsustainable; then the importance of innovation as both an adaptive response and a driver of change is clear.

2. Documentary as a creative practice and form of cultural production

What is the function of documentary as a form of cultural production and as a creative practice within the framework of creative and cultural industries, and how does documentary production in New Zealand fit within this framework?

In Chapter Three I describe television documentary as a kind of mine canary for public service broadcasting. Documentary is a cultural form that, as a public good, does not tend to thrive in a commercial market environment. Thoughtful social critique, longform investigative inquiry, the presentation of challenging or alternative viewpoints, a creative representation of the real, a distinctive authorial voice... these hallmarks of documentary have no place in ratings-driven primetime. Increasingly, and in New Zealand especially, they seem to have no place on television screens at all.
As Mary Debrett argues, documentary has an important social function, one that requires public support:

*Whether or not publicly subsidized programming can deliver public service goals in a broadcast marketplace depends on the accommodation of priorities other than revenue and ratings. Continued subsidy for social documentary as a discrete genre is a key element in preserving television programme diversity, for as documentary’s past truth and reality claims become untenable, only social purpose remains to differentiate the genre from the ragbag of factual programming.* (Debrett, 2004, p. 20)

Documentary is a unique cultural form that plays an important role in the wider media ecology, and in a public sphere that facilitates civic participation, debate and the sharing of knowledge. Innovation is necessary, not for innovation’s sake, but to ensure the continuity of the project of documentary (and public service media) in a challenging and changing media environment.

One of the central aims of this research was to identify specific factors that either support or inhibit innovation in New Zealand’s documentary production ecology. The issue of the demise of public service broadcasting in New Zealand has been given considerable attention in this thesis, particularly in the chapters concerning television. NZ On Air provides limited intervention in an intensely competitive, highly commercial television environment that favours format-driven factual series over the discourse of sobriety that documentary (and the one-off form in particular) represents. Analysis of output confirms the views of documentary makers interviewed and prior research in this area, that the one-off documentary is in demise, that diversity of documentary content is limited and that the unbridled commercialism of the television broadcasting environment has had a negative impact on the documentary production ecology.

Drawing on the work of researchers such as (Bennett, 2008), (Bennett & Strange, 2008), Debrett (Debrett, 2009)(Debrett, 2010), Horrocks (Horrocks, 1996b) (Horrocks, 2010)
and (Cunningham, 2013) I argue that a strong public service media organisation is essential to promoting innovation overall, and that documentary in particular cannot be adequately supported without it. Whereas the last standing public service broadcaster, Maori Television, does support a range of documentary content and offers possibilities for formal innovation, it lacks the reach and resources to function as a ‘market organiser’ or ‘market leader (Cunningham). The very marked lack of innovation in the television broadcasting sector of the documentary production ecology demonstrates that a commercially driven, risk-averse market does not adequately support innovation or change.

The lack of innovation and the risk aversion that has contributed to the demise of documentary in New Zealand television has had a much broader impact on the entire documentary production ecology as a whole. For many years the television industry provided many independent documentary makers with a relatively stable income source, enough to build a professional industry. This is no longer the case. As one veteran documentary maker bemoans:

_I am saddened by the demise of documentary making in NZ. Much of this can be attributed to the commercial nature of all our free-to-air television channels, except Maori Television but it has requirements round te reo. The Film Commission and NZ On Air are looking at ways of combining to support documentary makers but without opportunities on television there is nowhere for young people to learn how to make the kinds of feature documentaries being sought. Storytelling is a craft that needs honing and while film schools turn out graduates, where do they go to earn a living and upskill? Without another source of income it is virtually impossible to live as a documentary maker in New Zealand any more. That is sad because there are so many stories to be told in this country that are not being investigated. We need an inquiring media to preserve our democracy. (Anonymised, personal communication, 2013)._
While documentary makers may eschew the limitations of the television broadcasting environment and seek to make feature documentaries for theatrical distribution (or online delivery), this sector is not sufficiently robust to support a sustainable career as a professional documentary maker. Several established documentary makers I spoke to talked to had either ceased to work professionally in television production or mentioned colleagues who had left filmmaking to pursue more stable occupations. All the documentary makers interviewed talked about how challenging it is to make ends meet and several admitted that their craft was only sustainable because of the support of a partner or income from another job. The withdrawal of experienced documentary makers from the production ecology is a serious concern. A younger generation of documentary makers may bring fresh ideas, but a distinction should be made between innovation and novelty. Great innovation may be seen in a filmmaker who hones his or her craft over time, who is able to learn from mistakes and adapt and change with each new work. This may be seen, for example, in the recent films of Leanne Pooley who, during the period of this study, made an historical docudrama for the first time for television (*Shackleton’s Captain*), followed by an internationally released feature docudrama, which was highly innovative (technically and creatively) in its use of 3D and special effects, the seamless integration of dramatic action with archive footage and narration based entirely on interview audio (*Beyond the Edge*).

### 3. Innovation

*Within the unique conditions that define New Zealand’s documentary production ecology, what factors either support or inhibit innovation, and what does innovation really mean within this context?*

The conditions of New Zealand media ecology – a highly competitive and deregulated media environment and a lack of innovation-focused cultural policy – are simply not supportive of innovation for a cultural form/industry such as documentary. In this context I have found that while examples of innovation may be hard to find, innovation is greatly needed to address the challenges the production ecology faces.

From a creative perspective, certainly innovations such as i-doc/web doc and multiplatform documentaries are exciting and may also perform a useful social and
cultural role; but when conventional television documentaries are in decline and documentary makers are struggling to sustain any kind of viable career in production, these forms of ‘innovation’ may seem to be lacking in relevance. This message came through loud and clear in interviews with documentary makers who generally expressed little enthusiasm for exploring new forms of documentary when it was so challenging for them to work even in the established forms of television and film documentary within the current system.

Questioning the value of innovation (and creativity, which was a term I gave more weight to during the initial period of my research) was also an important aspect of the critical research process as I explored these terms as central values in creative industries, a critical field much criticised for expounding neoliberal values and “valorising creative labour at the expense of exposing its precariousness” (Cunningham, 2013, p. 12). The process of interviewing participants in the documentary ecology (filmmakers in particular) made me wary of romanticising innovation as a kind of indeterminate panacea for the very tangible problems that the individuals I spoke with described.

This is a concern that Stuart Cunningham has addressed well in his own recent work on innovation in the creative sector:

*If we can agree that innovation and change are pervasive, thoroughly double-edged and worthy of sustained analysis, then the debates in the humanities about the creative industries need substantial recalibration. It would be desirable to move beyond the depressing predicament of much debate based on exaggerated dualisms. ... Instead of being caught in this totalising crossfire, we can ask a range of questions that are subject to analysis, both theoretical and empirical: At what rate is change occurring? What are the different impacts in the different sectors? Are these changes genuinely innovative, and, if so, are their impacts beneficial, and for whom? And so on. The role of policy, then, can be*
understood as responding to the place of cultural activity in its wider socio-economic context. (Cunningham, 2013, pp. 12–13)

By observing, recording and analysing the activities of the production ecology and through my own production-related activities, I began to realise that my focus and my understanding of innovation was too narrow. I had chosen ecology as a framework in order to examine the factors that support or inhibit innovation, but I had focused, at least initially, on what was *not* happening within the system, rather than what *was*. I had chosen innovation and change as keywords in the title of my thesis, but had not fully come to terms with the nature of the relationship between these terms. As Cunningham describes above, one of the most useful ways that I could find to recognise and come to a better understanding of innovation was to step back and try to objectively observe what was happening in the production ecology. Many of the chapters in this thesis focus on documenting, analysing and contextualising what has occurred within the documentary production ecology.

Another significant barrier to innovation is that cultural policy in New Zealand in the areas relevant to documentary production lacks commitment to innovation. Even though innovation is one of NZ On Air’s core values, the term ‘innovation’ is not clearly defined and is often conflated with ‘quality’. NZ On Air’s 2013 Statement of Intent, for example, describes innovation as “encouraging new ideas, creativity and quality production standards” (NZ On Air, 2013a, p. 5). Innovation, in terms of policy should not only mean support for a greater diversity of content and a commitment to new and experimental work, but should also mean finding ways to support the development of a more sustainable production ecology. Specific goals for innovation could be developed, such as those identified by Canada’s NFB in its 2013 Strategic Plan, which sets the goal, “To further the NFB’s global leadership in creativity and innovation throughout all its activities and with particular reference to: a) programming, b) digital portals and applications, c) technical infrastructures, d) Discourse on creation and meaning” (National Film Board of Canada, 2013, p. 7).
Innovation is not a silver bullet however, and in this respect critics of the creative industries paradigm are right to wave a flag of caution at the idealisation of innovation and creativity; despite the NFB’s great efforts at championing documentary innovation, Canadian producers are still reliant on television broadcasters to make a living and documentary television production has been in sharp decline in Canada since the global financial crisis hit in 2008 (Documentary Organisation of Canada (DOC), 2013). However, looking at this situation in a different light, it may also be argued that the NFB’s investment in digital innovation is all the more important precisely because of the decline of broadcasting. Depending to some extent on ideological positioning, innovation may be seen as a vital public service role as a market leader, or as a correction for market failure. The NFB’s 2008 strategic plan for example identified that, “The digital transformation is altering in fundamental ways how audiences are consuming and interacting with audiovisual media. The characteristics of the digital era are interactivity, mobility, control of time, user-generated material and a general democratization of media” (National Film Board of Canada, 2008, p. 6). The report goes on to identify the need to keep up with new technologies and emphasises the importance of the organisation’s leadership role in “testing and experimenting with new modes of production and new technological and business models that will benefit the industry and maintain the creative vibrancy of the NFB”. NZ On Air and the NZFC are slowly taking steps to respond to change, but (as has been explicitly stated by NZ On Air) the policy is generally to let the market lead as far as innovation is concerned, which in my view that this is a critical weakness.

Isolation is also a factor that affects New Zealand’s production ecology in many ways. Because of the high influence of foreign content in a deregulated market that allows 100% foreign ownership and has no local content quota, NZ On Air’s key role is to ensure that, ‘New Zealanders see more of New Zealand on air’, as its slogan says. For the NZFC there is a greater focus on industry support and the mission of getting New Zealand films out on the world stage, but both agencies serve a similar function of ensuring that stories that reflect New Zealand’s cultural identity are both made and seen. With the limitations of the local market, it is a great challenge to balance such cultural values with support for the wider sustainability of the production ecology, but the
rapidly expanding possibilities of online distribution offer potential for global reach at little additional cost.

The remarkable changes seen in New Zealand television broadcasting over the past four years shows how volatile the ecology is, and while many changes during the period of this study are shaped by broader forces — technological and economic forces in particular — as I established in Chapter Three, such turbulence is not unique to the present time. The current situation is in many ways a return to the state Paul Norris described in 2004:

> What we have had in New Zealand is a contestable funding regime within a context of extreme deregulation, with effectively no public broadcaster and NZ On Air bearing the full burden of the responsibility for public broadcasting ... In the UK, such a fund would be an important but minor part of the fabric of public broadcasting, whereas in New Zealand the contestable fund is public service broadcasting. (Norris, 2004, p. 25)

Norris was writing on the eve of public broadcasting reforms, when the (largely ineffective) TVNZ charter came into effect and the commercial free digital channels TVNZ6 and 7 were introduced. Ten years later, not only have these reforms come and gone, but there have been many others. Even as I add my final thoughts to this thesis, there has been an announcement that could significantly challenge SkyTV’s dominance in New Zealand and truly mark the beginning of a post-broadcast ecology in New Zealand, as the dominant telecommunications provider (Spark) aims to launch a Netflix-styled Internet television service and has withdrawn from its resale (service bundling) agreement with Sky TV.

Such fluidity poses challenges, amplifying (for example) the precarity not only of producers, but all who depend on the market dimension of the production ecology.
However due to the size and closely networked, responsive nature of the ecology there are few degrees of separation at any point within the network and even individuals have the potential to effect change. The impact of the introduction of documentary strands on TV3 and TVNZ in the 1990s for example shows how responsive the ecology can be (in a positive way). In my own experience (with Loading Docs), I found that the system can be flexible, largely due to the efforts of passionate individuals. The project did not directly fit the aims or criteria of either NZ On Air or the NZFC, but thanks to the efforts of individuals within those organisations who saw the potential of the initiative, and the persistence of Julia Parnell and myself as producers, Loading Docs has been realised. At every step the project has relied on the strength of networks for support; on industry organisations to promote the call for proposals through newsletters and social media, on personal and professional networks for crowdfunding, and ultimately on various distribution networks to delivery the films to audiences. As a participatory, multiplatform, multi-modal media ecology develops further, the strength of networks in various forms — whether it be a community of practitioners, the commons or ‘the crowd’ — will remain a vital attribute of the documentary production ecology.

**Limitations of the research and recommendations for further study**

The period of this study (2010-2013) was concurrently the period in which I undertook the research. While this enabled me to observe, document and participate in the documentary production ecology in an in-depth manner and gain insights that would not have been possible had I been studying a bygone period, or had I been physically removed from the environment (as I was during the first year of the study), it gave me little time for reflection or the kind of critical analysis that can only be achieved in retrospect. To address this issue I have narrowed the scope of case studies to examine specific time periods and focus on specific issues. In the case of television, for example I limited my analysis of output to the 2010-2012 NZ On Air funding period with a specific focus on the implications of the broad definition of the term ‘documentary’ as a funding category. My research on documentary film centred on feature-length
I took a broad approach to studying the production ecology with the aim to gain a multifaceted perspective that accounted for multiple positions, including observation, interviews, participation through practice-led research and analysis of industry reports and data. I had initially anticipated that interviews would be one of the most important and informative aspects of the research and that these would also facilitate a form of interactive engagement with the production community and result in an additional form of publication more accessible to the general public than an academic thesis. Consistent with a practice-led approach I had proposed to record all interviews on video and obtained provisional consent from the majority of participants for their public use (in a limited form). What I found was that the interviews — while extremely useful for informing my understanding of perspectives of different actants in the ecology and a springboard for testing out some of my assumptions against participant experience and opinion — were generally too subjective and context-bound in nature to act as a firm basis for analysis. While filmmakers were generally happy to consent to be recorded on camera, this was not the case for some of the funders and broadcasters interviewed and this imbalance also affected the viability of using the recorded interviews in a balanced way. The presence of the video camera also deterred participants from speaking freely, on the whole, and I felt that many participants were more guarded and less candid than they may have been otherwise.

An additional limitation of the research was that much of my analysis is based on data sourced from third-parties and the accuracy or totality of the data is not always assured. Box office reports from the MPDANZ for example only provide a limited amount of data about box office takings, with many New Zealand documentaries failing to even register. While it can be assumed that NZ On Air’s reporting on funding is generally accurate, I did encounter some errors or irregularities such as the categorisation of Platinum Fund programmes *The Nation, Q & A* and *The Vote* as documentary rather than New and Current Affairs (since corrected). The searchable database that NZ On Air provides lists programme titles, production company names, funding category and
funding amounts, but no information about the programme itself (such as a short synopsis). Programme titles are also often working titles at the time that they receive funding and so can be subject to change and there is no searchable database of television listings, which meant that in many cases matching programmes funded with the date and time they first screened required extensive investigation by searching TV listings such as Throng.co.nz, broadcaster websites and production company websites.

**Recommendations for further research**

Further studies of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology would benefit from an interdisciplinary approach focused on cultural policy and economics, tied to practice-led innovation experiments. In particular, I believe the ‘experimental approach to public service innovation’ proposed by Potts and Kastelle (Potts & Kastelle, 2010) would be worth exploring in the New Zealand context. Potts and Kastelle propose the application of a scientific experimental method for public sector innovation rather than a Schumpeterian model of innovation based on incentive-driven market competition. In this model, randomised controlled policy experiments would trial different approaches that would examine mechanisms that support improvements in public sector innovation. I have described NZ On Air’s four-year Digital Content Partnership Fund as an informal experiment; one which, despite a lack of clear policy objectives has evolved into a more targeted and relevant initiative. A formal, structured approach to such a fund, where each project is documented and where different approaches to innovation are trialled would be beneficial not only to researchers but to the production ecology as a whole.

This research has focused on producers, broadcasters and funders and to some extent on intermediaries or supporting organisations such as festivals, crowdfunding platforms and membership-based organisations (such as guilds). There is much scope for further research on audiences; their attitudes towards documentary and their media practices. A study of audience engagement and response could be an element of a controlled innovation experiment.
In general, there is great value in the close study of public service media in the New Zealand context. The New Zealand case study presented by Debrett in *Reinventing Public Service Television for the Digital Future (Debrett, 2010)* sheds a great deal of light on the impact of neoliberal reforms on public service media, and the significant changes in New Zealand since the publication of this work merits further examination.

Studies of the media tend to focus on one dimension of either production, text, reception or technology and within these domains are further defined by frames such as culture studies, political economy or sociology. The aim of this research project has been to explore documentary production in the New Zealand context from multiple perspectives and to examine the relations between the different dimensions of media, using the model of ecology to frame this study of a complex, networked, evolving and adaptive system. There are specific aspects of media production that I have found to be currently under-researched, however. Development is the area of production in which I have invested a significant amount of time and energy as a producer, but the processes of research, collaboration, design and planning that are involved in development are given little attention in academic research. Funding is well-studied in many respects, but this is an area in which traditional models are changing rapidly with the emergence of crowdfunding and the influence of commons-based notions of ownership and participation and increased emphasis on philanthropy and public-private partnerships. Finally, distribution is the aspect of media industries that is undergoing the most significant change and has seen the greatest degree of disruption. All of these areas are closely related, and I have tried to demonstrate, particularly in my reflection on practice-led research as well as in my discussion of emerging production practices in Chapter Six.
Final thoughts: looking towards the future

It is my hope that this study of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology during a period of significant change that highlights not only the value of innovation, but of documentary itself, and that this work proves to be useful not just to future researchers, but also to producers, policy makers, content providers and others. Although in many ways the outlook presented in this thesis seems bleak, New Zealand audiences have long-supported and valued local documentary, both on television and (more recently) in cinemas and there are some positive signs of innovation and change. If independent, theatrical documentary continues to grow and find an audience (both in theatres and online), and if innovative funding models also continue to develop then there is a future for documentary in New Zealand. The future would be brighter, however, if there were a space for documentary on television; a space not just for factual entertainment or docudrama, or for programmes about crime, travel or food, but documentaries that examine diverse issues, reflect diversity, challenge, inform and promote discussion.

That space is growing increasingly smaller. To retain content such as documentary, current affairs, political debate, investigative journalism, children’s television and content that caters to the needs of minority audiences New Zealand needs public service media. My opinion is that NZ On Air is fighting hard to intervene in the market, using the might of the Platinum Fund to support quality documentaries, and strategically using special interest television slots and the digital content funds to stand up for minority content. But, this is one David and Goliath battle that I think cannot be won. As competition in the television market intensifies (particularly with the introduction of further online content streaming services), I believe it will become increasingly difficult for NZ On Air to exert its influence on the market. New Zealand needs more than a market intervention; it needs a market leader (Cunningham, 2013), a standard-setter (Born, 2004), an independent alternative. It needs innovation.

New Zealand is far from alone in facing the challenge of providing national public media services fit for the complex dynamics of the contemporary globalised and dispersed network society. Georgina Born, describing the challenges faced by the BBC cautions that,
... the existence of a unified public culture requires that minoritarian perspectives be brought together and made available for the majority. The goal must be to ensure the existence of channels for counter-public to speak to counter-public, as well as for their integration into an (always imperfect) unitary public sphere. The alternative is the extreme segmentation characteristic of commercial media in the United States, where ‘the logic of segmentation emphasizes the value of difference over the value of commonality’. Public service media cannot only be about a proliferation of micro publics, but about achieving a unifying space in which are displayed and in which mutual encounters take place between expressions of the sometimes incommensurable component cultures of the nation. (Born, 2004, p. 515)

While perhaps not yet at the point of segmentation and liberalisation of the United States, New Zealand does not have a shadow of the public service media provision the BBC offers UK citizens. New Zealand has never truly had a dedicated public service broadcaster and it would seem highly unrealistic to hope for one now. What remains of public service media is Maori Television; a network of independent regional community television and radio stations; Radio New Zealand, and government bodies NZ On Air and Te Mangai Paho. As individual and disparate entities these elements each have limited impact and reach. Working, not as a central organisation, but as a network – with a shared set of public media objectives and the ability to share content and other resources (such as media archives) – New Zealand could have the foundation for an innovative, multi-platform public service media ecology.

Radio New Zealand (RNZ) already functions well as a public service broadcaster, and is popular with audiences.\(^{41}\) RNZ has been making small steps towards extending its multiplatform capabilities with The Wireless website (aimed at ‘digital natives’) and its own website, which increasingly offers complementary content in addition to online audio. RNZ funding has been frozen since 2008 however (Coalition for Better Broadcasting, n.d.-b), and it is therefore struggling to try do more with less funding.

\(^{41}\) See [http://www.radionz.co.nz/about/audience-research](http://www.radionz.co.nz/about/audience-research) for most recent audience research statistics.
Maori Television (as has been discussed in Chapter Four) offers audience content that cannot be found on commercial networks (including quality standalone documentaries). The Association of Regional Television Broadcasters NZ lists 12 free to air regional community stations on its website (The Association of Regional Television Broadcasters NZ, n.d.). All of these media providers already offer public service media content, and are supported by NZ On Air to varying degrees. Additionally, NZ On Air offers funding for digital content independent of television broadcast. Audience reach for these digital initiatives could be expanded through partnerships with a public media network. A new charter for public service media would need to be introduced, drafted through public and industry consultation, and with innovation as a core value.

The Coalition for Better Broadcasting (CBB), a charitable trust evolved from movements to ‘Save Radio New Zealand’ in 2010 and ‘Save TVNZ7’ in 2012, is governed by a Board of Trustees that includes Dr Peter Thomson, an academic who is arguably New Zealand’s leading expert on public service media policy (Coalition for Better Broadcasting, n.d.-c). While I disagree with the CBB’s call for a single public service television channel, I strongly endorse the proposal that a 1% levy on the revenue of commercial broadcasters and Internet Service Providers be introduced (Coalition for Better Broadcasting, n.d.-a). As the CBB argues, similar levies apply in many countries (including Australia) and it is common practice for pay television companies to pay to screen free-to-air channels (must carry, must pay), yet SkyTV pays nothing to carry TVOne, 2 and 3. The CBB estimate that such a levy would be worth at least $60m. This level of funding could be directed towards the operational costs of Maori Television, Radio New Zealand and an increased contribution to regional community radio and television stations, with a percentage of funding specifically allocated to online, mobile and multiplatform content. As TVNZ no longer performs any public service function either it should be sold, along with its assets (excluding archives), or else the profits from TVNZ should be redirected towards public service media services. NZ On Air’s existing digital funds could be expanded with specific funding for ‘innovation R&D’ initiatives that lead rather than follow the market with a focus on exploring new business opportunities for the creative and cultural sector and expanding audience reach and engagement (similar to the UK’s Digital R&D Fund for the Arts) (NESTA, n.d.).
Whatever the future holds, I remain hopeful of the potential of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology (and the broader community) to find a way to respond the challenges of a culturally conservative, highly commercial media environment. Through interviews, analysis and experience I have learned that one advantage of New Zealand’s size is that networks and behaviours can be relatively flexible and open, and that an individual with vision, or a group with will and persistence can have impact to effect change. I also remain certain that innovation is necessary – particularly as a cultural policy value– in order to respond to the challenges presented by the changing media ecology. The same factors that have brought about changes such increased competition for audience attention, the emergence of new media platforms for distribution and new ways of engaging audiences, could also be seen as opportunities. However, innovation is necessary to take advantage of these opportunities; to explore alternative models for funding/distribution/circulation and even production; to experiment with new forms that engender greater audience engagement and participation; and to examine what documentary is, does and can be in an ever-changing and evolving ecology.
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## Appendix A: Comparison of funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV One</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Television</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV One</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Television</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minute series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platinum</td>
<td>1 x 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total hours</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: One-off documentaries (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PROD. COMPANY</th>
<th>BROADCASTER</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>SCREENED</th>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>STRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘A DAY IN THE LIFE’ (Wildman)</td>
<td>Red Sky Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>31 December 2012</td>
<td>$205,040</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL</td>
<td>The Sunday News Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>6th August 2009</td>
<td>$205,040</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>ALONE AGAINST THE ASIAN</td>
<td>The Sunday News Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>6th August 2009</td>
<td>$205,040</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>WHO KILLED THE CREWES?</td>
<td>Project Melting Pot Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm Wednesday, 24 June, 2010</td>
<td>$105,710</td>
<td>real life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘WAGING WORLD WAR II ON THE LAST FRONT’</td>
<td>28 Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>21 September, 2010</td>
<td>$94,958</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘THE CHANGING FACE OF CRIME’</td>
<td>Top Shelf Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm Wednesday, 24 June, 2010</td>
<td>$127,632</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>WHO KILLED TRENT KEEGAN?</td>
<td>Project Melting Pot Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm Wednesday, 24 June, 2010</td>
<td>$115,606</td>
<td>real life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>KARLI THOMAS and RAIDERS OF THE LAST TUNA</td>
<td>2B Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>8:30pm – Wednesday, 4 December, 2011</td>
<td>$94,958</td>
<td>environment, eco-activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>THE DAY MY LEGS STOPPED WORKING</td>
<td>Project Melting Pot Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>5pm, Sunday April 29, 2012</td>
<td>$127,632</td>
<td>health, social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘THE GLORIAVALE PROJECT’</td>
<td>Pacific Screen Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm Tuesday, June 19, 2012</td>
<td>$104,033</td>
<td>society, investigative, religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>MOKO A DOLPHIN IN DANGER</td>
<td>KHF Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>4pm, 2012</td>
<td>$112,420</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INKUBATOR</td>
<td>Top Shelf Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>5pm, Sunday April 29, 2012</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘ANZAC’</td>
<td>Locales</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>5pm, Sunday April 29, 2012</td>
<td>$137,622</td>
<td>world issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>HIGH TIME</td>
<td>Top Shelf Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>8:30pm – Wednesday, 4 December, 2011</td>
<td>$124,340</td>
<td>health, social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>ONE FRACTION (One 16th)</td>
<td>33 Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm – Thursday, July 21, 2011</td>
<td>$95,865</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘INSIDE TATTOOING’</td>
<td>Buto Productions</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm – Thursday, July 21, 2011</td>
<td>$90,578</td>
<td>culture, social, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NAZI HUNTER</td>
<td>Ponsonby Productions</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm – Thursday, July 21, 2011</td>
<td>$114,996</td>
<td>society, investigative, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INSIDE CHILD POVERTY - A SPECIAL REPORT</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9pm, Sunday April 29, 2012</td>
<td>$105,400</td>
<td>society, investigative, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘THE FAMILY BEANSPROUT’</td>
<td>Iguana Films Pty Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$105,288</td>
<td>profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>A BIT MENTAL</td>
<td>Luke Nola &amp; Friends</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9.30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$26,038</td>
<td>health, social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>LESSE THE INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$32,427</td>
<td>crime, interview supplementary to drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘TAYLOR’S MILLION’</td>
<td>Red Sky Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$127,632</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>INSIDE THE INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$104,033</td>
<td>crime, interview supplementary to drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>YOUTH</td>
<td>SAUS Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$137,622</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>THE INVESTIGATOR SPECIAL - ‘THE NIP TUCK TRIP’</td>
<td>33Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$90,965</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>THE PRICE OF FISH</td>
<td>Howard Taylor Productions</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$90,707</td>
<td>environment, social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>PRINCIPAL MEDICINE</td>
<td>KHF Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$105,070</td>
<td>society, investigative, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>INSIDE MY FATHER</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$107,298</td>
<td>health, social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>MIND THE GAP</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$160,890</td>
<td>health, social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>A BIT MENTAL</td>
<td>Luke Nola &amp; Friends</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$50,938</td>
<td>health, social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>YEAR OF THE PIGEON</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$107,298</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NAG HAMER</td>
<td>Red Sky Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$114,996</td>
<td>crime, investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>JUDAS: MY STORY</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$105,070</td>
<td>society, investigative, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>THE PRICE OF FISH</td>
<td>Howard Taylor Productions</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$90,707</td>
<td>environment, social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>WE ARE THE STORY</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$131,512</td>
<td>society, investigative, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>GODFREY’S FUR?</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60</td>
<td>9:30pm, Wednesday 10 August, 2011</td>
<td>$90,965</td>
<td>culture (kiwi identity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: One-off documentaries (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE ROAD TO THE GREAT WALL</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Manawatu Films Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.00 PM</td>
<td>Culture, Society</td>
<td>culture, society</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CAN I PASS FOR ITALIAN</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Tawera Productions Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$113,048</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.30 PM, Sunday 26 April</td>
<td>culture, crime, politics</td>
<td>culture, crime, politics</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>STORIES OF THE DREAMTIME</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Rongo Productions Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$65,491</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.30 PM, Sunday 14 April</td>
<td>culture, profile, history, anzac</td>
<td>culture, profile, history, anzac</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE ROAD TO THE GLOBE</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Rongo Productions Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$131,809</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.30 PM, Saturday 29 April</td>
<td>culture, arts</td>
<td>culture, arts</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Charlotte Yates</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.30 PM</td>
<td>Culture, Society, Sport, Politics</td>
<td>culture, society, sport, politics</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE WAIT OF THE NATION</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Aotearoa Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
<td>2012, 8.30 pm</td>
<td>Culture, Society, Sport, Politics</td>
<td>culture, society, sport, politics</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>ANNIVERSARY (El Alamein: Line in the Sand?)</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Notable Pictures Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$118,762</td>
<td>2012, 7:00 am</td>
<td>Culture, Society</td>
<td>culture, society</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>BRING BACK BUCK</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Marlau Productions Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$124,800</td>
<td>2012, 8.30 pm</td>
<td>Sport, Society</td>
<td>sport, society</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Tawera Productions Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$125,685</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.30 PM</td>
<td>Culture, Society</td>
<td>culture, society</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>THE GREEN CHAIN</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Charlotte Yates</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Qtv</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>$161,007</td>
<td>2012, 8.30 pm</td>
<td>Culture, Sport</td>
<td>culture, sport</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>PROD. COMPANY</td>
<td>BROADCASTER</td>
<td>FORMAT</td>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>SCREENED</td>
<td>STRAND</td>
<td>THEMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-10</td>
<td>HELEN CLARK, THE ROAD TO POWER</td>
<td>Octopus Pictures Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>2x 60 mins</td>
<td>$294,505</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 24th at 9:30pm &amp; Wednesday, July 24th at 9:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td>INSIDE REPORTS</td>
<td>Red Sky Film &amp; Television Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>2x 60 mins</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-10</td>
<td>A SHOCKING REMINDER</td>
<td>Paua Productions Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>2x 60 mins</td>
<td>$315,562</td>
<td>8:30pm Monday, February 13, 2012</td>
<td>earthquake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-03</td>
<td>BEAUTIFUL MACHINE</td>
<td>ION Films Ltd</td>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$160,068</td>
<td>Not yet screened on FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>BILLY T - TE MOVIE</td>
<td>BTJ Movie Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$199,999</td>
<td>6:45pm, Sunday 5 January 2014</td>
<td>Moon Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-08</td>
<td>BLAKEY</td>
<td>Sticky Pictures Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>8:30pm Tuesday, December 6, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-08</td>
<td>WHEN A CITY FALLS</td>
<td>Frank Film</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>7:30pm – Wednesday, February 22, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>THE LAST OCEAN</td>
<td>Ross Sea Documentary Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>8.30pm, Tuesday 2 October, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>Broadcaster</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Screened</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td>personality/celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>KEEP CALM AND CARRY ON</td>
<td>Jam TV Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 30 mins</td>
<td>$266,646</td>
<td>8:00pm Wednesday, August 21, 2012</td>
<td>parenting</td>
<td>Jacqui Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>GLOBAL RADAR</td>
<td>Jam TV Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>$479,779</td>
<td>7:00pm Sunday, August 7, 2011</td>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>Te Radar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>IS MODERN MEDICINE KILLING YOU?</td>
<td>Eyeworks New Zealand Film &amp; TV Drama Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>$501,726</td>
<td>8:00pm Wednesday, October 10, 2012</td>
<td>health/wellbeing</td>
<td>Presented by Dr Francis Pitsillis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>GET FRESH WITH AL BROWN</td>
<td>Fish-eye Films Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>$498,740</td>
<td>7:00pm Saturday, September 10, 2011</td>
<td>cooking, travel</td>
<td>Chef Al Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>UNSUNG HEROES</td>
<td>Cream Media Limited</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>$415,325</td>
<td>7:30pm Wednesday, December 19, 2012</td>
<td>community, society, obs doc</td>
<td>obs doc, narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>COUNTRY CALENDAR 2011</td>
<td>Television New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>26x 30 mins</td>
<td>$361,311</td>
<td>7:00pm Saturday, March 12, 2011</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>BIGGER, BETTER, FASTER, STRONGER</td>
<td>The Down Low Concept</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>$648,543</td>
<td>8:00pm – Monday, February 7, 2011</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>James Coleman and Greg Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>WHAT’S REALLY IN OUR FOOD? 3</td>
<td>Top Shelf Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>$684,494</td>
<td>7:30pm – Tuesday, May 17, 2011</td>
<td>Consumer issues, Health</td>
<td>Carolyn Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>SAVING GEN Y</td>
<td>Black Inc Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>12x 30 mins</td>
<td>$531,924</td>
<td>8pm Saturdays April, 2013</td>
<td>health, society, Maori</td>
<td>health, weight loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>MISSING PIECES 3</td>
<td>Eyeworks New Zealand Film &amp; TV Drama Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>13x 30 mins</td>
<td>$897,257</td>
<td>8:00pm – Tuesday, September 27, 2011</td>
<td>reality TV, reunions, narrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>SONGS FROM THE INSIDE</td>
<td>Awa Films Limited</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>13x 30 mins</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>Sunday 18 March at 8.00pm, 2012</td>
<td>crime, music therapy</td>
<td>NZ musicians Anika Moa, Warren Maxwell, Massey Rika and Ruia Aperahama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>WHARE MAORI</td>
<td>Scottie Douglas Productions Ltd</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>13x 30 mins</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>Sunday 8 May at 8pm., 2011</td>
<td>Maori architecture</td>
<td>Architect Rau Hoskins (Ngā Puhi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>SHEARING GANG</td>
<td>Great Southern Television Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>$443,845</td>
<td>9:35pm Tuesday, January 31, 2012</td>
<td>culture, reality</td>
<td>series, narrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>HISTORY UNDER THE HAMMER</td>
<td>Greatstone Pictures Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>13x 30 mins</td>
<td>$597,105</td>
<td>7pm, Sunday 26 Feb, 2012</td>
<td>history, obs doc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series Title</td>
<td>Production Company</td>
<td>Broadcast Channel</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Air Date</td>
<td>Descriptive Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADAR ACROSS THE PACIFIC</td>
<td>Zeitgeist Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>7:30pm Tuesday, June 19, 2012</td>
<td>travel, culture, pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL RADAR 2</td>
<td>Jam TV Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>Wed 6 March 8pm 2013</td>
<td>travel, culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE POLITICALLY INCORRECT GUIDE TO GROWNUPS</td>
<td>Razor Films Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>7:00pm Sunday, February 26, 2012</td>
<td>healthy/wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTERS 2</td>
<td>FishEye Films Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>7:30pm Saturday 8/06/2013</td>
<td>cooking, traveling, nz geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY CALENDAR 2012</td>
<td>Television New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>26x 30 mins</td>
<td>7pm Saturdays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE GC</td>
<td>Black Inc Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>8:00pm – Wednesday, May 2, 2012</td>
<td>reality TV, docuseries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISON FAMILIES</td>
<td>The Gibson Group Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>tbc late 2013</td>
<td>Crime, reality TV, narrated reality TV style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT’S REALLY IN OUR FOOD? 4</td>
<td>Top Shelf Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 14th at 7:30pm, 2012</td>
<td>Consumer issues, Health, narrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKING TRACKS (working title)</td>
<td>The Gibson Group Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>7x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>Travel, geography, cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADAR ACROSS THE PACIFIC 2</td>
<td>Zeitgeist Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>travel, pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE LIFE AND TIMES OF TEMUERA MORRISON</td>
<td>Black Inc Media Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>docuseries/scripted reality, Temuera Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPP COUNTRY</td>
<td>启发 Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>food, travel, geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ STORY</td>
<td>Jam TV Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>19-Oct-13</td>
<td>profiles, people and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY CALENDAR 2013</td>
<td>Television New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>30x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>presenter intro, rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY SECRET</td>
<td>Eyeworks New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>investigative reality TV, spin off of missing pieces, journalist David Lomas (missing pieces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE PROPHETS</td>
<td>Scottie Productions Ltd</td>
<td>Maori Television</td>
<td>7x 30 mins</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 7 at 8.00pm</td>
<td>history, spirituality, Rev Hinini Kaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONGS FROM THE INSIDE 2</td>
<td>Awa Films Limited</td>
<td>Maori Television</td>
<td>11x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>social issues, personal stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANA WAIRUA (broadcast as Te Ara Wairua)</td>
<td>Brave Star Media Ltd</td>
<td>Maori Television</td>
<td>11x 30 mins</td>
<td>9:30pm, Monday 8 July 2013</td>
<td>social issues, personal stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEARING GANG 2</td>
<td>Great Southern Television Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>10x 30 mins</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td>rural, obs doc, narrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE (screened as the animal files)</td>
<td>Screntime New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>13x 30 mins</td>
<td>Thursday June 6th, 8.30pm</td>
<td>obs doc, medical, documentary, narrated, docudrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>Broadcaster</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Screened</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td>personality/celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>NZ DETECTIVES series 2</td>
<td>The Gibson Group Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>3x 60 mins</td>
<td>$366,000</td>
<td>Tuesday, 9.35pm, June 25, 2013</td>
<td>crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>CHEF ON A MISSION</td>
<td>Imagination Television</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$452,371</td>
<td>Tuesday August 23 at 8.30pm, 2011</td>
<td>food, culture, travel, health</td>
<td>chef simon gault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-03</td>
<td>BEYOND THE DARKLAND’S 4</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$583,029</td>
<td>9:30pm Wednesday, April 13, 2011</td>
<td>crime</td>
<td>Psychologist Nigel Latta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-08</td>
<td>ROCKED THE NATION 3</td>
<td>Satellite Media Group</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$679,430</td>
<td>8:30pm – Wednesday, August 17, 2011</td>
<td>crime, sports, human interest</td>
<td>Dai Henwood, 100 NZ sporting moments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-08</td>
<td>FIRST CROSSINGS</td>
<td>Eyeworks New Zealand</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>5x 60 mins</td>
<td>$591,268</td>
<td>8:30pm Tuesday, 24 Jul 12</td>
<td>historical, geography,</td>
<td>self-described as action documentary. Presenters are adventurers Kevin Bigger and Jamie Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natural history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>THIS TOWN</td>
<td>Jam TV Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$570,001</td>
<td>7.30PM, SATURDAY 5 OCT</td>
<td>geography - people</td>
<td>100% character driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-08</td>
<td>BEYOND THE DARKLANDS 5</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 60 mins</td>
<td>$706,272</td>
<td>8:30pm Monday, September 3, 2012</td>
<td>crime</td>
<td>Psychologist Nigel Latta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-08</td>
<td>THE HARD STUFF WITH NIGEL LATTA</td>
<td>Razor Films Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$749,787</td>
<td>not yet screened</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigel Latta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-10</td>
<td>FIRST CROSSINGS 2</td>
<td>Eyeworks New Zealand</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>8x 60 mins</td>
<td>$1,037,748</td>
<td>Tuesday 8.30pm, 9/07/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-12</td>
<td>BACK TO THE SOURCE</td>
<td>Top Shelf Productions</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$728,846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td>AFTERMATH</td>
<td>Paua Productions Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>5x 60 mins</td>
<td>$917,588</td>
<td>Sunday 24 Feb 8:50pm – 9:45pm/ Monday 19th August, 8.35pm/ Monday 26th August, 8.35pm (2 more to screen)</td>
<td>Christchurch earthquake</td>
<td>documentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>BROADCASTER</td>
<td>DURATION</td>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>SCREENED</td>
<td>SUBJET</td>
<td>FORMAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>DESCENT FROM DISASTER</td>
<td>Screentime New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$1,229,974</td>
<td>9:30 TUESDAY 16 JULY, 2013</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>part docudrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>CANCERMAN, THE MILAN BRYCH AFFAIR</td>
<td>Project Melting Pot Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$710,842</td>
<td>9:30pm Sunday, August 26, 2012</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>docudrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>THE GOLDEN HOUR</td>
<td>Desert Road Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$712,417</td>
<td>9:30pm Sunday, July 22, 2012</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>docudrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06</td>
<td>SHACKLETON'S CAPTAIN</td>
<td>Making Movies Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$812,500</td>
<td>9:30pm Sunday, June 3, 2012</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>docudrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>THE HUNT FOR THE PINK AND WHITE TERRACES</td>
<td>Jam TV Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>1x 60 mins</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>9:45pm Sunday, August 7, 2013</td>
<td>science, natural history</td>
<td>docudrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>WILD COASTS</td>
<td>South Pacific Pictures Limited</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>5x 60 mins</td>
<td>$794,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>natural history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-03</td>
<td>PRIMEVAL NEW ZEALAND - WHERE WILD MEETS WEIRD</td>
<td>NHNZ</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 60 mins</td>
<td>$270,554</td>
<td>7:30pm Tuesday, January 17, 2012</td>
<td>natural history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-08</td>
<td>WILD ABOUT NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>NHNZ</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$1,463,330</td>
<td>Tuesday, 3rd of September at 8:30pm, 2013</td>
<td>natural history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-03</td>
<td>STRONGMAN - THE TRAGEDY</td>
<td>A Bigger Picture Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$884,752</td>
<td>Sunday May 13, 7:00pm, 2012</td>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>Wheeler &amp; Simpsons Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60 mins</td>
<td>$274,963</td>
<td>Monday 11 Nov 7:30pm, 2013</td>
<td>social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>WHANAU ORA</td>
<td>ScoLife Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>not yet screened?</td>
<td>social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-10</td>
<td>THE HEALTH STORY</td>
<td>PRN Films Ltd</td>
<td>TV3</td>
<td>1x 60 mins</td>
<td>$274,721</td>
<td>not yet screened?</td>
<td>social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-08</td>
<td>OCEANZ (Our Big Blue Backyard)</td>
<td>NHNZ</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
<td>not yet screened?</td>
<td>natural history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td>OPERATION OVERDUE</td>
<td>Rogue Productions Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>screening 2014</td>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td>NANCY WAKE: A LOVE STORY</td>
<td>The Gibson Group Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>not yet screened?</td>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td>PIRATES OF THE AIRWAYS</td>
<td>Lippy Pictures Ltd</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 90 mins</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>not yet screened?</td>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-08</td>
<td>BEYOND THE EDGE</td>
<td>General Film Corporation</td>
<td>TV One</td>
<td>1x 120 mins</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
<td>not yet screened?</td>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-03</td>
<td>THE FORGOTTEN GENERAL</td>
<td>Kingfisher Films Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>1x 60 mins</td>
<td>$179,971</td>
<td>Sunday April 21, 2013</td>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-08</td>
<td>MAKING NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>Trip Shelf Productions Ltd</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>4x 60 mins</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Scheduled for 2014</td>
<td>history/seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-12</td>
<td>WAR NEWS</td>
<td>The Gibson Group</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>5x 60 mins</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
<td>Sunday 8:30pm from January 19, 2014</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>innovative/hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td>KEEPING IT PURE</td>
<td>Greenstone TV Limited</td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>6x 60 mins</td>
<td>$1,123,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>environment</td>
<td>investigative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I have been engaged in a PhD study of New Zealand’s documentary production ecology since early 2010 and my response to this paper is primarily based on this research. I also participated in a recent discussion on this paper facilitated by the Documentary NZ Trust.

Response to NZ On Air Questions

1. Are there important points omitted in the brief environmental scan for broadcast documentary in Parts One and Two that need to be considered? If so, what are they?

Part One: 3,4,5

Defining documentary

Defining documentary is indeed challenging, enough to have kept documentary scholars busy for several decades. (It is often easier to define documentary by what it is not, hence the ACMA approach (4) which I believe works well as a functional definition). However, some effort to define documentary may go a long way in creating greater
transparency about exactly what kinds of programmes NZ On Air supports. Rather than using documentary as the master funding category for all factual content, the current content landscape would be more accurately represented if documentary were represented as a subcategory of factual. (TVNZ clearly draws a distinction between documentary and popular factual: http://tvnz.co.nz/programme-sales-catalogue/popular-factual-3395256). NZ On Screen has a very comprehensive system of categorisation by genre also). Most series funded by NZ On Air would best be categorised as factual/popular factual rather than documentary (The GC being the most obvious example of this).

Categorisation by subject (as in 16 and Annex A) is also informative and should be retained as a useful means of measuring and reporting diversity. The clearer and more transparent reporting on NZ On Air investment is, the better.

Part One: 6

More weighting should be given to the changing and important role of NZ On Air in the absence of a public service broadcaster/media provider. What is the role of NZOA in a climate that is radically different to the one under which it was established, (in the context of an industry paradigm shift arguably as great, if not greater than the one that precipitated the formation of NZ On Air)?

Part One: 8

Value for money

Value for money is important in terms of NZ On Air’s responsibility to invest wisely and fairly on behalf of New Zealanders, but ratings are an increasingly poor indication of value for money, giving us limited information about the viewing habits of the small sample of households monitored. What we don’t know is how New Zealanders are watching TV. The 2011 Public Perceptions survey may give a good indication that a significant number of people continue to watch ‘live’ television with some frequency,
but the restriction of the survey sample to those with landlines does skew the results towards older and more affluent viewers.

If we do consider value for money in a changing media environment, we need to think about how the life of content can be extended and reach the widest possible audience. This means delivery across multiple platforms (including cinema).

In the absence of a dedicated public service media provider NZ On Air has an even greater responsibility to give consideration to other kinds of value that commercial broadcasters cannot deliver so easily in the current climate, (social and cultural value specifically).

Risk

The broadcasting environment in NZ is too competitive for the market to take risks where new platform opportunities are concerned. This means audiences miss out on opportunities for increased engagement, niche services and diversity. Look to Canada for a model of how an innovation agenda can transform a government media agency, redefining its purpose and direction in the 21st Century: [http://www.fastcocreate.com/1679850/how-canadas-nfb-became-one-of-the-worlds-hippest-digital-content-hubs](http://www.fastcocreate.com/1679850/how-canadas-nfb-became-one-of-the-worlds-hippest-digital-content-hubs). It’s not just a matter of taking risks on cutting edge content; it’s about the direction of public service media in the 21st century. NZ needs to evolve beyond supporting the production of content to supporting meaningful ways for audiences to engage with and participate in media in ways that commercial broadcasters do not and cannot support.

Online content and innovative content such as interactive documentary may not currently provide a clear business model or value for money directly, but nor do they compete with TV content for audience attention. Rather;
The new platforms can also be an effective tool in the circulation of work. The documentary is not threatened by the multiplatform: time passed in front of various screens accumulates. The television viewer is not a species facing extinction; the number of hours spent watching television increases each year, along with interest in documentaries. Online distribution platforms and broadcaster portals serve as audience-multipliers. They increase the influence of documentaries. (Observatoire du Documentaire | Documentary Network, 2011)

More focus needs to go not only to the delivery of content but to audience/community engagement. In Australia for example, the ABC’s innovation strategy is increasingly focused on strategies for Social TV or Second Screen viewing to develop and engage communities around content. Commercial broadcasters might explore innovation in this way for a high-rating programme like The Block where social media engagement delivers greater value for advertisers, but not for facilitating discussion or participation around social or political issues in the context of a documentary one-off or series.

2. Or have we included points that are not sufficiently relevant or which have been given too much weight? If so, what are they?

Part One: 20-23

As stated above, too much weight can be given to ratings and perception surveys. Popular factual series are screened in prime-time slots and promoted heavily because these programmes have commercial appeal. NZ documentaries screened in late night or early morning weekend slots and without publicity are clearly less likely to ‘perform’.

3. Do you agree the goals framed in para. 55 in Part Three are the right ones to underpin NZ On Air’s documentary and factual programme funding policy?
Yes, in principle these are appropriate goals, but more work needs to be done to further develop clear strategies and actions to achieve these goals, tied to an overall strategy that addresses the changing role of NZ On Air as a public service media agency in a hybrid/expanded media environment. The statement that NZ On Air should “encourage innovation by supporting broadcasters to take more risks in backing a wider range of documentary programmes and programme makers; and also by considering other platforms” is particularly vague. (58) proposes some very good ideas, but just how will NZ On Air effectively ‘encourage’ broadcasters to support innovation?

4. If not, what do you suggest?

-  

5. Are there ideas discussed in paragraphs 56-59 in Part Three that you strongly agree or disagree with? Why?

There are a number of good ideas here, particularly:

**Diversity**

Greater cooperation with NZFC and other stakeholders is a very good idea (and also represents value for money).

**Innovation**

Online outlets & platform partnerships: NZ On Screen is a fantastic resource that has developed a strong audience following. This is a resource to be treasured and developed. Again, the NFB is a good model for possible directions for NZ On Screen as an innovation hub. NZ On Screen could further support both local and international content sales and explore VOD options (providing a return to the content maker).

**Value for money**
Initiatives to extend the life and reach of content through online catch-up and VOD are vital. We are making some wonderful content that simply isn’t given enough exposure and, after a short period of time, ultimately disappears. Audiences value NZ documentaries but are they given sufficient opportunities to find them? This is a key issue in the absence of documentary strands like *Inside New Zealand*.

6. Are there other ideas to encourage change that we should consider?

Telling New Zealand stories and ensuring that we see ‘more of New Zealand on Air’ should still be an important mission for NZ On Air, but it is difficult to maintain quality and diversity of content in such a small media ecology when content makers are confined to a fairly rigid notion of ‘New Zealandness’. We must look beyond the local market to maintain a sustainable production ecology. In the long term this is good for producers and good for audiences. A number of very talented and highly experienced documentary makers that I have interviewed in the course of my research have told me that they are walking away from television or even from production in New Zealand.

An innovation fund (in partnership with the Film Commission) not tied to broadcast commitment and not as restricted in terms of NZ subject matter, (perhaps directed in the first instance at documentary makers with a strong critical reputation), would assist our top documentary makers in securing international funding. This would serve to support the long-term sustainability of documentary production in New Zealand, increase opportunities to create high-quality, innovative documentaries and enhance New Zealand’s international reputation as producers of quality content. This fund may prove to serve the goals of diversity, innovation and value for money very well, arguably having the potential to deliver better results on each of these fronts than the existing Platinum Fund.

**Summary**

This discussion paper presents an accurate picture of the current state of NZ documentary and proposes some useful initiatives. However, what is really needed at
this point in time is a bolder longterm strategic vision for NZ documentary. In the absence of a public service media provider NZ On Air is as relevant and necessary as ever, but funding policies must nonetheless change to fit the new media ecology. Documentary is, by definition, deeply rooted in public service media values. As such, NZ On Air’s the revision of NZ On Air’s documentary funding policies should be embraced as an opportunity to further the evolution of NZ On Air as a unique and innovative public service organisation with a greater commitment to innovation, diversity and sustainability.
Appendix J

Index of documentary feature films screened in New Zealand Cinemas in multi-centre film festivals and in general theatrical release, 2012

Index by Festival/Release

3 feature films with feature film funding from the New Zealand Film Commission 290
   When a City Falls (2011) ................................................................. 290
   Brother Number One (2011) .......................................................... 293
   Beautiful Machine (2012) .............................................................. 297

2 Films at the World Cinema Showcase .............................................. 302
   Te Hono ki Aotearoa (2012) .......................................................... 302
   Mental Notes (2012) ................................................................. 304

5 films at the Documentary Edge Festival ........................................... 307
   Disappear into Light (2011) ............................................................ 307
   Intersexion (2012) .................................................................. 308
   Yakel 3D (2011) ...................................................................... 310
   View from Olympus (2011) ......................................................... 312
   Nazi Hunter (2012) ................................................................. 314

10 films at the NZIFF ................................................................. 316
   The Last Dogs of Winter (2011) ....................................................... 316
   How Far is Heaven (2012) .............................................................. 318
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3 feature films with feature film funding from the New Zealand Film Commission
(Released in cinemas nationwide, without a NZ festival release in 2012)

WHEN A CITY FALLS (2011)

Producer: Gerard Smyth
Director: Gerard Smyth
Duration: 106 minutes
Website: http://whenacityfalls.co.nz/
Facebook:http://www.facebook.com/pages/When-A-City-Falls/154927581246936
5,812 likes (as of 30/12/2012)

Festival release: Melbourne International Film Festival 2012

General release: 12 weeks in general release. (Released November 2011)

Gore - St James

Arrowtown – Dorothy Browns’ Wanaka-Cinema Paradiso

New Plymouth – Art House cinema

Napier – Globe Theatrette

Matakana – Matakana Cinema

Hamilton – Lido

Timaru – Movie Max Digital

Auckland – Rialto

Dunedin – Rialto

Wellington – Reading

Christchurch – Reading, Hoyts
Invercargill – Reading

TV Screening: TV3 22 February 2012. Part of an earthquake anniversary special.

Distributor: Metropolis

DVD Sales/Online Distribution

DVD sales on own website (http://whenacityfalls.co.nz/). NZ$26 DVD

Funding:

NZFC 2011 feature film investment $65,000

NZFC 2011 Early Development fund $5,000

NZFC 2012 Additional Investment $211,000

NZ On Air 2011 $115,000

Total: $396,000

Box Office:


Synopsis:

One man's journey through disaster, recovery and discovery.

2010 on the Canterbury Plains and all is well. Lambs, blue skies and daffodils. In Cathedral Square choir boys sing to their God. Punts push new season's tourists along the Avon. They photograph the 'Garden city'; the 'most English city outside of England'.

We get hit with a 7.1 earthquake. We stand up, wave our fists at the heavens and compliment ourselves on our ability to recover. And then we get hit even harder. Now the city has fallen. Many are dead. Many injured. Many narrowly escape.

A fragile people reappear in the following days. We have learnt from the first earthquake and once again a response is growing. Once again adrenaline is taking over. Now the whole country is rallying for Christchurch. It's the energy of the people
that's unprecedented. Communities are rising from the sand. People are holding tight to each other.

A year later and the quakes keep rolling. Now the Canterbury earthquakes are the most ever quakes recorded in a series. And we're still counting.... "When A City Falls" sees New Zealanders in our darkest days. How do we respond? Who do we become? We discover something wonderful about ourselves. We discover we are a functional people, concerned and caring for our neighbours, our fellow Kiwis.

"When A City Falls" travels way beyond earthquake reactive television footage to a tale of hope, an uplifting story that speaks of the kindness of human hearts.

(http://www.frankfilm.co.nz/when-a-city-falls.html)
**BROTHER NUMBER ONE (2011)**

**Producer:** Annie Goldson, Rob Hamill, James Bellamy

**Director:** Annie Goldson, Peter Gilbert

**Duration:** 97 Minutes

**Website:** [www.brothernumberone.co.nz](http://www.brothernumberone.co.nz)

**Facebook:** [http://www.facebook.com/BrotherNumberOne.film](http://www.facebook.com/BrotherNumberOne.film)

1,058 likes (as of 30 December 2012)

**Festival release:**

NZIFF 2011

Also MIFF 2011 (Australia), IDFA 2011 (Netherlands), FIPA 2011 (France)

March, 2012 | South East Asia Film Festival | Singapore

May, 2012 | Human Rights Watch Film Festival (Q&A) | Chicago

June, 2012 | Human Rights Watch Film Festival (Q&A) | New York

March, 2012 | Human Rights Watch Film Festival | London

March, 2012 | OzDox Screening & Q&A | Sydney

April, 2012 | Sports Film Festival | Russia

**General release (NZ):**

1 March, 2012 | Tea Party Screening | Rialto **Newmarket**

4 March, 2012 | Screening and Q&A with Rob Hamill | The Lido - **Hamilton**

5 March, 2012 | Screening and Q&A with Rob Hamill | The Lighthouse - **Petone**

5 March, 2012 | Screening and Q&A with Rob Hamill | Penthouse Cinema - **Wellington**

6 March, 2012 | Screening and Q&A with Rob Hamill | The Suter - **Nelson**
8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Embassy - Wanganui

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Basement - Rotorua

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Focal Point - Fielding

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Focal Point - Levin

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Cinema Kororareka - Russell

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Light House - Petone

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Rialto - Tauranga

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | The Victoria - Hamilton

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Rialto Newmarket - Auckland

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Odeon - Gisborne

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Hollywood - Christchurch

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Rialto - Dunedin

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Bridgewater Cinema - Auckland

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Penthouse Cinema - Wellington

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Majestic Cinema - Taihape

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Cinema 2 - Hawera

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | Seahorse World - Picton

8 March, 2012 | NZ Theatrical Release Opens | State Cinema - Nelson

8 March, 2012 | Screening and Q&A with Rob Hamill | Bridgewater Cinema - Auckland

9 March, 2012 | Film Talk | Rialto Newmarket

15 March, 2012 | Opening | Gecko - Motueka

15 March, 2012 | Opening | Movieworld - Timaru

15 March, 2012 | Opening | Starlight Cinema - Taupo
15 March, 2012 | Opening | Globe Theatrette - Napier

15 March, 2012 | Opening | Reading Cinema - Invercargill

16 March, 2012 | Screening & Q&A with Rob Hamill | Rialto - Tauranga

22 March, 2012 | Opening | Shoreline Cinema - Waikanae

22 March, 2012 | Opening | Thames

12 April, 2012 | Opening | The Arthouse - New Plymouth

20 April, 2012 | Opening | Takaka

3 May, 2012 | Screening and Q&A with Rob Hamill | Matakana Cinemas

Distributor: Metropolis

DVD Sales/Online Distribution

DVD sales on own website (http://brothernumberone.co.nz/shop) USD$20 + postage & handling

Via TransitMedia (educational distributors)

TV Screening:

TV3, July 19 2012. 44min Broadcast Version

Funding:

2009 NZFC Feature Film Investment $250,000

2009 NZOA for TV3 $170,000

Total: $420,000

Box Office:


Synopsis:
**Brother Number One** is a New Zealand documentary on the torture and murder of New Zealand yachtie Kerry Hamill by the Khmer Rouge in 1978. It follows the journey of Kerry's younger brother, Rob Hamill, an Olympic and Trans-Atlantic champion rower, who travels to Cambodia to retrace the steps taken by his brother and John Dewhirst, speaking to eyewitnesses, perpetrators and survivors. (http://brothernumberone.co.nz/)
SHIHAD: BEAUTIFUL MACHINE (2012)

Producer: Laurence Alexander, Grant Roa, David White (co-producer)

Director: Sam Peacocke

Duration: 102 mins

Website: http://shihadmovie.com/

Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/shihadmovie

916 likes (as at 30 December 2012)

Festival release:

None

TV Screening:

Rialto Channel, June 2013

Distributor: Rialto Cinema

DVD Sales/Online Distribution

DVD sales via www.mightyape.co.nz (not advertised on film website) NZ$34.99

Distributed by Vendetta Films (http://vendettafilms.co.nz/)


General release:

Premiere May 17, 2012

Auckland

Event Albany

Event Broadway, Newmarket

Event Highland Park
Appendices

Event Manukau
Event Queen St
Event St Lukes
Event West City
Event West Gate
Hoyts Sylvia Park
Hoyts Wairau, Glenfield
Monterey Howick, Auckland

Fielding
Focal Point Cinema Feilding

Gisborne
Odeon Cinema Gisborne

Hamilton
Event Chartwell
Hoyts Hamilton Te Awa

Havelock North
Cinema Gold, Havelock North

Levin
Focal Point Cinema Levin

Martinborough
Circus Cinema Martinborough

Matakana
Matakana Cinemas
New Plymouth
Event New Plymouth

Palmerston North
Downtown Palmerston North

Paraparaumu
Downtown Paraparaumu

Taihape
Majestic Cinema Taihape

Te Puke
Capitol Te Puke

Wanganui
Embassy 3 Wanganui

Wellington
Empire Island Bay
Event Embassy Wellington
Event Queensgate, Lower Hutt

Whakatane
Cinema 5 Whakatane

Whangarei
Event Whangarei

Whitianga
Mercury Twin Whitianga

Ashburton
Regent Ashburton

Christchurch

Hoyts Riccarton

Hollywood Sumner

Dunedin

Rialto Cinemas Dunedin

Motueka

State Cinemas Motueka

Nelson

State, Nelson

Takaka

Village Theatre

Funding:

2010 NZFC Feature Film Investment $755,000

2011 NZFC Feature Film Investment $58,900

2010 NZOA for Four (C4) $160,000

Total $973,900

Box Office:


Synopsis:

For over 20 years, Shihad has defined New Zealand rock music. From their roots in Wellington’s furious 90s punk metal scene, to the wild Berlin days, the tragic overdose
of their manager, the international explosion of The General Electric, and the infamous American name-change, Shihad: Beautiful Machine asks – what went wrong?

More than a documentary, this is an all-access pass to an extraordinary rock saga, charting a legendary band’s fight with fame, fortune, the industry, and finally – itself.

(http://www.shihadmovie.com/the_Story/index.html)
2 Films at the World Cinema Showcase

TE HONO KI AOTEAROA (2012)

Producer: Jan Bieringa

Director: Jan Bieringa

Duration: 84 minutes

Website: None

Facebook: None

Festival release:

World Cinema Showcase 2012

http://www.worldcinemashowcase.co.nz/tehonokiaotearoa.html

TV Screening: None

Distributor: None

General release: None

Funding:

Museum VolKenkunde, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Creative New Zealand and Toi Maori Aotearoa.

Synopsis:

“Don’t crash it”, jokes Chappy Harrison as he hands over captaincy to Koos Wabeke, the young Dutchman who will guide a beautiful new waka taua down Dutch canals. The waka, Te Hono ki Aotearoa, was commissioned for the Museum Volkenkunde in Leiden by Toi Maori Aotearoa. This lively film describes its creation – and the dedication of all involved to avoiding crashes of the inter-cultural kind. Dutch immersion in kaupapa waka begins propitiously in museum director Steven Engelsman’s desire to get it right and in the affinity he strikes with the master carver Hekenukumai Busby.
Given a front row seat from the earliest negotiations through to the handing over, filmmaker Jan Bieringa is alert to the different ways in which so many men on the project, young and old, Maori and Dutch, inhabit the rituals that invest meaning in the work. With all due tact and admiration she marks the generation of something deeply stirring: a taonga destined never to return but to make Aotearoa manifest on European waters.

(http://www.worldcinemashowcase.co.nz/tehonokiaotearoa.html)
MENTAL NOTES (2012)

Producer: Jim Marbrook

Director: Jim Marbrook

Duration: 70 minutes

Website: None

Facebook:

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Mental-Notes/253435324739415

84 Likes (30 December 2012)

Festival release:

World Cinema Showcase 2012

General release:

21 June onwards – Paramount, Wellington
21-22 & 25-26 June – Metropolis, Dunedin
23 June onwards – Academy, Auckland, Waiheke Cinema, Auckland
1 & 5 July – Dome, Gisborne
5 July onwards – Hollywood, Christchurch.

Distributor: None

TV Screening: None

Funding:

Mental Notes was made with the financial support of the Frozen Funds Trust, a feature film finishing grant from the New Zealand Film Commission, and a reTHiNK Grant from Mind and Body Consultants. (http://www.onfilm.co.nz/2012/06/19/acclaimed-kiwi-doco-returns-to-nz-cinemas/, retrieved 24/09/2012)

NZFC Feature film finishing grant $10,000
Synopsis:

“They had benign names like Cherry Farm, Seaview and Sunnyside, but for many they were simply known as ‘the Bins’. These old psych hospitals housed thousands of patients and long term residents. They were a culture unto themselves, a world of ‘back wards’, ‘ECT trolleys’ and ‘seclusion rooms’. Mental Notes is the story of five survivors from the Bins. It is the portrait of a unique group of people who are coming to grips with a past that is difficult for many of us to imagine today.”
— Jim Marbrook Mental Notes

The bad old, very bad old days of mental health care in New Zealand are recalled with dismay, disbelief and a touch of gallows humour by five survivors in Jim Marbrook’s gently affirmative documentary. All were institutionalised in places that luckier New Zealanders remember just driving past with a contraction of fear and curiosity, scary places that burrowed into national consciousness and individual insecurity for generations.

Fear was justified, as these witnesses can testify. Diagnosis could be devastatingly simplistic – ‘We were all schizophrenics in those days’ – and definitive. Tens of thousands were judged incompetent for life and herded, injected, restrained and medicated to fit. Some were admitted as children, considered too unruly for fostering by Child Welfare, and grew up inside.

We return to the abandoned asylums with two men who recall the worst of times amongst the debris of the cells and cages that once held one of them, and the dayroom from which the other made his escape. Former nurses and psychiatrists provide measured recollections of too-readily embraced revolutions in treatment and the ‘toxic and disabling’ psych hospital culture that persisted in New Zealand long after One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest provided a popular damnation of it.

Marbrook has the grace never to feed on the persecution of his subjects. He honours their endurance and enables their stories to emerge from the shadows and leave their indelible blemishes on our social history.
(http://worldcinemashowcase.co.nz/mentalnotes.html)
5 films at the Documentary Edge Festival

DISAPPEAR INTO LIGHT (2011)

**Producer:** Leonie Reynolds

**Director:** Leonie Reynolds

**Duration:** 73 minutes

**Website:** None

**Facebook:** None

**Festival release:** Documentary Edge

**General release:** None

**TV Screening:** None

**Distributor:** None

**Funding:** Unknown

**Synopsis:**

*Jo Randerson is the daughter of a priest, a playwright and a performer who takes no prisoners when it comes to the integrity of her work.*

*Her largest scale work yet is a black comedy about death, and about what it means to engage with life.*

*This observational documentary follows nine months in Randerson’s life as she applies for highly competitive funding, puts a team together, and embarks on the long journey to opening night.*

INTERSEXION (2012)

Producer: John Keir

Director: Grant Lahood

Duration: 68 minutes

Website: http://www.intersexionfilm.com/

Facebook:

Festival release: Documentary Edge Festival

TV Screening: Sunday 10th July, 10.40 pm, TV One

Distributor: None

DVD Sales/Online Distribution

On film website (http://www.intersexionfilm.com/purchase-intersexion-film/)

USD$45 plus postage

General release:

Screening at Academy in Auckland 6 Sep 2012 - 12 Sep 2012

Gecko in Motueka.

Funding:

NZ On Air (TV One) $169,836 (to Ponsonby Productions 2008)

Synopsis:

Every new parent asks: “Is it a boy or a girl?” But what happens when doctors cannot answer that question? One baby in 2,000 is born with genitalia so ambiguous that it is impossible to tell if the child is male or female. That startling but little known statistic means the number of intersex babies equals two rugby teams every year. Their birth certificates – instead of showing “male” or “female” — are sometimes marked “I” for indeterminate.
Director Grant Lahood follows Mani Bruce Mitchell, NZ’s first “out” intersex person, as he/she travels to meet other intersex people living in America, Ireland, Germany, South Africa and Australia.

Expatriate Kiwi sexologist Dr John Money of the world renowned Johns Hopkins Medical School believed that gender was the product of “nurture not nature.” His studies into intersex people led to a particular surgical treatment model for babies born with ambiguous genitalia – the idea being that doctors could produce healthy and happy men and women by intervening early in an intersex child’s life. Usually that meant a family secret that had to be kept at all costs.

But as the film shows, human sexual development is never that straight forward. This is a heart-warming story told with a mix of laughter and tears in the most frank and revealing way.

(http://www.documentaryedge.org.nz/2012/ak/film/intersexion)
**YAKEL 3D (2011)**

**Producer:** Rachel Wilson

**Director:** Rachel Wilson

**Duration:** 70 minutes

**Website:** [http://www.yakel3dfilm.com/](http://www.yakel3dfilm.com/)

**Facebook:**

[http://www.facebook.com/pages/Yakel-3D-Film/120676874672970](http://www.facebook.com/pages/Yakel-3D-Film/120676874672970)

47 Likes (at 30 December 2012)

**Festival release:**

Documentary Edge (World Premiere)

**TV Screening:**

None

**Distributor:**

Global Media Consult

**General release:**

Screenings at Rialto Newmarket (Auckland) November 2012

Dunedin

**Funding:** unknown

**Synopsis:**

*Yakel 3D* is New Zealand’s first 3D feature release, directed by Rachael Wilson and shot by Emmy Award winning cameraman Michael Single. It beautifully explores the fragility of one of the last primitive cultures left today.

*Set in a remote Vanuatu tribal village and shot over three years, this is the remarkable story of 108-year-old Chief Kowia near the end of his long, eventful life. A survivor of*
tribal wars, colonization and epidemics, he has rejected the modern world in favour of a life free of material goods — without money or clothes. It is their jungle that provides life’s necessities.

As the charismatic Chief faces the end of his life, he worries what will happen to his people when he is no longer there to guide them. Can his culture stay strong? Or will his people be tempted by greater riches and leave behind their tribal lives?

(http://www.documentaryedge.org.nz/2012/ak/film/yakel-3d)
VIEW FROM OLYMPUS (2011)

Producer: Richard Riddiford

Director: Geoffrey Cawthorn

Duration: 72 minutes

Website: http://geoffreycawthorn.com/view-from-olympus/

Facebook:

Festival release:

Previously screened NZFF 2011, Doc Edge 2012

TV Screening:

TV One Artsville, 2011

Distributor:

General release:

None

Funding:

NZ On Air $122,980 (2009)

Synopsis:

John Psathas, a New Zealander and son of Greek immigrants, was commissioned to compose the music to the opening and closing ceremonies of the Athens Olympics in 2004. At 44 years of age, he has achieved extraordinary international praise as a composer to watch. Drawing from classical, jazz, rock and Greek folk tradition, he grabs audiences and takes them on a thrilling musical journey.

This is an intensely personal story about a man whose life and music is split between his Greek and New Zealand identities. Psathas grew up in a close immigrant family in small town New Zealand where his parents ran a fish and chips shop. When they and his sister returned to Greece, Psathas remained in New Zealand forging a stellar
career. Now, with his own young family established in New Zealand but with his parents aging, he is at an emotional crossroad.

Director Geoffrey Cawthorn takes viewers on a journey into Psatha’s life and music. The film observes Psathas at home in Wellington, where he works creating new compositions and teaching at the New Zealand School of Music. It follows him back to the towns of his childhood and onto Greece for an emotional reunion with his parents. The film climaxes with a triumphant performance in Germany of his best-known work, View from Olympus.
NAZI HUNTER (2012)

Producer: John Keir

Director: Alex Behse

Duration: 50 minutes

Website: none

Facebook: none

Festival release:

TV Screening:

TV3, Inside New Zealand

9.30pm, 9 August 2012

Distributor:

none

General release:

none

Funding:

NZ On Air, Ponsonby Productions, $114,996 (2011)

Synopsis:

Are there monsters amongst us?

Wayne Stringer, an ex-cop, is New Zealand’s Nazi Hunter. He secretly investigated 47 “displaced persons” who originally came to New Zealand at the end of WWII.

This film interweaves his secret year-long investigation with the story of his prime suspect — an elderly North Shore man who had been a machine gunner in the “mobile murder unit” responsible for the killing of thousands of Eastern European Jews in Holocaust.
Stringer travelled to the Baltic States where he was given access to war records held for years in KGB archives safely behind the Iron Curtain and visited the killing grounds in Lithuania and Belarus. He also linked in with war crimes investigators from other countries.

The film poses the question: as a result of the investigation into suspected Nazi war criminals, has New Zealand become a more or less safe place for modern era war criminals looking for a bolt hole?

(http://www.documentaryedge.org.nz/2012/ak/film/nazi-hunter)
10 films at the NZIFF

THE LAST DOGS OF WINTER (2011)

Producer: Costa Botes

Director: Costa Botes

Duration: 97 minutes

Website: http://costabotes.com/the-last-dogs-of-winter/

Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/Dogsofwinter

1,065 Likes as of 30 December 2012

Festival release:

NZIFF, IDFA, Sydney, Toronto

TV Screening:

None

General release:

Rialto Auckland from 4.10.2012

Other screenings TBC

Distributor:

None (self)

DVD Sales/Online Distribution

Not yet, but Costa Botes has an online store for other films on his website (http://costabotes.co.nz/)

Funding:

2010/2011 NZFC Funding $176,770 Feature Film Investment

NZFC Development Finance for Feature film projects $10,000
Total 186,770

Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)

*We’re delighted to present the New Zealand premiere screenings of NZIFF veteran Costa Botes’ spectacular documentary. The Last Dogs of Winter has already been winning friends for its ornery conservationist hero and his more camera-friendly young Kiwi assistant at major film festivals around the world (Toronto, IDFA and more). It also serves, for those of us unable to make the journey ourselves, as an immersive visit to Churchill, Manitoba, Polar Bear Capital of the World. — BG

“For the past 40 years, in a remote and harshly beautiful corner of northern Manitoba, Brian Ladoon has devoted his life to preserving and breeding an endangered species: the Qimmiq, Canada's indigenous Eskimo dog... A wilderness lover’s delight... this intimate, gorgeously rendered documentary intelligently surveys Ladoon’s quixotic mission, the numerous obstacles he faces, and the uneasy co-existence of man, animal and nature in the small town of Churchill (pop. 873)...

Botes comes to Ladoon’s story through fellow New Zealander (and producer) Caleb Ross, a former actor [The Tribe]. As a 20-something, the adventuresome Ross travelled to Canada for love, but, as he notes, the affair went south and he went north, enticed by a job posting that read, ‘Come to Churchill, breed Eskimo dogs, see polar bears’...

Filming with a lightweight HD camera and only his wife as crew... Botes intercuts artfully shot interviews with spectacular outdoor scenes. Among the most captivating are those of the chained dogs interacting with the curious bears, and the lumbering white bears gamboling with one another in the snow.” — Alissa Simon, Variety

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/wellington/film/ee7aae24-966e-4031-9215-ab0b7746a92a)
HOW FAR IS HEAVEN (2012)

Producer: Miriam Smith

Director: Christopher Pryor, Miriam Smith

Duration: 99 minutes

Website: http://howfarisheavenfilm.com/

Facebook:

None

Festival release: NZIFF

TV Screening:

None

Distributor:

Self (River Pictures)

General release:

Throughout New Zealand

19 weeks in release in 2012 (still screening in the final week of 2012)

Funding:

Independent Filmmakers Fund (NZFC & Creative New Zealand) $63,000

+ 2012 NZFC Feature Film Investment $182,453

+ Wanganui district council $33,000

Total = 278,453

Box Office:
Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)

The Sisters of Compassion have lived in the remote village of Jerusalem / Hiruharama on the Whanganui River in New Zealand for 120 years. Today, only three nuns remain - their legacy on the river is coming to an end. This is a complex world of powerful dualities; Maori & Christian spirituality, parties & prayers, pig hunting and perfume appreciation...

Over the course of a year, the film follows the journey of Sister Margaret Mary, the newest Sister to Jerusalem, who is a regular volunteer at the local school. Through an intimate, observational gaze, the film is captivated by the spellbinding personalities of the local kids, whose humour and unique philosophies transcend the harsher realities of life.

Throughout all seasons, the Sisters’ daily practice of compassion engages with the traditions of local Maori. Together they must learn to navigate life’s heartbreak and joy.

Filmmakers Christopher Pryor & Miriam Smith lived and filmed in Jerusalem for a year, gaining privileged insight into this special world.

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/film/d0801541-30a2-44ed-8f8e-db69907f26c8)
SONG OF THE KAURI (2012)

Producer: Mathurin Molgat

Director: Mathurin Molgat

Duration: 100 minutes

Website: http://www.songofthekauri.com/

Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/SongOfTheKauri

184 Likes at 30 December 2012

Festival release: NZIFF

TV Screening:

Distributor:

General release:

Kerikeri - Cathay Cinema 20 Dec – 26 Dec

Auckland - Devonport, The Vic Cinema - Screenings from the 17th of November

Papakura - Hawkins Theatre, 6th & 20th November

Newmarket - Rialto Cinemas, Thursday 15th November – Wednesday 21st November

Rotorua - Basement Cinema, Tuesday 11 December

Gisborne - Dome Cinema, Wednesday 12 December - Thursday 20 December

Wellington - Paramount Cinema, Screenings from the 22nd of November

Nelson - Motueka The Gecko Theatre, 22 Dec – 24 Dec

Hokitika - Regent Theatre, Screening dates to be announced

Kaikoura - Mayfair Kaikoura, Screening dates to be announced

Christchurch - Sumner, Thursday 13 December - Monday 17 to Wednesday

Akaroa - Cine Café, 20 Dec – 21 Dec
Queenstown - Arrowtown, Dorothy Browns, Tuesday 4 - Tuesday 11 December, 22 Dec - 1 Jan

Dunedin - Rialto Cinemas, Thursday 15th November – Wednesday 21st November

Gore - SBS St James Theatre, Screenings to be announced

Twizel - NZFC The Regal, Screenings to be announced

**Funding:**

Feature Film Finishing Grant $10,000

**Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)**

Filmmaker Mathurin Molgat tells us that New Zealand lost 96% of its native kauri forests through felling and fire between 1820 and 1974. Land clearances account for much more of that statistic than any timber trade. Molgat’s documentary is a labour of clear-eyed love, addressing the politics of exotic tree plantations in a land where the native species are uniquely beautiful and may possess a commercial potential that has never been explored. But does any government plan in the present for a harvest 60 years hence? Without demonising the perpetrators, Molgat explains the history of destruction, then finds inspiration in a man whose craft is dependent on chopping down more trees – judiciously and one at a time. Northland’s Laurie Williams is a luthier of international repute. We watch him working with the kaitiaki of the forest to select and fell a tree that will provide the material for his eagerly sought-after guitars and violins. Philosophers, musicians, economists, historians, scientists, professors and woodsmen amplify Molgat’s lyrical, holistic treatise.

(https://www.nzff.co.nz/auckland/film/b6f7607e-d2cc-4445-a386-ca947abe5f9b)
PERSUADING THE BABY TO FLOAT (2012)

Producer: Keith Hill

Director: Keith Hill

Duration: 83 minutes

Website: none

Facebook: none

Festival release:

NZIFF

TV Screening:

none

Distributor: none

General release: none

Funding: Unknown

Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)

The ongoing artistic collaboration between Norman Meehan, Bill Manhire and Hannah Griffin has produced two sublime CDs, with a third in the can for release later in 2012. This film captures them mid-process, as songs from Making Baby Float are rehearsed and then performed in front of an audience for the live recording.

The great virtue of the film is its close and calm focus on Hannah Griffin’s wonderful performances: rapt and unselfconsciously absorbed in rehearsal, blooming expressively in performance. It has the shape of a classic music doco. Interviews and conversations footage reflecting on the process of collaboration are cut in with the rehearsals and performances. Only towards the end do powerful full performances emerge, and only at the very end does the audience appear and applause breaks out like the release of a pent breath.
Mutual admiration shines out of the interviews, but moments of unease are recorded too. At one point Manhire says of ‘Kevin’, a setting of a sad and grave elegy to a late friend that features initially quite shocking moments of gospel uplift, “I hated that song at first, I have to say”. There is something fundamentally wrong with the notion of setting poetry to music. A good poem contains its own music already and needs nothing added. But when the additions are as sensitive and imaginative as these, exceptional new artworks arise. This poetry and music lover is persuaded. — Fergus Barrowman

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/film/persuading-the-baby-to-float)
THE LAST OCEAN (2012)

Producer: Peter Young

Director: Peter Young

Duration: 85 minutes

Website: http://www.lastocean.org/

Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/thelastocean

3,288 Likes on Facebook as of 30 December 2012

Festival release: NZIFF

TV Screening:

Prime, 8:30pm Tuesday, October 2 2012

Distributor:

Unknown

General release:

RIALTO Tauranga

Tuesday 25th September 11.15am
Wednesday 26th September 4.30pm

The Village Theatre Takaka

Wednesday 26th September 7.30pm

Sunday 30th September 4.30pm

State Cinemas Nelson

Tuesday 25th September 11.10am, 2.50pm and 7.00pm
Wednesday 26th September 11.10am, 2.50pm and 7.00pm

Picton Cinemas
Friday 28th September 11.00am and 3.00pm
Saturday 29th September 11.00am and 3.00pm
Sunday 30th September 11.00am and 3.00pm
Monday 1st October 11.00am and 3.00pm
Tuesday 2nd October 11.00am and 3.00pm
Wednesday 3rd October 11.00am and 3.00pm
Monterey Cinemas Howick
Tuesday 25th September 1.45am and 5.10pm
Wednesday 26th September 5.10pm
The Victoria Theatre Devonport
Daily from Saturday 29th September
The Roxy Cinema Wellington
Tuesday 25th September 10.45am
Wednesday 26th September 2.45pm
RIALTO Newmarket
Tuesday 25th September 5.00pm
Wednesday 26th September 10.20am
RIALTO Dunedin
Wednesday 26th September 12.00pm
Waiheke Cinemas
Sunday 30th September 7.30pm
Hollywood 3 Christchurch
Saturday 29th September 4.00pm
Sunday 30th September 2.00pm

**Funding:**

2012 NZOA funding for Prime $80,000

NZFC Feature Film Finishing Grant $25,000

Total: $105,000

**Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)**

*The Last Ocean* is a documentary directed by Peter Young, one of the country’s leading nature cameramen and a key figure in the international movement to end fishing in the Ross Sea. Facing depleted fisheries everywhere else the fishing industry has found its way south to the last pristine marine ecosystem on earth and to the Antarctic toothfish (sold as Chilean seabass in up-market restaurants and delis around the world). The fishers plan to remove 50% of the adult toothfish from the Ross Sea and in doing so will destroy the natural balance of Earth’s last untouched ocean. Environmentalists, commercial fishers and governments are going head to head over this issue, which raises the simple ethical question: do we fish the last ocean or do we protect it? Young’s ravishing Antarctic footage lends emotive force to a detailed account of the conservationist case and the long political and diplomatic campaign to counteract the hungry fishing lobby. — BG

“The toothfish produced a gold rush mentality and we then found things got out of control.” — Stuart Prior, Head of Antarctic Policy Unit, NZ 1996

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/auckland/film/35d8f2fa-25c9-4a04-9f5e-3f9e757116ed)
TATARAKIHI: THE CHILDREN OF PARIHAKA (2012)

Producer:
Gaylene Preston (Executive Producer)
Paora Te Oti Takarangi Joseph and Janine Martin

Director:
Paora Te Oti Takarangi Joseph
Co-director Janine Martin

Duration:
65 minutes

Website:
http://www.parihakafilm.com/

Facebook:
http://www.facebook.com/Tatarakihi
293 Likes as of 30 December 2012

Festival release:
NZIFF

TV Screening:
None

Distributor:
None (self)

General release:
Rialto Dunedin from September 20, 2012
Havelock North - Cinema Gold
Friday 21 September 4:30 p.m.
Sunday 23 September 1:00 p.m.

Masterton - Regent3
Saturday 27 October - 2:00 p.m.
Tuesday 30 October - 6:00 p.m.

New Plymouth - EVENT 3
Saturday 27 October - 4:00 p.m.
Sunday 28 October - 1:30 p.m.
Wednesday 31 October - 10:30 a.m.

Waiheke Island
Sun 18 Nov 2012 - 5:00pm
and a second screening on Tue 20 Nov 2012 - 7:30pm

Rialto Newmarket from November 1, 2012

**Funding:**

The TSB Community Trust $30,000

Pozible crowdfunding A$8,494

Pozible crowdfunding A$1,700

NZFC Feature Film Finishing Grant $10,000

Total: $50,194

**Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)**

In 1881 the children of Parihaka greeted the government invaders with white feathers of peace. Tatarakihi tells the story of a ‘journey of memory’ taken by a group of Parihaka children who travel to the South Island 130 years later. They follow in the footsteps of their male ancestors who were transported south after the Taranaki land confiscations of the 1860s. Wellington War Memorial, Addington Jail and Ripapa Island in Lyttelton Harbour are key stations on the long bus journey to the caves at Andersons Bay in Dunedin where the Parihaka men were imprisoned. The prisoners were forced to labour
on buildings, roads and embankments. These enduring expressions of Dunedin’s 19th-century prosperity were founded on something closely resembling slavery. Ensuring that the experience of the slaves endures as well, the passage of knowledge conveyed in and by Tatarakihi is both sombre and enriching. The film is narrated by the children and combines footage of their hikoi (some of it shot by the children themselves) with vivid archival photography. — BG

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/christchurch/film/99b9f12c-2da3-4ff4-a663-a260bd6a7b75)
MAORI BOY GENIUS (2012)

Producer: Pietra Brettkelly

Director: Pietra Brettkelly

Duration: 84 minutes

Website:  www.maoriboygenius.com/

Facebook:

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Maori-Boy-Genius/280325718682247

498 Likes as of 30 December 2012

Festival release:

NZIFF, Berlin, Sheffield, Sydney, Melbourne

TV Screening:

MTS, Sat November 12 at 8.30pm and repeated Sunday November 27 at 6pm, 2011

Distributor:

(Sales) Cinephil

DVD Sales/Online Distribution

Sales via film website (http://www.maoriboygenius.com/store/) US$19.95 plus shipping

General release:

None

Funding:

2010 NZ On Air (MTS) NZ$155,000

Indiegogo US$5920 (approx NZ$7,200)

Total $162,200

Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)
Ngaa Rauuira Pumanawawhiti, 16 years old at the time of filming, is a charismatic young man through whom a great many aspirations flow. Born under a double rainbow, he’s carried a weight of expectation ever since – and with it a wealth of iwi pride and support. Steeped in Māori culture and political struggle, he has an avid appetite for political philosophy, and the hope that he might grow into a leader is not one he’s ever ducked. In her first documentary feature to address a New Zealand subject (but not her first to garner international attention), Auckland filmmaker Pietra Brettkelly (The Art Star and the Sudanese Twins) accompanies him through a critical turning point in his education. Chaperoned by his father, Ngaa Rauuira travels to Yale where he is enrolled in intensive political science seminars. In a world away from the wider whānau, he encounters more daunting challenges and choices than have been thrown in his path before. The film we are screening incorporates material seen in the one-hour documentary commissioned and broadcast last year by Māori Television. — BG

http://www.nzff.co.nz/film/e7869756-d23b-48c2-9618-8292dd788abf
PICTURES OF SUSAN (2012)

**Producer:** Dan Salmon, Tash Christie

**Director:** Dan Salmon

**Duration:** 86 minutes

**Website:** http://picturesofsusan.com/

**Facebook:** None (Susan King has website and Facebook page)

**Festival release:** NZIFF

**TV Screening:** none

**Distributor:** None

**General release:**

**Funding:**

$25,000 post-production grant NZFC 2012

**Synopsis:** (from NZIFF Programme 2012)

*Auckland ‘outsider artist’ Susan King stopped talking in 1955 when she was four years old and has said next to nothing since. Her grandmother recognised the little girl’s talent for drawing and kept her supplied with coloured pencils and paper. For 20 years Susan described her world in thousands of drawings, pages filled with delight, playfulness, curiosity and terror. Then she stopped. Her family sadly packed her pictures into boxes and stored them under beds and in the attic. There were 20 years of silence before she drew again. Of late, Susan’s art brut has been discovered by the dealer world. A 2009 show in Sydney garnered further, international demand, and compounded an ethical quandary for the family who can only guess at the artist’s wishes. Dan Salmon began filming them all in 2008 and his fascinating, thoughtful film performs its authorised role in their ‘outing’ with sensitivity and admiration. — BG*

“In 2008, I began filming... Over the next three years something extraordinary has happened. Susan has gone from shut down and non-communicative to happy, smiling and engaged... But her late rebirth as an artist is no guarantee of a happily-ever-after
story. Susan doesn’t talk and still lives with her mum. The family are desperate for her to enjoy the attention of the art world, but no gallery or institution will take on 10,000+ pictures, and the Kings refuse to sell or split the collection... Our families hold us up as well as hold us back, and Susan is happier, healthier, drawing again in the bosom of her loving family. Maybe that’s enough for her? Unless she decides to tell us, we may never know.” — Dan Salmon (http://www.nzff.co.nz/film/720f0585-742f-4841-b6f6-67ecda073d97)
TONGAN ARK (2012)

**Producer:** Echo Zeanah-Janman

**Director:** Paul Janman

**Duration:** 69 minutes

**Website:** http://tonganark.net/

**Facebook:**

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Tongan-Ark/121780031235309

1,280 Likes on Facebook as of 30 December 2012

**Festival release:** NZIFF

**TV Screening:** None

**Distributor:** None (Self)

**General release:**

Auckland

Mangere Arts Centre 29 September

Christchurch

Rangiruru Girl’s College 28 September

Wellington

3 screenings at The NZ Film Archive, Wellington, October

Auckland

Auckland Art Gallery on October 22

**Funding:**

Screen Innovation Production Fund $15,000

**Synopsis:** (from NZIFF Programme 2012)
Paul Janman’s lyrical documentary inducts us into the surprising world of Futa Helu and his ‘Atenisi Institute, an unconventional Tongan institution that proudly stands apart from church and state. Polynesian and classical European cultures entwine in what is probably the world’s smallest and poorest university, built on the swampy outskirts of Nuku’alofa. It is a place that prides itself on freedom of expression and thought, but also a place of rigorous devotion to a very purist notion of education, based on the teachings of the ancient Greek philosophers whom its founder valued above all. The Institute has fallen on tough times of late; among the crumbling buildings students are sometimes outnumbered by the stray dogs and pigs that wander the campus. It has survived due to the fundraising efforts of the school’s performing arts troupe, who specialise in another of Futa’s great loves: classical Italian opera. As Futa’s health declines, the burden of preserving the school falls increasingly on his somewhat hesitant family and the school’s eccentric faculty. — MM

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/film/d884cbe0-d1aa-40d0-9435-ff259a21f9fc)
VILLAGE BY THE SEA (2012)

Producer:
Bhim Singh, Krishna Chouhan. Supported by The Edith Collier Trust

Director: Michael Heath

Duration: 61 minutes

Website: none

Facebook: none

Festival release: NZIFF

TV Screening: none

Distributor: None

General release: None

Funding
Supported by The Edith Collier Trust

Synopsis: (from NZIFF Programme 2012)

In this gentle documentary Michael Heath follows up his earlier Edith Collier portrait (NZIFF07) to transport us to the Irish fishing village of Bunmahon where the New Zealand artist painted during the summers of 1914 and 1915. The beautifully shot landscapes – silver sea, misty green hills and radiant lilac skies – are interspersed with Collier’s painted versions. The camera leads us down leafy lanes and past derelict farmhouses at a contemplative pace in keeping with the quality of Collier’s work. Scored throughout with traditional Irish folk music, the film is a quiet exploration of the beauty of this seaside town, seen through a brush and a camera lens. Although Collier’s Bunmahon residency was a century ago, interviews with locals reveal a strong connection to this Antipodean painter. To their disappointment, her work has never been exhibited in Ireland: Collier returned to New Zealand with the sketches and paintings, and gradually abandoned her artistic dream. This melancholy-tinged story
pays tribute to an under-acknowledged artist and the continued legacy of her work. — JR

(http://www.nzff.co.nz/film/c1f76413-8461-4496-a1ae-3aa56b2bc1e5)
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