



TELEFILM CANADA'S 2012 ANNUAL PUBLIC ASSEMBLY

Advance Internet Questions Summary

Q. Why are you no longer broadcasting this meeting live on the Web? The time delay removes all interest...

Q. Will the meeting be broadcast via Skype, a live Webcast or podcast?

A. We have adopted a hybrid approach that allows us to meet our clients and partners face to face while allowing other stakeholders to submit advance questions via email. A video of the Annual Public Assembly will also be made available on Telefilm's Website, along with a Q&A for questions received. We considered the costs of a live Webcast meeting and the impact on our administrative budget.

Q. Why is the Annual Public Assembly taking place in Toronto?

A. It has been our practice in recent years to use the Annual Public Assembly as an opportunity to meet with clients and stakeholders in regions across Canada. Our meetings are rotated from one region to another. Telefilm Canada's previous annual public assemblies took place in Montreal, Halifax and Saint-Boniface, Manitoba.

Q. What's happening with the Spark Plug program? It was an extremely important diversity initiative.

A. The Spark Plug program was discontinued in 2006. It was later replaced by the Official Languages Activity (ALO-OLA) Program and the Featuring Aboriginal Stories Program, which were in turn discontinued in 2011 and integrated into our new [Development](#) and [Promotion](#) programs. Telefilm continues to support emerging talent through initiatives such as the [Micro-Budget Production Program](#). As well, through our redesigned Development program, new and minority community talent have the opportunity to work in collaboration with eligible film production companies.

Q. The film and television industry is changing very fast. When do you think you'll develop a promotion support program for new platforms in order to foster the spread and influence of such works?

A. Telefilm's new [Micro-Budget Production Program](#) focuses on supporting emerging talent who leverage digital platforms for the production, distribution and promotion of their feature films. The redesign of our Distribution programs, which we are currently working on, will also take into account these new needs. Finally, we recently led, with the Canada Media Fund (CMF) and the CRTC, an industry-wide Symposium on the promotion of Canadian content. Discussions on strategies related to new platforms are central to this initiative.

Q. Regarding the Development Program, ineligible applicants (i.e., those with no feature films released in the last five years) can attempt to be included as part of another producer's application. This is not practical and might be a form of discrimination. How does one know which producer has funds available? Why would they wish to be involved? Even if such an arrangement was possible, odds are that the other producer may have already filed his or her once-a-year application... The fact that packaging funding is now included in development is another hurdle to be overcome, especially in higher budget national features... Will Telefilm modify its current policy to give consideration to all of this?

A. It is not at all uncommon for producers to partner together to develop and produce feature films. The reasons for partnering are many, and we have seen this in many of the applications received for our Development program this year. Further, from our industry consultations, it was made clear to us that producers wanted more autonomy and flexibility in making project decisions; there was a need for less 'hand holding' from Telefilm. This was one of the fundamentals behind our Development program redesign.

Emerging talent as well as those from targeted communities (such as Aboriginal filmmakers and Francophones outside Quebec) can now benefit from a new relationship with established companies. Our new Development program allows these scriptwriters to apply under the umbrella of an established company. Furthermore, those companies, if successful, receive support over and above their own slate of projects. It is our goal that the partnerships created between new talent and experienced producers will help develop stronger projects that will more likely lead to successful productions that reach their audiences.

We don't allocate money in advance to producers (who then apply...); we fund their portfolio as submitted, if successful. So Telefilm can't alert someone in advance as to the funds that a producer will have. It is incumbent on the producer to put together their best portfolio—which can certainly include partnerships with others (including new talent).

Once the final decisions have been completed, our plan is to follow up with a post mortem on the first year of our Development program.

Q. If Telefilm's goal is to produce 100% of the feature films they are developing, then how will a producer—who is not able to access development money now—ever be able to secure production funding from Telefilm? With these changes, is it not fair to say that the producers who received a development slate in 2012 are probably the only producers, going forward, able to access Telefilm money, development or production? And who actually advised Telefilm that 1/3 is a terrible ratio? Doesn't Hollywood produce less than 1% of the films they develop?

A. We understand that the creative industry is an R&D industry where there will probably not be a 100% success rate of development projects going into production. What we reported was that, at this time, only 1/3 of the projects being produced with Telefilm's support (in production), received Telefilm funding in development. This is to say, 65% of projects in production currently at Telefilm, were developed without our support.

That being said, Telefilm has sought to better identify and customize development support to the needs of its wide range of clients. Our Program Redesign initiative, most notably, allows for more fluidity, flexibility and autonomy—three needed elements that were made clear to us by clients during industry consultations.

Telefilm is aware that this industry requires the constant injection of new and emerging talent for it to thrive. For this reason, Telefilm created additional financial incentives, under the redesigned Development program, for opportunities with established production companies in order for new talent to have an increased chance of seeing their scripts developed, produced, and ultimately reach their audiences.

Q. With over 75% of the development money spent, Telefilm has so far funded development of only five companies in the Atlantic region, compared to 27 last year. Why should 95% of feature film producers be shut out from Telefilm's public development money? Isn't there a better answer to Telefilm's own budgetary problems than putting thousands of careers at risk?

A. One of the main objectives of our Development Program Redesign has been to give producers more autonomy and flexibility when it comes to project decisions; to make it easier for them to work with us; to be less bureaucratic. These points were repeatedly raised during our industry consultations.

From this, administrative cost savings have been achieved, which are being reinvested into our programs. Something that is vital given our current funding context.

In fact, in 2011-2012, we transferred \$1.2 million of our administrative budget to funding programs.

At the writing of this Q&A (November 2012), Development funds have not all been invested. This wasn't the case at the same time the year previous.

We are committed to portfolio diversity and it still remains to be seen how many development projects from Atlantic Canada will be supported this fiscal year.

In its inception year, the impact of the new Development program is too early to determine. However, we will be conducting a post mortem on the process in early 2013—we will be soliciting the industry for feedback. At that time, we will decide if adjustments are needed.

Q. Telefilm's Success Index calculation, used to determine "successful companies" that can ultimately access public development money, does not take into account *film budget size*. Therefore, the companies that are now able to secure development money are simply the companies that have made large-budget films (and also, ironically, the films that have *lost* the most money). In other words, Telefilm's new policy strategy is *to give the same producers they've always funded, more*

money. Can Telefilm please provide a list of the low budget feature film production companies that were successful at attaining development slates from across the country in 2012?

A. As Telefilm stated in its most recent corporate plan, *Fostering Cultural Success*, the creation of a broader measurement for success was a top priority. Over the past 10 years, experience has taught us that, while success at the box office continues to be important, this must be looked at in conjunction with other factors, such as new distribution platforms. The Success Index is a quantitative tool that will allow us to measure the overall success (commercial, cultural and industrial) of Telefilm's investment portfolio over time.

Telefilm will continue to reward success, as well as continue to be committed to maintaining a diverse investment portfolio of productions that are most likely to succeed with an equally diverse range of audiences, whatever the region, language or cultural community.

Due to confidentiality concerns, we cannot identify or label certain companies as 'low budget'. However, as with all of our programs, decisions are posted quarterly online under Investment Reports on our Website (<http://telefilm.ca/en/telefilm/investment-reports>).

Q. Is Telefilm willing to make changes to the Success Index?

A. The components of the *Success Index*, at this time, will not change. The components being: commercial success, cultural success and industrial success.

This is not to say that the information gathering mechanisms, and processes, will not improve and change. They will. We already have a number of suggestions from producers and other stakeholders on what we should be focusing on to improve the reporting of data.

Q. Most of this severe loss of confidence rippling through the industry directed at Telefilm is a result of both the (a) lack of transparency and (b) lack of consultation with its sudden development policy changes of last spring. Going forward, can Telefilm provide a public list of the names of the people who they consult with and each person's role in the feature film industry? Furthermore, can Telefilm move toward more meaningful consultation with the producers themselves? Furthermore, can Telefilm be more aware of conflict of interest, and that many of their policy changes might benefit some producers greatly, and hurt others? Furthermore, can Telefilm—like any Crown organization governing a public pot of money—be transparent with their data, including publishing Success Indexes for each company, producer and film.

A. Firstly, Telefilm has never consulted more with the industry than it has in the last 2½ years. Many of our ideas regarding the changes and redesign came from the industry who told us two things: less bureaucracy, and more autonomy.

We have consulted with various organizations in the industry, including the provincial agencies, producers associations, writers associations, distributors, and so on (please refer to the Annex for a list of consultations). The expectation is that the representatives in these groups share the information with their members or colleagues.

In addition, we have had meetings with individual producers. It is impossible for us to have a meeting with all producers; however, we are confident that the producers and other stakeholders with whom we have consulted are representative of the industry at large.

That being said, unless an organization has officially made public their position, in order to have candid and open discussions with stakeholders, we must respect their confidentiality regarding submitted comments.

Finally, we cannot share individual Success Index scores, as some of these results are directly linked to confidential commercial and financing data provided by clients. Of course, details regarding Telefilm's own investments are public as always.

Q. I am extremely concerned at what I perceive to be a lack of foresight in Telefilm's approach to determining their definition of a producer by using the methodology that a producer can only be recognized by them as such if he or she has only had a film distributed theatrically in Canada in the past five years. There are many very experienced producers, such as the award-winning Norman Jewison and other people, who have produced films that did obtain theatrical releases in Canada prior to the set forth five-year deadline who have proven that they are professionally and creatively capable of producing motion pictures. The fact that they may not have done so in the past five years should mean that they should be stripped of the recognition of their abilities by this provision of Telefilm's guidelines.

A. There is no new definition of a producer for any of our programs. The eligibility criteria for a producer applying to Telefilm's Production Program have not changed. It is the eligibility criteria for our Development program that have been modified this fiscal.

As you are well aware, the Development programs were over-subscribed, generating high administrative costs and lengthy decision-making times. We heard from the industry that this needed to change. Our goal with the Program Redesign is to respond to client needs more efficiently by streamlining the administrative process, and reducing the decision-making time. To this end, we are simplifying the guidelines and clarifying the eligibility criteria.

The new Development process is in its first iteration. We have heard suggestions and feedback from various producers like yourself. Consequently, we will do a post mortem on Development in the new year, and seek to address the concerns expressed.

Q. What percentage of Telefilm's production support last year went to new and emerging filmmakers?

A. Support of new and emerging talent has been a priority of Telefilm throughout the years. Through our various programs and training initiatives, Telefilm actively supports new and emerging talent as it is critical to the growth of our industry.

For the purpose of these statistics, we defined new and emerging talent as those individuals whose projects were supported, for production in 2011-2012, who were producing and/or directing a first or second feature-length film.

In 2011-2012, approximately 45% of all production projects supported were with new and emerging directors (i.e. 34 projects supported). In the English-language market the figure reaches 57% (25 projects supported), and in the French-language market it is 29% (9 projects supported). In terms of new and emerging producers, approximately 25% of all production projects were with new emerging producers. In the English-language market the figure is 34% (15 projects supported), and in the French-language market the figure is 13% (4 projects supported).

This does not reflect the entirety of Telefilm's support to new and emerging producers and directors who are also supported through development, marketing, training, talent-development and festival initiatives, as well as other regional activities. In addition, this year, we introduced the new Micro-budget Program which specifically targets new talent from across the country.

Summary of questions asked during the Q&A period of the Assembly

Q. Can you tell us more about the Success Index? Why did you develop it and how does it work?

A. (M. Roy) Two years ago, I was going through some background information in preparation for a speech that I had to deliver. I was astonished to find out that only 6% of the gross revenues of English Canadian films came from theatrical—that is box office. Yet, we were using this indicator as sole indicator of success for our Canadian films. I thought it was not only incomplete, but unfair to the producers as well.

It overlooked the fact that 65% of their gross revenues came from international sales and the fact that 15% of those revenues came from television. It also overlooked the fact that a percentage of revenues came from DVD and probably other types of platforms and screens, and so on. It was not only incomplete, but it was really unfair.

We had discussion with management, which came up with this indicator—what I call a composite indicator—that takes into consideration all aspects of the success of a film in reality. How does it work? Sixty percent of the Index bears on the economic measurement indicators, 40% of which is the home box office—theatrical. Thirty percent bears on the cultural aspect of the success of a film. Because we need to bear in mind that we have some films that are not necessarily huge successes at the box office, but they garner tons of rewards in festivals all around the world. This creates a buzz for Canadian film, Canadian cinema, that other films—perhaps more successful at the box office—will benefit from. So we need to take this into consideration as well, when it is time to assess the success of a film.

Finally, 10% of the indicator bears on the industrial side of it, how the producer was able to see some private investment in his production, because as Carolle mentioned earlier, our records show that the films that have the most private investment in them are the most successful films as well. This is how the indicator works.

Q. With the development eligibility that was implemented last year, is that sort of criteria going to be implemented towards the production financing or funding?

A. (C. Brabant) No, the eligibility criteria have not changed in production and won't be changed.

Q. This is an annual public meeting. You're presenting your annual report and your financial documents. We all came down to this public meeting to look at those documents and ask you questions. You're talking about money, but where's the financial report? How can we inform ourselves to ask you questions if we don't have the annual report and the financial statements in front of us?

A. (C. Brabant) Well, we made a decision two years ago, again to be more conscious of the dollars we're spending. We were printing these annual reports and it was very expensive, and a very little number of people were actually using those. So we've moved to a more efficient, energy-wise solution, to have the information on the Web and you can print the information if you want. There are PDF versions and I think that we've moved to that solution two or three years ago. So far, people have been very satisfied with that solution.

Q. What is the definition of emerging talent?

A. (C. Brabant) Emerging talent, as a definition for us, is a production company or a filmmaker that has not produced a large number of films—that would be an emerging talent. It has nothing to do with the age. It's the background as measured with the track record of the company or the filmmaker, and that would be our definition of emerging talent.

Q. Hi, I'm Jack Blum. I'm Executive Director of Reel Canada and somewhat stunned to have been quoted from the stage. Just for your information, Reel Canada does bring film festivals of Canadian film to high schools across the country. Telefilm seeded the project and has been foundational in steady financing and allowing it to grow. We're at the point where in a couple more years, if we continue... We're in seven provinces right now. Soon we might be able to take advantage of it, to promote films before they are released—the right film and the right circumstance. I just wanted to ask Madame Brabant, if you could talk a little bit more about these new opportunities for promotion that you have in mind, and different ways in which you're hoping to raise the profile of the Canadian brand?

A. (C. Brabant) It's a project that started with our new strategic plan that was presented three years ago. It was really linked to the idea of building demand. As we've mentioned in many of these speeches that we've made, we realized three years ago that, yes, we had fulfilled the portion of our mandate that was to build an industry, and you're the proof of that. There are successes, there is content on our screen. But we felt that we were still struggling to get people wanting to watch the content. That's where we started thinking about how we could do that. We were very pleased that the Canada Media Fund and other partners thought the same. In the future, one of the projects that we'll put in place, would be in line with the screenings that we did, for example the event at MIPCOM. But that's just a first step. I think that we were testing the idea and we're very happy that we're continuing with the CMF on this; and we're hoping that there will be more. We were pleased with the results of the Symposium in Ottawa, and we were pleased that there were many people who want to participate in these initiatives. The CMF and Telefilm will actually meet tomorrow with the CRTC to see what will be the next step. The

plan is to come up at the CMPA [Canadian Media Production Association] with a more formal plan. In the meantime, we have organized screenings of *Midnight's Children* in various regions of Canada.

Q. I'm Elvira Lount, I'm a producer from BC, and so I'm kind of unusual in this room today. First of all I'd just like to say that the producers in BC feel very similar... feel the same as the ones from Ontario and the Atlantic provinces who have expressed in the media in the last day their dissatisfaction with Telefilm's new plan for development. Many of us feel that we're on a sinking boat that's been torpedoed by Telefilm and our chances of survival as producers are slim. Just to get that out of the way. My question is, how many BC producers have received slate development funding from Telefilm; how does that compare with previous years; how does that compare with the average of the province, other regions of the country; and how has BC and the West fared in 2011-12 in your annual report, as far as a percentage that BC has... and the West have received out of Telefilm's total funding—both development and production, promotion, etc. Because last year it was only 6.5%, whereas 34% of the population comes from the west; and we received only 6.5% of the funding.

A. (C. Brabant) For the first part of your question, as I mentioned earlier, we don't have the final figures, because the money has not been completely spent. We'll have the final result for development and we will be presenting those results when we get them, but the money has not completely been spent. What we can say now is that the money has been spent so far from all across the country. Emerging talent have been receiving money, but I don't have the specifics, so sorry I cannot answer the first part of your question, because we don't have the data completed yet.

(M. Roy) Can I just give a general answer to the first part of the question and then you can get into the specifics maybe? I talked to you earlier about some background information that I went through two years ago in preparation for a speech. One of the data that really also struck me is that in English Canada the market share, of course we're talking box office, home box office here, but the market share of the Canadian English films was 0.9%.

Now, you cannot get much lower than that. It became obvious to me that we needed to change things. When I say we, I'm not only talking about Telefilm, I'm talking about the industry; I'm talking about everybody. Because the big challenge that we have now and the big challenge that we're going to have for the next few years is to make sure that... We now have among the best producers, best directors, best actors, and best technicians in the world. Those people can now compete with the best in the world and they can work with the best in the world. The problem that we have is to have this recognized by the population, by the Canadian audiences. It doesn't seem like we're there yet.

We need to do something and we need to do something together, because it's not only one group that will achieve that—it's the whole industry and the public bodies together will achieve that. We need to convince the Canadian audiences that we have a product that is among the best products in the world. In order to do that, we need to make sure that the best products get to the screen, so that we can seduce the Canadian public.

We don't make our fund allocations by regions. Really, frankly, we make our allocations by the quality of the projects that we receive. If we get more quality projects from BC than any other region—and we've

had that discussion this morning—BC will get a bigger share. We need to make sure that we get a quality project on the screen, so that we can convince the Canadians that we have a product that is among the best in the world. That's my general answer.

Q. (Elvira Lount) How can you create quality projects in development, you're not even looking at screenplays? The industry based on creative projects, starting at the beginning with the screenplay. You've ousted that business now.

A. (M. Roy) Well, you know what, the screenplay doesn't tell much.

(C. Brabant) And what we've heard from you, from everyone, and that was one thing that was consistent from the many people and organizations I met. From Newfoundland to Halifax, to Vancouver, Victoria, you told us that you knew what you were doing, that you had the autonomy, that you've demonstrated that you were able to determine what projects were good and what projects should be developed; and that you were tired that Telefilm would be holding hands at every step of the process. And that's exactly the changes we made. We trust that you're able to determine which projects should be financed and which projects we should be looking at. That's exactly what development is all about. You're right in saying that we've raised the bar for development.

Again, another thing that came out very strong in the meetings we had is that—although we do have a definition for distribution and we've been doing that for a long time—we needed to determine who is legitimate as a distribution company. We have done so for production companies, and we decided that for development we should be doing it. The bar we set was that in order to be a production company, because we're financing films, you needed to have produced a film in five years—one film. Even if it had not been financed by Telefilm. Because you told us that we should be taking into account—and that's true—we should be taking into account the experience that you have in television. We did so. Yes, you cannot have autonomy at the same you're asking us to make all the decisions. It's a balance and that's why the Index comes in handy. Believe me, we wouldn't have been doing our job without having been looking at your track record, and we've always been doing that—always. From 1968 to today. With the Index, we're doing it in a more fair approach. We were doing it without tools. It's a tool—it's not a decision-maker. It's about being able to compare in a more transparent manner.

Going back to the second part of your question, yes, we know that there is a problem and, in fact, we have identified that problem of the reduction in financing, particularly for British Columbia. We've looked at the data and without going into too much detail, we're actually having a meeting with CMPA-BC at the end of the month. We're not the only party involved. We can assure you that for development, for low budget, for production, Telefilm's financing has not changed significantly over the years. The statistics could vary from one year to the other, but very slightly. It's very fair; it has been spread across the country and there have not been any changes.

The changes have been in the national projects. We're only able to finance eight or 10 national projects in English every year. The trigger for being able to get financing in national projects is really the market interest. The statistics that you're referring to is that it was high in 2007 and it's low in 2011. But in 2007

there were only three [BC] producers who got the bulk of the money. One is no longer in business and the two others moved to Ontario.

So I think that there are reasons we're only financing high-end projects at 25% of the production budget; the 75% has to come out from somewhere else. What we've seen is there has been a high rate of abandoned projects—particularly in BC. We're concerned about that, and we're going to be talking and trying to see if we can find solutions. But it's going to be in partnership with others, because we're not the only party responsible for that.

Q. My name is Avi Federgreen. I'm a producer and distributor. We have a couple of issues. One is most of the films that are being financed in Canada now have budget levels of about \$1 million. The last people that are getting paid and, in most cases, not getting paid are producers. There are many producers that are deferring, deferring, deferring and never seeing a penny. How they can potentially sustain an existence in this industry none of us know; and I'm one of those people.

The second part of the problem is that when you're making movies like that, most distributors don't want to take on those types of films. When they do, they only see the interior of one or two theatres for the entire country. When you're basing decisions on success, you can't have much success if only two theatres are projecting your film, so there's a huge problem with that, especially—like I said—when most of the films that are being made in Canada every year—and I'm seeing a lot of them coming to me looking for a distributor and seriously begging me to take a serious look at it—they're all being made for below \$1 million and I may be their only answer.

A. (C. Brabant) For the first part of your question, it's a very, very competitive environment—that's for sure—and we don't disagree with that. On average, we're only saying yes to 20-25% of the projects we're getting. We're only have the resources to finance 20-25% of the projects we're receiving. One of the moves we're making is we feel that we should be giving more money for allowing producers to be able to produce their films. So we're going to be putting more money for lower budget films and we're expanding the definition of lower budget films to up to \$2.5 million.

As I was saying previously, we're not there to finance 100% of the films; we're basically—and it varies from the level of asking that comes to Telefilm—but on average, around 30%. It could vary for lower budget films, but it's around 30%. Yes, it's challenging to get the rest of the financing, that's why we came up with the idea of the Talent Fund. If we're successful, we're going to have access to partners that will be willing to put more money. That's a tool. It's not the answer to everything.

As I was mentioning, we're going to be working with the CMPA-BC to see if there are other potential solutions. We've developed the tool of the Micro-Budget Production Program to give opportunities and possibilities for producers and emerging talent to do their first film. When you're talking about measuring success, of course the tool will be different, depending on what is it. As I was saying, we're not using the Success Index as a black and white tool to say 'you're in or you're out.' It's just one tool.

Of course, there are very talented people at Telefilm who are making the decisions, and they will use their judgment to assess the request, depending on the request, depending on the size of the budget, etc. And of course, we're not asking from the same level of success from someone who's coming in with

a request for a low budget film—below \$2.5 million—and someone coming in with a \$10 million film. That's different and that's going to be taken into consideration.

We think that by the way we're measuring success we're actually opening the door to more talent and more recognition from sources that are different. As an example, for first time filmmakers—and that's where they start their careers—they often are being very successful internationally in the markets, in the festivals, and we're now recognizing that as an element of building the track record of the production companies as well as the filmmakers.

Q. I would first like to start with a statement on behalf of the Producers Roundtable of Ontario and then we'll ask a question. One of the fundamental beliefs of PRO is 'More for the many, not a lot more for the very few'. The way money is allocated by Telefilm Canada, where they won't give us the numbers—and we've asked, I promise you we've asked—is that they are giving too much to the people at the top of the economic food chain and not enough to the emerging and mid-level. We're willing to work with government and artists from all sectors to ensure that this practice is not allowed to continue.

PRO has three requests, which I know we've sent in, but have yet to have received a response to which I'm very disappointed to say. One is the companies that secured development financing for this year should be moved to the end of the line for next year. PRO Ontario, PRO Atlantic Canada, and I guess I should give you the warning that PRO Western Canada is on its way, should both be given a permanent seat on Telefilm's working group.

Before Telefilm's proposed funding evaluation is implemented, it should also undergo an independent audit that is funded by Telefilm or Heritage Canada and shared with the industry.

I understand that Boards need people with a variety of experience. My question is: Roughly, what percentage of your Board members have experience in the film industry and is this the right mix of expertise to guide Telefilm through our rapidly changing industry?

A. (M. Roy) Well, as far as the Board is concerned, I can answer this. This part of the answer is that no Board member of Telefilm can have some interest in the audiovisual industry. It is a conflict of interest rule that was implemented, I believe it was four, five years ago... six years ago maybe when I came in. So, we cannot have on our Board a member who has a personal interest in the audiovisual industry.

But I can tell you one thing though. The Board members of Telefilm, some of whom have background knowledge about the industry, are very dedicated people, very generous with their time. They're very devoted and they work very hard for the well-being of the industry—that I can assure you. But it is very difficult to find a person who would have a very specific knowledge of the industry without having any interest in that industry—this is the challenge that we are faced with.

Q. We were just in a Telefilm meeting, and one of the things that most frustrated me as a producer is that this new development program was supposed to alleviate things, but it didn't feel like it is.

A. (C. Brabant) Well for some it has. In the past, and again it might not be a specific answer to your question, but in the past, decisions around development were taking on average 18 weeks and we felt that this was unacceptable.

Q. I guess it's just a year, but in our economic environment, I can't go a year without a cheque. We can't wait for May...

A. (C. Brabant) We are very diligent in responding to requests. As for the first one, I suspect that we would have to consult, because I don't know if some of your colleagues in the room would be approving that if they get development they won't get it next year.

I think that we make a point to be very diligent in the way we're responding. As for the PRO, correct me if I'm wrong, but starting from May, we've had at least five meetings with you, so I think that we are responding to your request. We cannot come up and have all the answers on the following day you're sending the request. We will be working on what you're suggesting. We will come up with an answer. But, as I was saying, at least for one of them, it will require further work because there will be certainly consultations to be made.

Q. Given that Telefilm has the approach to encourage micro-budget, encourage investment from the private sector, one of the biggest assets I believe Telefilm has is unproduced, developed projects over 30 years—more than 30 years. If that is really the goal, and that Telefilm makes negligible money back from productions that go into production, that were developed by Telefilm but are not financed by Telefilm—it's a very, very small number—where there's so many producers out there that could create micro-budget projects that are getting private sector investment, that are going to new markets, if Telefilm would consider forgiving the repayment of loans—development loans—for projects that they're not going to invest in and turning that development loan into an investment into the project, so that you don't have to pay back... Quite often I see projects that have \$100,000 worth of development on them that Telefilm's never going to finance. But you could take that project, create a Web series or create some other project with it, if you didn't have to pay back the \$100,000 to Telefilm—you could just put that in as an investment. You're not getting the money back anyway, so why wouldn't you consider forgiving those loans as a repayment and just invest in them, and open up opportunities for every producer that's been producing for 30 years for Telefilm, to take those projects in a new market. Some of those projects are 10 years old and there didn't exist a Web that you could put projects out on. Why don't you use that money that's not real money for you—you're not getting it back—invest in it for the projects and let producers do what we can in the private sector?

A. (C. Brabant) We will certainly be looking into that. We will take that as a suggestion. In that way of thinking, I think that we were doing some actions. One of the things that we've done is—and it might not work for Ontario because of the provincial tax credit—but since April 1st, we've been offering the option for producers that we don't necessarily acquire ownership rights in the production. So that's something that we've done in order to transfer full ownership of the projects to production companies.

Annex

Program Redesign Consultation List

Academy of Canadian Cinema and Television (ACCT)	Hamilton Film Production
Association coopérative des productions audio-visuelles (ACPAV)	Item 7
Alliance Films	K Films
Alliance of Aboriginal Media Producers	KinoSmith
Alliance des producteurs francophones du Canada (APFC)	Lowenbe Holdings
Association des réalisateurs et réalisatrices du Québec (ARRQ)	Manitoba Film and Music
Attraction Media	Max Films
Brightlight Pictures	micro_scope
Buffalo Gal Pictures	Minds Eye Entertainment
Burns Films	Mongrel Media
Canadian Association of Film Distributors and Exporters (CAFDE)	National Screen Institute of Canada
Cinémaginaire	Novem Communications
Cinéastes indépendants	Ontario Media Development Corporation (OMDC)
Cineplex	Pixcom
Cirrus	Pope Productions
Canadian Media Production Association (CMPA)	Pristine
Canadian Media Production Association (CMPA) BC Branch	Producers Roundtable of Ontario
Copperheart Entertainment	Producers Roundtable of Atlantic Canada
Dark Thunder Productions	Productions Rivard
Directors Guild of Canada (DGC)	Prospero Pictures
DHX Media	Rhombus Media
Entertainment One	Rogers
Christal Films	SARTEC
Films 53/12	Screen Sirens
Films Caramel	Serendipity Point Films
Foundation Features	SODEC
Foundry Films	Topsail Productions
	Union des artistes
	Union Pictures
	Vera Rights Management (Aver)
	White Pine Pictures
	Whizbang Films
	Writers Guild of Canada