

SUBMISSION
BY
MEDIA ENTERTAINMENT AND ARTS ALLIANCE
TO
AUSTRALIAN FILM COMMISSION
REGARDING
PROPOSED BILATERAL FILM CO-PRODUCTION AGREEMENT
BETWEEN AUSTRALIA AND SINGAPORE

JANUARY 2005

The Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance

The Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance (Alliance) is the industrial and professional organisation representing the people who work in Australia's media and entertainment industries. Its membership includes journalists, artists, photographers, performers, symphony orchestra musicians and film, television and performing arts technicians.

The Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance understands that Singapore's Media Development Authority (MDA) is interested in Singapore and Australia negotiating a bilateral Film Co-production Treaty.

The Alliance further understands that Austrade is interested in supporting closer relations between the audiovisual industries in Australia and Singapore.

In January 2004, the AFC released its *Policy for entering new Film Co-production arrangements and the review of existing arrangements* in respect of the International Co-production Program it administers.

The policy identifies the resources required to negotiate treaties and administrative arrangements and sets out criteria for the selection of new co-production partners. The Alliance is also aware of the ongoing resources required to administer applications for provisional certification.

The Alliance is not aware of any productions – feature films, documentaries or television drama productions – in development or seeking finance that would benefit from the negotiation of a treaty between the two countries.

The Alliance has just made submission to the AFC in respect of the proposal for a Treaty to be negotiated between South Africa and Australia. That submission noted that, in the early 1990s, Australia pursued an aggressive strategy to secure a number of co-production treaties and memoranda of understanding under Australia's International Co-production Program. A number did not eventuate, including those with the Ukraine, Russia and Japan. One has resulted in no co-productions, namely the treaty with Israel. Others have resulted in little activity, such as the Treaty with Italy, whereas the Treaties with the United Kingdom and Canada have resulted in a number of productions, that might not otherwise have been produced, being realised.

Although there may well be some similarities between the industries in Singapore and Australia, the Alliance has not been able to identify a need within the Australian industry for a Treaty between Australia and Singapore. Consequently, the Alliance does not believe the resources to negotiate and administer such an arrangement can be justified.

Without a demonstrated need, the outcome is likely to be similar to what occurred with Israel. The existence of a Treaty and similarities between industries are not of themselves likely to result in productions being produced that otherwise could not have been financed.

In the event a production of merit does emerge that could genuinely be facilitated by such an arrangement, a one-off memorandum of understanding could be negotiated between the AFC and the MDA.

The Alliance notes the paper prepared by MDA for the AFC benchmarking Singapore against the AFC's criteria for entering new treaties. This submission therefore makes comment on the arguments set out in the MDA paper.

Industry Interest and Potential for Projects

It is important that the film industries of the co-producing countries each have a strong interest in co-producing films together. To warrant the time and resources of negotiating a Treaty or Administrative Arrangement, there should be significant potential for co-production projects, and not just in the short term.

There should exist benefits to each co-producer pursuant to an official arrangement which would not be available if the co-producers produced the project outside the official arrangement.

Further, the government of the proposed treaty partner must be willing to pursue an official co-production arrangement with Australia.

The MDA paper cites comparable average budget sizes for feature films and documentaries, geographical proximity and a history of joint commercial production to support a case for industry interest and potential for projects.

The MDA paper states that the average budget for an Australian feature film produced during 2002-2003 was US\$1.7 million and that this average “compared to the average made-by-Singapore Co-produced feature which costs US\$1.5 million”¹.

While the Alliance is not in a position to comment on average budgets in Singapore for that period, it is consistent with data available about production budgets for titles produced and/or released during the period 1991 and 2002 as set out in Attachment A.

However, according to the AFC, the average production budget for Australian films released in 2003 was A\$6.4 million, falling to an average of A\$4.75 for films released in 2004.²

The Alliance notes the existing partnerships with Australia cited on page 4 of the MDA analysis, namely a series of master classes, Glen Goei’s *Forever Fever* represented by Australian sales agent, Beyond Films, Goei now working with Dragonslayer and has established a relationship with Arclight Films, and the annual Australian Film Festival held in Singapore.

Whilst developing relationships between countries is important for access to finance and distribution, the instances cited did not require a formal co-production arrangement to be in place. Nor does the Alliance consider that the development of stronger relationships between Singaporean and Australian producers, sales agents and distributors requires a formal arrangement to be in place.

The primary purpose of a co-production arrangement is to enable the production of films that would not otherwise be financed and that have cultural resonances in both countries. Market place relationships such as those of a distributor or sales agent and a producer can occur in the absence of a formal country to country arrangement.

The Alliance notes that funding available to Singaporean films from the MDA’s Content Development Schemes are available to official co-productions and official co-productions can also satisfy local content quotas on television. However, it appears funding is capped at S\$500,000 per project and the local content quota is only an overall transmission quota of 6% of programs broadcast between 7pm and 11pm. Thus although both access to subsidy and quota are available they do not mirror the support mechanisms available in Australia.

Of concern is the relatively low level of subsidy available as this would raise issues about the principles of reciprocity over time. Indeed, it is difficult to establish how reciprocity of access to government support could ever be achieved.

¹ *Australia – Singapore Co-production Agreement: Analysis*, Media Development Authority, page 1.

² 2004 Box Office Background, Summary version, Australian Film Commission, 27 January 2005, page 4.

Similar Film Industries

In order to facilitate production opportunities, the film industries in Australia and the other co-producing country should have similar infrastructures. For example, there should be an established film and television industry and a public sector entity which will administer the official co-production program. Further, there must be government support and subsidy of the local film industry by way of (for example) tax concessions, direct investment in film and television productions and local content quotas.

The history of the industry in Singapore is a long one.

Film production in Malaya was centred in Singapore from the late 1930s until the early 1970s and was dominated by the Malay language films produced by the Chinese companies, Shaw Brothers and Cathay-Keris. The first film produced in Singapore, *Xin Ke*, was produced in 1926 by Liu Peh Jing who wanted to make films for the Chinese immigrant population in Singapore. The first Malay feature film, *Laila Majnun*, was produced in 1933 by the Montilal Chemical Company of Bombay and its success prompted the Shaw Brothers to expand their presence from exhibition to production, encouraged by the prospects of making films in Malay for Malayan and Indonesian consumption. Interrupted by World War II, their fortunes were buoyed by the discovery of the legendary P. Ramlee who, as leading man, singer, actor and as director, was responsible for a string of box office successes.

The other major exhibitor present on the Malay peninsula was the Cathay Organisation, established in 1935 by Loke Wan Tho. Its production arm, Cathay-Keris, established in 1953, produced 115 Malay language films before it closed in 1972.

The third major production house was Kong Ngee Co Limited which, from the mid-fifties, produced Teochew opera films and Kokkien dialect productions.

However, the combined impact of the introduction of colour and of television saw production costs rise, audiences shrink and profits plummet with all studios in Singapore closing by 1972.

In the wake of the studio closures, production personnel migrated to Malaysia. Although independent filmmakers struggled to produce films in Singapore, their output resulted in the 1970s being dubbed “the decade of the B-movie”. Despite a continuing enthusiasm for a local film industry, less than ten features were produced during the seventies, a virtual collapse given “that the golden age produced more than 24 films a year”³.

The film industry continued to languish in the 1980s although the Economic Development Board explored film incentives hoping to lure offshore production to the country, with a particular eye on what might happen when British rule came to an end in Hong Kong in 1997.

The Singapore International Film Festival was established in 1987 to foster film appreciation and stimulate interest in an indigenous industry. Whilst it achieved admirably in its first goal, it was less successful with respect to the second, although the introduction of the Short Film Competition in 1991 provided opportunities for young filmmakers to reach an audience.

In 1991 *Medium Rare*, the first Singaporean English-language film was produced, the only film made that year. Based on a true story set in Singapore, although the writers and producer were Singaporeans, the director was British, the two leads American and many of the cast and crew were recruited from outside Singapore. With a budget of S\$1.5 million, it failed at the box office, making only S\$130,000. Although a critical and box office failure, like many other films of the time, censorship restrictions did not assist. Another Singaporean film, *Bugis Street*, located firmly in Singapore set in the infamous and sleazy tourist district of Bugis Street, was also directed by a foreigner, in this instance, by a director from Hong Kong. It also failed to recoup its production budget, albeit performing better than *Medium Rare*.

³ *Film in South East Asia: Views from the Region*, editor David Hanan, SEAPAVAA in association with the Vietnam Film Institute and the National Screen and Sound Archive of Australia, Hanoi, 2001, page 201.

In 1996, the Cathay Organisation ventured back into production with the first box office hit for years, Ong Keng Sen's *Army Daze*.

In 1998, the year the Singapore Film Commission was established, a well known Singaporean television comedian, Jack Neo, wrote and starred in *Money No Enough* which became the second highest grossing film in Singapore of all time, second only to *Titanic*, taking S\$5.8 million. Interestingly, much of the success of *Money No Enough* can be attributed to the fact that it was distinctly Singaporean, exploring and satirising "dominant features of Singaporean life, such as Singapore's obsession with money, how government policies have a taxing effect on people's income and the lengths to which Singaporeans go to get a good deal."⁴ Importantly, it was filmed in dialect, previously forbidden in the media during years when the government was encouraging the use of Mandarin. "Even though the film was poorly shot, its usage of Chinese dialects endeared the film to many Singaporeans who felt that the film articulated their cultural identity."⁵

Even during the hey-day of the industry, Singapore has struggled with the issue of cultural identity, with the majority of its output during the 20th century being produced by Chinese or Malays, featuring Malay performers and directed by Malays, Indians, Filipinas and Hong Kong Chinese.

With the establishment of the Ngee Ann Polytechnic's Film, Sound and Video Department, graduates have been joining the industry since the late 1990s. However, unsurprisingly given its geographical proximity, many are finding work in the Malaysian rather than the Singaporean industry.

Since 1999, Singapore has been producing approximately six features annually.

Government support for the industry is relatively new and although discussed at length during the 1980s, did not eventuate in real terms until the creation of the Singapore Film Commission, now a part of MDA, in 1998.

Today, "Singapore's media environment is highly regulated. Censorship is common, internet access is regulated and private ownership of satellite dishes is not allowed.

"Two big players dominate the media scene. Singapore Press Holdings, which has close links to the ruling party, has a virtual monopoly of the newspaper industry. MediaCorp, owned by a state investment agency, operates TV and radio stations. The companies have announced the merger of their main TV operations."⁶

Mediacorp operates the entertainment-based Channel 5 and Channel 8, the Malay channel Suria and the Indian/arts channel Central. SPH Mediaworks operates the English language Channel I and the Mandarin language Channel U.

Although there is a local content quota for television, by Australian standards it is extremely low. However, censorship serves to restrict access to much offshore production especially during prime time hours.

Censorship is approached significantly differently in Singapore and has resulted in some astonishing outcomes.

In 1994, Eric Khoo's entry in the Singapore Short Film Competition, *Pain*, was banned. "Ironically, Khoo was awarded the Best Director for *Pain*, a stark and surreal portrayal of one man's preoccupation and obsession with inflicting pain. To top that, he was also given the Special Achievement Prize. Not a

⁴ *Film in South East Asia: Views from the Region*, editor David Hanan, SEAPAVAA in association with the Vietnam Film Institute and the National Screen and Sound Archive of Australia, Hanoi, 2001, page 206.

⁵ *Film in South East Asia: Views from the Region*, editor David Hanan, SEAPAVAA in association with the Vietnam Film Institute and the National Screen and Sound Archive of Australia, Hanoi, 2001, page 208.

⁶ Source: BBC, *Country Profile – Singapore*, last updated 14 January 2005, available online at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/country_profiles/1143240.stm.

bad effort at all for a work not seen by the public, except perhaps the jury.”⁷ The Peter Bogdanovich 1979 film set in Singapore, *St Jack*, was banned in Singapore for decades and not seen by audiences in Singapore until 1997 and then only at the Singapore International Film Festival.

While ratings for cinema releases were overhauled to some extent in 1990s, and while the credibility of the Singapore International Film Festival depended on being able to screen films seen widely internationally, censorship is still a concern, and particularly so on television.

Thus, while Singapore, like Australia, has a long cinema history, the industries in the two countries, government support mechanisms and censorship regimes differ significantly.

Importantly, to the extent that the Alliance has been able to ascertain, the benefits available to Singaporean producers by having a production achieve national treatment in Australia would be considerably greater than would be the case for an Australian producer being able to achieve national treatment in Singapore.

Not surprisingly, given that Singapore is a smaller country than Australia, the pool of highly skilled personnel is greater in Australia than in Singapore. Further, whilst Singapore is a developed country, rates of pay for those in the film and television industry in Singapore are understood to be lower than is the case in Australia.

Benefit Reciprocity with Partner Nations – National Treatment

It is crucial that co-production projects will be granted national status in the co-producing country and be eligible for current industry assistance in that country and be able to access the benefits available to the local film and television industries.

The principle of “national treatment” would require that films made under a Treaty or Administrative Arrangement must be treated as Australian films and also as national films of the other country. The necessary implication of this is that there is some benefit in a film being a national film of the other country. That is, there is government assistance available, and the co-producers are able to bring comparable benefits to the project.

Although official co-productions are able to secure direct investment from the MDA, the maximum available per production is S\$500,000. Given that the investment guidelines of Film Finance Corporation Australia enable it to invest between 30% and 35% of a production’s budget, it is likely that over time reciprocity of financial participation might not be achieved.

Over-Riding Balance Over Time of Financial and Creative Participation and of Reciprocity

Australia’s existing Treaty and Administrative arrangements require that there be a balance over time of financial and creative participation of the co-producers.

In assessing potential Treaty partners, there is a need to look at the likelihood of whether co-productions with the proposed Treaty partner will achieve balance in regard to financial and creative participation so that the Treaty will be of benefit to both nations and will not work in favour of one of them disproportionately.

There is also a need to look at the likelihood of a balance over time in regard to the use of subsidy and support provided by each co-producer’s Government to ensure that projects made under the official co-production arrangement are not likely to be accessing government subsidy in one country only.

⁷ *Two weeks of glorious fun, Banned film grabs Best Director Award*, The Sun, Friday 6 May 1994, available online at <http://www.keshvani.com/about/thesun.htm>.

The Alliance does not understand what the MDA means when it states in its paper: “MDA endeavours to ensure a balance of both financial and creative participation from the production and government sector”.⁸ Although this may be the case, it does not address how the principles of over-riding balance over time of financial and creative participation and of reciprocity might be achieved.

Comparable Employment Conditions

Note that it is a requirement of Australia’s current Treaty arrangements that “conditions of work ... in each co-producing country are in broad terms comparable.” For this reason, it is important to be aware of work conditions of cast and film crew in the proposed co-producing country to ensure that this comparability can be met.

Note that Australia’s Administrative Arrangements with France and New Zealand do not require this comparability but such criteria should be assessed in any new administrative arrangement which Australia enters.

The Alliance has not been able to establish with any certainty what the employment conditions for cast and crew are in the Singaporean film and television industry. However, we understand rates of pay are lower than is the case in Australia. Further, we note that the MDA makes no assertion that employment conditions are comparable in the two countries.

Cultural Exchange

Issues of cultural exchange should be considered. For example, will the Treaty or Administrative Arrangement open up a new market for Australian films. Will films which have resonance in both cultures be produced?

At Attachment B is a breakdown of Australian programs released in Malaysia and Singapore for the period 1 January 2000 and 1 November 2004.

All programs sold to Singapore were sold to both Singapore and Malaysia. It is possible that censorship reasons might affect the ability of many Australian productions to secure distribution in Singapore.

The MDA papers notes that there is no quota for cinematic release but goes on to say “coproductions can take advantage of the 153 halls (28 cineplexes), 41,647 seats available to the local audience.”⁹ This is already the case and a co-production agreement would not allow for wider theatrical distribution of Australian feature films.

The only Australian feature to be filmed in Singapore of which the Alliance is aware is Bruce Beresford’s *Paradise Road*, set during World War II after the fall of Singapore. Clearly, this is an example of a production that could be expected to find resonance in both cultures.

However, given some quite significant differences between the two cultures, it is likely that the potential for productions that would find resonance in both cultures and not be able to be realised in the absence of a formal co-production arrangement would be so small as to not warrant the negotiation and administration of such an arrangement.

Finally, participation in showcase events such as the Australian Film Festival held in Singapore can proceed without the need for a formal co-production arrangement, as can the MDA securing Australians to run master-classes.

Is the Treaty in the National Interest?

This criteria is applicable to all Treaties entered into by the Australian Government and is not specific to Films Co-production Treaties.

⁸ *Australia – Singapore Co-production Agreement: Analysis*, Media Development Authority, page 3.

⁹ *Australia – Singapore Co-production Agreement: Analysis*, Media Development Authority, page 3.

A National Interest Analysis (“NIA”) must be carried out in regard to a proposed Films Co-production Treaty and tabled in Parliament. A NIA is essentially a cost-benefit analysis which requires that the proposed Treaty has an overall national benefit.

The NIA will note why Australia should become a party to the Treaty. The NIA looks at foreseeable environmental, economic, social and cultural effects of the Treaty; the obligations it imposes; its direct financial costs to Australia; and the consultation which has occurred with relevant stakeholders.

In addition, if the Treaty could have the effect of a reduction in competition, a Regulatory Impact Statement must be prepared.

In the case of a Films Co-production Treaty, the Parliamentary Committee assessing the NIA is likely to require benefits such as the following:

- Australian consumers will have increased choice as there is more diverse product available to them;*
- The Australian film industry will make films which would not otherwise be made;*
- There will be an increase in employment of Australians;*
- There will be an increase in audiences overseas for Australian film;*
- There will be an interchange of film personnel and actors between the co-producing countries;*
- The Australian Government will benefit from strengthening of diplomatic ties with the proposed treaty partner.*

For the reasons outlined earlier in this submission, the Alliance does not believe the evidence exists to demonstrate that the criteria that would be considered in an RIS would be satisfied.

The Alliance considers that, in the event a production of merit is identified that can be financed only as an official co-production between Singapore and Australia, there is no impediment to the negotiation of a one-off memorandum of understanding. Consequently, the Alliance does not believe the need exists nor the circumstances warrant the expenditure of the very considerable resources required to negotiate a formal Treaty or Administrative Arrangement between Australia and Singapore.

ATTACHMENT A

Singapore Films 1991-2002

Disclaimer: The information featured in this section is gathered from various sources including websites, local press, local distributors and producers. It is intended to serve as a guide only and the SFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information.

Title	Release Date	Producer	Production Cost (S\$)	Singapore Box Office (S\$)
1. Song of the Stork ⁽¹⁾	Jan-03	Mega Media	(US\$)1,000,000	N.A.
2. I Not Stupid	Feb-02	Raintree Pictures	1,000,000	3,800,000
3. Dirty Laundry ⁽²⁾	Mar-02	Temasek Hall	30,000	10,000
4. Angel Heart ⁽³⁾	Mar-02	Touch Entertainment	1,100,000	N.A.
5. TalkingCock: The Movie	Apr-02	Wu Liao Media	150,000	120,000
6. The Eye	Jun-02	Raintree/ Applause Pictures (HK)	(US\$)2,500,000	1,990,000
1. The Tree	Apr-01	Raintree Pictures	1,100,000	720,000
2. Return to Pontianak	Jul-01	Vacant Films	150,000	140,000
3. Hype ⁽²⁾	Aug-01	nu(STUDIOS), NUS	19,000	N.A.
4. Miss Wonton ⁽⁴⁾	Aug-01	DreamChamber Films	700,000	15,000
5. Sharp Pencil	Aug-01	Under Pressure Pictures	189,000	2,000
6. One Leg Kicking	Nov-01	Zhao Wei Films/ Raintree/ SFC	900,000	716,000
1. 2000 AD	Feb-00	Raintree/ Media Asia Films (HK)	6,231,000	910,698
2. Crazy People	Mar-00	Wealth Film Production	500,000	35,061
3. Stamford Hall ⁽²⁾	Apr-00	Temasek Hall, NUS	18,000	3,500
4. Stories About Love	Aug-00	Zhao Wei Films/ Cyberflics	300,000	50,600

5. Chicken Rice War	Nov-00	Raintree Pictures/SFC	800,000	400,000
1. Lucky Number	Jan-99	DS Movie Production	500,000	360,000
2. Liang Po Po: The Movie	Feb-99	Raintree Pictures	800,000	3,032,000
3. Where Got Problem	May-99	JSP/ Sunnez Productions	900,000	140,000
4. That One Not Enough	May-99	Cathay Asia Films	850,000	1,020,000
5. The Truth About Jane and Sam	Jul-99	Raintree/ Films Unlimited (HK)	1,200,000	1,058,452
6. The Mirror	Sep-99	Golden Mandarin/ Mandarin Films (HK)	2,000,000	160,000
7. Street Angels	Sep-99	Act Venture Films	1,000,000	115,805
8. Eating Air	Dec-99	Multi-Story Complex	800,000	352,586
1. Forever Fever	98	Tiger Tiger Productions/ ChinaRunn	1,500,000	800,000
2. Money No Enough	98	JSP Films	800,000	5,800,000
3. Tiger's Whip	98	River Films	1,000,000	60,000
4. Teenage Textbook	98	Monster Films	500,000	680,000
1. A Road Less Travelled	97	Oak 3 Films	320,000	29,000
2. God or Dog	97	L S Entertainment	1,100,000	497,000
3. 12 Storeys	97	Zhao Wei Films	280,000	650,000
1. Army Daze	96	Cathay Asia Films	700,000	1,600,000
2. Bugis Street	96	Jaytex Productions	2,000,000	1,000,000
1. Mee Pok Man	95	Zhao Wei Films	100,000	450,000

1. Medium Rare	91	Derrol Stepenny Productions	2,000,000	130,000

1. 'Song of the Stork' is a co-production between Singapore and Vietnam. It has been theatrically released in Vietnam and won the Best Feature Film at the Milano Film Festival. It has yet been released commercially in Singapore.
2. 'Dirty Laundry', 'Stamford Hall' and 'Hype' were not released commercially. 'Hype' was shown at Deauville Asian Film Festival.
3. 'Angel Heart' had limited release at Touch Community Theatre.
4. 'Miss Wonton' is classified as a US/ S'pore film, directed by a Singaporean but with American investors. It won an award at the Locarno Film Festival.

Source: Singapore Film Commission, available online at
http://www.sfc.org.sg/statistics/statistic_list.shtm

Note: 1 Australian Dollar (AUD) = 1.26316 Singapore Dollar (SGD) as at 31 January 2005.

ATTACHMENT B

Sales of Australian feature films, telemovies, mini-series and documentaries to Malaysia and Singapore for the period 1 January 2000 – 1 November 2004

Title	Type	Kids?	Buyer	Eps	Term	Territory	Rights
Crash Zone II, The	MS	Y	Ambang Media Sdn Bhd	13	2	Malaysia	TV
Cybergirl 6000	MS	Y	Ambang Media Sdn Bhd	26		Malaysia	TV
Genie From Down Under Series 2	MS	Y	Ambang Media Sdn Bhd	13	2	Malaysia	TV
Round the Twist 1	MS	Y	Ambang Media Sdn Bhd	13	2.8	Malaysia	TV
Round the Twist 2	MS	Y	Ambang Media Sdn Bhd	13	2	Malaysia	TV
Round the Twist 3	MS	Y	Ambang Media Sdn Bhd	13	2	Malaysia	TV
Dolphin Mania	DO		Arief Trading - Malaysia	1		Malaysia/Brunei	TV
Brilliant Lies	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Crackers	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Custodian, The	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	4	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Dead Heart	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1		Malaysia	C
Devil Game, The	TM		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	2	Malaysia	TV
Einstein's Wife	DO		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	4	Malaysia	CC
Gross Misconduct	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	4	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Heavens Burning	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Human Journey, The	DO		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	3	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Kiss or Kill	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Lantana	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Looking for Alibrandi	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
My Mother Frank	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Risk	FE		Asia Teleprogramming Int'l Ltd	1	3	Malaysia/Singapore	C
Don't Blame Me	MS	Y	Global Station Sdn Bhd	26	2	Malaysia	TV
Looking For Alibrandi	FE		Golden Communications Sdn Bhd	1	2	Malaysia	TV
Lucky Break	FE		Intercontinental Comms	1	1	Malaysia	TV
On The Beach	MS		Metropolis Television Inc	2		Malaysia	TV
Tribe	MS		Metropolis Television Inc	2	2	Malaysia	TV
Road from Coorain, The	TM		Not Advised	1		Malaysia	CC
Legacy of the Silver Shadow, The	MS	Y	Panca Embun Sdn Bhd	13	2	Malaysia	TV
Close Contact	TM		Sky Network Tv Ltd	1	3	Malaysia	CC
Man Who Sued God, The	FE		Sunny Films	1	5.3	Malaysia	ALL-F
Hard Word, The	FE		Suraya Filem Production	1	7	Malaysia	ALL-F
Ocean Girl Animation Series	MS	Y	Tv3 Malaysia	26	2	Malaysia	TV

Code: MS – television mini-series; DO – documentary; FE – feature film; TM – telemovie; Kids? – children's program; Y – yes; TV – free-to-air television; C – cable; CC – closed circuit (hotels); ALL-F – all rights including theatrical.

Source: Film Finance Corporation Australia