



DOCUMENTARY  
ORGANIZATION OF CANADA  
DOCUMENTARISTES  
DU CANADA

215 Spadina Avenue  
Suite / Bureau 126  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5T 2C7  
416.599.3844  
1.877.467.4485  
www.docorg.ca

## DOC CMF Policy Review

### **Context and Overview**

The Canada Media Fund (CMF) finances Canadian documentaries predominantly through Broadcaster Performance Envelopes (BPEs). In the English-language market, one-off point-of-view documentaries are also supported through the POV Fund.<sup>1</sup>

The vast majority of CMF funds are channeled through the BPEs. In 2012-13, 77% of the CMF's total TV production funding of \$346 million went through BPEs. Broadcasters select eligible projects and allocate dollars from their envelopes to fund these productions. Each year broadcasters are assessed by the CMF on the performance of their envelope, based on weighting factors (usually 5 factors) that may be modified in any given year. Weighting factors are established by the Board and are applicable to all genres.

For the documentary genre, two of these weighting factors have negatively impacted documentary productions and genre allocations:

- The loss of the Licence Fees Over Threshold (LFOT)
- The increased emphasis on audience and particularly the Total Hours Tuned (THT) audience measurement

For the 2013-2014 BPE allocations, the Licence Fees Over Threshold (LFOT) weighting factor was removed and broadcasters no longer receive extra points for paying higher than required licence fees. This has influenced the way they approach licence fees. Based on feedback from documentary producers, broadcasters are now managing their envelopes by setting maximum licence fees they are prepared to pay for documentaries in order to spread their envelopes across more projects. This is forcing producers to lower budget levels in order to make a project and its financing viable.

The second weighting factor impacting the documentary genre is the increased emphasis on audience and particularly the Total Hours Tuned (THT) audience measurement. As will be demonstrated in this report, the THT factor, weighted at 40% of total points for envelope calculations, has skewed envelope calculations in favour of documentary series airing on private sector specialty channels, in both language markets. This has been to the detriment of documentary one-offs as well as feature-length documentaries that are not being funded by the big broadcast groups, including the private conventional networks and pay-TV movie channels.

Part of the issue here is the exception allowed in the documentary genre for broadcasters to fund "docu-soap" productions, which do not meet the criteria for "in-depth" analysis as required within the CMF's definition of eligible documentaries.

In the final analysis, if the trend favouring large specialty broadcast groups licensing series is to be redressed, it will be done with the help of incentives offered to broadcasters to deliver more documentary programming, especially one-offs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Across all language markets, other small CMF selective funds may support documentaries in other languages or regional allocations, but those funds are not reviewed in this report.

## Summary of Main Recommendations

### Broadcaster Performance Envelopes

1. The BPE weighting factors have to be reviewed when applied to documentary programming:
  - a. The French-language method of separating one-offs and series when weighting the five factors should be applied to the English-language market.
  - b. THT and OFR should both count for 20% each instead of 40% and 15% respectively.
  - c. Historical Performance should be increased to 25% to reward those broadcasters who license documentaries (similar to the French-language weighting), and to 35% for one-offs.
  - d. DM points should be eliminated for one-offs and broadcasters should be given 10% bonus points when licensing one-offs.
  - e. Re-examining Licence Fees over Threshold as a weighting factor.
2. “Docu-soap” series should be capped at 25% of BPEs and these programs should not be funded after the second season.
3. Incentives have to be developed to support broadcasters who program documentary one-offs and limited series.
4. Licence Fee Thresholds as established for the French-language market should be incorporated into the English-language market.

### Development Funding

5. English-language broadcasters should allocate their development funding along similar percentage allocations as for production financing. For the English language documentary genre this would represent 16.5% of the development envelope. This development funding should be invested across all regions of production in the country.

### English Pre-Development Fund

6. The size of the Pre-development Fund should be increased, given its importance to documentary producers. More funds and more tranches should be available.

### POV Fund

7. The envelope for the POV Fund should be doubled.
8. The evaluation criteria needs to be streamlined and must be more transparent. The Digital Media component should be removed and higher points should be allocated for the creative elements, production team and program objectives.
9. The POV Fund should move away from its strict requirement for a Canadian broadcast licence and expand the definition of eligible broadcast licence triggers to include foreign broadcasters and digital delivery broadcasters, such as the proposed NFB channel.
10. Licence Fee Thresholds as a percentage of the budget should be tiered to provide a lower percentage requirement for feature-length documentaries, similar to French-language thresholds.

### Regional Allocations

11. Drama and documentaries spending should be separated when determining regional allocations of CMF funding.
12. A regional bonus system should be reinstated to fund regional productions.

## 1. CMF Broadcaster Performance Envelopes

Broadcaster Performance Envelopes (BPEs) are calculated by measuring a broadcaster's performance against that of other broadcasters in each genre, based on five weighted factors: audience success – total hours tuned, audience success – original first run, historic performance, regional licensing and digital media investment. The CMF then calculates each broadcaster's share of credit annually for the performance factors, by language and genre. Each broadcaster is then allocated a corresponding share of available CMF funding.

For 2013-14, the five factors are weighted as follows:

ALL GENRES	ENGLISH ENVELOPES	FRENCH ENVELOPES
AUDIENCE SUCCESS – TOTAL HOURS TUNED	40%	40%
AUDIENCE SUCCESS – ORIGINAL FIRST RUN	15%	15%
HISTORIC PERFORMANCE	15%	25%
REGIONAL PRODUCTION LICENCES	20%	10%
DIGITAL MEDIA INVESTMENT	10%	10%

### Factors Analysis

The two Audience Success factors equate 55% of a broadcaster's weighting, and for the documentary genre, the following illustrates how broadcasters in each language market performed in terms of scores used to determine BPEs for 2013-14.

In the English-language market

- Shaw dominated the audience numbers in the English-language documentary genre, averaging 50% of the points awarded to all broadcasters for both audience categories. Shaw also scored highest in Historic Performance and second-best in Regional Licensing after Bell.
- CBC and Bell both averaged less than 20% in the audience factors.
- The edu-nets TVO and Knowledge barely scored in the audience numbers.
- CBC scored very low in the regional category but quite well in Digital Media (DM) Investment, although specialty operators Stornoway and Blue Ant dominate the digital category. Bell and Shaw scored very poorly in the DM category at less than 3% for Shaw and zero for Bell.

In the French-language market, CMF separates documentary series from one-offs in calculating scores. They then add these two together in calculating scores for the genre overall.

- For documentary one-offs Astral and Radio-Canada (SRC) dominated all categories, with Astral scoring highest in Audience - Total Hours Tuned while SRC dominated first-run audience numbers. SRC eclipsed all others in the DM category, and led Regional Licensing and Historic Performance categories by a significant margin over Astral.
- For French-language documentary series however, Astral scored significantly higher over SRC in all categories except Regional Licensing, and obviously committed quite strongly to DM Investment for documentary series.
- Télé-Québec and TFO both score poorly in audience numbers.

With the Total Hours Tuned audience factor weighted at 40%, the most successful broadcasters in the documentary genre were Shaw and Astral. Shaw received the highest amount of the 2013-14 English-language documentary allocation at \$5,507,410 or 44% of the total, and Astral was awarded \$4,593,904 of the French-language documentary allocation or 54%. Having one corporate group hold more than half of an entire genre's envelope in a given market raises questions about envelope allocations and should be examined by staff and the CMF board.

In comparison, Bell garnered 23.6% and CBC 19.5% of the English market allocation and SRC received 33.8% in the French market. Nonetheless all three received less than \$3 million of the documentary allocation.

Télé-Québec was the only educational broadcaster in either language to receive a documentary allocation, at \$531,286 or 6% of the documentary French-language total. Knowledge (\$0.97 million) and TVO (\$2.48 million), given the small sizes of their envelopes (less than \$2.5m), were given full flexibility across genres and so their actual allocation for documentaries is not available.

### **Broadcaster Funding of Documentaries**

By looking at the documentary projects funded through the broadcaster envelopes for 2012-13, we can see how broadcast groups have been allocating their documentary funds. (See Appendix 1 for full tables).

#### English-language market

- In 2012-13, CMF English-language documentary funding equaled \$24.6 million (representing 16.5 % of CMF funding). Across this total documentary allotment, 64% went to documentary series, 34% to one-offs and 2% to DM projects.
- In the French-language market, \$18.6 million was funded of which 71% went to multiple-episode documentaries, 25% to one-offs and 4% to digital media projects.
- **Over 91% of English documentary funding through Shaw and Bell were for documentary series**, with the spending by these two groups representing 60% of the total English documentary allocation.
- The primary channel licensing documentary projects was Shaw's History specialty channel. It accounts for more than 85% of Shaw's total documentary funding, all of which goes for series production. By comparison, Shaw's conventional Global TV network spent 8% of Shaw's envelope for one-offs.
- For Bell, 100% of its documentary allotment went to the Discovery specialty channel with over 91% to series productions.
- Conversely, the CBC invested 85% of their documentary envelope in one-offs. Within the CBC's envelope almost all of it went to the CBC's conventional network at 97% and only a small amount through the CBC's documentary specialty channel. CBC invested in one documentary series (outside of one-offs for Nature of Things or Doc Zone) for its main network and spent the bulk of its envelope on one-offs, predominantly for the main conventional network.
- None of these broadcasters spent any envelope allocations on digital media investment in their documentary projects.

French-language market

- In the French-language market, the **Astral group had more than 50% of the total documentary envelope and spent 86% of it on multi-episode documentary series across their specialty group**. Canal D was allocated the most funds in the Astral group, at 62% of their envelope. Next was Historia at almost 20% and then Canal V at 11%.
- For Radio-Canada, the split was more balanced, with 54% going to series and 43% to one-offs. Almost half the Radio-Canada envelope went to the main network SRC, with RDI and ARTV specialty channels receiving the rest of the envelope funds almost equally.
- Both Astral and Radio-Canada invested in digital media, although the percentage allocation to digital media in both cases was small, less than 4% of the respective envelopes.

#### **Recommendation #1:**

##### **Implementing different weighting factors for the documentary genre.**

DOC recommends a complete re-haul of the CMF factor weighting for the documentary genre, including:

- Applying the French-language model of separating one-offs and series when weighting the five factors to the English-language market.
- Reducing the imbalance between the audience factors from 40% for THT and 15% for first-run to 20% for each factor.
- Increasing the weighting factors for Historical Performance to reward those broadcasters who have been licensing documentaries to 25% for series (similar to the French-language weighting), and to 35% for one-offs.
- Eliminating the DM points for one-offs and give the 10% as bonus points for the licensing of one-offs.
- Re-examining Licence Fees over Threshold as a weighting factor.

## **2. CMF Documentary Definition**

In the English-language market, the History Channel and Discovery Channel accounted for 38% of the CMF's documentary genre allocation in 2012-13, with the CBC accounting for another 25%. The balance was spread across a number of smaller broadcasters, none of which exceeded \$1.5 million.

There continues to be an issue regarding the CMF's documentary definition in relation to the allowance of 'docu-soap' types of documentaries. In 2012-13, Shaw's History specialty channel funded series such as Canadian Restorers and Bomb Hunters, which may not have met stricter documentary definitions without these exceptions. Similarly, Bell's Discovery specialty channel funded the renewal of such series as Pyros and Licence to Drill.

In the French-language market, Astral commands 54% of the documentary envelope, of which 86% is spent on series. This is a significant stake in the marketplace and raises questions of whether one corporate group should hold such a position in one genre.

In 2012-13, History and Discovery spent their funding on the following projects.

<b>HISTORY Channel - 2012-13</b>		
<b>TITLE</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>COMMITMENT</b>
Air Aces I (1-6)	Cineflix (Air Heroes) Inc.	\$898,785
Bomb Hunters II (11-15)	Productions Pixcom Inc.	\$347,256
Canadian Restorers I (1-8)	Productions Pixcom Inc.	\$490,000
Dangerous Persuasions I (1-6)	Persuasion Productions Inc.	\$750,000
Ice Pilots NWT V (53-65)	Propheads V Productions Ltd.	\$909,272
Museum Secrets III (15-22)	Museum Media Season III Inc.	\$1,250,000
Yukon Gold I (101 - 110)	Klondike Productions Inc.	\$1,400,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,045,313</b>
<b>Discovery Channel - 2012-13</b>		
<b>TITLE</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>COMMITMENT</b>
Aliens: The Definitive Guide	Handel Productions (BF) Inc.	\$290,000
Breakout III (9-16)	BK3 Productions Inc.	\$584,482
Dangerous Flight II (9-18)	Productions Pixcom Inc.	\$250,000
Licence to Drill III (13-20)	Productions Pixcom Inc.	\$920,894
Pyros II (1-8)	Pyros 2 Productions Ltd.	\$1,200,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,245,376</b>

A significant portion of documentary funding is being allocated to “docu-soap” type of series on private sector specialty channels owned by the bigger private broadcasting groups. As noted above, the private broadcasters spent over 90% of their documentary allocation on series, and within those series there are many docu-soap type of programs.

DOC seriously questions the on-going allowance of docu-soaps to qualify for CMF funding. These programs are radically reducing the funding available for actual “in-depth” documentary programming and are skewing the audience THT numbers as a weighting factor. Should the CMF consider it necessary to continue to fund docu-soaps, these programs should be capped at no more than 25% of a broadcaster’s documentary envelope allocation and should only be eligible for funding for the first two years of a series. These programs garner sufficient audiences to be financed through the private sector and not through the CMF, especially once established.

This issue raises the greater question of harmonizing definitions: the CRTC and the CMF have adopted similar definitions for documentaries. The CMF however, allows an exception for the production of ‘living history’ and ‘docu-soaps’, which the CRTC does not. Instead, the CRTC has created a new program category for reality-style programming and has removed those types of programs as qualifying as documentaries for the purpose of their new Programs of National Interest policy regime. The CMF should be liaising with the CRTC to determine which type of programs should be considered as documentary versus reality programming for PNI calculations.

It is DOC’s view that “docu-soaps” should not qualify for PNI.

**Recommendation #2:**

**“Docu-soap” series should be capped at 25% of BPEs and these programs should not be funded after the second season.**

**Recommendation #3:**

**Incentives have to be developed to support broadcasters who program documentary one-offs and limited series.**

**3. Licence Fee Thresholds (LFT)**

The English-language and French-language markets have different approaches in calculating licence fee thresholds to trigger CMF funding.

DOCUMENTARY PROGRAMMING		
LANGUAGE	PROJECT	
	TYPE	LICENCE FEE THRESHOLD
ENGLISH	Projects of six episodes or less, and with Eligible Costs of less than \$400K per hour*	30% of Eligible Costs or \$100K per hour, whichever is less
	Projects of seven episodes or more, and with Eligible Costs of less than \$400K per hour	40% of Eligible Costs or \$100K per hour, whichever is less
	Projects with Eligible Costs of \$400K per hour or more*	\$100K per hour
FRENCH	Projects with Eligible Costs of less than \$100K per hour	35% of Eligible Costs
	Projects with Eligible Costs of \$100K per hour to \$400K per hour	20% of Eligible Costs
	Projects with Eligible Costs of more than \$400K per hour to \$750K per hour	15% of Eligible Costs
	Projects with Eligible Costs of more than \$750K per hour	10% of Eligible Costs
	Feature-length Documentary projects with Eligible Costs of \$100K to \$750K	12% of Eligible Costs
	Feature-length Documentary projects with Eligible Costs of more than \$750K	10% of Eligible Costs

For higher budget levels in the English-language market, the LFT becomes too expensive for broadcasters to licence. For example, an English language feature-length documentary (1.5 hours) with a budget of \$751,000, where the LFT is \$100,000 per hour would have a total LFT of \$150,000 placing it out of reach of most broadcasters.

One solution could be lowering the LFTs, but the concern is that it will simply put more pressure on documentary producers to either lower budgets or find financing outside the CMF.

**Recommendation #4:**

**The approach for the Licence Fee Thresholds as established for the French-language market should be applied to the English-language market.**

**4. BPE Development**

The CMF allocates development funding to broadcaster groups. It calculates each broadcast groups' performance in each language relative to all others competing for those funds.

Development envelopes are calculated on the basis of two performance factors:

- Historic performance
- Performance envelopes

In the French-language market in 2012-13, there was a total of \$2.87 million in development envelopes, of which \$1,002,405 went to documentaries (35% of the total). Of this amount, 52% went to documentary series and 48% to one-offs.

For 2012-13, in the English-language market there was a total of \$7.27 million in development envelopes, of which \$714,777 (less than 10%) was allocated to documentaries. Of this documentary amount, 56% went to series and 44% to one-offs. Given that the documentary genre envelope allocation is set at 16.5% for the English market, this low amount of funding to develop documentaries is an area of major concern.

Underwriting development costs is particularly burdensome for documentary production companies. Documentary producers work on smaller projects with less upside than drama producers and have limited capital as a result of frequently putting in 100% of their tax credits to fund their projects. Yet very few documentary projects are being actively being developed by broadcasters in the English-language market.

**Recommendation #5:**

**English-language broadcasters should allocate their development funding along similar percentage allocations as for production financing. For the English language documentary genre this would represent 16.5% of the development envelope. This development funding should be invested across all regions of production in the country.**

**5. English Regional Pre-development Fund**

The CMF introduced an English regional (non-Toronto) pre-development fund for 2013-14 that was set at \$1.35 million. This fund did not require a broadcaster commitment, only a letter of interest, and was over-subscribed after one day. Of this amount, \$622,604 or 46% went to documentary projects for pre-development. Combined with regular development funding, this amount raised the documentary genre to 15.5% of total development and pre-development funding.

While this 15.5% is more in line with documentary genre's envelope allocation percentage of 16.5%, it is nonetheless worrisome that documentary producers have to rely on this temporary fund to initiate a project. As well, there is no data indicating that a pre-development interest letter by a broadcaster will subsequently translate into an actual broadcaster licence commitment, for further development or production funding.

**Recommendation #6:**

**The size of the Pre-development Fund should be increased, given its importance to documentary producers. More funds and more tranches should be available.**

**5. POV Fund**

The CMF's POV envelope is critically important to documentary producers in the English-language market. It is the only program that supports one-off point-of-view documentaries that do not fit in the conventional 'strand' type of television programming (such as CBC's Nature of Things or Global's 16x9 strand), as well as feature-length documentaries that do not have a broadcast window.

While the current iteration of the POV Fund is flawed, DOC seeks to work with the CMF to enable the fund to more effectively support these types of projects. There has been much discussion amongst DOC members regarding the POV fund and the necessity of having a broadcaster involved by the final stages. Other issues surround the evaluation matrix as it is applied to

projects seeking POV funding. Given the program’s popularity and its consistent oversubscription, DOC is recommending that the POV Fund be doubled.

**POV Evaluation Grid**

The POV Fund is a selective fund based on an evaluation grid and assessed by a decision-making jury. The CMF’s current evaluation grid for POV documentaries is based on the following criteria:

**CMF Assessment Criteria Points**

<b>Market Interest – 30 points</b>
• Distribution and/or broadcast interest
• Audience potential
• Marquee benefits
<b>Creative Elements – 30 points</b>
• Originality and creativity
• Innovation in form and
• Production Values
• Track record, experience and achievements of the Creative team
<b>Production Team – 10 points</b>
• Track record, experience and achievements of the Production team
<b>Program Objectives – 15 points</b>
• Social relevance and impacts
<b>Digital Media Component – 15 points</b>
• Degree of richness and substantiality
• Originality & Creativity
• Market Interest

Documentary producers have complained that the POV evaluation criteria are too broad and vague. The assessment criteria need to be clarified and better defined so that producers can submit suitable applications to the CMF.

**Market Interest**

The elements within the Market Interest criterion are vague and producers do not know how to address them. For example, based on members’ experience, it is not enough to have a Canadian broadcaster on board to demonstrate audience potential. The documentary producer is also expected to provide a comprehensive marketing and distribution strategy for distribution at every level, including theatrical, non-theatrical, international and digital platforms. This requires an extensive amount of work on the producer’s part, but is information that is highly speculative at the time of application. Awarding points based on speculation does not seem appropriate.

Another concern is the cap placed on marketing expenses within the marketing plan, which are too low rate and do not reflect distribution realities.

Marquee benefits is an ill-suited criterion to apply to documentary and should not be part of the assessment matrix. On one hand, it can be highly subjective, as it is dependent on the nature of the project. On the other hand, there are few **recognizable** Canadian experts. Someone with a particular niche following relevant to a documentary project may not be recognized as marquee.

Furthermore, producers seeking to score points on the Marquee Benefit may find themselves in a Catch-22 situation. Although an internationally recognized foreign star doing the narration may bolster the Marquee Benefits score, it will also reduce the project's Canadian content points and make it ineligible for CMF funding.

**Digital Media Component**

Finally, Digital Media as a component of the evaluation grid is problematic. Documentary producers face significant hurdles funding the digital media component of a one-off project, as often broadcasters are not particularly interested in funding one-off digital media strategies and other sources of funding are hard to find. A VOD window should be sufficient to meet the digital media requirement. Any rich and substantial digital media strategies beyond VOD should be awarded bonus points for the purposes of evaluation but the component should not be included in the evaluation grid for the POV Fund.

**Proposed Evaluation Grid**

Overall, documentary producers believe that the evaluation grid should increase its focus on three main areas: the creative elements of the project, the production team and program objectives. In particular, the evaluation process should place the most weight on the merits of a project based on its creative components. Therefore DOC proposes the following evaluation grid for the POV Fund.

<b>Market Interest – 20 points</b>
• Distribution and/or broadcast interest
• Audience potential
<b>Creative Elements – 50 points</b>
• Originality and creativity
• Innovation in form and
• Production Values
• Track record, experience and achievements of the Creative team
<b>Production Team – 15 points</b>
• Track record, experience and achievements of the Production team
<b>Program Objectives – 15 points</b>
• Social relevance and impacts

**Licence Fee Thresholds and Broadcaster Triggers**

The CMF has suggested it is considering opening up the POV Fund to allow international broadcasters to act as broadcast triggers. DOC supports this position and believes the CMF needs to expand its definition of broadcasters to include digital (internet) broadcasters such as the proposed NFB online channel. These internet broadcasters are interested in licensing

documentaries and making them available to their subscribers and as such should be treated similar to pay-TV as a broadcast trigger.

Additionally, there are two other issues relating to broadcast licence fees in the POV Fund. The first is the CMF practice of pro-rating licence fee thresholds when a POV project receives funding from both a broadcaster performance envelope and the POV Fund. This has resulted in licence fees being required at a significantly higher level and difficulties when projects encounter budget changes.

Secondly, the POV licence fee threshold is currently set at 15% of the budget. This is an issue when the documentary project is feature-length and the 15% threshold becomes difficult to reach. DOC recommends that CMF align its approach to licence fee threshold with that of the French language market. For feature-length documentaries with budgets between \$100,000 to \$750,000 the licence fee threshold is 12% and for budgets over \$750,000 the threshold is 10%.

#### **Recommendations**

- 7. The POV Fund is an important fund for documentary producers and is oversubscribed. Its envelope should be doubled.**
- 8. The evaluation criteria should be streamlined. The Digital Media component should be removed and higher points should be allocated for the creative elements, production team and program objectives.**
- 9. The POV Fund should move away from its strict requirement for a Canadian broadcast licence and expand the definition of eligible broadcast licence triggers to include foreign broadcasters and digital delivery broadcasters, such as the proposed NFB channel or Netflix.**
- 10. Licence Fee Thresholds as a percentage of the budget should be tiered to provide a lower percentage requirement for feature-length documentaries, similar to French-language thresholds.**

#### **6. Regional Production**

DOC is hoping to receive the data showing the breakdown of documentary funding by region. However, the analysis presented above shows that Bell and Shaw scored quite well in the English Regional Licensing factor for envelope calculations, with the CBC doing less well. For the French-language market, Radio-Canada scored well in Regional Licensing and to a lesser extent Télé-Québec.

The regional English production incentive is unpredictable. A province can lose its funding simply by having one drama series come into production, temporarily increasing the province's CMF access. However, documentary producers may, at the same time, be underserved in CMF financing in that particular province.

#### **Recommendations**

- 11. Drama and documentaries spending should be separated when determining regional allocations of CMF funding.**
- 12. A regional bonus system should be reinstated to fund regional productions.**

## APPENDIX 1 - CMF Broadcaster Performance Envelope Analysis

### BPE Analysis –English-language – 2012-13:

	Series		One-offs		DM		Sub-Total	% of Total
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	\$	%	
<b>SHAW:</b>								
Global	\$0	0.0%	\$569,345	100.0%	\$0	\$569,345	8.1%	
History	\$6,045,313	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$6,045,313	85.7%	
Food	\$439,514	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$439,514	6.2%	
<b>Total Shaw</b>	<b>\$6,484,827</b>	<b>91.9%</b>	<b>\$569,345</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,054,172</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<b>BELL:</b>								
Discovery (Total Bell)	\$2,955,376	91.1%	\$290,000	8.9%	\$0	\$3,245,376	100.0%	
<b>CBC:</b>								
CBC	\$900,000	15.3%	\$4,983,195	84.7%	\$0	\$5,883,195	96.5%	
documentary	\$0	0.0%	\$212,442	100.0%	\$0	\$212,442	3.5%	
<b>Total CBC</b>	<b>\$900,000</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>\$5,195,637</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,095,637</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

<b>Total - 3 groups</b>	\$10,340,203	63.1%	\$6,054,982	36.9%	\$0	\$16,395,185	66.6%
<b>Total Eng Doc envelope</b>	<b>\$15,636,581</b>	<b>63.5%</b>	<b>\$8,424,361</b>	<b>34.2%</b>	<b>\$547,904</b>	<b>\$24,608,846</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*\*all other broadcasters at less than \$1.5 million in doc funding

### BPE Analysis – French-language:

	Series		One-offs		DM		Sub-Total	% of Total
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
<b>ASTRAL</b>								
Canal D	\$4,706,766	80.8%	\$1,006,713	17.3%	\$111,721	1.9%	\$5,825,203	62.0%
Historia	\$1,780,100	98.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$20,000	1.1%	\$1,800,100	19.2%
Canal Vie	\$859,817	85.5%	\$100,840	10.0%	\$45,000	4.5%	\$1,005,657	10.7%
Ztele	\$338,970	81.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$75,000	18.1%	\$413,970	4.4%
Musimax	\$348,508	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$348,505	3.7%
<b>Total Astral</b>	<b>\$8,034,161</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>\$1,107,553</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>\$251,721</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>\$9,393,435</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Radio- Canada:</b>								
SRC	\$1,074,001	39.2%	\$1,542,896	56.3%	\$124,701	4.5%	\$2,741,598	47.9%
RDI	\$750,151	49.3%	\$726,951	47.8%	\$45,000	3.0%	\$1,522,102	26.6%
ARTV	\$1,290,460	88.2%	\$172,168	11.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$1,462,628	25.5%
<b>Total Radio-Canada</b>	<b>\$3,114,612</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	<b>\$2,442,015</b>	<b>42.6%</b>	<b>\$169,701</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>\$5,726,328</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Total - 2 corp groups</b>	\$11,148,773	73.7%	\$3,549,568	23.5%	\$421,422	2.8%	\$15,119,763	81.4%
<b>Total Fr Doc envelope</b>	<b>\$13,184,188</b>	<b>70.9%</b>	<b>\$4,692,111</b>	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>\$709,380</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>\$18,585,679</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*\*all other broadcasters at less than \$1.5 million in doc funding

## APPENDIX 2

### CMF Documentary Definition – Excerpts from Appendix A- Definitions and ERs CMF Guidelines 2013-14

## DOCUMENTARY PROGRAMMING

### A - Definition

A Documentary is defined as an original work of non-fiction, primarily designed to inform but that may also educate and entertain, providing an in-depth critical analysis of a specific subject or point of view over the course of at least 30 minutes (less a reasonable time for commercials, if any). These programs shall not be used as commercial vehicles.

Note: Although the CMF recognizes that there is market demand for factual programming that contains elements of lifestyle or reality television, this type of programming will not be eligible for CMF funding because it does not qualify as a “Documentary”. The CMF’s mandate is to provide funding support to projects in the under-represented genres, including documentary programs. The definition of “Documentary” set out in this section (including the definition of Ineligible Programming) implements this mandate. The CMF will closely adhere to this definition of “Documentary”. The CMF will not fund projects that are “Ineligible Programming” or that do not otherwise meet the definition.

### 2. Ineligible Programming

[includes a list including How-to’s, Lifestyle and Reality programming]

### 3. Eligible Programming

While the following two categories of programming share some superficial similarities to the foregoing ineligible categories, the CMF views these as eligible because they meet the documentary definition.

#### Living Histories

- Where competition and selection of subjects is behind the scenes and where any prize or contest element is eliminated.
- Is characterized by voluminous research.
- Has a window into the past through use of subject/characters (i.e., a docu-drama brings alive the past through recreation).

Examples: Pioneer Quest, 1900 House, and Destination Nor’Ouest.

#### Docusoap

- Is not dependent on contrivances.
- Characters recur on future episodes.
- The location does not change and therefore, the setting is integral to the storyline.

Examples: Ice Pilots, Family Renovation, La Cité and Islam Québec.

## APPENDIX 3

### CRTC Documentary & Reality Definition

#### **CRTC Definitions - Programs of National Interest**

*Programs of national interest will include programs that belong to categories 2(b) Long-form documentary and 7 Drama and Comedy, as well as award shows of national or regional scope that celebrate Canadian creative talent and/or cultural diversity and achievements in Canadian arts and culture (broadcasting, film, music, video, new media and the arts sector).*

PNI was developed to support Canadian productions that have a harder time being financed by Canadian broadcasters. The CRTC's program definitions are below.

#### **CRTC Definitions - Category 2(b) Long-form documentary**

Original works of non-fiction, primarily designed to inform but may also educate and entertain, providing an in-depth critical analysis of a specific subject or point of view over the course of at least 22 minutes. These programs shall not be used as commercial vehicles. ***Further, programs that fall under the category 11(b) Reality television do not qualify as 2(b) programming.***

**(Note: this is identical to the CMF's basic definition.)**

#### **CRTC Definitions - Category 11(b) Reality television**

Programs that present unscripted dramatic or humorous situations, document actual events and typically feature ordinary people instead of professional actors. This type of programming involves passively following individuals as they go about their daily personal and professional activities.

***Though unscripted, this programming may be directed and may resemble a soap opera – hence the popular references to “docusoaps” and “docudramas.”*** Though this type of programming may be factual, it lacks or has very minimal amounts of in-depth critical analysis of a specific subject or point of view that is the key defining element of category 2(b) Long-form documentary programming.

## APPENDIX 4

Specific feedback received from producers:

### **“Paying back” development advances**

Why are producers asked to ‘pay back’ development advances before they can get production financing?

Can’t CMF simply subtract it from the first ‘production drawdown’?

Since there is a time gap between closing development and starting production, producers incur interest charges when they have to borrow money to remit the advance.

### **Allowable marketing expenses**

Why are website updates not considered allowable marketing expenses? Not every doc is going to have a CMF funded digital media companion project. If the broadcaster refuses to fund the DM component (and many of them do refuse) the producer has to incur the costs.