

From: Ryan FitzGerald [<mailto:ryanmcfitz@gmail.com>]
Sent: November-18-13 2:52 PM
To: Info - Canada Media Fund/Fonds des Médias du Canada
Subject: Responses to Industry Consultation 2013

Good afternoon,

I was hoping I might be able to add my thoughts for consideration in response to the questions posed in the Industry Consultation presentation.

1. Should innovation remain the main evaluation criteria?

No. The overwhelming emphasis on "innovation" fails to constrain the nature of the innovation appropriately. It means that applicant projects that wish to be competitive for funding need to over-extend their areas of experimentation, which is fundamentally at odds with a sound revenue-generating strategy. Innovation must be kept in moderation so that projects engage in *evolution* and not *revolution*.

2. Should interactivity be a requirement for all projects?

Yes, as long as the quality of the interactive continues to be taken into account. "Press a button to continue" is no more interactive than opening a door.

3. Should projects related to television or film properties remain ineligible?

I have no strong comment on this topic, other than the political fear that film & TV, industries with more heavily-developed infrastructure and funding, tend to emerge from collaborations in domination over their interactive counterparts, which can lead to the tail wagging the dog. This may simply be a transitional issue.

4. Is the Experimental Stream too focused on games?

No. Games are a viable media capable of artistic or commercial merit. Removing otherwise worthy games from consideration would be like dictating that lower-quality films should be funded because there are already too many of a given genre that are of abundant quality.

5. Should additional eligibility criteria be introduced to reduce oversubscription?

Yes. Companies with a track record of success should be required to demonstrate ongoing sustainability.

6. Has the jury process worked well?

The process seems to suffer from delays and extensions. This is frustrating for those companies that cannot engage in fruitful work until funding is greenlit and awarded, which causes a subsequent ripple across production as these companies may then fail to have a viable product in time for showing at a market or conference.

7. Should CMF continue to fund projects at 3 different stages?

Yes.

8. Are the maximum contributions per stage still appropriate?

I would enjoy seeing these contribution caps rise, as it will greatly enhance the international marketability of successfully produced projects. I appreciate that budgets are tight and governments aren't falling all over themselves for the pleasure of funding Canadian art & entertainment though, so I suspect this is a growing pain that may take a generation.

Regardless, interactive producers continue to gnash their teeth at the amount of money spent in a film production industry that, while fruitful in terms of the number of people it employs, doesn't seem to produce any market-driven content that is enjoyed by any significant percentage of Canadians.

9. Is the funding allocation to the Experimental Stream still appropriate?

I would enjoy seeing this fund increase, but then, who wouldn't...?

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns. In other areas of scrutiny, I would like to add my vote to take to heart the excellent proposal and comments proffered by Stitch Media.

Regards,
Ryan

Ryan FitzGerald
c: 709.682.6373
Skype & Twitter: RyanMcFitz