

**Senate Environment, Communications, Information Technology & the Arts
Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Communications, Information Technology and the Arts
Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts
Budget Estimates Supplementary Hearings 20 November 2002**

Outcome 4, Output 4.1, 4.2

Questions: 211-244

Topic: National Film and Sound Archive / ScreenSound Australia, name change,

Written Question on Notice: 211

Senator LUNDY asked:

What is the exact name of the organisation now?

Answer:

The formal name of the organisation is the National Screen and Sound Archive and the shortened marketed brand is ScreenSound Australia.

Written Question on Notice: 212

Senator LUNDY asked:

Who authorised the 1999 name change and subsequent changes?

Answer:

The then Minister for the Arts and the Centenary of Federation, the Hon Peter McGauran MP.

Written Question on Notice: 213

Senator LUNDY asked:

Were all these changes also authorised by Cabinet?

Answer:

This is a decision for the responsible portfolio Minister.

Written Question on Notice: 214

Senator LUNDY asked:

What is the legal status of these names?

Answer:

The names are registered under the *Trade Marks Act 1995*.

Written Question on Notice: 215

Senator LUNDY asked:

Can they be altered at will by the Secretary or by you?

Answer:

See answers to Questions 212 and 213.

Written Question on Notice: 216

Senator LUNDY asked:

Are you aware of a complaint made by Screensound Pty Ltd, a post-production company based in Sydney, objecting to the usurpation of its business name by the Commonwealth?

Answer: Yes.

Written Question on Notice: 217

Senator LUNDY asked:

When did you discover that you had adopted the same name and virtually the same internet address as this company?

Answer:

Shortly after the name change.

Written Question on Notice: 218

Senator LUNDY asked:

Did you take action to resolve this conflict?

Answer:

Yes. See Question 219.

Written Question on Notice: 219

Senator LUNDY asked:

When was this action taken? Please provide an outline of the action taken.

Answer:

Discussions at officer level occurred shortly after the name change.

More recently, action includes:

- A meeting between the Director of ScreenSound Australia and the proprietor of Screensound Pty Ltd on 19 September 2002; and
- Follow-up contact offering advice in relation to managing e-mail traffic was made by ScreenSound Australia in the first week of October and then again on 10 October 2002.

In every contact ScreenSound Australia has had with Screensound Pty Ltd, ScreenSound Australia has reiterated its offer for Screensound Pty Ltd to advise ScreenSound Australia of any misdirected emails in order for them to respond appropriately. No further advice, complaints or concerns have been provided to ScreenSound Australia by Screensound Pty Ltd.

Written Question on Notice: 220

Senator LUNDY asked:

How would you propose to resolve the matter? What would or could be the cost to the taxpayer?

Answer:

At this stage it is not clear that Screensound Pty Ltd requires further action from ScreenSound Australia.

Written Question on Notice: 221

Senator LUNDY asked:

Has Screensound Pty Ltd indicated it will be taking legal action?

Answer:

No.

Written Question on Notice: 222

Senator LUNDY asked:

I understand there were two submissions to the Minister in March and May 1999 to change the name. Do they comprise the entire official rationale for the name change? If not, what are the other contemporary documents? Can they be provided to this Committee?

Answer:

The attached briefs to the Minister (dated 19 March 1999, 12 May 1999, 4 April 2000 and 6 April 2000) deal with the name change.

Written Question on Notice: 223

Senator LUNDY asked: Do the two submissions presented to the Arts Minister in March and May 1999 comprise the entire official rationale for the name change?

Answer:

See answer to Question 12.

Written Question on Notice: 224

Senator LUNDY asked:

If not, what are the other contemporary documents? Can they be provided to the Committee?

Answer:

See answer to Question on Notice 222.

Written Question on Notice: 225

Senator LUNDY asked:

All the national collecting institutions in recent years have progressively standardised their self-explanatory names to start with "National" - National Film and Sound Archive, National Museum of Australia, National Gallery of Australia, etc - and this also conforms to international practice. Why was it decided to suddenly adopt a non-standard, non-self-explanatory name? Why isn't this issue covered in your submissions - was it overlooked? Were the other institutions consulted?

Answer:

There is no policy requiring standardisation of the names of the national institutions. The name change for ScreenSound Australia took into account circumstances and factors relevant to its role. No consultation with other institutions was warranted.

Written Question on Notice: 226

Senator LUNDY asked:

What research was done on the professional implications of the name change, and how this might affect perceptions of the Archive's role and standing in the eyes of its peers and stakeholders?

Answer:

Market research conducted prior to the June 1999 name change launch included professional stakeholders of the organisation, including research on perceptions.

Written Question on Notice: 227

Senator LUNDY asked:

Was the actual proposed name pre-tested with your opposite numbers overseas and stakeholders in Australia?

Answer:

No.

Written Question on Notice: 228

Senator LUNDY asked:

What was the purpose of the stakeholder focus groups and interviews which were held as part of market research?

Answer:

All the market research conducted prior to the June 1999 name change launch was intended to provide more and better information on the perceptions of the organisation, perceptions of the existing name and what might be the impact of alternative branding.

Written Question on Notice: 229

Senator LUNDY asked:

Did you receive the transcripts or recordings? If not, in what form was feedback delivered, and what notice did you take of it? Can a copy be provided?

Answer:

The report on the market research was in the form of a PowerPoint presentation given to senior staff and was made available to the Council. Transcripts and recordings were not provided. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is attached.

Written Question on Notice: 230

Senator LUNDY asked:

Why was the crucial word "archive" dropped altogether in June 1999?

Answer:

The word 'archive' was dropped from the name on the basis of advice from consultants.

Written Question on Notice: 231

Senator LUNDY asked:

Why has it not been restored to the public identity?

Answer:

The word 'archive' is present in the name, ScreenSound Australia, National Screen and Sound Archive.

Written Question on Notice: 232

Senator LUNDY asked:

Is it possible there will be another name change?

Answer:

It is not proposed at this time.

Written Question on Notice: 233

Senator LUNDY asked:

In submissions to the Arts Minister in 1999 regarding the name change it asserts that the name National Film and Sound Archive is misleading to external stakeholders and that there is a confusion of identity with the National Archives of Australia. The Annual Review 1999/2000 states there was a flood of complaints after the change. Was there any documentary evidence to say that the name was confusing? Can a copy be provided?

Answer:

The Annual Review of 1999/2000 states that "Screen Sound Australia's change of name and the relocation of its Sydney Office provoked a total of 73 complaints (with 47 of these provided orally to staff members at several meetings and conferences)". An extract from the Annual Review and an extract of relevant market research are attached.

Written Question on Notice: 234

Senator LUNDY asked:

Prior to the change, was there any cost benefit analysis to assess the opportunity cost of abandoning equity in the NFSA brand? If so, what was the outcome?

Answer:

No. However, a corporate positioning consultant was engaged to assess branding and issues surrounding a possible change. This firm strongly advised that there would be benefit in a change of name.

Written Question on Notice: 235

Senator LUNDY asked:

Was a business case also developed, with a budget and success/failure standards?

Answer:

A detailed case for the name change launched in June 1999 was developed, based on consultancy reports, previous research and in-house assessment and analysis by the then National Film and Sound Archive. A specific budget was allocated for the purpose. Standards for the brand were not distinguished from broader performance standards for the organisation as a whole.

Written Question on Notice: 236

Senator LUNDY asked:

An audit of the re-branding process was done by KPMG late in 1999, but the report was not made public. What were the principal findings?

Answer:

The KPMG report dealt with technical issues relating to tendering processes, the contract and management of the relationship with the consultant. The principal finding was a need to tighten processes within ScreenSound Australia for the management of contract work. A contracts manager was subsequently engaged.

Written Question on Notice: 237

Senator LUNDY asked:

Had there been any financial mismanagement? Were all the documents and contracts in order? Can a copy be provided to this Committee?

Answer:

The report found that the documentation for the contracts was not in order and recommendations were made regarding improvements to future tendering processes as well as file maintenance. There are privacy and commercial-in-confidence concerns about public release of the report in its entirety. Major findings were that:

- tendering processes and maintenance of documentation required improvement;
- contract management processes required improvement;
- procedures for invoicing and reconciliations required improvement;
- a recommendation was made in relation to one employee of ScreenSound Australia; and
- ScreenSound Australia should pursue further action in relation to some outstanding deliverables and clarify ownership rights in relation to contract materials.

All recommendations have been implemented.

An edited copy of the report is attached. Deletions made reflect privacy and commercial-in-confidence concerns relating to third parties.

Written Question on Notice: 238

Senator LUNDY asked:

What was the full cost of the re-branding, including consultants' fees, staff time, opportunity cost of lost sales and lost recognition, flow on effects on practicalities like stationery and signage, etc.?

Answer:

The cost of the consultants relating specifically to the re-branding was \$158,388.

The cost of signage and stationery for ScreenSound Australia was generally incorporated into the need for maintenance and renewal of these materials. The cost of replacing signage for the Acton headquarters, Mitchell storage facilities, and the Sydney and Melbourne sites totalled \$10,234. This cost included street and tourist signage, banners, building and entrance signs.

There is no evidence of any significant opportunity costs, in relation to lost sales and lost recognition. The evidence has been to the contrary.

Written Question on Notice: 239

Senator LUNDY asked: Can you provide me with an annual breakdown of product sales figures from 1998 to now?

Answer: The table below outlines sales from 1998 until the end of last financial year.

Year	Annual Product Sales	No. Products Produced
1997/1998	\$459,770	28
1998/1999	\$572,228	16
1999/2000	\$337,091	14
2000/2001	\$425,378	12
2001/2002	\$353,087	12

Notes:

- 1998/1999: An increase in product development in 1997/98, saw revenue benefits in that financial year but also more significantly in 1998/99. 1998/99 was also atypical as General Motors Holden (GMH) co-produced the *Fifty Years of Holden* video with the then National Film and Sound Archive. The Archive, Festival and Holden were co-branded on the slick. This product significantly boosted sales for the financial year.
- 1999/2000: January to June 2000 - retailers were reluctant to buy product given nervousness about the potential impact of the GST. ScreenSound Australia's Sydney Office also moved in this year and no longer had a shopfront presence for product sales. Repositioning of many products into different price ranges also occurred in this year to adjust to marketplace demands.
- 2001/2002: ScreenSound Australia reduced the scope of its product program to assess the market place as DVD products were introduced into the domestic and educational market and the demand for videos decreased. This also enabled the Archive to "gear up" for DVD production itself. The first ScreenSound Australia DVD was produced in the 2001/02 financial year (*The Man From Hong Kong*).

Written Question on Notice: 240

Senator LUNDY asked:

What follow-up assessment and evaluation has been done? Has your original rationale been tested? For eg. a study into the general public preference and awareness of these names to see what each communicates now?

Answer:

ScreenSound Australia has conducted evaluations in keeping with its performance indicators. Performance indicators that relate most clearly to branding include product sales, visitor numbers to the Headquarters site, visitor numbers to touring programs and enquiries for access services.

A table of ScreenSound Australia visitor numbers and enquiries is included below.

Year	No. of Visitors	No. of Enquiries
1997/1998	69500	9889
1998/1999	70200	9968
1999/2000	67500	10240
2000/2001	77500	10590
2001/2002	97000	9788

Notes:

Total number of visitors who attended a live presentation, exhibition, screening or event at ScreenSound Australia's headquarters in Canberra.

Total number of enquiries for Collection Access services received by Canberra, Melbourne and Sydney offices.

Written Question on Notice: 241

Senator LUNDY asked:

Apart from the cabinet decision, what governance documents or charter does the Archive have? Are there any binding professional philosophies, ethics, standards or guidelines which cannot be overruled by the Minister or Secretary?

Answer:

As part of the Department, ScreenSound Australia is subject to the same governance framework as DC1TA. This includes the *Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997* and the *Public Service Act 1999*, relevant sections 10 and 13.

Written Question on Notice: 242

Senator LUNDY asked:

Would the Secretary or the Minister have power to change, dismember, or abolish the Archive without parliamentary approval?

Answer:

ScreenSound Australia is part of the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts and is subject to the same legislative framework and parliamentary procedures in this respect.

Written Question on Notice: 243

Senator LUNDY asked:

Despite the designation of the name "National Screen and Sound Archive" as a formal title and the limiting of the title "ScreenSound Australia" to a "trading name", is it the case that for all practical purposes ScreenSound is used and promoted as the de facto institutional name?

Answer:

No. (Refer annual reviews, website, logo, letterhead and other corporate documents.)

Written Question on Notice: 244

Senator LUNDY asked:

Do you believe that ScreenSound is an adequate and proud permanent name for Australia's National Film and Sound Archive?

Answer:

ScreenSound Australia is an appropriate marketing name for Australia's National Screen and Sound Archive.

BACKGROUND NOTES:

The following contextual notes have been compiled by Ray Edmondson, a member of Archive Forum

- **Question 211:** The marketed brand ScreenSound Australia was announced on 21 June 1999 and was not then represented as a "shortening" of anything. The formal name National Screen and Sound Archive was adopted about a year later. By definition the former cannot be a shortening of the latter.
- **Question 235:** If a detailed case was developed it has so far not been published as a coherent document, nor provided in response to recent Freedom of Information requests which specifically sought it. No specific assessment of the success/failure of the brand has been made available to date and it is possible that no such assessment has ever been made.
- **Questions 236 and 237:** Having been provided to Parliament with these answers, the edited copy of the audit report is now a public document, although the existence of the report was never revealed in the Annual Reports of the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, where audits are normally required to be listed. The report is primarily concerned with the management of this particular contract, not with contract administration in the Archive generally. It found that the rebranding process had been poorly defined and managed, that key documents were missing, that proper procedures were ignored, that there was no contract defining the deliverables or fee for the consultancy, and that there had been poor management of the project throughout the consultancy
- **Question 239:** Information is presented as dollar amounts, which include unspecified price changes, not as the more meaningful figure of the number of units sold - the best measure of actual audience reach - which was the practice until June 1999 (when the name change occurred). Unit sales have in fact fallen significantly since the name change.

- **Question 240:** The notably higher number of visitors in 2001/2002 coincides with a major new exhibition at the Archive which opened in 2001, and the March 2001 opening of the nearby National Museum, which draws over 400,000 visitors a year, has given the Archive the benefit of flow-on traffic. There is no evidence that these figures have been influenced by 'branding'. The number of enquiries (mostly from industry users) has remained fairly static.
- **Question 243:** Nowhere in any of the sources mentioned is the status of the name "National Screen and Sound Archive" made clear: it appears in small type under the ScreenSound banner and could be taken as an advertising phrase, or interpreted as some subset of ScreenSound Australia. In publicity, correspondence and conversation it is easily omitted altogether. The reader can judge from the answers to the questions what the respondents believe the de facto name to be.