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A great producer is a gifted storyteller. And as any great producer can tell you, the key to a great story is that essential question: What happens next?

At the Producers Guild, we’re in the middle of a very important story for our profession: the adoption of the Producers Mark. Elsewhere in this issue, you can read about the Mark and its implications at considerable length.

But while the Producers Mark is an important story — and for those of us who have lived through it, a gripping one — it’s not the only story of our Guild and its members. For all of the deserved excitement surrounding the Mark, it’s important to remember that the Producers Mark, at present, only impacts the individuals who take the “Produced By” credit in theatrical motion pictures. That group includes some of our most valuable members, women and men who are essential to the functioning of this Guild. That said, they do not comprise a majority of our membership.

Without raining on the parade, it’s just as important that we remember the limitations of our new Producers Mark:

- It does not (at this point) apply to television. Roughly half of our membership is based in television.
- It only applies to the “Produced By” credit. A majority of our members, including our entire AP Council, typically receive a different screen credit.
- The Mark is licensed free of charge. It may bring prestige to our Guild, but it does not provide the Guild with revenue to offer new benefits to its members.

And yet, in spite of these facts, our membership has supported the Producers Mark with near unanimity. It’s my sincere hope that the producers who will benefit from the Mark — those taking the “Produced By” credit in motion pictures — will remember this as our Guild faces the challenges ahead. And these challenges continue to be major ones: inconsistency and cost of health insurance; the power to own one’s own library and intellectual property; fair participation in the revenues generated by content; finding greater employment opportunities for members; and of course, the tangled snarl of producing credits that prefaces virtually every episode of television.

Many of these issues are of less pressing importance to our members who serve as the primary producers of motion pictures. But just as our fellow members supported their interests with the Producers Mark, it is incumbent upon them to repay that support by honoring and working toward the professional priorities of their PGA colleagues.

The success of the Producers Mark is the end of a chapter, not the story itself. But we’ll meet the succeeding challenges the way we met this one — as one Guild, fighting for and alongside each other, adopting our fellow members’ struggle as our own, and continuing to benefit from our solidarity and unity.
The PGA at Sundance:

A few days before the Producers Guild Awards, the Guild was already celebrating a group of producers — not in a Beverly Hills ballroom, but inside an unassuming bar in Park City, Utah. For the first time, the Producers Guild of America descended upon the Sundance Film Festival, joining the 60 PGA members screening 40 films in this year’s official selection.

The increasing role of film festivals within the industry led the Guild to include Sundance, along with nine other film festivals, in the distribution qualifications for PGA membership. The time had come for the PGA to jump on the bandwagon (or in Sundance’s case, the shuttle bus) to engage directly with independent producers. Sundance regular and PGA East Chair Peter Saraf, whose film The Kings of Summer (which screened under the title Toy’s House) premiered at Sundance this year, explained, “We have to show the producing community that we are there to support them. If you become a member of the Producers Guild, you will become part of a community that will make your job and your life better and more effective. We have to show up at the places where the producers are.”

Over the course of the festival, the PGA met with many members and potential members alike, whether at events sponsored by organizations like The Blackhouse Foundation, Indiewire, and the Sundance Producers Initiative, or simply by bumping into them on the street corner. The Guild also frequented the New York Lounge, where PGA East Director Mitzie Rothzeid was able to address groups of filmmakers on PGA membership and the Producers Mark. The Guild’s signature event during the festival was its inaugural Producer’s Breakfast, featuring PGA President Mark Gordon and festival mainstay Harvey Weinstein, a recipient of the PGA’s 2013 Milestone Award. Sponsored by EP Financial Solutions and open to producers screening in or attending the festival, Gordon and Weinstein took the stage at Ciserò’s Ristorante on the morning of January 21 for a candid conversation about the art and craft of producing and the role of film festivals. “Films very often guide us into new territory and show us that new territory is possible,” said Weinstein of the films at Sundance, adding that the festival “transformed my company, and I think it will transform other companies and more importantly, give a great forum for filmmakers.”

Weinstein shared his opinions on topics including this year’s Oscar race, the effects of evolving distribution platforms and instant reviews, and the need to curb piracy. “Good can triumph over evil if the angels are as organized as the mafia,” Weinstein paraphrased from Kurt Vonnegut to describe his anti-piracy stance. Mark Gordon affirmed the PGA’s presence at the festival, stating, “It was a great idea to be together as producing community. We initiate the projects and bring in writers and directors and bring them to studios, and it’s important that somebody stands up for us.”

The PGA’s successful trip to Sundance was the culmination of a year’s worth of recognizing members screening in each of the 10 qualifying film festivals. Planning a return to next year’s Sundance, and with its sights set on additional festivals, the PGA looks forward to continuously supporting a strong network of independent producers.

By Patrick Gerety

Julie Goldman, Harvey Weinstein and Mark Gordon, Christine Vachon, and Lars Knudsen, and Fredrik Malmberg discussed the making of Ain’t Them Bodies Saints, as well as their history with Sundance. “What we experienced was how important film festivals like Sundance are for creating a community,” said Van Hoy, “and making those first connections that lead to long-lasting relationships.” Van Hoy and Knudsen also had Mother of George and Narcos Cultura in this year’s selection. When discussing how they constantly juggle numerous projects, Van Hoy replied, “You’re always looking for your own limitations, and I’d rather find them myself than have someone else find them for me.”

Guild members also spoke about the sense of community they felt from belonging to the PGA. Julie Goldman, who brought the documentaries God Loves Uganda, Gideon’s Army, and Margin to Sundance this year, declared, “I love being a producer. I don’t want to direct films. I love producing documentaries. It’s exactly what I want to be doing, so it’s terrific to be part of an organization of like-minded people... It’s very rare to find that group.”

Premiering both Stoker and The East at the festival, Michael Costigan observed, “a group of talented filmmakers felt like something I would love to be a part of, and I think there’s a lot of exchange of ideas and information and craft that can go back and forth. I think it’s a really important organization and I’m encouraging other friends to join and be a part of it because I think of what it represents, and it’s such an important piece of the filmmaking equation.” The Necessary Death of Charlie Countryman’s Ron Yerxa and Albert Berger added to that sentiment. “We applaud the PGA in trying to reassert the producer’s proper position in the film chain,” said Berger. “We initiate the projects and bring in writers and directors and bring them to studio, and it’s important that

Who screened at Sundance? 60 PGA members with 40 films

What festivals count toward PGA membership? AFI, Berlin, Cannes, Los Angeles, New York, Sundance, Telluride, Toronto, Tribeca, Venice

Which credits and projects qualify a producer for membership? The credits of Producer/Produced By, Executive Producer, Co-Producer, Co-Executive Producer, Supervising Producer or Line Producer on a feature-length film

GET ON THE (SHUTTLE) BUS

Full video interviews from Sundance can be found at the PGA’s YouTube channel: www.youtube.com/producersguild

Photos by Kevyn Fairchild and Patrick Gerety

Additional research by Connie Panzariello
On October 12, 2010, the Producers Guild released an “open letter” from 145 of the industry’s most prominent motion picture producers, addressed to their studios, distributors and colleagues. The letter read: “As PRODUCERS, we hereby place our full support behind the PRODUCERS MARK, as endorsed by the Producers Guild. In doing so, we wish to stipulate that our names, when credited as ‘Produced By’ in motion picture productions, be followed by the distinctive mark: p.g.a.”

Less than two years later, the first Producers Mark appeared on The Magic of Belle Isle; the certified producers were two PGA members, Lori McCreary and Alan Greisman, and one non-member, Rob Reiner. A few weeks later, the second film bearing the Producers Mark, Lawless, was released with two of the film’s four producers — Douglas Wick and Lucy Fisher — certified with the p.g.a. As the year concluded, the Guild celebrated the first animated feature to receive the Mark, Rise of the Guardians, and the first certified Oscar nominee, Silver Linings Playbook.

Early this year, the Guild announced that three of the industry’s six major studios — Universal, 20th Century Fox and Sony (under its Columbia Pictures and Screen Gems banners) — had signed agreements with the Producers Guild to implement the Producers Mark on their releases. DreamWorks Pictures and DreamWorks Animation likewise signed. While not yet a signatory, The Weinstein Company has demonstrated its early support by implementing the Mark on Lawless; and Silver Linings Playbook. As this magazinePrepare to go to press, the Guild is finalizing its agreement with Disney to implement the Producers Mark on their films.

Make no mistake: The Producers Mark is going to be a regular feature on movie screens going forward. As the first new screen credit in a generation, it’s important for readers of this magazine and members of the producing community to learn what the Producers Mark means, how it came to be, and most important: how to qualify for and receive the Producers Mark on their own credits.

This represents only the third time in this magazine’s 13-year history that we have not featured a “Case Study” interview as our cover story. We hate to break precedent, but it’s not every day that our Guild makes entertainment history.

Within our editorial coverage, we’ve included testimonials from some of the Producers Mark’s most passionate supporters. The pride and excitement of those prominent producers reflects our own; we are overjoyed to share it with our readers and our industry.
Making the Mark

The road to the Producers Mark has been a long and winding one. *Produced by* editor Chris Green talked to PGA Presidents Mark Gordon and Hawk Koch (the latter on leave of absence from PGA duties) and National Executive Director Vance Van Petten to learn how the Producers Mark became a reality.

**So, what’s the story behind the Producers Mark?**

**MARK:** Really, the story starts at least 20 years ago. The AMPPSA made a decision in their negotiation with the Writers Guild to move the producer’s credit from the second position to third, so that the writer’s credit contractually would appear just before the director. Traditionally, that had been where the producer’s credit went. Producers were very upset, I think, for two reasons: number one, we wanted to retain our position; and number two, there was no consideration as to how producers would feel about this. No one picked up the phone, even on an unofficial basis, to ask how this was going to go over within the producing community. So a lot of producers, myself included, gathered at a meeting in Dick Zanuck’s gin.

**HAWK:** I was there.

**MARK:** Every important producer in town was there. I don’t know why the hell they invited me, but I was thrilled and honored to be there, and I really listened. There was a lot of anger, disappointment and ultimately, frustration. At the end of the day, producers were left asking, well, what can we do? And the answer, really, was nothing, because we weren’t organized. It was very painful.

**HAWK:** We all felt that we weren’t being taken seriously, that we were disrespected. After all, we knew what we brought to the industry. But though there wasn’t a lot of action, there was certainly the feeling of being disrespected.

**MARK:** After I took the job, I spoke to all of the Board members, all of the producers I could, really, and I asked them their number-one priority. And by a substantial margin, the answer was “credits.” We’re a more diverse membership now, so we have more priorities, but there was a mandate to address the credit problem from the very beginning.

**HAWK:** Once Vance came on board, we worked well together. I was very supportive of bringing Kathy [Kennedy] in as PGA President, and her mantra was about the need for job criteria. The only way anybody was going to understand what a producer does is if we listed all the criteria. A short time later, we all went up to Kathy’s house on a weekend, and literally sat down around a table and asked, “Alright, what do you do as a producer?” There was a TV section over here and a features section over there, and we talked everything out and wrote it all down. It was like the First Continental Congress of producing!

**MARK:** We had to make it clear from our perspective, from the Guild’s perspective, what a producer is and what it is that qualifies a person to receive a producer credit. So the first order of business was to create a code of credits. That was step one. Step two was to enforce that code at our own Awards, to be able to say that we at the Producers Guild believe that these are the people who truly produced our nominated features and TV shows, that this is what it takes to be a bona fide producer.

**HAWK:** Not long after, I was fortunate enough to be elected to the Board of the Motion Picture Academy. Kathy was on the Board, I think Larry Gordon was the other producer on the Board. And as we started to arbitrate our Producers Guild Awards, we saw naturally that if we could get the Academy to use our arbitration system, that would really give it some teeth. The executive committee of the Producers Branch of the Academy saw that the Producers Guild was doing a good job arbitrating and giving out awards only to the people who actually produced the movie, even though other people may have gotten producer credit. So eventually, the executive committee decided to use the PGA arbitration system to inform and guide the Producers Branch as to who they thought were the right people to be nominated for an award. We got a lot of traction through the Academy.

**MARK:** I think we felt emboldened to the place where we thought that if we could make the determination for the Academy, we should be able to arbitrate credits on screen. And so on both a formal and informal basis, we began having conversations with the studios. It became very clear to us that although we felt that we were right in what we wanted to accomplish, we were not going to be able to persuade the studios to allow us to determine who would get “Produced By” credit on a film.

**HAWK:** A number of prominent members—including Kathy, Jerry Bruckheimer, Brian Grazer, Dick Zanuck—came with us to meet with the studios. And although they were hesitant to say so in the room, at the end of the day, the studios’ answer was always no. It wasn’t gonna happen.

**MARK:** It was met with such universal rejection that we stopped for a moment and went back to the drawing board. A couple of years earlier, Vance had proposed an idea, which was effectively to put a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on producing credits. It would be something like a trademark that would appear on screen to distinguish between the producers who really did the work versus producers who were given the credit but did not qualify, based on our standards, as bona fide producers of the movie.

**VANCE:** It was clear that the studios were not going to give us control of the “Produced By” credit. So what we needed was something that we did control. A certification mark could be “trademarked” and controlled by the Guild, and licensed out to distributors or copyright owners for use in screen credits.

**HAWK:** Mark and I were elected as Guild Presidents in 2010. Not long after, Vance came back to us with the idea for the Mark. Studios could control the credits for their own productions. But only the person who did the work could get the Mark. Mark Gordon and I realized, wow, this is a way we can do it. We saw the light, and we started to use our contacts in the business to try and make it happen.

**VANCE:** Early on, we determined that the Mark should be the initials of the Guild, but rendered in a way that was distinct from our logo. Clint Eastwood was actually a pixels expert in those early talks, he persuaded us that the Mark shouldn’t indicate “membership in the club,” but should apply to every producer who did the work, regardless of whether or not she or he was a Guild member. So that was how we arrived at the lowercase p g a. The biggest hurdle after that was making sure that there wasn’t a conflict with the Professional Golfers Association. But we’ve always gotten along very well with the “other” PGA.

**MARK:** There was a lot of conversation about how people would feel about the Mark following their name. It was something that the community had seen with the ASC, the ACE, the CSA, and so on, but those were membership...
hearing for us is that even though we weren’t able to get the studios to allow us arbitrate screen credits, over the last five or six years, studios have cracked down very aggressively on “Produced By” credits. They do not give out those credits with the frequency that they used to. That is a direct result of the aggressive work that the Guild has been doing for the past 10 years in arbitrarily eligibility for the awards shows, and our “Campaign for Fair Credits,” which was led by Marshall Herskovitz. We had already seen the positive result of our work, and we had already come quite a long way, but now we wanted to put the finishing touches on it to say, “These producers really did their work.”

HAWK: This proposal had met to it. The studio still could give credit to another producer who had negotiated it. They just weren’t going to get the Mark if they didn’t do the work. If you do the work, you get the Mark!

MARK: We went to every studio, and we went again and again, and it was not easy.

VANCE: There were all kinds of obstacles. One studio actually requested that we obtain a Business Review Letter from the Department of Justice, confirming that there would be no anti-trust concerns as a result of the Producers Mark. This is not an easy thing to accomplish. At the time we submitted our request, in the summer of 2011, the Obama administration had only issued five such letters — just five letters over 2½ years. But we succeeded. And not only did the Department of Justice confirm that there would be no anti-trust implications to the Producers Mark, they stated an opinion that the adoption of the Mark would be a positive development for the industry and for the public. An ironic postscript: the studio that requested that we obtain this letter still hasn’t signed on to support the Mark.

Did the producers grasp what the Mark was trying to do?

HAWK: Absolutely! They got it. They were asking me, “Do you think this can help?” They were all struggling with how nobody wanted to listen to them. And I said, “This is the way we can make this happen.” We sent the letter to every studio, to every executive at the studios. We put it in the trades. And then we wanted to put the finishing touches on it to say, “These producers really did their work.”

HAWK: This had met to it. The studio still could give credit to another producer who had negotiated it. They just weren’t going to get the Mark if they didn’t do the work. If you do the work, you get the Mark!

MARK: We went to every studio, and we went again and again, and it was not easy.

VANCE: There were all kinds of obstacles. One studio actually requested that we obtain a Business Review Letter from the Department of Justice, confirming that there would be no anti-trust concerns as a result of the Producers Mark. This is not an easy thing to accomplish. At the time we submitted our request, in the summer of 2011, the Obama administration had only issued five such letters — just five letters over 2½ years. But we succeeded. And not only did the Department of Justice confirm that there would be no anti-trust implications to the Producers Mark, they stated an opinion that the adoption of the Mark would be a positive development for the industry and for the public. An ironic postscript: the studio that requested that we obtain this letter still hasn’t signed on to support the Mark.

They were asking me, “Do you think this can help?” They were all struggling with how nobody wanted to listen to them.

And I said, “This is the way we can make this happen.”

MARK: But we also found champions in the community. It was a very brave thing for these guys to do. No one likes change. No one likes to commit to something that takes their time and reduces some flexibility. But three studios signed agreements to certify their producing credits with the Producers Mark, starting with Ron Meyer at Universal, and then Michael Lynton at Sony; the third studio to come in was Fox, thanks to Jim Gianopulos. They agreed to do this because they had this right thing to do — that it was fair, it was appropriate, and that it should be clear who really did the work of producing a film. Because the job of the producer has so many functions, screen credits can be misleading. Producers credited onscreen can be everything from someone who just wrote a check, to someone’s manager, to the actual person who developed the script and saw it all the way through from beginning to end. Without the Mark, those people on the screen all look the same, so to be able to distinguish between those names is a very, very powerful thing.

HAWK: Putting up money is not producing a movie, that’s an important thing to say. Financing a movie is not the same as producing a movie. You want to know what a producer does? Look at our Code of Credits. Look at our criteria. If you do a majority of those things, you qualify for the Producers Mark.

So what’s the next step? How will the Guild encourage producers to request the Mark?

HAWK: I think that if everything else, it starts small and it starts to happen. As movies start to come out and that Mark is on it, the other producers say, “I want that Mark on my movie, because I’m a producer!” It starts to snowball. What should happen now is that every producer, no matter if you’re doing a little movie or a big movie, should insist on the Mark.

Do you remember the first time you saw the Mark on a film?

HAWK: The first time I saw the Mark was on Lawless, after Doug Wick and Lucy Fisher’s names. I was so proud. We’ve made a difference in the lives of real producers. I’m as proud of this as just about anything I’ve ever done.

MARK: This was a very, very important issue for Hawk and me. We went about this with the fervor of getting a movie done, which is. We cannot fail. We will not fail. We must accomplish this. We will not take no for an answer.

Fortunately, we had some terrific men at these studios who were willing to change our culture. It was a very wonderful and heartening thing in this day and age, when everything is so business-oriented and corporate. But these guys did stand up and say, “This is the right thing to do. We are going to stand with you.” These men made it happen and our debt to them is enormous.

HAWK: Over the whole process, my only regret is giving up that argument over what the certification should be called. This thing could have been the “Producers Hawk.”

MARK: Nice try, pal.
When the Guild first proposed that we could provide a mechanism for arbitrating producing credits, the industry was skeptical. The Guild was told that it would never be able to get producers to fairly arbitrate and evaluate their peers’ contributions. As PGA National Executive Director Vance Van Petten observed, “[The industry] thought that producers were too independent and self-interested. What none of the naysayers took into account was the growing outrage within the producing community surrounding deceptive credits. Producers may be fiercely independent, but they readily recognized that this was a collective problem that required a collective solution.”

Here we are, more than 10 years later, and the determination process has not only survived, but thrived. First utilized for the 2001 Producers Guild Awards, the eligibility process was created to determine which producers on a film should receive producing honors for their work on a motion picture.

Through the years, this process has been revised, fine-tuned and made applicable not only for awards consideration, but has been extended to determine which producers on a film are eligible to be certified via the Producers Mark.

Over the years, this process has gained such credibility that several major studios have agreed to submit every one of their releases for Producers Mark certification. Those companies include 20th Century Fox Studios, Universal Pictures, Columbia Pictures, Screen Gems, DreamWorks Studios and DreamWorks Animation. The Guild is currently in negotiations with the industry’s other major studios and companies. We’d like to take this opportunity to lead you step-by-step through the determination process as it applies to motion pictures that are submitted for Producers Mark certification.

1. The process begins at the start of post-production on a motion picture, when a studio or production company decides to submit one of its productions for Producers Mark certification. This decision is communicated to the PGA by submission of the “Notice of Producing Credits,” a two-page form listing names, titles and contact information for all major creative and executive contributors to the project. The studio or production company in charge of submission of the Notice of Producing Credits Form must also submit the film’s proposed or actual Onscreen Credits list, as well as the Crew Member Contact list. Companies are encouraged to utilize the easy-to-use, online Notice of Producing Credits Form via www.producersmark.org.

2. Following appellate determination, all credited producers informed of the determinations with the industry’s other major studios and companies. As any reader of this magazine knows, the job of the producer is fundamentally multifaceted. The Eligibility Form captures a full and comprehensive range of a producer’s potential duties; for each of those duties, the eligible producer is requested to indicate her/his level of responsibility — minimal, substantial or final. The Form also includes “free response” questions, inviting the producer to describe the nature of her or his involvement with the project.

3. As Eligibility Forms are distributed to the credited producers, Third-Party Verification Forms are sent to non-producerorial contributors to the project — the writer(s), director, casting director, costume and production design- ers, director of photography, UPM, production supervisor, etc. Participants are notified of appellate arbiters’ decision within 24–48 hours.

4. Eligibility Determination completed and Eligibility Determination letter emailed to all credited producers, notifying them of the arbiters’ decision.

5. Participants notified of appellate Eligibility Determination, if applicable. Participants now have opportunity to contribute additional relevant evidence or testimony.

6. Following appellate determination, all credited producers informed of appellate arbiters’ decision within 24–48 hours.
Since the Justice Department decided long ago that producers can’t go on strike, the PGA has been in the unenviable position of trying to get the industry to do the “right thing” on credits without having the collective bargaining muscle to make it happen. So it makes me particularly proud that the Guild has not only found a solution to proliferating credits, but more importantly, has convinced so many companies to embrace it. Sometimes, right does win out over might.

– MARSHALL HERSKOVITZ

Assistant director, associate producer(s), production manager, visual effects supervisor (if applicable), editor, composer, and post-production supervisor. These forms are far simpler, and merely ask the respondent to indicate which of the eligible producers they interacted with over the course of their work. At no time are studio executives invited or required to be a part of the process; apart from the initial submission of the Notice of Producing Credits, the entire undertaking takes place wholly outside the studio auspices.

All Eligibility Forms and Third-Party Verification Forms are kept strictly confidential. The success of the process is absolutely dependent on the respondents’ willingness to be candid in their testimony, and the only way to promote such candor is to maintain the strictest confidentiality in every case. All completed forms are sent directly to the PGA, and go immediately into the production’s file. In the rare event that they are shared, it is only in confidence with other reputable producers serving on credits. In the rare event that they are shared, it is only in confidence with other reputable producers serving on credits.

4. Once the documentation is assembled, a date is set for the determination panel. Such panels typically consist of three experienced producers (though never less than two), each with numerous credits in the genre of the production in question. Those three producers are drawn from a lengthy list of potential panelists. Prior to the commencement of the arbitration, all eligible producers are sent that list, and have the opportunity to strike any name, for any good faith reason, if a producer feels that a panelist might demonstrate bias. So while producers whose projects are being arbitrated don’t know the names of the panelists conducting the arbitration, they are assured that any panelist who might display a conflict of interest will not be a part of the proceeding.

5. The determination proceeding itself is completely confidential. Over the course of the determination, panelists examine and debate sensitive questions that will determine producers’ eligibility. Apart from the PGA Administrator(s) offering summaries and clarifications on the rules, no one apart from the panelists is present during the proceedings.

6. Once the panelists have arrived at a clear understanding of every producer’s contributions to the project, it’s their job to weigh those contributions according to the guidelines laid out by the PGA. In motion pictures, the Guild suggests that contributions to the development of the project are weighted at 55%; pre-production is weighted at 20%; physical production 20%; and post-production and marketing are, collectively, weighted at 25%.

I applaud the Producers Guild for championing this cause. Lots of people deserve credit for a successful movie. Now the person who deserves as much credit as anyone will finally be known and recognized thanks to those three powerful letters: p.g.a.

– JEFFREY KATZENBERG

Assistant director, associate producer(s), production manager, visual effects supervisor (if applicable), editor, composer, and post-production supervisor. These forms are far simpler, and merely ask the respondent to indicate which of the eligible producers they interacted with over the course of their work. At no time are studio executives invited or required to be a part of the process; apart from the initial submission of the Notice of Producing Credits, the entire undertaking takes place wholly outside the studio auspices.

All Eligibility Forms and Third-Party Verification Forms are kept strictly confidential. The success of the process is absolutely dependent on the respondents’ willingness to be candid in their testimony, and the only way to promote such candor is to maintain the strictest confidentiality in every case. All completed forms are sent directly to the PGA, and go immediately into the production’s file. In the rare event that they are shared, it is only in confidence with other reputable producers serving on credits. In the rare event that they are shared, it is only in confidence with other reputable producers serving on credits.

4. Once the documentation is assembled, a date is set for the determination panel. Such panels typically consist of three experienced producers (though never less than two), each with numerous credits in the genre of the production in question. Those three producers are drawn from a lengthy list of potential panelists. Prior to the commencement of the arbitration, all eligible producers are sent that list, and have the opportunity to strike any name, for any good faith reason, if a producer feels that a panelist might demonstrate bias. So while producers whose projects are being arbitrated don’t know the names of the panelists conducting the arbitration, they are assured that any panelist who might display a conflict of interest will not be a part of the proceeding.

5. The determination proceeding itself is completely confidential. Over the course of the determination, panelists examine and debate sensitive questions that will determine producers’ eligibility. Apart from the PGA Administrator(s) offering summaries and clarifications on the rules, no one apart from the panelists is present during the proceedings.

6. Once the panelists have arrived at a clear understanding of every producer’s contributions to the project, it’s their job to weigh those contributions according to the guidelines laid out by the PGA. In motion pictures, the Guild suggests that contributions to the development of the project are weighted at 55%; pre-production is weighted at 20%; physical production 20%; and post-production and marketing are, collectively, weighted at 25%.

I applaud the Producers Guild for championing this cause. Lots of people deserve credit for a successful movie. Now the person who deserves as much credit as anyone will finally be known and recognized thanks to those three powerful letters: p.g.a.

– JEFFREY KATZENBERG

Assistant director, associate producer(s), production manager, visual effects supervisor (if applicable), editor, composer, and post-production supervisor. These forms are far simpler, and merely ask the respondent to indicate which of the eligible producers they interacted with over the course of their work. At no time are studio executives invited or required to be a part of the process; apart from the initial submission of the Notice of Producing Credits, the entire undertaking takes place wholly outside the studio auspices.

All Eligibility Forms and Third-Party Verification Forms are kept strictly confidential. The success of the process is absolutely dependent on the respondents’ willingness to be candid in their testimony, and the only way to promote such candor is to maintain the strictest confidentiality in every case. All completed forms are sent directly to the PGA, and go immediately into the production’s file. In the rare event that they are shared, it is only in confidence with other reputable producers serving on credits. In the rare event that they are shared, it is only in confidence with other reputable producers serving on credits.

4. Once the documentation is assembled, a date is set for the determination panel. Such panels typically consist of three experienced producers (though never less than two), each with numerous credits in the genre of the production in question. Those three producers are drawn from a lengthy list of potential panelists. Prior to the commencement of the arbitration, all eligible producers are sent that list, and have the opportunity to strike any name, for any good faith reason, if a producer feels that a panelist might demonstrate bias. So while producers whose projects are being arbitrated don’t know the names of the panelists conducting the arbitration, they are assured that any panelist who might display a conflict of interest will not be a part of the proceeding.

5. The determination proceeding itself is completely confidential. Over the course of the determination, panelists examine and debate sensitive questions that will determine producers’ eligibility. Apart from the PGA Administrator(s) offering summaries and clarifications on the rules, no one apart from the panelists is present during the proceedings.

6. Once the panelists have arrived at a clear understanding of every producer’s contributions to the project, it’s their job to weigh those contributions according to the guidelines laid out by the PGA. In motion pictures, the Guild suggests that contributions to the development of the project are weighted at 55%; pre-production is weighted at 20%; physical production 20%; and post-production and marketing are, collectively, weighted at 25%.

I applaud the Producers Guild for championing this cause. Lots of people deserve credit for a successful movie. Now the person who deserves as much credit as anyone will finally be known and recognized thanks to those three powerful letters: p.g.a.
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As a long time proponent of strengthening the “Produced By” credit, I became an avid supporter of the idea of the Producers Mark. So I was excited when it became clear last summer that the launch of the Mark was going to coincide with the release of Silver Linings Playbook in the fall. We were a Weinstein Company film and they had already enthusiastically approved the use of the Mark on Lawless, the second film to feature it. We proudly became the fourth.

Along with my fellow producers, Donna Gigliotti and Jon Gordon, it was a tremendous thrill to see our card come up on the screen for the first time with our names, followed by the p.g.a. initials, and know that we were a part of this historic move toward a fully regulated producer credit — an idea whose time has truly come.

– BRUCE COHEN

The panel first determines whether or not the grounds for an appeal are valid. If not, the prior panel’s decision is reinstated. If there are legitimate grounds for the appeal, the panel will review all documentation in light of any new information, and render a new decision. After an appeal decision is handed down — either reinstating the initial panel’s decision or offering a new list of certified producers — there is no further recourse.

That’s all folks — the story of the Producers Mark determination process made easy. It is the most accurate and successful system to date to determine which producers actually performed a majority of the producing functions on a project.

Nikki Livolsi serves as Director of Legal Affairs & Arbitrations for the Producers Guild.

In order to qualify for Producers Mark certification, a producer must demonstrate responsibility for a majority (more than 50%) of the job functions.

7. After a panel’s decisions are handed down and distributed to the participating producers, aggrieved parties may file an appeal with the PGA, suggesting that the panel was not in possession of important information that would have changed the outcome, or was in some manner derelict in its duty. After collecting any additional information, the PGA Administrator will convene an appeal panel, including one panelist from the original panel and two new panelists, who will approach the issue with fresh eyes.

I am so proud to be a part of the Producers Mark effort, both as a participant on the Board of the PGA as well as an employee of Pixar. I am overjoyed that the art, commitment and dedication of the producer’s position will be fairly and thoroughly acknowledged through the Producers Mark. And I am delighted that both Disney and Pixar have been so incredibly supportive of the induction of the Producers Mark. Kudos to the tenacions Mark Gordon, Hawk Koch and Vance Van Petten for never giving up on their undying support of this Mark and thus protecting the integrity of the producer’s role in making great art!

– DARLA K. ANDERSON

Visiting: FilmSF.org or Call: 415.554.6241

San Francisco could rebate up to $600,000 per TV Episode or Feature Film.
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Many Hollywood execs have probably considered a zombie apocalypse at one time or another. But thanks to creative visionary and acclaimed producer Gale Anne Hurd and her producing team, we are experiencing it, and loving every engrossing (and sometimes gross) moment.

The AMC hit, The Walking Dead (TWD), based on a series of graphic novels by Robert Kirkman, is filmed in metro Atlanta and now in its third season. We’ve heard the statistics. We’ve seen the reviews. It’s among the biggest TV success stories in recent memory. So we decided to ask four members of ‘The Working Dead’ (as the production team is known on set) about how they make it happen and get their take on why it has become such a phenomenon.

Hurd, known worldwide for blockbuster features like Aliens, Armageddon and The Terminator franchise, is the show’s executive producer and the backbone of the zombie dream team. Hurd’s hands-on nature and enthusiastic energy for her work pervades every aspect of the show. Besides being involved in casting, providing script notes, and having final cut, she can often be found on set, in the day-to-day mix of physical production. Hurd believes, “You can’t produce from an office. A movie or a series gets made on set.”

Team Zombie

Hurd, known worldwide for blockbuster features like Aliens, Armageddon and The Terminator franchise, is the show’s executive producer and the backbone of the zombie dream team. Hurd’s hands-on nature and enthusiastic energy for her work pervades every aspect of the show. Besides being involved in casting, providing script notes, and having final cut, she can often be found on set, in the day-to-day mix of physical production. Hurd believes, “You can’t produce from an office. A movie or a series gets made on set.”

And Hurd knows what it takes, having developed most of her own projects over the years from conception to completion. Hurd’s career started at Roger Corman’s company, New World Pictures, where she learned all aspects of filmmaking. At New World, Hurd notes, “We did everything.” A self-described control freak, Hurd says she wouldn’t know how to do it any other way. She loves every stage of producing including both the creative aspects as well as the nuts and bolts. She doesn’t distinguish between the two as they are so intimately intertwined on TWD — two sides of the same coin.

Hurd’s team also includes producer Denise Huth, the on-set producer and keeper of the ‘zombie bible.’ For 11 years, Huth worked with filmmaker Frank Darabont, who discovered Kirkman’s comic and served as the series’ showrunner in its initial season. Intimately understanding the logic of the show, how the choices are made, and why the decisions work, Huth ensures consistency from performance to performance and season to season.

One Big, Happy Zombie Family

Unless otherwise indicated, photos by Gene Page, courtesy of AMC.
Walking Dead team members (from left) Tom Luse, Denise Huth, co-producer Jolly Dale, Gale Anne Hurd, production supervisor Caleb Womble.

season. This is a function especially vital on TWD where the new zombie reality requires consistency to be believable. “I'm a set rat at heart,” Huth admits. “I am the only one who's there pretty much all the time, which is awesome. I love the crew — working with them, with the directors and the writers, the actors and having those relationships.” Huth ensures any new director, cast member or crew member gets up to speed quickly. “It's a blast to be there in the trenches and get to make this show. It's fun and it's hard. But I have the greatest job in the world.”

Huth credits much of the show’s success to Hurd’s vision. “I'm a set rat at heart,” Huth admits. “I am the only one in the important roles that bring the show to life. I'm a set rat at heart.” Huth maintains in a constant state of motion, Huth stressing the importance of collaboration and trust. And once you have that relationship, you're plotting their demise,” Hurd laughs. “It is truly a wonderful family.”

Huth confirms that TWD cast and crew also embrace this notion of family. “Our actors don't just go hang out in their trailers. They're on set all the time. They hang out with the crew. It’s such a family vibe. We were a very close-knit group right from the beginning.” Gadd emphasizes it’s not just cast and crew. “Writers come to set. They are involved. They come to every show for prep and shoot. They are very much a part of the mix of production.” Hurd agrees, calling TWD “old school” in its approach to storytelling. The makeup effects are shot in-camera, relying less on special effects in post. “We have a brilliant production designer,” he observes, “Grace Walker. It takes a great vision and support to create this world.” (Side note: Walker is the term used in the show when referring to zombies, so Grace has placed herself in good company.)

Zombie Love

All four producers maintain the same message regarding the group effort of TWD. “We trust each other!” Hurd states emphatically. “We're there for each other. We enable people to have lives outside the show.” Hurd says her team’s natural and deep affection is evident in their Twitter posts. “We truly love and support each other. It's not the fake ‘Hollywood love’ where you say that in public and then behind the scenes you’re plotting their demise,” Hurd laughs. “It is truly a wonderful family.”

Huth confirms that TWD cast and crew also embrace this notion of family. “Our actors don’t just go hang out in their trailers. They’re on set all the time. They hang out with the crew. It’s such a family vibe. We were a very close-knit group right from the beginning.” Gadd emphasizes it’s not just cast and crew. “Writers come to set. They are involved. They come to every show for prep and shoot. They are very much a part of the mix of production.” Hurd agrees, calling TWD “old school” in its approach to storytelling. The makeup effects are shot in-camera, relying less on special effects in post. “We have a brilliant production designer,” he observes, “Grace Walker. It takes a great vision and support to create this world.” (Side note: Walker is the term used in the show when referring to zombies, so Grace has placed herself in good company.)

Zombie Life

Hurd, Luse, Huth and Gadd believe a huge component to the show’s success is its consistency and verisimilitude. Hurd credits the underlying material as instrumental in imagining and executing this world, which is as believable and grounded as it can be, given the nature of a zombie apocalypse. “The entire team takes the show very seriously,” says Hurd, “It’s not campy.” Hurd particularly recognizes the groundbreaking work of Kirkman and Darabont in fleshing out the world of the show.

One of the more difficult aspects of creating and maintaining the believability of the show is the lack of electricity in the story’s world. Apart from the usual challenges of physical production, the team also must ensure viewers can’t see a light in a distant building, a plane flying overhead, or hear a leaf blower. Luse’s motto: “There is no zombie lawn service. The show is written to recognize talent and initiative and readily supports those who want to expand their knowledge base and contribute at a higher level. For example, Luse started with TWD as UPM and is now an executive producer. Greg Nicotero, the gifted SFX and makeup expert who brings the zombies to life, is also now an executive producer and directs second unit. Two additional crew members will be directing episodes in this upcoming season. As Luse puts it, “Gale has very high standards and she expects you to meet those standards,” while also praising Hurd for creating an atmosphere of opportunity, not of hierarchy. Huth agrees. “Gale’s very good at stepping in when help is needed, but letting people shine in their function on the show.”
Post-production also has a huge influence on creating the believability and consistency of story. Gadd says, "A lot of television depends on music to move things along and to help the story. We are conscious of using it in a much more supporting role. There's a specificity in the music and sound effects in our show." Because killing a zombie requires a severe blow to the head, Gadd's post team spends a lot of time creating realistic sound effects. Gadd reports that the actors tend to prefer this method as opposed to shooting the effects practically. (An added benefit: job security for Paul!)

The producers believe this world and its inhabitants are the chief reason viewers continue to tune in. "Our core characters are trying to do the right thing and trying to hold onto their humanity in this incredibly insane world," Huth states. "That's compelling." Huth believes that with the hardships people face in contemporary life, the show's zombies have become a compelling metaphor for that struggle. Gadd reinforces this notion of uncertainty that the zombie metaphor taps into. "It just comes down to surviving. What would you be willing to do? What would you have to do? Would you have to change the person you are now to be able to survive?"

In the world of TWD, "People that you love become monsters," observes Luse. "People aren't people anymore." Luse feels the emotional toll it takes on the characters as they protect or lose their humanity is pivotal. "People can identify. People are trying to survive. There are dwindling resources. It puts a tremendous pounding on their humanity." Gadd believes the show strips away so much of modern daily life and instead focuses on what's important. Once all those things are taken away, what are you left with? How would you deal with it?

And it's not just viewers who react strongly to storylines. "I've never experienced a show where the crew is so affected when the scripts come out," Huth reports. "I'll have grips or PAs coming up to me and saying, 'Oh, my God. I read the script.' They really get into it and they're very, very moved by it. I think that comes out in the quality of the show."

Post-production also has a huge influence on creating the believability of story. Gadd says, "A lot of television depends on music to move things along and to help the story. We are conscious of using it in a much more supporting role. There's a specificity in the music and sound effects in our show." Because killing a zombie requires a severe blow to the head, Gadd's post team spends a lot of time creating realistic sound effects. Gadd reports that the actors tend to prefer this method as opposed to shooting the effects practically. (An added benefit: job security for Paul!)

The producers believe this world and its inhabitants are the chief reason viewers continue to tune in. "Our core characters are trying to do the right thing and trying to hold onto their humanity in this incredibly insane world," Huth states. "That's compelling." Huth believes that with the hardships people face in contemporary life, the show's zombies have become a compelling metaphor for that struggle. Gadd reinforces this notion of uncertainty that the zombie metaphor taps into. "It just comes down to surviving. What would you be willing to do? What would you have to do? Would you have to change the person you are now to be able to survive?"

In the world of TWD, "People that you love become monsters," observes Luse. "People aren't people anymore." Luse feels the emotional toll it takes on the characters as they protect or lose their humanity is pivotal. "People can identify. People are trying to survive. There are dwindling resources. It puts a tremendous pounding on their humanity." Gadd believes the show strips away so much of modern daily life and instead focuses on what's important. Once all those things are taken away, what are you left with? How would you deal with it?

And it's not just viewers who react strongly to storylines. "I've never experienced a show where the crew is so affected when the scripts come out," Huth reports. "I'll have grips or PAs coming up to me and saying, 'Oh, my God. I read the script.' They really get into it and they're very, very moved by it. I think that comes out in the quality of the show."

Zombie Power

The “great guiding force” is how Gadd describes Hurd’s leadership of TWD. And even though Hurd says her life is a bit more hectic producing TWD than if she were solely focused on features, she is thriving in the medium and enjoying it immensely. "Producing TV is so different from a feature. A feature is one 100-page script. A TV series is 50-52 pages each week. In the time that it takes to make one feature, I can make 16 hours of character-driven drama." Contrary to conventional wisdom, Hurd maintains that TV is a producer’s medium. "Even if you’re not a writing producer, the producer is the one who has final cut and sets the tone for the show. In TV, it’s the producer’s vision that’s brought to life."

Readily acknowledging the mentors and friends who have nurtured her career over the years, Hurd praises Roger Corman, Debra Hill, and Larry Gordon. Even with the depth and breadth of her experiences, she professes that she learns from and is inspired by her TWD family every day. Her mantra: "You surround yourself with people who are better at their jobs than you are."

Hurd makes producing TWD sound easy and admits that, in some ways, "it is." Hurd’s recommendation for producers who want to create a positive and successful working environment is threefold: "Hire the right team, empower your team members to do their jobs, and communicate effectively.” Maintaining those three priorities makes the process feel easy.

Huth, Gadd, and Luse agree that their TWD opportunity has been one of the best of their careers. Huth states, "I think we all sort of feel like this is a once-in-a-lifetime show. This will be a show we all look back on in our lives and say, 'Oh, I got to work on The Walking Dead.' The actors feel that way and the crew feels that way. And it's special. As corny as it sounds, the show is special. We're all very invested in being a good team."

It's a team that, Gadd emphasizes, works closely for 10 months of the year. And it's a team that, Hurd proudly acknowledges, has produced the show on budget every season.

Is it possible The Walking Dead family is genuinely this happy and supportive? Apparently in zombie-land, it is possible. Huth summarizes beautifully, "We're lucky. We're just lucky. I think a lot of times you realize you had the best experience of your life after it's over, and we kind of all know it while it's happening. That's really cool."

From left: Greg Nicotero, Gale Anne Hurd and Denise Huth discuss a production issue on set.

SURE, YOU COULD TAKE THE MIDNIGHT TRAIN TO GEORGIA, OR YOU MAY JUST WANT TO HOP ON ONE OF THE 26 FLIGHTS PER DAY FROM LAX TO ATLANTA

For more information, please call the Georgia Film, Music & Digital Entertainment Office at 404.967.4057, or visit us at georgia.org/fmd
Producer Share Participations

The Reporting of New Media

by Anita Wu

To the generations of multi-taskers and people constantly on the go, Netflix’s brand promise of delivering content to its users “anytime, anywhere”1 has an undeniable appeal. Hulu Plus entered the marketplace with an offer to provide its subscribers with “More wherever. More whenever. Than ever.”2 Several other content service providers followed suit. And consumers have responded in droves. So how does a producer share participant even begin to assess whether he or she is reaping the equitable, financial benefits from the explosion of new media distribution? The first step is to know what to look out for.

In the world of profit participations, “new media” distribution generally refers to on-demand access to content for display on a digital device such as a television, computer, smartphone or tablet. In certain instances, the content is transmitted through intermediary equipment such as a gaming console or set-top box. The sweeping use of the word “new” is a misnomer as some of the related technologies have been around since the late 1990s, and their application in the entertainment space followed soon afterward:

Video On Demand – The system grants access to a program for a limited time, and at the discretion of the end user, for a pay-per-transaction charge. Most of the major cable and Internet operators offered video on demand to its customers starting in the early part of the last decade.

Electronic Self-Through – Also known as video downloads, the system enables consumers to purchase for download a digital media file for storage on a hard drive. iTunes first offered video downloads to its customers through the iTunes Music Store in 2005.

Subscription Video On Demand – The system typically offers unlimited access to the content made available by the service provider in exchange for a monthly subscription fee. In 2007, Netflix offered subscription online streaming to supplement its disc-mailing rental service. Now, Netflix customers have the option to subscribe to either or both of these services.

Ad-Supported Content Streaming – The system features a combination of banner advertising and commercials before, during and/or after the exhibition of a program. In 2008, Hulu launched its free online streaming service to the public. In 2010, it launched its subscription Hulu Plus service which offers users an expanded content library with limited advertising.

Older programs can play an important role in the introduction and sustainability of a new media platform. Cash-strapped start-up companies oftentimes shy away from the hefty price tags attached to newer titles. Also, newer titles may be covered by exclusive output deals that deny their availability for years to come. As such, the initial licensing of older programs may be a win-win proposition for both the buyers and sellers. These programs remain attractive to well-established new media platforms as companies seek to differentiate themselves from, and surpass, their competitors by way of their unique selection offerings. For example, in January 2013, the U.K.’s LOVEFILM and NBC Universal announced a deal which will likely bring classic American television shows such as Knight Rider to new generations of British online streaming audiences.3

Similarly, newer programs can be sought after aggressively by traditional television networks striving to meet the demands of their technologically savvy customers by expanding into new media platforms (e.g., Internet websites and mobile applications), and multi-platform new media companies promoting their services as viable alternatives to traditional television and inciting the “cord-cutting” movement.4

The profit participants in programs delivered through new media may see a boost in revenues reported on their statements. Unfortunately, the statements are generally obscure and, short of an audit, the limited information presented makes it nearly impossible to determine how the various forms of new media were accounted for, if at all. A closer look at the underlying accounting records and other supporting documents may reveal:

a) The reported revenue sources, territories and licensees.

b) The nature and amount of reported revenues, and whether such revenues represent the distributor’s receipts or a lesser portion thereof.

c) The amount of estimated future revenues for the licenses reviewed.

d) The distribution fees charged, if any.

e) The nature and amount of costs charged.

Further analyses of the information may indicate whether the statements are in compliance with the accounting terms of the profit participation agreement, or if an objection should be made.

In the absence of specific contractual language, a distributor will likely default to reporting for new media revenue based on its standard accounting practice, which typically groups it under the broad category of “home entertainment” and allows the distributor to report the revenue based on a 26% royalty. Historically, starting in the 1980s, the cost of buying raw materials, manufacturing, encrypting, packaging and transporting physical VHS, and then DVD, products left distributors with a relatively small realizable profit per unit. The 26% royalty rate applied to the revenues was originally intended to represent the distributor’s estimated profit margin, and simpli-
The new media business models may be as complex and inventive as their technologies. And absent clear language in the agreement for the treatment of non-title specific incentives like those mentioned above, distributors tend to exclude them from the statements.

Generally, the effect of the royalty issue is easily calculated at the amount of the distributor’s receipts less the amount reported on the statements. For instance, if a studio is reporting $1 million on your participation statements as a 20% royalty on the $5 million it received for digital downloads of your film, you may wish to raise a claim against the studio for the $4 million of unreported receipts.

Other potential issues are not as easily identified or quantified without access to the new media licensing agreements, whose financial terms are guarded to the level of Fort Knox. With denied access, we are left to assume that the content owners receive any combination of incentives including per-title license fees, shares of advertising revenues, shares of subscriber fees, barter advertising time, exclusivity premium payments, bonus payments and/or an equity interest in the company, as each of these items may or may not apply. The new media business models may be as complex and inventive as their related technologies. And absent clear language in the agreement for the treatment of non-title specific incentives like those mentioned above, distributors tend to exclude them from the statements, while producer share participants argue that a portion should be allocated to their programs and included in gross receipts.

Looking ahead, how could a profit participant protect his or her best interests for new forms of distribution that have yet to be conceived? Ideally, he may wish to reserve the right for, and monetize, all aspects of the new media uses of their programs. Likewise, their advocates, including the attorneys and auditors, must continue to review participations guided by the premise that when the distributors make money from new media, so should the related producer share participants.

In the coming installments of our series, we will explore other hot-topic issues affecting producer share participations including vertical integration and self-dealing.

Anita Wu is a Principal in the Motion Picture and Television Participation Services Group of Green Hasson Janks, with more than 13 years of experience auditing profit participations on behalf of producers, talent and investors in the entertainment industry.

1 Websource: https://signup.netflix.com/
6 Websource: http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr-esq/director-hal-needham-sues-warner-416688

profit definitions to explicitly include most known forms of new media as home entertainment, with the revenue reported as a 20% royalty. Despite their adamant protests, most profit participants have had very little success so far in getting the studios to modify these terms.

Nevertheless, profit participants continue to challenge the studios’ accounting practices. At the time of this writing, a high-profile class-action lawsuit had recently been filed on behalf of profit participants against five major studios for their method of reporting the same home video royalty under contracts that pre-dated what was to become the industry standard for traditional home video distribution. Instead, the plaintiffs claim that they are entitled to participate in 100% rather than 20% of the home video receipts.4 Undoubtedly, this case will be closely watched as it unfolds.

outcome of periodic collective bargain-

The rapid development, availabil-

ity and consumption of new media continue to push the related financial numbers to new heights. And with more at stake than ever, the individual and collective group of profit participants cannot give up their fight in trying to get the distributors to fairly account for, and monetize, all aspects of the new media uses of their programs. Likewise, their advocates, including the attorneys and auditors, must continue to review participations guided by the premise that when the distributors make money from new media, so should the related producer share participants.
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We congratulate our Award winners…

The Darryl F. Zanuck Award for Outstanding Producer of Theatrical Motion Pictures:
ARGO
Ben Affleck, George Clooney, Grant Heslov

The Award for Outstanding Producer of Animated Theatrical Motion Pictures:
WRECK-IT RALPH
Clark Spencer

The Award for Outstanding Producer of Documentary Theatrical Motion Pictures:
SEARCHING FOR SUGAR MAN
Malik Bendjelloul, Simon Chinn

The David L. Wolper Award for Outstanding Producer of Long-Form Television:
GAME CHANGE
Gary Goetzman, Tom Hanks, Jay Roach, Amy Sayres, Steven Shareshian, Danny Strong

The Danny Thomas Award for Outstanding Producer of Episodic Television, Comedy:
MODERN FAMILY
Cindy Chupack, Paul Corrigan, Abraham Higginbotham, Ben Karlin, Steven Levitan, Christopher Lloyd, Jeff Morton, Dan O’Shannon, Jeffery Richman, Chris Smietnot, Brad Walsh, Bill Wrubel, Danny Zuker

The Norman Felton Award for Outstanding Producer of Episodic Television, Drama:
HOMELAND
Henry Bronell, Alexander Cary, Michael Cuesta, Alex Gansa, Howard Gordon, Chip Johannessen, Michael Klick, Meredith Stiehm

The Award for Outstanding Producer of Live Entertainment & Talk Television:
THE COLBERT REPORT
Meredith Bennett, Stephen Colbert, Richard Dahm, Paul Dinello, Barry Julian, Matt Lappin, Emily Lazar, Tanya Michnevich Bracco, Tom Purcell, Jon Stewart

The Award for Outstanding Producer of Competition Television:
THE AMAZING RACE
Jerry Bruckheimer, Elise Doganieri, Jonathan Littman, Bertram van Munster, Mark Burnett

The Award for Outstanding Producer of Non-Fiction Television:
AMERICAN MASTERS
Prudence Glass, Susan Lacy, Julie Sacks

The Award for Outstanding Sports Program:
REAL SPORTS WITH BRYANT GUMBEL

The Award for Outstanding Children’s Program:
SESAME STREET

The Award for Outstanding Digital Series:
30 ROCK: THE WEBSIDES

Name the awards show that opens with a hilarious musical number, features a “who’s who” of celebrities on the red carpet, and ends with a theatrical feature award that has Hollywood insiders breathless with anticipation? You guessed it — the Producers Guild Awards!

On January 26, 2013, the PGA held its 24th annual awards gala at the Beverly Hilton Hotel, recognizing outstanding achievement in producing for film, television and new media.

The show itself has grown in size and stature over the last 24 years, and now occupies a decisive place among precursors to the Oscars. The winner of the Darryl F. Zanuck Award for Outstanding Producer of Theatrical Motion Pictures has predicted the Best Picture Oscar every year since 2007.

Executive producer Michael De Luca and his production team, headed by Branden Chapman, did an exceptional job producing this year’s show, complete with the requisite Bruce Vilanch zingers, and featuring a house band fronted by Greg Field and Dave Koz. The gourmet menu, sponsored by Cadillac, was created by Jon Shook & Vinny Dotolo, the culinary rock stars behind Animal and Son of a Gun.

The ceremony began with a prerecorded segment sporting the deceptively dull title, “A Conversation About Producing,” in which PGA President Mark Gordon attempted to
define the role of the producer. Then, to the surprise of everyone except those involved in the production or anyone who knows Mark personally, he burst into song. With lyrics by Gary Tellalian and performed by an ensemble that included everyone from Shonda Rhimes to Hawk Koch to Paula Wagner to Ray Liotta, this hilarious opening number (sung to the tune of “Do-Re-Mi”) celebrated the misadventures of producers in pursuit of that most elusive element of the profession — “dough.” Not only one of the funniest production numbers of the entire awards season, it holds the distinction of being the only such number to feature Norman Lear sitting on the toilet.

Mr. Lear also figured prominently in the acceptance speech for the PGA Award for Achievement in Television that bears his name. Honoree J.J. Abrams, accepting this year’s award, delivered one of the most thoughtful and eloquent speeches of the awards season. A consummate storyteller, he began with his childhood memories of All in the Family, concluded with an emotional tribute to Mr. Lear, and in between weaved a richly observed narrative that reflected his entire career through the heartfelt acknowledgment of his family, mentors and peers. Abrams was given a warm introduction by the star of one of his earliest hit shows — the stunning Jennifer Garner.

Another highlight was the surprisingly emotional speeches from Harvey and Bob Weinstein accepting the Milestone Award. After being introduced with equal parts love, humor and exasperation by Robert De Niro, Quentin Tarantino and Robert Rodriguez, Bob and Harvey spoke in turn of the challenges they’ve faced, both day-to-day and throughout their careers. They also spoke of their profound respect and love for each other, for the artists and films that have inspired them, and for the motion picture industry to which they have dedicated their lives.

Filmmakers Lee Hirsch and Cynthia Lowen also had reason to acknowledge Bob and Harvey, as The Weinstein Company was the U.S. distributor of their provocative and challenging documentary Bully, the honoree of this year’s Stanley Kramer Award. The award recognizes achievements or contributions that “illuminate provocative social issues in an accessible and elevating fashion.”

The Visionary Award, sponsored by Delta Air Lines, was presented to Russell Simmons, who was introduced with respect and gratitude by LL Cool J. It’s hard to imagine an individual whose artistic, commercial and humanitarian achievements have had more of an impact on our culture than Simmons. He further earned the respect of his fellow producers by keeping his remarks brief.

The opposite was true of Eric Fellner and Tim Bevan, who received the David O. Selznick Achievement Award for Theatrical Motion Pictures, and whose catalog of individuals and groups meriting acknowledgment was considerably more comprehensive. Nonetheless, one would be hard-pressed to find producers more deserving of this honor. After an enthusiastic introduction by Anne Hathaway, a beautifully edited sequence of clips highlighted their astonishing body of work — from romantic comedies like Love Actually and Notting Hill, to the genre-defying works of the Coen brothers, to literary and musical adaptations like Pride and Prejudice and this year’s Les Misérables.

Among other notable PGA Award winners, the producers of Modern Family received the Danny Thomas Award for Outstanding Producer of Episodic Television, Comedy; the producers of Homeland received the Norman Felton Award for Outstanding Producer of Episodic Television, Drama; and once again, the Oscar for Best Picture was foreshadowed at the PGA Awards, when the producers of Argo received the Darryl F. Zanuck Award for Outstanding Producer of Theatrical Motion Pictures.

Accepting the Zanuck Award, Ben Affleck reminded the assembled that he is still an actor and is currently available.
1. They owned the night: Milestone recipient Harvey Weinstein with Zanuck Award winner Ben Affleck.
2. Stanley Kramer Award honorees Lee Hirsch and Cynthia Lowen with presenter Bradley Cooper.
3. Russell Simmons graciously receives the Visionary Award.
4. PGA President Emeritus Marshall Herskovitz with presenter Anne Hathaway.
5. PGA member Grant Heslov accepts the Zanuck Award for Argo.
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Chadwick Boseman as Jackie Robinson in 42.

Baseball stretches a long way back in Hollywood, indeed to the very origins of motion pictures. One of the earliest depictions of the sport was an 1899 Edison Company production of "Casey at the Bat," a short film based on the popular poem. But while there have been a few swings and misses through the decades, some of the very best movies with a baseball backdrop involve period storytelling.

Cinematic baseball has covered a compelling cross-section of topics including the raucous early days of the game (Cobb, Eight Men Out and The Babe), toiling in the minors with Long Gone, women players in A League of Their Own, the plight of the Negro player in Soul of the Game and The Bingo Long Traveling All-Stars & Motor Kings to more recent times addressing the media and hero worship in 61* as well as looking at the game’s spiraling economics with Moneyball. Add in some of the sport’s mythological elements via Field of Dreams and The Natural, it is easy to conclude that going back in time has produced some of Hollywood’s most memorable baseball pictures.

With the latest period baseball film now out in theaters, 42, about Jackie Robinson breaking baseball’s color barrier, Produced by wanted to go back in time and see what hurdles producers have encountered over the years in getting their movie made.

Among the things we found in speaking with various producers was the passion they had for their project despite studio concerns about the broad marketability of the subject matter, and how their creativity was put to the test by having to produce on a relatively small budget. Throw in the inevitable obstacles that come with period pictures: location logistics, time pressures and the verisimilitude of set/costume design, as well as the key unique challenge of casting and training believable performers as baseball players. On top of it all, given baseball stories’ domestic commercial tilt, producers knew they couldn’t rely heavily on international funding sources or big foreign box-office numbers. No doubt, these producers share a passion for the game — a passion that the production process tests to the limit.

Leading off, some producers faced challenges simply because the storyline was not especially uplifting. Producer David Lester, whose credits include Air Force One, The Shawshank Redemption, and Bull Durham, talks about how his first hurdle on Cobb, a warts-and-all look at baseball legend Ty Cobb, was simply the subject matter. "Because the material was real dark," says Lester, "studio people knew it was not going to be a happy feel-good movie. It was also questionable whether word of mouth would make it popular. So we felt we were being allowed to do something most filmmakers would not be able to do."
main stadium; period-friendly Wrigley Field in Chicago was effectively camera-ready. It was the smaller fields that gave the producer a challenge, which required finding ballparks that were big enough for a pro game to take place and not resemble some schoolyard.

“We ended up doing a large chunk of the shooting at a stadium in Evansville, Indiana,” recalls Greenhut. “About 90 minutes from there, the Rockford Peaches’ home games were filmed in Huntingburg, Indiana. The stadium was completely renovated. We also did something in Kentucky, but mostly it was a two-sphere operation — one in Chicago and one in Evansville.”

Greenhut is currently developing another period baseball picture about a blind sportswriter that covers the Mets and Yankees, a story that covers 30 years ending approximately in the present day.

But if you build it, will they come?

Crowds are another major issue, as anytime you’ve got a sports movie — contemporary or otherwise — a producer has the tremendous overarching challenge of creating the fan atmosphere. Through the years, producers have had nightmares trying to figure out ways to fill the seats, many toiling before the days when digital effects could bail them out. With local boosters and a Jimmy Buffet concert, we were going to try to pull off a trick,” recalls Cobb producer Lester. “So I did my part and put together a good-sized parking crew to direct the extras when they arrived at the stadium so they could easily slip into the wardrobe department. That day I watched the filmmakers set up and as evening comes, I look over at the parking lot and no one is coming. There are only the attendants standing around. It was a gruesome scene. Maybe 100 showed. After about an hour, [director] Ron [Shelton] comes over and says, ‘Looks like we’re screwed, aren’t we?’ I say, ‘Yes, looks like we are.’ He adds, ‘But I can get you 40 more background people.’ He says, ‘Do it,’ so I gather all of our parking attendants and put them through wardrobe.”

Lester continues: “A great second unit cameraman named Mark Vargo took the 140 people we had, including extras, parked in the stands, and with an AD, worked that crowd all day, moving them around the stadium to get the shots we needed. We effectively worked with 140 in lieu of 8,000. We all said, ‘this is what you have to do.’

The Pride of the Yankees, a movie about the great Lou Gehrig, was shot at his hometown stadium in Huntingburg, Indiana. The stadium was completely renovated. I was there when Gary Cooper couldn’t convincingly mimic Gehrig’s left-handed swing. And despite being a fine actor, Anthony Perkins didn’t show good form in throwing the ball from the outfield while portraying troubled player Jimmy Piersall in Fear Strikes Out.

Today, it is much different to make a great baseball movie because most people consider themselves experts. There’s no dedicated cable network that includes original footage of swash-buckling pirates or YouTube videos showing the real Wyatt Earp in a Wild West shoot out, so actors have room for error and invention in films in those genres. But millions of audience members have grown up playing and following baseball, while the sport is now

of singing the praises of seasoned costume designers. Typical is Barbara Boyle, who remains efficacious when it comes to her designers for Eight Men Out.

“Nora Chavooshian is a great production designer and Cynthia Pratt, who also costumed A League Of Their Own, is a tremendous costume designer. They were brilliant, because they had no money, and look what they brought out! Their process is amazing. They researched lots of photos and did some drawing. There was so much press about the 1919 White Sox that there was an abundance of photos to research. The uniforms were baggy and heavy. We had two sets of home and away uniforms, and they looked great.

You can have great stadiums filled with real fans in the stands and players in the field dressed just right, but when it comes down to it, if producers cannot fill those authentic uniforms with convincing performers as ballplayers, the film strikes out.

Every baseball movie aficionado has heard stories of the filmmakers having to reverse the negative of The Pride of the Yankees because Gary Cooper could not convincingly mimic Lou Gehrig’s left-handed swing. And despite being a fine actor, Anthony Perkins didn’t show good form in throwing the ball from the outfield while portraying troubled player Jimmy Piersall in Fear Strikes Out.

Today, it is much different to make a great baseball movie because most people consider themselves experts. There’s no dedicated cable network that includes original footage of swash-buckling pirates or YouTube videos showing the real Wyatt Earp in a Wild West shoot out, so actors have room for error and invention in films in those genres. But millions of audience members have grown up playing and following baseball, while the sport is now

in places like Engel Stadium in Chattanooga, TN, Luther Williams Field in Macon, GA, and Rickwood Field in Birmingham, AL, venues that lent themselves to period baseball. Hoover altered these places to look like parks Robinson played at both in his minor and major league career.

One of the more authentic sites to shoot period baseball films, Rickwood Field, was built in 1910. It is America’s oldest still-standing ballpark, built by industrialist and team owner Rick Woodward and having served as the home fields for the Birmingham Barons and the Birmingham Black Barons of the Negro Leagues. Its production credits include Cobb, Soul of the Game and 42 among others.

But speaking of religious sites, even non-baseball fans are familiar with the holy shrine in the Bronx, The House That Ruth Built—Yankee Stadium. So the cinematic story of the hero is coming. There are only the attendants standing around. It was a gruesome scene. Maybe 100 showed. After about an hour, [director] Ron [Shelton] comes over and says, ‘Looks like we’re screwed, aren’t we?’ I say, ‘Yes, looks like we are.’ He adds, ‘But I can get you 40 more background people.’ He says, ‘Do it,’ so I gather all of our parking attendants and put them through wardrobe.”

Lester continues: “A great second unit cameraman named Mark Vargo took the 140 people we had, including extras, parked in the stands, and with an AD, worked that crowd all day, moving them around the stadium to get the shots we needed. We effectively worked with 140 in lieu of 8,000. We all said, ‘this is what you have to do.’
on TV and the Internet 24/7. They know the players and the flow of the game. America’s obsession with sports demands that producers make every second of screen action believable. It is a central tenet of any baseball movie … any sports movie, quite frankly.

Tull, an avid student of sports cinema, explains why this aspect of 42 was a priority for him personally: “As someone who is a sports fanatic and an athlete, one of my biggest pet peeves as a movie fan is when it is very obvious to the audience that the actor portraying an athlete has never played the sport in his life and it just takes you out of the moment,” says Tull. “From a cast perspective, [actor] Chad Boseman, who is a great natural athlete, spent months training to get ready for the role of Jackie Robinson, both with Phil Carlson, a great physical trainer, and several baseball coaches and coordinators. The other players with secondary roles were former college players. We wanted to make sure that side of it was right.

A period baseball picture also presents the challenge of capturing how they played the game in that era. Tull credits his director of photography with helping devise ways to suggest that elusive quality.

“Don Burgess, our brilliant DP, had a lot of ideas about how to get the audience to feel like they were really in the game. Remember, too, that the style of the game in the ’30s, ’40s and ’50s was very aggressive, maybe more violent than it is today. Guys really went in with spikes flying and so forth, so we really wanted to give a sense of what that was like.”

Unquestionably, prop houses, private collectors and longtime equipment manufacturers like Rawlings and Hillerich & Bradsby have helped with providing period-style bats, balls and gloves, but nearly all the producers are quick to credit Major League Baseball and longtime equipment manufacturers like Rawlings and per our deal with them, they supplied a lot of the footage and uniforms we used to make sure everything was correct. They, in fact, had approval over those things, and per our deal with them, they supplied a lot of the footage and uniforms we used to make sure everything was correct. We couldn’t have had the accuracy in the picture that we had without them.”

With Moneyball being a more recent moment in the game’s history, it raises a question; while most of these period films have been critically acclaimed, modest box-office hits and have stood the test of time, given the different dynamics of the film business, could some of these movies even get the green light today?

Mark Johnson, whose producing credits include Diner, Rain Man and The Rookie, is not sure about another of his baseball hits, one featuring Robert Redford back in the mid-’80s.

“Getting The Natural made today would be very difficult, because when we made it in 1984, the U.S. box office drove the business. I’m guessing back then it was approximately 80% of the total box office,” says Johnson. “Money back to the producer from the distributor was significantly less, and the exchange rate was different. Look at something like the Life of Pi … it appears about two-thirds of its business came from outside the U.S. So I think it would be hard to do a baseball movie today, particularly a period story. I’m impressed with how Sony made Moneyball. It is a smart baseball movie.”

Despite often coming to the plate with two strikes against them, producers continue to find ways to score with their period baseball projects largely because they’re driven by passion. And with 42 opening this spring across America, just in time for baseball season, the tradition of dedicated film producers’ love of the game plays on.

America’s obsession with sports demands that producers make every second of screen action believable. It is a central tenet of any baseball movie … any sports movie, quite frankly.

Barry Pepper and Thomas Jane in 42.

The Real Deal!

“As new technologies in the photographic world emerge on what seems like a daily basis, one has to be open to embracing what they may have to offer. Often times the performance does not match the hype and that can be frustrating. I have no interest in being simply the first to use some new technology. However, I am interested in being one of the first embrbers of new technology that actually delivers the high expectations. It has been clear to me for years that Clairmont Camera has been doing just that.”

Jim Michaels, PGA, DGA

www.clairmont.com
They Want to Take You Higher

The High Frame Rate 3D Promo Shoot Showcases Top PGA Talent

by Tracy Balsz

Photos by Michael Q. Martin

With the success of The Hobbit and the launch of cinema in 48 frames per second (fps), the industry is all abuzz. What is high frame rate (HFR)? What does it mean for me as a producer? Does it take more time? Is there special equipment needed? Who works in HFR?

These questions were all answered recently during an HFR 3D promo shoot hosted by GDC Technology and RED Digital Cinema. PGA member Salvy Maleki, producer and EVP at GDC, was in need of original HFR footage to use in a promo to showcase the company’s HFR Integrated Media Block (IMB), only to find that there was no content available to license. So, she took the initiative to organize a live-action, special effects shoot, shot in HFR 3D, to really show off different frame rates, comparing 24 to 48 and 60 frames per second.

“This was a dream project to produce. It was a great opportunity to work with some of the industry’s greatest innovators in 3D and cinema technology. It made the experience even more satisfying to work with fellow PGA members. Everyone jumped on the bandwagon for the opportunity to be a part of this evolution that is taking place,” Maleki explained.

Maleki contacted Brian Henderson and Ted Schilowitz at RED Digital Cinema to partner with on the shoot, and then contacted fellow PGA member Michael Sarna, CEO of Inmotion Entertainment and a renowned action director, for his expertise in action/stunt scenes. A soundstage on the RED Studios lot in Hollywood was the location for a two-day shoot in February.

What is different about an HFR 3D shoot from any other 2D or 3D shoot?

According to Sarna, when shooting action sequences on traditional film at 24fps, the shutter opens and closes 24 times a second, capturing only 12 frames per second of useable footage. When shooting at 48fps or 60fps, the camera captures two to three times as much information, thus avoiding the closure of the shutter. So in shooting at these higher frame rates, a producer or DP guarantees complete capture of the action sequence. When filming digitally, quickly panning the camera (as is often required in action sequences) commonly results in warping or bowing of the image. But the higher the frame rate, the less warping is experienced.

Ted Schilowitz of RED Digital Cinema commented about the ambitious nature of the shoot and the ease of how it all went during the production days.

“We shot with three 3ality TS5 rigs,” he reports, “with Angenieux zooms, one on a jib, one on a dolly and one floating on various high hats and sticks to get as much coverage as possible. We executed the shoot at a base frame rate of both 48fps and 60fps, and within those project rates shot high speed, up to 120fps. We did a lot of experimentation and learning on the set thanks to an amazing crew of experienced EPIC shooters and on-set techs that were all there to learn with us. We walked away with vast amount of footage to learn from and view on the big screen in both 3D and 4k at 48fps, 60fps and an extraction to 24fps.

“The thing that was most telling,” he continues, “was that a shoot like this took no longer to execute than doing a shoot of the same sophistication with 2D cameras shooting at the normal 24fps. We never waited on camera setup any longer than working in 2D, and we had some very big stunts that could only be executed once or twice, so we had to be ready to get all the coverage we wanted at all these various frame rates. We were able to invite the crew to view the fruits of their labor right after shooting, and instantly screened the big fire gag stunt, some high falls and gunfights on a giant screen directly from the EPIC 5k files, in the nearby 4k theater.”

From an equipment perspective, HFR doesn’t require any different equipment than that of any 2D or 3D shoot, added Steve Schklair, PGA member and CEO of 3ality Technica, who supplied the stereoscopic 3D production team, equipment, cameras, lenses, software control systems and all the acquisition equipment as well as technical management of the workflow. Frame rates are a function of having the right cameras and recorders on set more than anything else.
"Once a frame rate is selected," notes Schklair, "it gets plugged into the system, no matter the speed. Switching between multiple frame rates, as in this shoot, took a few minutes longer as we had to change settings to switch back and forth between takes, but even so, the shoot went easily and was very efficient. HFR is a normal evolution of the system; it doesn’t take any extra effort from S3D equipment standpoint, and we are very supportive of it.”

Sarna advises from a director’s point of view that “the main difference in working in HFR is the consideration needed for post-production. I was fortunate to have consultants all around me as I directed each scene. While I concentrated on the storytelling, Josh Wexler, our stereoscopic/VFX supervisor, helped me during each shot, pointing out considerations in the stereo space, while post-production supervisors David and Leo were on set during production, to make sure that all media was being captured correctly.”

Discussing with the post-production/visual effects team, it seems that working together is the key. David Scott Van Woert and Leo Vezzali (both PGA members as well) of Identity FX, worked alongside fellow member Gregg Katano of Hi-Ground Media to provide post-production and 3D visualization services on the promo.

“We were heavily involved from day one of preproduction and on set to help shape the processing of the data, so there was not a mountain of information at the end,” remarked Van Woert.

“HFR 3D demands integration on set between pre, production and post,” adds Katano. “With higher frame rate comes double, triple, quadruple the amount of data that we must now sift through in post, under the same time and budget constraints as 24 frames.”

“Salty is a true filmmaker at heart, and did a fantastic job as producer in guiding this shoot, as we all discovered just how to work together,” touted Michael Sarna. According to Maleki, “This shoot probably was the most expensive five-minute promo ever shot, once you add up the overall value of talent and services. It started as a crew of 10 and quickly grew into a crew of 77, with 22 stunt guys, a fire gag, gunshots, two dollsies and a crane.”

This promo will be seen at upcoming trade shows and industry events to which PGA members will be invited.
You’re driving down the 405 on the way to LAX, and when passing the RAVE Cinemas near the Howard Hughes Parkway exit, it’s hard to miss the big IMAX sign emblazoned on the side of the building. When you go to the movies to see the next Hollywood blockbuster, you may opt to see it on one of IMAX’s huge 70mm screens. Or while taking the kids to one of the major science museums, whether in downtown Los Angeles, New York, Washington, D.C., or Tokyo, you might just buy tickets to see the current IMAX documentary at a facility’s theater and thrill to an adventure in the Arctic, the deep sea, or a visit to the Hubble telescope in outer space.

IMAX is a multifaceted company, and is more and more a staple for major filmmakers and the worldwide audience that is their market. On a recent visit to IMAX’s West Coast headquarters, I was privileged to meet with their top executives. As producers, we have a stake in their core businesses, and here you’ll get a glimpse of some of the intriguing aspects of their company.

For one, they have smart management. Greg Foster, Chairman and President of IMAX Entertainment, leads the team, a first-rate group of veteran executives in production, distribution, and quality control/post-production on IMAX’s large-format 70mm and digital film business. IMAX makes it a point to be extremely friendly to directors and producers. Christopher Nolan, James Cameron, Steven Spielberg and J.J. Abrams, to name a few, are clients as well as fans of the IMAX technology that the company is famous for.

It’s a company that has evolved over its 45-year existence. Foster, who’s been with the company for 12 years, is a former senior studio exec (MGM/UA) with family roots in the film business: His father was one-half of the famous Turman-Foster Co. producing partnership and his brother is PGA member and producer Gary Foster. The business is in his blood, and he has embraced the IMAX format and culture in order to help make it the success that it is today.

IMAX Corporation has had a couple of good years, financially speaking, which is evidence of its big screens’ growing popularity. “We have 600+ theaters in 53 countries,” states Foster. “In essence, we program globally. So we have to program for China, we have to program for Poland, we have to program for Israel, we have to program in some places where there are both digital and film locations, and in some places where there’s just digital. We have to program for our institutional as well as our commercial films. Global content has become a huge part of what we do, and we’ve adjusted our selection process to reflect that.”

The second model IMAX has developed over the last dozen years is the release of Hollywood studio blockbusters in IMAX format, billed as special releases which makes them “event” films. Foster and New York-based IMAX CEO Rich Gelfond have steadily built this business over the last decade. Many of last summer’s viewers flocked to see The Dark Knight Rises in 70mm instead of standard 35mm.
Most of these films go through IMAX’s patented process called DMR™ which stands for ‘digital re-mastering’. This starts with a digital encoding of a standard 35mm Hollywood film, ends with a re-mastered, (usually) higher resolution digital format for multiplexes, and if necessary, large reels of high-resolution 70mm film for those IMAX theaters still using film projection.

DMR has steadily improved over the years, as witnessed by one prominent director who had his classic film restored in the IMAX DMR process. In August 2012, IMAX and Paramount Pictures announced a one-week exclusive re-release of Raiders of the Lost Ark to promote the release of the Blu-ray collection. The film, before it underwent DMR, was already restored in a 4k digital intermediate with 7:1 surround sound from the original negative. The process for IMAX theaters, like the complete restoration, was supervised by Steven Spielberg and sound designer Ben Burtt. “I didn’t know if the 1981 print would stand up to a full IMAX transfer,” admitted Spielberg, “so I came expecting a sort of grainy, muddy, and overly enlarged representation of the movie I had made years ago. But I was blown away by the fact that it looked better than the movie I had made years ago.”

The third type of IMAX film is less common, a hybrid between 35mm and IMAX’s 70mm format for multi-screen theaters, like the complete restoration, was supervised by industry IMAX veteran David Keighley’s post-production arm, DKP 70MM, is an on-site subsidiary of IMAX. A 40-year veteran and early IMAX innovator, this operation is an award-winning post-production image and quality control facility. Working closely with directors such as Nolan, Brad Bird, and J.J. Abrams, Keighley is the expert the filmmakers rely on when preparing the look of their film sequences shot in IMAX. Today, 90 percent of all large-format films, whether produced by IMAX or by third-party producers, use Keighley and DKP 70MM Inc. for post-production and quality control.

With the company’s tremendous growth in the last decade, another key player whose job has expanded is Phil Groves, SVP Worldwide Head of Distribution, Studio-Exhibitor Relations. Groves is directly involved in working and negotiating deals with the studios. Says Groves, “In earlier years, we were doing whatever we could to prove the concept of IMAX in terms of Hollywood fare. We had three films released when I first started, and this year we’ll be back to you with what we’re good at doing.”

But they still have room for their documentaries. “The institutional side of our business is really important to us, for a number of reasons,” notes Groves. “They are the legacy of our brand, and their presence informs our brand, and informs the consumer’s perception of our brand.” And we’re sort of developing the fanboys-to-be at those museum locations. As they grow to become avid moviegoers, they have a benchmark against which to measure the whole cinematic experience.”

Foster readily acknowledges the importance of producers. “We’ve been talking about directors, and we should also talk about producers. Coming from a family of producers, I’m definitely biased. A movie like The Dark Knight and the Batman series doesn’t happen without producers like Emma Thomas and Chuck Roven. We worked on all of the Harry Potter movies, and the one constant that we had was [producer] David Heyman. When we work with Jim Cameron, for every time I speak with Jim, I speak with Jon Landau five times. For the producers, it is their job to provide their partners, the directors, with the tools to get their movies made the way they want them to. And we’re one of those tools.”

IMAX does not try to be a studio, but works to support the goals of its studio partners. Foster, somewhat succinctly, sums it up: “They’re really good at what they do, and we try to be really good at what we do,” always emphasizing IMAX’s priority of being a good partner. “Instead of telling them what to do it, you say, ‘Do you what you want. Do it your way. And when you’re done, give it to us, and in anywhere from two to six weeks, we’ll be back to you with what we’re good at doing.’ And that’s taking whatever it is, and making it better. We take projec-tors, and we make them better. We take cameras, and we make them better. We take movies, and we enhance them. We sprinkle our pixie dust on them, and they are improved. We can’t take something that’s not good and make it excellent, but we can take a double and make it a home run. We can take a single and make it a triple. That’s how we do things.”

This philosophy and approach has obviously worked well for the company, and one can’t help thinking that the rising generation of studio filmmakers will continue to look for more ways to take advantage of the IMAX process and partnership.
BAD WORDS — Powered by the Sun

The script of Jason Bateman’s directorial debut, Bad Words, carries the theme: “Where there’s a will, there’s a way” — and his production used that adage well when working to use solar power while filming this winter. They were interested in running a “green set” and adding solar was a high priority.

Solar power has been tried on several prominent movie sets in recent years, yet even the greenest producers have found it to be a challenge. Fox’s The Big Year broke through when it used solar power on location in the Yukon in Canada — but they were dealing with vast open spaces. Solar can be a challenge — especially in constrained locations — but the highly motivated producers at Darko Entertainment and Aggregate Films put their heads together with DC Solar Solutions and found a way.

Filmed on locations all over Los Angeles, Bad Words is one of the first movie productions to successfully use solar power extensively. Bateman and his producing team employed solar power to run their base camp, telecommunications and light towers. According to transportation coordinator and DC Solar Solutions rep John Brubaker, this precedent-setting choice brought significant rewards.

“I’ve been working in this business for nearly 30 years. My dad worked in the business, so I grew up on movie sets. I was always bothered by the noise and the smell — it just didn’t seem right that a movie could be so disruptive to the community where it was being shot. So I feel like I’ve been looking for reasonable fuel alternatives all my life.”

Brubaker has been on the hunt for better ways for years, and it’s been a long road. “There has long been a sense that solar was never going to be right for movies — the batteries were just too big, and you needed too many of them. But when my dad encountered DC Solar up at a car show in Carmel and we saw what was possible now that the batteries had been substantially improved, we were very impressed.”

Executive producer Darren Demetre comes from Portland, Oregon, and his green cred is unassailable. He was very happy with the solar experience on Bad Words, and attests to the fact that it was a positive experience overall for cast and crew as well. “It has been great for a film of this size to have such fantastic tools. It has been not only a savings on fuel but also a convenience on sensitive locations where generator noise is an issue.”

One of the challenges with solar has been the need for constant sunshine — but the new batteries store more amperage than ever before. If you’re shooting in Southern California (or another sunny location), you’re good to go — though folks filming in Vermont may still want to hold off a few more years. The other previous challenge was physical footprint — solar used to require too much space for productions shooting in tight spots like quaint neighborhoods or busy cities. But on Bad Words, the whole solar setup fit on just a few trailers, which tucked easily on the street or into the small parking lot at L.A.’s American Legion.

Demetre was especially enthusiastic about DC Solar Solutions’ light towers: “The best piece of gear they had was the lights. Since there was no generator, we could power them up early or late without noise. When we were shooting at the American Legion, it was great for early calls not to have the genny running.”

The community benefits are multiple. Smell and noise are utterly eliminated — you can shoot all night and not keep anyone up due to these interferences in neighborhoods. In some communities with restrictions on how early you can start in the morning (such as Pasadena or Beverly Hills), it makes a big difference that you can start up in the pre-dawn hours in complete silence.

The calculations were not complete at press time, but the early word is that the integration of solar into the power portfolio for Bad Words can be good for the bottom line, too — or at least, it is heading in the right direction. When gas prices are high, the comparative analysis works out well for most alternatives — and now solar is moving more reliably into that category, too.

Certainly on big-budget movies, solar will become more and more practical as time goes on. Demetre believes, but “for an indie under ten million, solar might be a luxury — but the other benefits are impressive: it does reduce the amount of hours we ran the base camp generator, and with the noise level at certain locations so much less than usual, we were very pleased.”

Soon, solar power may have even more to offer the production industry. Brubaker reports that there are new hybrid solar trailers coming out equipped with a fuel generator that will kick in if the clouds come in and the solar batteries run out of juice.

DC Solar operates on both the West and East Coasts — and even provided solar power trailers to coastal towns in New Jersey after Superstorm Sandy. John Brubaker has been helping to spread the word, too. “I spoke at a breakfast for Teamsters who’d like to know more about integrating solar into their next production. Hey, Teamsters are going green, too!”

“Four or five years ago, when you went to talk to a studio about putting solar power on their set, they’d ask a lot of questions and you’d never hear back from them,” he said with a smile. “Now, the studio executives ask: How soon can I have it?”

KATIE CARPENTER

For more information, go to www.gggreenstudiorentals.com
Your PGA Health Benefits

PGA members have a variety of healthcare options available to them. While none of them represents a "perfect plan," many members will be able to improve their coverage or the cost of their coverage through their PGA membership. Members may take advantage of two options: Employer-paid coverage and self-pay coverage.

Qualifying for Employer-Paid Coverage Through the Motion Picture Industry Plan

Am I eligible?

To be eligible for the program, you must:

- Be credited as an executive producer, producer, associate producer or post-production supervisor;
- Work for a company that is an AMPTP signatory, or signatory to Motion Picture Industry Health Plan;
- Work on a theatrical motion picture or prime-time network television program; some primetime cable and syndicated series also qualify, as do productions for which an AMPTP member agrees to make contributions; and
- Work on a production that utilizes a West Coast IA Crew.

How many hours do I have to work to qualify for coverage?

To qualify for the Industry Health Plan, a producer must be credited with 600 hours (automatically computed at 56.5 hours per week) within a six-month qualifying period. To maintain coverage, he or she must be credited with at least 400 hours for each subsequent six-month period. If a member becomes ineligible, his or her eligibility for benefits will be reviewed every month until he or she accumulates enough contribution hours within a six-month span to re-qualify for benefits.

I've determined that I qualify; how do I get my coverage to start?

Contributions are not automatic; they must be directly requested by the producer. Producers request contributions by signing and submitting a participation form within 60 days of starting eligible employment. If the producer does not submit a signed participation form, he or she will be deemed to have waived his or her right to contributions with respect to the job. Participation forms should be provided by the employer upon request. If you have difficulty obtaining a form, contact PGA National Executive Director Vance Van Petten at (310) 358-9020 x104.

My company isn't an AMPTP signatory. Am I out of luck?

Not necessarily. If you are employed by a company that is a signatory to both the IATSE Basic Agreement and the Motion Picture Industry Health & Welfare and Pension Plans, you can request that they make voluntary contributions, even if they are not members of the AMPTP. This request has been granted many times, but can be difficult to secure. A good way to know if your production has signed on to the IATSE Basic Agreement is to check if the camera, grips, or sound providers are union.

If I qualify, is my employer required to approve my coverage?

Unfortunately, no. However, the cost to the employer is reasonable enough that many employers will approve the coverage.

Additionally, standard practice has dictated (though again, not required) that once a production begins making contributions to the Health Plan for one producer, it will make those same contributions for any eligible producer on the show, provided coverage is requested in a timely fashion.

Self-Pay Plans: Producers Health

In a perfect world, every PGA member would qualify for employer-paid coverage. For those who do not qualify, the PGA offers self-pay options which, because of our group status, are likely to offer better rates than what members can find on the open market.

The Producers Health Plans are available nationally. If you’re currently without health insurance, we encourage you to call immediately to see if you qualify for a plan that suits you. Even if you currently have coverage (particularly other self-pay coverage), it would be worth your while to investigate the options you may have through the PGA self-pay plans.

Questions? Contact:

Employer-paid Plan
Kyle Katz (310) 358-9020 x101

Self-pay Plans
Scott Brandt (888) 700-7725
That’s the list we have right now, two months before we raise the curtain on this year’s PBC. Which means we’ve got just about eight weeks to round up even more major producers, top executives, power players and digital innovators to join you at the Conference.

There’s that word again: YOU. If you’re a producer, you know where you need to be over the weekend of June 8–9. For those two days, 20th Century Fox Studios is going to become the capital of the producing world, as more than 1,000 guests and attendees gather for a full weekend of sessions and workshops, mentoring roundtables, networking events and lots more. Trust us, if you’re looking to take your producing career to the next level, the Produced By Conference is where you need to be.

Early bird registration lasts until April 30. If you register before that date, not only will you save some hard-earned cash, but you’ll get advance notice of when individual sessions will be open for registration. Last year, our sessions with Christopher Nolan & Emma Thomas, Mark Cuban, and Brian Grazer & Peter Berg were practically full the day that we opened them for registration. See where we’re going with this? If you want to get the most out of your Conference experience, be a smart producer, and lock in your registration before the April 30 deadline.

June 8 and 9
20th Century Fox Studios, Los Angeles
Register today at
www.producedbyconference.com
PGA OSCAR PARTY

As the rest of this magazine would indicate, the past year has seen a lot of “firsts” for the Guild ... the first-ever Producers Marks appearing on credits, the PGA’s first official presence at Sundance. Now you can add another one to the list: the Producers Guild’s first-ever official Oscar® party!

Held on Oscar night, February 24, at Planet Dailies at the L.A. Farmer’s Market, the event doubled as the Guild’s major West Coast recruiting event of the season. It was a fantastic night all around — not only did the Academy concur with the Guild’s choice of Argo as the year’s best picture, but more than 60 producers and producing team members submitted applications to join the PGA.

Though the event was hosted by the Guild’s always-enterprising AP Council, members from all three Producers Guild councils were on hand to celebrate and share the camaraderie with new recruits. Congratulations to AP Council Vice President Rebecca Graham Forde, Pamela Keller, Christina Lee Storm and their fellow AP Council organizers, who made this event happen. We’re totally gonna win that Oscar pool next year.
New Members
The Producers Guild is proud to welcome the following new members, who have joined the Guild since December 1, 2012.

PRODUCERS COUNCIL
JEFF ALTROCK
TRACY BACAL
MARTIN BLENCOWE
BRANDEN CHAPMAN
MICHELLE COLBERT
CHRISTOPHER COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER G. COWEN
NEAL DODSON
JOHN STUART DORSEY
RICHARD CHARLES DUGDALE
JOHN STUART DORSEY
NEAL DODSON
CHRISTOPHER G. COWEN
CHRISTOPHER COLLINS
MICHELLE COLBERT
BRANDEN CHAPMAN
MARTIN BLENCOWE
TRACY BACAL
MARTIN BLENCOWE
BRANDEN CHAPMAN
MARTIN BLENCOWE
BRANDEN CHAPMAN

NEW MEDIA COUNCIL
NICK BRACCIA
SEAN CAREY
SEAN DOORLY
ROCCO LEO GAGLIOTI
JORDAN SETH GERSHOWITZ
KAYVAN GHAIWI
BEHNAAM KARBASSI
RYAN LANDELS
MICHAEL MEYER
BLADIMIAR NORMAN
STEVE SCHLAIR
ELVIRA SKYE

AP COUNCIL
Associate Producer/Production Manager
Production Supervisor
REBECCA AGBE-DAVIES
AKUA PEARL BOAKYE
DIANA CHENG
BHARON DIETZ
LESJEE GANT
DUCILIO ERIC MARTINEZ
NICHOLLE MILKAN
KELLY ELIZABETH RIGG
ALINE ELIZABETH ROBEY
SUSAN SLAGLE ROGERS
JORDAN SETH GERSHOWITZ

Post-Production
JENNA BAJER
NATHAN BETTISWORTH
SEAN J. CAMPBELL
ELIOTT DIGUISEPPE
KENNETH TODD GILBERT
JOSH SAMAEL PIT
MIKE SOMMER
VINNY STEVES
PAULITO T. TANCONCO

Visual Effects
WENDY AARON GARFINKLE
MARC LUCIAN KOLBE
PAUL MCFEELY
REBECCA RAIN
MARK JOSEPH SIMONE

Member Benefits
• Discounted registration for Produced By Conference
• Access to all-new PGA Job Board, online résumé search, employment tools and job forums
• Vote on Producers Guild Awards and receive discount tickets to the event, as well as DVD screeners for awards consideration
• Full access to PGA website including events, calendar, social networking tools
• Eligibility for individual, family and small business healthcare options through Producers Health Insurance Agency
• Participation in the Motion Picture Industry Health, Welfare & Pension Plan
• Eligibility for PGA Mentoring Program
• Listing of contact and credit information in searchable online roster
• Admission to special PGA pre-release screenings and Q&A events
• Free attendance at PGA seminars
• Arbitration of credit disputes
• Wide variety of discounts on events, merchandise, travel
• Complimentary subscription to Produced by

PRODUCERS GUILD OF AMERICA

60
Produced by

March – April 2013

New Dawn Effects
newdawneffects.com  323.395.9940

The best SPFX experience you will ever have!
2012 was a good year for keeping busy; I had worked on a Discovery Channel competition show and a top-rated science series. But after six years as an AP, I’d not yet figured out a plan to step up to field producer. So, last October I reached out to the PGA Mentoring Program.

My assigned mentor was Jude Prest. He has been a showrunner for some of the same networks I’ve also produced for, as well as many others. We first met by phone and he agreed our pairing was a match. (I also had read his own Mentoring Matters column from this magazine’s Spring 2012 issue.) For our first face-to-face meeting, I went to the WB lot in Burbank. There, I shadowed Jude for a week as he selected the cast and prepped the script for a ghost story re-creation shoot. We hit it off, and I had a blast watching him plan scary practical VFX.

A week later on set, I watched Jude in action. Jude is also an actor and an actor’s director, who can energetically demonstrate stunts himself, like getting thrown from a chair into a wall (by a ghost). He stays focused and funny. Many of the actors on the shoot had worked with him before and were returning for more. I even got to play a nonspeaking part, and felt what it was like to be directed by him. It confirmed something I’ve witnessed with quality producer/directors throughout my career: Whether you are working with professional actors or taking family portraits in the back of a department store, you have to make people comfortable, yet energized.

A month later, over lunch, we brainstormed a health/wellness reality concept that I plan to execute as a sizzle reel to showcase my skills to production companies. Jude stressed the importance of finding strong characters and offered to shepherd me through the different cuts of the reel. At the time of this writing, I’m in pre-production, but looking forward to getting Jude’s eyes on the rough cut the minute it’s ready. I’m also approaching potential on-camera talent, not as an AP pre-interviewing them this time, but as a producer enthusiastic about bringing in new collaborators for an enjoyable and creative process. So far, I’m noticing that it’s making all the difference in winning them over.

When I’m out shooting my project, I’ll imagine that Jude is the showrunner for my not-yet-reality series. And because of my on-set experience with him, I’m sure I’ll find moments when I’ll ask, “What would Jude do?” What I learned through my PGA mentorship with Jude Prest will, without question, help my career. Thanks to the PGA for this opportunity, and a special thanks to Jude Prest for the privilege of riding shotgun on his show.