

News Bargaining Incentive

Consultation on Revenue Distribution

April 2026

Submission by ACE Radio Broadcasters Pty Limited – ACMA Registered News business

13th May 2026

Questions

Q1: Do you have any concerns with the proposed registration and application process?

Q2: Would your organisation meet the criteria as set out under the ACMA register? If not, please explain which component of the eligibility criteria may cause an issue.

Q3: Is the proposed eligibility criteria fit-for-purpose in ensuring that the scheme supports continued investment in public interest news, diversity of media voices, and quality journalism?

Q4: Do any of the proposed eligibility criteria present significant costs or administrative burden for your organisation?

Responses

Q1: We do not have any concerns in respect of the proposed registration and application process.

Q2: Our organisation has met the criteria and is listed on the ACMA register.

Q3: Yes, our opinion is that the proposed eligibility criteria does support continued investment in public interest news, diversity of media voices, and quality journalism.

Q4: We do not envisage incurring significant costs to meet the eligibility criteria for our organisation.

Questions

Q5: Is FTE journalists a good approximation for investment in news and journalism, and an appropriate basis for determining payments to the sector?

Q6: Are the identified editorial roles clear and fit-for-purpose? Are there other roles that should be included?

Q7: Do the proposed evidentiary requirements present any specific difficulties, or a sizeable burden, for your business? Are there any risks arising from these evidentiary requirements?

Responses

Q5: We believe that FTE journalists is an appropriate basis for determining payments to the sector. The number of journalists employed by an organisation generally determines the amount of public interest news content created.

Q6: The identified Journalist editorial roles are clear and fit-for-purpose. We do not believe other roles should be included.

Q7: We do not see a burden in producing the proposed evidentiary requirements and we would support the proposed evidentiary requirements, in order to ensure the system has the appropriate controls and checks in place.

Questions

Q8: Are the above weighting categories an appropriate and effective means of accounting for the economies of scale and resourcing differences across the sector; and meeting the objectives of the Statutory Payment Scheme?

Q9: What weighting values would best achieve these aims?

Responses

Q8: We believe that the weighting categories put forth are very appropriate and would be necessary to ensure equitability of the scheme and support diversity and representation objectives.

Q9: Regional and Remote. Our Company operates in a number of regional areas across Victoria and Southern New South Wales. We are increasingly finding it difficult to attract and retain staff to work in our regional areas. As a result of this, we believe an appropriate weighting to be put into place for regional and remote would be a weighting value of 1.5 times. This would then recognize the difficulties and additional costs we deal with in regards to resourcing News Journalists.

Questions

Q10: Is the proposed retention obligation an appropriate measure to ensure that funding provided to the sector delivers against a clear and valid public purpose?

Q11: Are there any risks or other issues we should take into consideration with regard to the retention obligation, including time periods and tolerance thresholds?

Q12: What penalties should apply for organisations that are later found to have mis-reported their eligibility or employment practices?

Responses

Q10: We agree with the proposed retention obligation. The News Organisations need to be supportive of the scheme and commit to maintaining the generation of public interest news content.

Q11: We do not see any risks or other issues that should be taken into consideration with regard to the retention obligation.

Q12: In respect of penalties for organisations that have mis-reported their eligibility, there should be a requirement for them to return any grant payments distributed to them while they were non-compliant and the organisations should be excluded from the scheme for a minimum period of two years.

Questions:

Q13: Do you have any concerns about the general approach to regular reporting and an event-based notification framework?

Q14: What lead-in time would you require for information required under regular reporting and event-based notices? Do you have any concerns about the feasibility of collecting this information, the timing or sequencing of obligations, or disclosure of commercially sensitive information?

Q15: Do you have any concerns or views about penalties under the scheme, including the thresholds and penalties for serious non-compliance?

Responses

Q13: We believe that the proposed regular reporting framework put forth is reasonable and appropriate.

Q14: We would request a lead in time of eight weeks to provide information under regular reporting and event-based notices. We do not have any concerns about the feasibility of collecting this information, the timing or sequencing of obligations, or disclosure of commercially sensitive information, subject to the administrative authority ensuring that any and all sensitive information is safeguarded and kept confidential.

Q15: We do not have any concerns regarding penalties under the scheme. Penalties are necessary to ensure that all organisations are motivated to correctly report and not engage in non-compliance of the scheme.