AUSTRALIAN
GUILD OF SCREEN
COMPOSERS

AUSTRALIAN GUILD OF SCREEN COMPOSERS

AGSC AI Policy and Code of Ethics v1.0

Written for composers. What we believe, what the Guild will do, and what we are asking of others.

v1.0 Endorsed by the board 20 October 2026

A note to composers from the AGSC AI Committee

This document is written for you, not for a lawyer, or a policy officer. If you are a screen composer who has never engaged with generative AI technology and does not intend to, it should still make sense. If a word or a sentence doesn't make sense, we would like to hear about it.

We aim to address three key priorities for the Guild simultaneously: clearly state the Guild's position on AI in screen music, detail our action plan alongside our requests to key stakeholders, and offer members actionable tools; including a standard for your professional practice and strategies for negotiating with screen producers.

We've intentionally avoided a set of rules with penalties attached. The Guild has neither the resources nor the standing to police anyone, and pretending otherwise would cost us the credibility we need for advocacy on your behalf. What we can do is take a clear public position, promote it, and back it with the Human Made mark, and provide the contract tools and education described below, to support our members, you, to continue to work and compose in the current AI landscape.

70% of AGSC composers surveyed in 2026[1], wrote about work disappearing. That's where this document starts.

Overview

Your music should not be used to train an AI system unless you give consent first, and each and every time consent should be sought to train a model. Any remuneration for the use of your works in AI systems should be on a recurring basis, and the remuneration should actually reach you, the writer. The Guild will work with APRA AMCOS who are well positioned and equipped to negotiate any potential licensing schemes being designed.

Music written by a person is different from music generated by an AI system, and the industry should be able to tell the two apart. The Guild will launch a *Human Made* mark, backed by a public list, and ask broadcasters and funders to recognise it.

Assistive AI Tools that help you refine, automate, or analyse your own work are accepted. However, generative AI systems that output music for you from a LLM (Large Language Model), LMM (Large Music Model) or similar, are not considered works a member can present as their own composition. That is the line the membership has already drawn, and our Code of Ethics (below) reflects that.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges carry rights and responsibilities that copyright does not cover. Who can give permission depends on who holds cultural authority, and consent can be withdrawn. Nothing that is cultural knowledge or cultural IP goes into a tool that learns. This part of the policy was developed with the advice of Alyelhentye Nawu at APRA AMCOS.

Screen composition is work, and the Guild will defend it as work: the commissions, the rates, the rights, and the pathways that let new and established composers build careers.

1. AGSC AI Survey, 2026, open-ended comment box answers.

We will advocate alongside guilds and collecting societies, here and overseas, to ensure that training already done on members' music, without consent, is acknowledged, accounted for and remedied where it can be.

And we will give you a paragraph you can hand a producer when asked to promise "no AI was used", contract clauses in the Guild's templates, and a simple list of what these tools actually do.

Every figure in this document comes from the AGSC AI Member Survey, which ran from 14 July to 1 August 2026 and had 76 responses. Percentages are of the members who answered that particular question.

A glossary at the back explains the handful of specialist terms we could not avoid. And an annex at the very end restates our asks in the formal wording needed for submissions, so that a policy officer can lift them without reading the whole document.

Why this policy exists

The immediate reason is practical. Government legislation on AI is expected in late 2026/early 2027, APRA AMCOS is developing its own policy, and a parliamentary inquiry into AI is due to report by the end of November. If the Guild has an adopted position by the October AGM, we are in those conversations while the rules are still being written. If we wait, we are commenting on someone else's finished work.

The deeper reason is the one members gave us. A quarter of you described the harm of AI in cultural terms before you described it in financial ones. Some members put it in terms of what the craft is for:

> *I think all generative AI is a mistake, I worry people will lose touch with the joy of the journey and the love of the craft, I worry people will lose touch with what makes incredible music incredible, its soul.*
>
> **AGSC MEMBER, AI MEMBER SURVEY 2026**

Music written by a person carries a point of view developed through a lifetime of lived experience, a working relationship with the filmmaker, and a body of craft built over a career. A system trained on the work of thousands of composers may produce something that sounds like human work. But *it isn't human work*. The Guild's view is that this difference matters. Audiences and producers should be able to hear it, and the people whose work made the systems possible should have a say in whether their work is used by that system, and a share in what it earns. Everything that follows is a way of making that view count.

1 Consent, Licensing and Copyright

Your consent to be involved with AI systems, and being paid for that involvement.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

Your music can't be used to train an AI system without your consent, given in advance, for each and every use. Saying yes once is not saying yes forever. Further, permission is not the same as a sale. Where your music is used in training, payment should be ongoing and should reach you, not stop at the first company in the chain.

We support the Government's decision (October 2025) not to create a copyright exception for AI training, and will advocate that this remains the status quo. We support APRA AMCOS's call for a working, paid licensing scheme built on consent and payment. We add one thing to that call: **any licensing scheme must ensure that royalty payments reach composers and writers.**

There are three different things being licensed here, and we want them kept apart:

1. The music that has already been taken and used in model development.
2. The ongoing training that keeps using it to develop new models and;
3. What is done with the music the system then produces.

A single agreement that blurs the three things above will not serve composers well.

WHY?

81% of members support this position. Support is strongest among the most experienced members. The doubt members raised was whether the money under a potential licensing system would ever arrive.

> *I fear that any money from the proposed licences will be significantly diluted by the time it flows on to the composer.*
>
> **AGSC MEMBER, AI MEMBER SURVEY 2026**

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

- Maintain our standing working relationship with APRA AMCOS, to support and facilitate ongoing consultation, advocacy, and lobbying on this issue.
- A publicly published list of composers (and their 1-2 most recognisable works) who support the AGSC AI code of ethics, so that we speak for a defined body of composers and music rather than a general principle.
- Consult with APRA AMCOS on the details of how money from any licensing scheme would reach a screen composer.
- Update the Guild's own contract templates to incorporate consent around model training rights.

WHAT WE ARE ASKING OF OTHERS

Of APRA AMCOS:

- publish the rules for who gets paid what before any collection begins;
- distribute on evidence that a work was actually used where that can be shown, and say plainly where it cannot;
- add two separate flags to the record of each registered work, one saying whether it is cleared for AI training and one saying whether AI was used in making it;
- and set a payment floor so that small earners are not administered out of the scheme.

Of producers and their lawyers: stop writing training rights into buyouts.

Of government: hold the line on no copyright exception, and uphold current copyright laws in Australia.

IN PLAIN TERMS

If this policy gets what it asks for, nobody could use your music to train a system without asking you, and if you said yes you would be paid for as long as it was used.

What it does not mean the Guild cannot make this happen on its own, and the question of how licensing and remuneration would work for music already used in training has not yet been answered. We are being honest that this is the largest unfinished piece of work in the policy. If you have signed a buyout, this policy does not undo it; it aims to stop the next one taking training rights too.

2 Transparency and Accountability in AI Systems

Knowing what is going on with your work.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

You should be able to find out what a system was trained on, how AI is being potentially used on a screen production, and whether the music an audience is hearing was made by a person or a generative AI system. The duty to disclose sits with the people who have the information: the companies building the systems, and the producers using them. It should not be pushed onto a composer who cannot know something that wasn't disclosed to them.

WHY?

More than half of the members who gave a definite answer have met an AI clause in a contract in the last two years. Members experience this as a clause they do not understand and cannot assess.

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

Write a standard one-page AI disclosure schedule that a member can attach to a composition contract. Write a producer-facing declaration that says what AI is being used for on the production. Insert both into the Guild's contract templates.

WHAT WE ARE ASKING OF OTHERS

- **Of the companies building these AI systems:** Transparency. We want them to disclose a detailed list of the works used for training their AI platforms.
- **Of broadcasters and platforms:** label AI-generated music at the point where the audience hears it, which we will pursue jointly with the other guilds who already back it. Labelling is arriving faster through platform policy than through law (Apple has moved to label AI-generated music where distributors supply the information), so the technical standards for that information are where this will be decided.

IN PLAIN TERMS

You will have a page you can attach to a contract that asks the producer to say what AI is being used for, and you can ask for the same in return.

What it does not mean the Guild cannot force a producer to tell you anything. It gives you a standard way to ask, and it makes silence noticeable.

3 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges

Who has the cultural authority to say yes?

This pillar was developed with the advice of Alyelhentye Nawu, a specialised team within APRA AMCOS dedicated to supporting and advocating for the rights and interests of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander music creators. The team develops culturally informed approaches to music rights management, including copyright, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural and Intellectual Property, Cultural Knowledges, ICIP, registrations, licensing, attribution, royalties and other rights and responsibilities arising at the intersection of culture and commerce.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges can include songs, music, language, stories, recordings, performances, cultural practices and other forms of cultural expression and knowledge. These can carry individual and collective rights and responsibilities. Who can give permission will depend on the Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges involved and who holds cultural authority for them.

Copyright permission and cultural permission are not always the same thing. Owning copyright, buying a licence, clearing a sample or finding something in a library does not necessarily give you cultural permission to use it. If your work involves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges, ask early: who has the cultural authority to say yes?

Consent needs to come from the right people, before the work starts, with a clear understanding of what is being proposed. Consent for one use is not consent for every use. Permission to record, perform, reproduce or license something is not permission to use it with AI. Consent can be withdrawn by those who hold the cultural authority to give it.

If AI is part of the process, say so before consent is sought. Do not put Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges into an AI tool without specific permission for that AI use. Putting something into an AI system does not remove the cultural rights and responsibilities connected to it. An AI-generated version does not automatically make something culturally appropriate to use.

The Guild does not support AI being used to imitate or generate Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural expression without the involvement or permission of those who hold the relevant cultural authority.

WHY?

This policy asks others to respect a composer's choices about how their music is used by AI. We need to show the same respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges.

Copyright does not cover every cultural right or responsibility. A sample might be licensed. A field recording might be publicly available. A producer might provide a reference track. An AI system might generate something that sounds culturally specific. None of these things, on their own, mean it is culturally okay to use. For composers, the principle is simple: Notice it. Ask early. Find out who has the cultural authority to say yes. And don't put Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges into an AI tool without specific permission for that AI use.

The Guild will help members understand what this means in practice. The Code of Ethics puts the composer's side of this in one line: nothing that is cultural knowledge or cultural IP goes into a tool that learns. The only exception is specific permission for that AI use from those who hold the cultural authority to give it.

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

- Develop practical guidance for composers on recognising when Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges may be involved and what to do next.
- Include protections for Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges in the Guild's contract templates and raise these issues with Screen Producers Australia.
- Develop guidance with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander composers, musicians and people with relevant cultural and industry knowledge, rather than relying on individual Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander members to repeatedly explain the basics.
- Support better ways of recognising and crediting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander creative and cultural contributions.
- Make sure the Guild's own approach to AI respects Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property, Cultural Knowledges and cultural authority.

WHAT WE ARE ASKING OF OTHERS

- **Of companies building AI systems:** Build safeguards that stop users from asking AI systems to imitate or generate Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural expression without cultural authority. The responsibility should not fall entirely on a composer who may have no way of knowing where an AI-generated sound, phrase or musical idea came from.
- **Of producers and commissioners:** Think about Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges when developing the brief, not at the end of production. If a brief asks for an "Indigenous feel", an "Aboriginal sound" or something similar, stop and work out what is actually being requested, whether Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges may be involved, and who needs to be part of that conversation. Allow time and budget for this process.
- **Of the wider music and screen industries:** Support better ways for important cultural information to travel with works and recordings. Cultural information can help people make better decisions, but it is not automatic permission to use something.

IN PLAIN TERMS

If your work involves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander music, language, stories, recordings, samples, Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges, don't assume that having access to something means you have cultural permission to use it. The same applies if a brief asks for an "Indigenous feel", a library contains an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander recording, an AI tool generates something that sounds culturally specific, or you are working with an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander artist.

Ask early: who has the cultural authority to say yes?

A copyright clearance, library licence or producer approval may not answer that question. And don't put Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property or Cultural Knowledges into an AI tool without specific permission for that AI use.

4 Music made by people

Human authorship, with a Human Made mark.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

Music written by a person carries something a system does not produce: a point of view cultivated through lived human experience, a relationship with the filmmaker, our knowledge and expertise. The Guild says this publicly, and asks the industry to be able to tell the difference.

We will create a *Human Made* mark that identifies a score as written by a person, backed by a public list so that a claim can be checked. In the case where there is a more widely recognised, pre-existing public mark that aligns with the Guild's Policy, we could optionally adopt that mark. AI cannot be credited as a composer.

WHY?

93% of members back the mark, the strongest result anywhere in the survey, with only one member against. Backing runs between 89% and 96% in every composer income band.

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

Launch the *Human Made* mark as an AGSC initiative with a public list. Start with it as a standard the market recognises, and build toward a standard the whole screen industry uses, with the Guild sharing the maintenance of a registry with other screen guilds. We can also lobby for a two-level version with industry: one mark for an entire production that is *Human Made*, and one for a score that is, since those are separate claims. Write a short producer-facing explainer of what the mark guarantees. Work with the Australian Screen Sound Guild, which is pushing Screen Australia for a human-made watermark or registry, so the sector ends up with one standard rather than three.

WHAT WE ARE ASKING OF OTHERS

- **Of broadcasters and funders:** recognise the mark.
- **Of Screen Australia:** one sector-wide standard, developed with the guilds.
- This is the pillar that sets the tone of the whole policy. The mark is something we celebrate and encourage, not a rule we enforce. There is no penalty for a member who does not use it, and the Guild will not be adjudicating breaches.

IN PLAIN TERMS

You will be able to put a mark on your credits and your website that says this score was written by a person, and a producer or broadcaster will be able to check that on a public list.

What it does not mean using the mark is voluntary, the Guild is not going to investigate anyone, and using tools that help you do your own work (see Pillar 5) does not disqualify a score.

5 How members work with AI

The AGSC Code of Ethics for Generative AI

This pillar is a member-facing Code of Ethics. It is short because members have already drawn the line for us.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

The line is between tools that help you make something, and systems that make it for you. Members may use AI tools that assist their craft. Members do not present music generated by an AI system as their own composition.

The Guild commits to keeping members informed: about what these tools actually do, about what contracts are asking of you, and about the energy and broader environmental costs of the systems that generate media and AI outputs.

WHY?

85% of members accept AI in audio restoration and clean-up. 56% accept AI-assisted mixing or mastering. 42% accept AI-equipped sample libraries. Support falls away sharply once a tool starts producing musical material, and not one surveyed member accepts a complete cue generated from a prompt to a generative AI music system. In the survey, that result does not vary by experience, income, or whether the member uses AI tools themselves.

There is a contradiction in the survey data – many members who say they use no AI at all still use iZotope RX or a mix assistant. To most of the members, AI means Suno and ChatGPT. The machine-learning tools already sitting in their sessions are just software. That is why the Guild will publish a plain list of what tools do, so that a contract clause and a composer's honest answer can be aligned as the same thing.

WHAT MEMBERS COMMIT TO

In practice the Code comes down to four commitments.

1. **I do not deliver music generated by an AI system as my own composition.**
2. **Where I use AI tools in a way that generates musical material, I tell the producer.**
3. **I do not put material I have been entrusted with, above all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges, into any tool that learns from what it is given.**
4. **I read what I am asked to sign about AI, and I ask the Guild when I am not sure.**

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

- Create template wordings you can hand a producer (as a ‘warranty’), which promises that no music-generating AI was used in the composition while protecting your right to use restoration, mixing and library tools.
- We will create AI and Cultural Intellectual Property clauses in the Guild’s contract templates.
- A published list of what AI tools actually do, in plain language, aligned with overseas guilds so that your contract language travels.
- Contract workshops pitched at the whole membership, since the confidence gap is flat across every career stage.
- We can also educate members on the environmental cost of tool choice, which members raised in the survey without being asked.

WHAT WE ARE ASKING OF OTHERS

Of producers: accept the terms of the template warranty paragraph, and stop asking composers to sign a promise about the word ‘AI’ with no agreed meaning.

IN PLAIN TERMS

Using RX to clean up a recording, a mastering assistant based around machine learning, or a sample library with clever features does not put you on the wrong side of this Code. Typing a brief as a prompt into Suno, and delivering its output to a production as your own work does put you on the wrong side of this Code. If a producer asks you to promise “no AI was used” in a contract, the Guild will give you a paragraph that lets you sign it with a clear conscience.

What it does not mean nobody is going to audit your sessions. The Code describes what the profession expects, and it matches what almost the entire membership already does.

6 Composition is work

A composer's work is protected labour.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

Screen composition is work, and the Guild defends it as work. That means the commissioned works, the rates paid for them, and the pathways that let composers build and establish careers. A member should be able to decline work that involves AI without professional penalty.

WHY?

This is the pillar members came to talk about in the survey. Many surveyed members have spoken about work disappearing, fees falling, and/or losing work to AI-generated or AI-library music. The harm is concentrated in short films, animation and games, which is where the newest and lowest-paid members work and the fields being automated first. Games composers report being told directly that they lost work at nearly twice the rate of any other field.

> *the most pressing issue is with pathways for younger composers to hone their craft as that is the work that is already disappearing.*
>
> **AGSC MEMBER, AI MEMBER SURVEY 2026**

The members calling loudest for an outright ban on generative AI in music are at the start of their careers. We have heard that through the survey, and this policy asks for the tools that let us do something about it.

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

Gather evidence. Australia has no modelling of what AI is doing to screen music work, which means we currently cannot argue it with anything but anecdotes. This is the enabler for everything else in this pillar. Benchmark rates, so falling fees can be demonstrated. Carry the case for the work that starts careers into the conversations with Screen Australia and the other guilds.

WHAT WE ARE ASKING OF OTHERS

- **Of Screen Australia and the funding bodies:** consider a condition on publicly funded low-budget content that the score is human-composed. This is narrower than a new fund, it is a condition on public money rather than a new spend, and it may be more winnable.
- **Of the other guilds and APRA AMCOS:** carry the 'AI buyout' problem (carve training rights out of future buyouts) jointly, since recording artists sign the same clauses with labels and a claim made across the whole music sector travels further than one made only by the AGSC.

Still exploratory and not yet a Guild position: a charge on AI platforms operating in Australia, directed back into the sectors their outputs displace.

IN PLAIN TERMS

The Guild is going to start counting: who is losing work, in which fields, and what is happening to fees, so that when we say the entry-level work is disappearing we can show it. What it does not mean: the Guild cannot stop a producer choosing a library or a system over a composer. It can make the choice visible, argue for conditions on public money, and make sure a member who says no to AI work is not punished for it.

7 Not doing this alone

International Alliances.

WHAT WE BELIEVE

The Guild does not make this argument alone. We work with screen composer guilds and collecting societies overseas, line up our definitions with theirs where we can, and act together where a joint position carries more weight than seven separate ones.

WHY?

88% of members rate international alignment as important, 58% very important. Alignment only helps if we agree with what we are aligning with. Members would rather we take a stronger position rather than a weaker one that matched other organisations.

WHAT THE GUILD CAN DO

Make formal contact with screen composer guilds, collecting societies and other organisations, in any territory and language, that share our values and positions, and build working relationships with them. Learn from the organisations already putting consent-and-payment licensing into practice: GEMA's licensed training dataset (PLAI) is the clearest working example anywhere of the approach this policy takes, and we will seek a direct connection with the composers it represents to understand it. Line up our list of what AI tools do with theirs, so that members' contract language works across territories. Keep a standing watch on the overseas court cases and brief the committee when rulings land.

IN PLAIN TERMS

When you sign a contract in another territory, or your music is used there, the definitions the Guild uses should mean the same thing that guild uses. And when an overseas guild wins something, we want to know quickly whether it can be won here. What it does not mean: we will not adopt an overseas position just because it exists.

The past and the future together

Members' catalogues are already inside generative AI music systems like Suno, Udio, and have been ingested without consent. Everything in the Government's current thinking is about what happens next. The Guild's position is that both the past and the future matter.

We will help build the forward-looking licensing infrastructure, through APRA AMCOS, so that consent and payment become the normal way these systems are trained, should they be allowed to exist by law in Australia.

At the same time we will keep saying publicly that the training already done on members' music without asking needs to be acknowledged, and remedied where that proves possible. A German court awarded damages this year for model training that had already happened, so the principle isn't just a fantasy.

In practice that means holding the line that the works were taken; asking whether they can be removed from the systems, while accepting that may be close to impossible; and then building licences that cover the three separate things named in Pillar 1: the music already taken, the ongoing training that keeps using it, and what is done with what the system produces.

How the policy will be used

The policy is a public statement of the Guild's position. It will sit on the Guild's website, be quoted in submissions and correspondence, and be handed to producers, broadcasters, funders and APRA AMCOS as the basis for what we ask of them. The annex at the back exists so that a policy officer can lift the asks without reading the whole document.

The Code (Pillar 5) is what the profession expects of members who use these tools. It is not enforced. There is no complaints process and no penalty. Its weight comes from the fact that it describes what almost the entire membership already does, and from the mark, and the template contract clauses that put it into practice.

The policy will be reviewed every twelve months, because the tools and the law are both moving. Nine of the survey questions were written to be repeated without change, and the first repeat is planned for 2028.

What happens next

Two parliamentary inquiries took submissions in 2026. The Senate inquiry into AI and data centres closed on 1 September. The Joint Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence closed on 14 September, and its terms of reference include the use of Australian creative content to train AI systems, which is our question. On 12 October the Joint Select Committee wrote to the Prime Minister recommending, among other things, that the Government examine current copyright settings, and it reports by 30 November. The Guild contributed to both inquiries through the Australian Copyright Council, of which we are an affiliate.

The Government's AI legislation is expected in early 2027 and APRA AMCOS's own policy work is expected in the coming months.

The things members will see first in the next 6 months are:

- The template wordings you can hand a producer (as a 'warranty'), which promises that no music-generating AI was used in the composition, while protecting your right to use restoration, mixing and library tools.
- We will create Generative AI and Cultural Intellectual Property clauses in the Guild's contract templates.

- A published list of what AI tools actually do, in plain language, aligned with overseas guilds so that your contract language travels.
- Contract workshops pitched at the whole membership, since the confidence gap is flat across every career stage.

Glossary

AI, generative AI, AI tools. “AI” gets used loosely. In this document, generative AI means software that produces new music, vocals, text, images or video on request: Suno, Udio, ACE Studio, ChatGPT and the like. AI tools is the wider set, which includes restoration software such as iZotope RX, mixing and mastering assistants, AI-equipped sample libraries and instruments, and assistants in your DAW. The Code’s line runs between tools that help you make something and systems that make it for you.

Training. Feeding recordings, scores and other material into a system so that it learns to produce material like it. If your music has been “used to train” a system, it was part of that feed, usually without anyone asking you.

Consent, opt-in. Nobody may use your music unless you say yes first. The alternative, opt-out, means your music can be used unless you find out and say no. The Guild’s position is opt-in, each time.

Licensing. Permission to use your music on terms, for a payment that keeps coming. Different from a sale, where you hand over the rights for a single fee.

Buyout. A contract in which you hand over all rights in your music for a single fee. Common in screen work. The concern in this policy is that a buyout signed years ago may be read as also handing over the right to use that music for AI training.

APRA AMCOS. The collecting society that licenses the performance and reproduction of music in Australia and pays royalties to its writer and publisher members. It sits on the Attorney-General’s advisory group on copyright and AI, where a paid licensing scheme for AI training is being designed. The Guild does not have a seat there, so most of our asks go through APRA AMCOS.

Works registration. The record APRA AMCOS keeps of each work you register with them. This policy asks for two flags to be added to that record: whether the work is cleared for AI training, and whether AI was used in making it.

Cue sheet. The list of music used in a programme, sent to APRA AMCOS so that royalties can be paid. Not the right home for AI information, because what is written there tends not to survive a work’s later uses.

Allocation rules, payment floor. The rules a licensing scheme uses to decide who gets paid what. A payment floor is a minimum below which a composer is still paid rather than administered out of the scheme.

Evidence of use. Proof that your particular music was used by a system. The technology to show this reliably does not yet exist, which is why the policy asks for it where it can be shown and honesty where it cannot.

Copyright exception. A change to copyright law that would let companies use your music for AI training without asking or paying. The UK and US have versions. Australia does not, and the Government has ruled one out.

Disclosure schedule, warranty, rider. A disclosure schedule is a page attached to a contract that says what AI is being used for. A warranty is a promise in a contract. A rider is a paragraph added to make a promise precise; the Guild's model warranty rider lets you promise no music-generating AI was used while protecting your use of assistive tools.

"Human Made" mark. A mark that identifies a score as written by a person, backed by a public list where the claim can be checked.

Members' AI register. A list, held by the Guild, of members who have asked it to represent their interests on AI and to count their works. It records what you want and what you object to, with the date, and which works you are talking about. It does not transfer any rights, and the Guild does not license anything on your behalf. It is open to every member, including composers who are published or who have signed buyouts, because your interests and your moral rights stay with you whoever holds the copyright.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property (ATSI CIP). A term used in Australia to describe the cultural rights, interests, responsibilities and relationships that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have in relation to their cultural heritage, Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Cultural Expressions. It may include tangible and intangible material such as language, stories, music, songs, performances, ceremonies, knowledge, designs, symbols, cultural objects, significant places, ancestral remains, genetic material, cultural and environmental resources, and records or representations of cultural heritage. ATSI CIP is living and may include inherited material, contemporary cultural expressions and future developments connected with that heritage. The relevant rights, responsibilities and authority may be individual, familial, group-based or collective and are determined according to the applicable Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander laws, customs, relationships and Cultural Protocols.

ICIP. Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) refers to Indigenous peoples' rights to their cultural heritage based on the fundamental right to self-determination. (Source: Terri Janke and Company)

Cultural Knowledge. Knowledge held, developed, maintained or transmitted within a cultural context. For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, Cultural Knowledge may include knowledge relating to Country, language, kinship, stories, music, ceremony, history, environment, cultural practices and other areas of cultural life.

Cultural Authority. The culturally recognised authority and responsibility to participate in or make a particular decision about access to, disclosure or use of specific Country, Cultural Content, Traditional Knowledge, Cultural Expressions or cultural practices. Cultural Authority is determined according to the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander laws, customs, relationships, protocols and decision-making processes and may be shared or differ according to the material, activity or proposed use. Cultural Authority does not, by itself, confer copyright ownership or authority to license copyright.

Copyright and ICIP. Copyright and ICIP are distinct and may apply to the same work, performance or sound recording. Copyright may be owned, jointly owned, controlled or administered by one or more

individuals or legal entities. Cultural rights, interests, authority and responsibilities relating to ICIP may be recognised or exercised by particular individuals, families, groups or communities under the relevant Indigenous laws, customs and protocols. Copyright ownership or control does not necessarily confer Cultural Authority, and Cultural Authority does not necessarily confer copyright ownership or control.

Free, prior and informed consent. A community's yes, given freely, before the work starts, by people who know what they are agreeing to. It can be withdrawn.

Displacement. Work going to AI-generated or library music instead of to a composer.

GEMA, PLAI. GEMA is the German collecting society. PLAI is the licensed training dataset it launched in July 2026, in which composers opt in and are paid.

Joint Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence. A parliamentary inquiry that took submissions until 14 September 2026, wrote to the Prime Minister on 12 October 2026 recommending that the Government examine current copyright settings, and reports by 30 November 2026. Its terms of reference include the use of Australian creative content to train AI systems.

Annex: the Guild's asks, for policy readers

This annex restates the asks in the wording used in submissions and correspondence. It is written to be lifted.

On consent and licensing. The AGSC supports the Government's position that there will be no text and data mining or other copyright exception for AI training, and supports APRA AMCOS's call for a functioning, paid collective licensing scheme built on consent and payment. The AGSC asks that any such scheme: operate on per-use, advance, opt-in consent; treat works already used in training, ongoing training, and output-level use as three separately licensed matters; publish allocation rules before collection commences; distribute on evidence of actual use where attribution permits, with the limits of attribution stated openly; carry two distinct flags at works-registration level (cleared for AI training; AI used in creation); and include a payment floor. The AGSC further asks that AI training rights be expressly excluded from buyout and assignment provisions in screen composition agreements.

On transparency. The AGSC asks for training-data disclosure obligations on model developers; a standard AI disclosure schedule and producer declaration for screen composition contracts; and point-of-broadcast labelling of AI-generated music, pursued with the other screen guilds. Metadata standards for AI labelling should be developed with rightsholder input.

On Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges. The AGSC asks that consent for the use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges come from those who hold the relevant cultural authority, before work starts, with a clear understanding of what is proposed, and that it be withdrawable by them; that consent for one use never be construed as consent for every use, and in particular never as consent for use with AI; that any AI involvement be disclosed before consent is sought; that developers of AI systems build safeguards that stop users from asking a system to imitate or generate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural expression without cultural authority; that producers and commissioners address Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges at the brief stage and allow time and budget for it; that the music and screen industries support better ways for cultural information to travel with works

and recordings, while recognising that such information is not permission to use something; and that protections for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges be included in industry contract templates.

On human authorship. The AGSC will establish a human-composed mark with a public register, and asks broadcasters, funders and Screen Australia to recognise it and to work toward a single sector standard with the Australian Screen Sound Guild's proposed watermark or registry. AI systems should not be credited as composers.

On member practice. The AGSC will publish an AI taxonomy, a model warranty rider, and AI and Cultural Intellectual Property clauses for its contract templates, and asks Screen Producers Australia to consider equivalent provisions.

On composer work. The AGSC asks for sector-specific evidence gathering on displacement and rate erosion, and asks Screen Australia to consider a human-composed condition on publicly funded low-budget content. Whether the AGSC seeks a funded entry-level pathway, alone or jointly, is a decision pending with the committee.

On international alignment. The AGSC will align its AI taxonomy and contract definitions with those of the Screen Composers Guild (UK), the Screen Composers Guild of America, BUMA SC, the PRS screen committee and GEMA, and will act jointly where a shared position carries more weight.

On works already used. The AGSC's position is that training already carried out on members' works without consent requires acknowledgement and, where possible, remedy, and that this sits alongside rather than in place of forward-looking licensing.