AUSTRALIAN
GUILD OF SCREEN
COMPOSERS

AGSC AI POLICY

Formal Asks for Submissions and Correspondence

The Guild's asks in the wording used in submissions and correspondence. Written to be lifted.

Companion to the AGSC AI Policy and Code of Ethics

v1.0 Published 20 October 2026

Purpose

This document restates the asks of the AGSC AI Policy and Code of Ethics (v1.0) in the wording used in submissions and correspondence. It is written to be lifted: a policy officer, legislator or counterpart organisation can take a paragraph from here without reading the full policy. The reasoning behind each ask, the member survey evidence and the plain-language explanation for composers are in the policy itself and are not repeated here.

Where a paragraph below is marked as subject to review or pending, the wording is not yet a settled Guild position and should not be quoted as one.

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, ongoing 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/human-made 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 screen composer guilds, collecting societies and other organisations, in any territory, that share its values and positions, and will act jointly with them 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.

Asks by addressee

The same asks, sorted by who is being asked, for use when writing to one body.

ADDRESSEE	ASKS
Australian Government	No text and data mining or other copyright exception for AI training. Uphold current Australian copyright laws and obligations. Training-data disclosure obligations on model developers. Acknowledgement and, where possible, remedy of training already carried out without consent.
APRA AMCOS	A paid collective licensing scheme on per-use, advance, opt-in consent; three separately licensed matters (works already used, ongoing training, output-level use); allocation rules published before collection; distribution on evidence of use with the limits of attribution stated openly; two flags at works-registration level; a payment floor. Support better ways for cultural information to travel with works and recordings.
Model developers	Disclose training data. Build safeguards that stop users from asking AI systems to imitate or generate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural expression without cultural authority.
Producers and Screen Producers Australia	Exclude AI training rights from buyout and assignment provisions. Adopt a standard AI disclosure schedule and producer declaration. Consider AI and Cultural Intellectual Property clauses equivalent to the Guild's templates. Address Cultural Intellectual Property and Cultural Knowledges at the brief stage, with time and budget for it.
Broadcasters, platforms and funders	Label AI-generated music at point of broadcast, with metadata standards developed with rightsholder input. Recognise the human-composed mark. Do not credit AI systems as composers.
Screen Australia and Music Australia	Work toward a single sector standard for human-composed marking with the guilds. Consider a human-composed condition on publicly funded low-budget content.
Other guilds and collecting societies	Pursue point-of-broadcast labelling and the exclusion of training rights from buyouts jointly. Align AI taxonomy and contract definitions across territories.