STREAMING REGULATION FOR NEW ZEALAND

THE PROBLEM

Major international streaming platforms Netflix, Amazon Prime, Apple+ and Disney+ (streamers) earn significant revenue from New Zealand audiences' monthly subscription fees. They pay no company tax here, use our publicly funded broadband infrastructure, and are not required to commission any local content which reflects our culture, place and people. Meanwhile, the local production sector has lost over **$50m a year** in production investment because of the devastating impact of this on our local broadcasters' advertising revenue. In some countries, international streaming companies have voluntarily invested in local content (including Australia) but that hasn't happened here in New Zealand.

THE SOLUTIONS

REVENUE LEVY

HOW IT WORKS

A percentage of a streamer's New Zealand revenue is paid as a fee to operate in Aotearoa. That money is reinvested into local production via the existing screen funding agencies NZOA, NZFC, and TMP.

EXAMPLE

A 10% levy on NZ streamer revenue could generate approximately $50m per year for the local screen industry.

PROS

- Simple to administer.
- Doesn't require platforms to commission directly.
- Funds flow through established agencies.
- New IP owned by producers.

CONS

- Requires robust revenue reporting to enforce.

FAQ

Concern streamers may pass cost on to consumers via price increases, however this has rarely happened in countries that have enacted this model.

USED IN

Denmark, Poland, Germany, Greece, Portugal, Canada

The Revenue Levy option has been ruled out by National and Labour, but there are other political parties in New Zealand.

DIRECT INVESTMENT (QUOTA)

HOW IT WORKS

Streamers are required to spend a set percentage of their revenue directly on commissioning local content, or to ensure a minimum share of their catalogue is local.

EXAMPLE

Australia requires platforms with more than one million subscribers to commission Australian content, with annual reporting to the ACMA regulator.

PROS

- Directly produces local content where the eye balls are going.
- Streamers become commissioners - creating new relationships for producers and talent.

CONS

- More complex to define and enforce.
- Spend may go to acquisitions rather than new commissions.
- New IP owned by streamers.

FAQ

Need to work around GAT trade agreements. Could the requirement have to also apply to local streamers?

USED IN

Australia, France, Italy, many EU member states

STREAMING REGULATION FOR NEW ZEALAND

A HYBRID APPROACH IS ALSO POSSIBLE

Some countries use both tools together - a baseline levy that funds the broader sector, combined with direct spend requirements for larger platforms. Australia's framework, in place from January 2026, offers platforms a choice between an expenditure or revenue mechanism, with strong anti-avoidance and reporting rules.

COUNTRIES ALREADY ACTING

Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Denmark, Netherlands, Switzerland, Portugal, Romania, Poland, Croatia, Belgium, Greece, Czech Republic, Norway, Sweden, Estonia, Slovenia, Ireland, and many more.

We are not asking for a hand-out - we are asking for a level playing field. With our local industry contracting due to the impact of the streamers, the cultural and economic stakes are real.

WHAT'S AT STAKE?

- **A sustainable domestic production industry, with jobs for writers, directors, producers, crew, editors and performers.**
- **New Zealand's stories - told by New Zealanders.**
- **Feature films and television series. Documentaries. Māori and Pasifika storytelling.**

Australia has acted.
New Zealand must act now.

Tell the Government: *It's time to regulate the streamers.*

- Contact your MP
- Share on social media and via email
- Discuss with your screen industry networks

New Zealand stories deserve to be told by New Zealanders.

#NZScreenIndustry #StreamerLevy #LoveLocal