From: [redacted]
To: Clara Hawker; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: [for review and comment] BI-753 Sacrifice - draft investigation report and draft Authority Paper [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Friday, 30 January 2026 4:39:44 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.jpg
CL meeting - Sacrifice.docx

OFFICIAL

Sounds good, Clara.

We can bring more of that language to the report.

I have notes from the CL meeting attached.

Thanks
[redacted]

[redacted]

Australian Communications and Media Authority
[redacted]

OFFICIAL

From: Clara Hawker [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 30 January 2026 4:22 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: [for review and comment] BI-753 Sacrifice - draft investigation report and draft Authority Paper [SEC=OFFICIAL]

OFFICIAL

H all

Thanks for this – I've had a look at both the Auth paper and the report and put some comments and tracks in.

Broadly, I'm not quite sure that it captures the vibe from Carolyn that this reporting skirted a fine line. You know my thoughts on it so apologies for sounding like a broken record, but I think she was in agreement (cat swishing tail). I can't find my notes from that meeting but would be glad if any of you have any that I could refresh my memory with. There were a couple of aspects in particular I think she was highlighting – maybe the bugle and Hitches?

In any case, I know it will be a no breach but I felt like she wanted a bit stronger language in there to signal to the ABC that we thought it was a finely balanced argument. I think in the Auth paper there is the opportunity to do this in a sentence under each issue – we are using very formulaic language in there about what *Staff considered* – while this is the case and should still be included, I think we can also make the point that there was a bit of back and forth on this and that it wasn't entirely straightforward. Same in the report – I've noted where I think we could draw things out a bit more, but grateful if you could check her comments about specific issues and I may have missed the mark.

Overall when I read it I don't really get a sense of any criticism from us and I think we can be a bit critical. I think it's almost ready, but maybe needs a bit more – I think you did something along the same lines for [redacted]?

Sorry to send you this so late in the day – let's chat on Monday about it if I've missed the mark or not making sense.

Thank you and hope you all have a great weekend!

OFFICIAL

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 30 January 2026 10:55 AM
To: Clara Hawker <Clara.Hawker@acma.gov.au>
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: [for review and comment] BI-753 Sacrifice - draft investigation report and draft Authority Paper [SEC=OFFICIAL]

OFFICIAL

Good morning Clara,

As discussed, please see attached the draft investigation report for Sacrifice and the draft Authority paper.

For ease of reference, I have attached/linked the following documents:

[redacted]
(ii) Memo sent to Carolyn Lidgerwood on 22 January 2025 (with attachments)
(iii) Link to the broadcast dated 10 March 2025
(iv) Timeline for NCA consultation processes (relevant to page 14 of the draft investigation report)
[redacted]
(vi) Draft Authority paper – also linked in here
(vii) Attachments for draft Authority paper at (vi)

If you would like to discuss the above further, please contact me.

Regards,

[redacted]

[redacted]
Investigations and Compliance Officer
Content Investigations Section

Australian Communications and Media Authority
[redacted]





The ACMA acknowledges First Nations peoples as the Traditional Owners and Custodians of Australia. We respect and celebrate First Nations peoples as the original storytellers and content creators of the lands on which we work and honour the enduring strength and commitment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to the land, waters and their communities. We pay our respects to Elders past, present, and emerging.



OFFICIAL