

T. 70

SURVEY ON PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS – 1992

Ten years after the first survey on programming in archives cinemas, which had been done by the Cinémathèque de Toulouse in 1982, the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections prepared a new questionnaire in order to have a better understanding of today's practices, policies and philosophies of the FIAF affiliates in this area. This questionnaire was sent to the 92 FIAF affiliates, then members and observers, who have become, based on the current categories, members, provisional members, associates or subscribers (Perth, Harare).

In comparison with the 1982 questionnaire, questions concerning relationship with researchers, loans between FIAF archives and the diffusion (14 questions) have been incorporated, the number of questions on programming in archive cinemas have been cut down to 20 (45 in 1982), and the main subdivisions have been kept:

I. Screening organisation – II. Financing of the screenings – III Making up the programs – IV. Origin of the copies – V. Audience information – VI The public. Those subdivisions mainly concern the cinémathèques which organize regular public screenings, whilst sections VII, VIII and IX concerning access questions were meant for all the affiliates, even those who have no programming activities.

During 1992 and up to August 93, the Commission received 76 answers to the questionnaire, participation rate of about 83%. At the Mo i Rana Congress, partial results, based on 68 answers, were presented and distributed by the Commission. The attached document sent in today (revised version–August 1993) includes 8 more answers, as well as the corrections given in Mo i Rana by some cinémathèques. This document includes 8 statistical tables which summarize the answers to the survey, which were sometimes completed by answers found in the annual activities report or in brochures or programs published by some affiliates. The 8th table comprises the group of 17 affiliates (among which, only 3 members) who unfortunately have not answered the questionnaire, with a short summary of their programming activity, based on other information sources already mentioned. The first table concerns the organization of public and more or less regular screenings, controlled by the archive (number of annual screenings, number of film theatres in the same town), the public (average attendance per screening) – we are unfortunately missing data on attendance capacity per theatre – , financing (expenses higher, lower or equal to receipts) and subscription systems. The second table relates to the 21 affiliates (about 27% of the participants in the survey) who don't organize public and/or regular screenings, with an outline description of their participation in outside events.

The third table gives proportion of screenings centred on silent film and indications on the existence of musical accompaniment. The fourth table is a result of the answers concerning the origin of the copies shown (percentage of copies coming from the archive itself, from other archives, from cultural organizations, from distributors and/or producers). The fifth table concerns access to researchers and give indications on technical viewing conditions in each archive (screening room, table, video, access to nitrate material).

Fédération
Internationale des
Archives du Film
rue Franz Merjay 190
1180 Bruxelles
Belgique
Phone (32-2) 343 06 91
Fax (32-2) 343 76 22

fiaf

The sixth table shows the results of the answers concerning the financial conditions of access (viewings and preparatory work, free of charge or against payment) as well as the total number of films shown and researchers admitted each year.

The seventh table concerns the relationship with the copyright holders (is there a general agreement, are there customary practices when you ask the authorization for screenings as well as for loans from other FIAF archives).

However, reviewing the answers concerning certain important questions in the survey has unfortunately not permitted to systematically regroup, in the form of statistical tables, the data relating to technical screening conditions (due to the lack of information on the equipment of the viewing rooms in the case of a great number of archives), to the making up of the programs (themes, hitherto unreleased films linked to current events, philosophy of programming) to the information to the audience, all questions which, in general, have not been given concise enough answers. On the other hand, the way questions were asked concerning distribution and loan policy to other archives has led to divergent interpretations of the concept of "distribution" and of "projection copy".

I. SCREENING ORGANISATION

1.2.3. 56 archives (57 when you count the 2 locations of the AFI) organise regular screenings open to the public, which means about 74% of the participants to the survey.

The regularity of those screenings varies, depending on the affiliates, from about one screening per week (Wellington, Wien-FA, Montevideo SODRE, Bangkok) to more than ten a day (when you have several film theatres in one city) in Mexico (CN and UNAM), Montevideo CU.

4000 screenings and more:	3
2000 screenings to 3000 :	3
1500 screenings to 1825 :	3
1000 screenings to 1300 :	13
500 screenings to 850 :	14
200 screenings to 450 :	11
less than 200 :	9

Were not considered: Berlin, London NFTVA and Rome which, although they organize a number of regular public screenings, do not yet have their own theatre.

4. Furthermore, nearly all the consulted archives participate in outside events.

5. Technical screening conditions: about 45% of the archive cinemas are equipped with all necessary formats and masks, as well as speed variations. A number of theatres are not yet equipped with speed variation for silent films, such as, for example, UCLA and AFI in the United States and Gosfilmofond in Moscow. About 50% of the answers mention a sound stereo system (Dolby or other).

II. FINANCING OF THE SCREENINGS

1. Although it is sometimes difficult to determine all the costs involved in their organization, the receipts are higher in 13 cases, lower in 32 cases (including are the 3 archives which offer free screenings and MOMA where the admission fee to the screenings is combined with the one to the Museum). Finally, 10 archives have a balanced budget.

2. A subscription system is proposed by 32 archives.

III. MAKING UP THE PROGRAMS

1. More than 80% of the archives focus their program (in general but not necessarily exclusively) on special themes. There are some exceptions though, such as Gemonia, Kobenhavn, Rochester, Wellington...

2. About 80% also show previews or hitherto unreleased films, although their number is often limited. Some exceptions: London IWM, Tokyo, Seoul and Wellington; very few in Amsterdam, Rio, Oslo, Kobenhavn and Washington LOC/NA.

3. More than 80% of the film archives take into account current events to prepare their programs. Some exceptions: London IWM, Rochester, UCLA (except when related to "minorities"), Montevideo SODRE, Tehran, Washington NA.

4. Nearly all the affiliates work with other cultural organizations, except Athens, London IWM, Tehran and Moscow.

5. The percentage of the screenings devoted to silent film (see enclosure 3) varies from 0% (Seoul) to 40% in Brussels, which even has a special room for silent films. The high percentages of Wellington (80%) and Wien FA (60%) are not very significant as they relate to a total of only 20 and 35 screenings a year.

From	0 to	2%	5
	5 to	8%	12
	10 to	15%	19
	17 to	20%	8
	23 to	25%	4
	30 to	35%	3
	40%	:	1
	60 to	80%	2

6. For 16 affiliates, silent films have – nearly always – musical accompaniment, – often – for 23 others, and – never or nearly never – for the remaining 16.

Those results have increased a lot since the 1982 survey.

7. The question concerning the general philosophy of programming will be the subject of a further in depth study by the Commission, which will try to analyse the regular programs of the archives in the last few years. During the symposium in Lisbon, Jean Paul Gorce had already made a good approach to the question, analysing the programs of about twenty films archives during the year 1988.

Showing national production constitutes the basis of programming in Bangkok, Seoul, Tokyo and São Paulo ("peculiar films"); classics are the basis in Moscow, Oslo, Stockholm; and bringing back the feeling of theatrical performances and reviewing forgotten films, is the philosophy in Amsterdam. Several film archives are looking for a balance between production periods, genres and countries covered by the history of cinema: Berkeley, Brussels, Bologna, Habana, Jerusalem, Lausanne, Madrid, Montreal, Toulouse, Helsinki, Rio... For Kobenhavn, to program is to show "interesting" films, for Buenos Aires and Quito, the philosophy of programming is linked to the availability of the copies...

8. Nearly all affiliates try to make up for the deficiencies in local distribution, even if they don't always have the means to do it. Some exceptions: London IWM, Luxembourg, Paris, Praha, Seoul.

IV. ORIGIN OF THE COPIES

1. As shown in enclosed document n°4, there again the divergence in percentages is extreme: about 45% of the archives rely on their own collections – i.e. from 50 to 99% – on their own holdings, to do their programming, 40% are using a percentage of it – varying from 20 to 40% –, 3 archives are reaching the 10% and 4 affiliates are barely touching their own holding (1 – 5%). Those statistics can be appreciated only if you take into account the total number of screenings (Doc. 1), the specificity and size of each collection and the philosophy of the established programming: Wellington which uses 95% of its collection for an annual total of 30 screenings, nevertheless shows fewer own copies than Berkeley whose percentage is 5%, for the 750 annual screenings... Those two extremes can be found in the same town, Washington, where AFI (1%) and LOC (99%) seem to complement each other also in programming (most of the AFI holdings are deposited with the LOC).

% from own collection

50 to 99%	25 affiliates
35 to 40%	8
20 to 40%	14
1 to 10%	8

% from other FIAF archives

40 to 60%	5 affiliates
25 to 35%	6
10 to 20%	21
0 to 5%	22

% from cultural organisations

35 to 60%	4 affiliates
15 to 20%	16
10%	16
2 to 7%	11
0 to 1%	6

% from producers – distributors

60 to 88%	5 affiliates
40 to 55%	6
20 to 35%	12
10 to 15%	10 ¹
0 to 5%	14

When compared to the results of the 1982 survey, one can see the affiliates have a greater tendency to use copies from distributors.

Are we dealing with rental fees, free loans by the copyright holders in return of possible services the archive? Should FIAPF promote a common policy, even make recommendations with regard to this relationship?

2.3. Enclosure n°7 gathers the answers in connection with the permission requests for public screenings and the existence of a general agreement with producers and distributors of each country. Here also you can find a strong tendency towards reduction of the freedom of screenings on the archive's premises: asking permission to the copyright holders has become a general practice: 22 archives say yes – for every single film –, 27 – for some films –, and only Belgrade, Brussels, Luxembourg, Moscow, Prague, Warsaw seem to ignore this practice by virtue of a general or implicit agreement with distributors in their country.

V. AUDIENCE INFORMATION

Nearly all the film archives have their program regularly advertised (50 out of 56):

- weekly calendar: 2 (Barcelona, São Paulo)
- monthly calendar: 27 (Amsterdam, Beograd, Bologna, Bogota, Brussels, Budapest, Buenos Aires, Jerusalem, Lausanne, Lisboa, Luxembourg, Madrid, Mexico UNAM and CN, Montevideo CU, München, NY Anthology and MOMA, Praha, Rio de Janeiro, Stockholm, Toulouse, Warsaw, Washington AFI and NA, Wien FM, Wiesbaden).
- bi monthly calendar: 9 (Berkeley, L.A. UCLA, Montreal, Oslo, Paris CF, Rochester, Sofia, Torino, Valencia).
- Quarterly calendar: 7 (Gemona, Helsinki, Kobenhavn, London IWM, Seoul, Washington LOC, Wien FA).

More than 90% of the affiliates advertise their programs in the press.

A few archives distribute a presentation leaflet or programme notes on each film: Athens, Helsinki, Lisboa (original texts), Madrid and Montreal on certain themes, Stockholm, Toulouse, NY MOMA.

About 50% of the affiliates send their programs out, on a regular basis, to the Programming Commission.

VI. THE PUBLIC

As it was impossible to gather quantitative data on attendance rate per screening and their general tendencies, the enclosure shows average attendance numbers per screening for each affiliate.

Average attendance of	30 to 50 spectators:	13 archives
average attendance of	55 to 75 spectators:	17 archives
average attendance of	84 to 130 spectators:	17 archives
average attendance of	160 to 200 spectators:	5 archives
average attendance of	250 spectators:	1 archive

VII. ACCESS TO RESEARCHERS

1. All the archives which have answered the questionnaire, i.e. 76, give access on their premises to individual researchers. Access to the AFI collections is given on the premises of the LOC or in the other archives which preserve them.

2. No selection is made by the archives in Bangkok, Budapest, Brussels, Den Haag, Harare, Lausanne, Luxembourg, Moscow, Ottawa, Reykjavik, Rome, Stockholm, Valencia, Warsaw, Washington NA, Wellington, Wien FM.

Most of the affiliates make sure they deal with serious research, ask the students for references etc... In the case of Amsterdam and Rio de Janeiro, priority is given to the study of their collection or to projects supporting their own archive's interests.

3. Access to national production is favoured in Bangkok, Bois d'Arcy, Brussels, Buenos Aires, Glasgow (local), Lima, Lisboa, Madrid, Montevideo CU, Montreal, Oslo, Praha, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Sofia, Torino, Toulouse, Warsaw, Wien FA.

Specific collections from the archive are also privileged in Bois d'Arcy (silent), Brussels (films which are not available in other archives), Montreal (animation), Praha, Torino, Warsaw.

Some restrictions on access to nazi propaganda films are applied in Wiesbaden.

4. Most of the archives only give access to projection copies.

Exceptionally and for cataloguing or other reasons, preservation copies are made available in Amsterdam, Athens, Beijing, Bois d'Arcy, Bogota, Buenos Aires, Brussels, Lima, London NFTVA, Luxembourg, Madrid, Mexico CN, Montevideo CU, Oslo (for foreign films), Sofia, Tehran, Torino, Toulouse, Washington LOC.

5. Enclosure n°5 attached hereto shows the technical viewing conditions which prevail in the 76 affiliated archives which have answered the survey.

51 archives have a special projection room for the researchers, 66 have viewing table(s), 60 have monitors or a projector for video, and 27 show nitrate copies to researchers (in a projection room or on a table, generally under supervision of an archive technician).

6. The table shown in enclosure n°6 gives the answers of the 76 archives concerning their financial conditions for access to researchers.

Out of 74 valid answers, 28 archives give free access to all researchers for viewings on their premises, 27 archives give free access only to students (Bangkok, Berlin, Den Haag, Istanbul, Koblenz, London IWM, Montreal (with references), Rochester (local students), Torino, Warsaw, Wellington, Wien FA and FM) or to national researchers (Habana, film makers of ICAIC, and Lima) or foreigners (Kobenhavn), or when it concerns video viewings (L.A. UCLA, Seoul) and other specific cases which are not further described.

The remaining 19 archives seem to have fees based on the nature and the scope of the research, with important fee reductions for students (for example a 50% discount) in relation to commercial use.

7. The second column of the table (also enclosure n°6) has to do with financial conditions relating to preliminary work done by archives for the researchers. Out of 73 valid answers 59 affiliated members perform that work for free, 14 archives ask for money depending on the quantity of work implied for their staff or the type of users (commercial, private, students, etc...).

8. The third column of this same table (Encl. 6), shows quantitative data concerning the number of films viewed by researchers each year, and the number of researchers who have visited the archive during the same year to view films on the premises. Some archives have given figures relating to the number of hours or the number of reels (Bois d'Arcy, Ottawa, Koblenz and London IWM), others have counted all the members of groups (schools for Kobenhavn) which together attended a single screening. This put apart, differences are enormous: from 15 to 6.000 films viewed, depending on the affiliates, for 4 to 6.000 researchers.

VIII. ACCESS TO FIAF ARCHIVES

1.2. Loans between archives is common practice, based on FIAF rules since its creation. The frequency of loans is determined by the nature and importance of the members' collections, as well as by geographical factors, which may be more or less favourable to exchanges.

Some archives borrow few films (sometimes none at all) from their colleagues for programming as shown in the table (encl. 4, second column) whilst other affiliates answer they never received any request for loans. Temporary loans between FIAF archives are done for free, the freight charges being for the borrower. In 1992 only Rochester seemed to charge handling costs for outgoing copies. United States archives have recently agreed to generalize this practice, with handling service fees varying between US\$80 and US\$250...

More and more archives seem concerned about the respect for deadlines given for returning the copies and require that technical conditions for projecting and handling films meet precise criteria. Some affiliates found their loan policy on reciprocity (Latin America).

3. The main condition required by most archives apparently, is the permission of the copyright holders. The third column of the table in enclosure n°7 gives the results of the answers given to the question concerning the need or not to get this permission for the FIAF loans:

out of 75 valid answers, 36 archives always require copyright holders' permission, 18 say "sometimes" or "only if necessary", 3 leave it to the decision of the borrower, and 10 don't follow this practice or already have the depositors' agreement by contract.

4.5. Most of the affiliates don't limit loans to national production although there also, the nature of the collections is determining, and some archives say they only make loans for national films or almost: Athens, Bangkok, Berlin,

Dublin, Habana, Istanbul, Mexico CN and UNAM, NY MOMA, Rio de Janeiro, Sofia, Tehran and Washington NA.

Yet, criteria concerning the loans of unique copies in an archive or in a country might vary depending on the nationality of the films: some archives say they lend their "unique" copies only very exceptionally and after making sure the film is protected elsewhere: Amsterdam, Bologna, Buenos Aires, Gemona, Lisboa, Luxembourg, Madison, Madrid, Montreal, Moskva, Munich, Paris CF, Tehran, Torino, Toulouse, Wien FM. Some archives add they make a unique copy available for joint preservation work: Beograd, Berlin, Glasgow, Washington LOC.

IX. DIFFUSION

The question concerning distribution practices by the affiliates, whether commercial or not, has often been interpreted broadly: some archives reckon they do non-commercial distribution by circulating a number of copies which are lent, for free or against payment, to film-clubs, universities, etc..., others, like Amsterdam, Berlin, Brussels, NY MOMA, Wiesbaden have a catalogue of films for which they have acquired the non-commercial rights (usually in 16mm) for their country.

The other affiliates who reckon they do non-commercial distribution are: Beijing, Beograd, Bologna (500 films lent per year), Budapest, Gemona, Glasgow (16 films), Habana, Jerusalem, Kobenhavn, Koblenz, Lausanne (exceptionally), Los Angeles UCLA (some programs), Madrid (indirectly through the Federation of Film-Clubs), Mexico UNAM, Montevideo SODRE (800 16mm films lent for free), Montreal (some copies for teaching of film making), Moskva, Munich (one film), Quito, Reykjavik, Rochester, São Paulo (sometimes), Washington AFI, Wellington.

On the other hand, some affiliates, well-known for their long tradition on this matter, have reserved their answer to this question.

April 1994.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

Secretariat
rue Franz Merjay, 190
1180 Bruxelles
Belgique
Tel: (32-2) 343 06 91
Fax: (32-2) 343 76 22

PROGRAMMING COMMISSION

Questionnaire on Programming and Access
(January 1992)

Please return to:
Filmoteca Española – Madrid (attn Catherine Gautier)
before March 15, 1992

I. SCREENING ORGANISATION

1. Do you organise regular screenings, open to the public?
2. If not, what is the context of your screening sessions?
3. On average, how many public sessions do you organise in a year?
4. Do you participate in events outside the Archive?
5. What are your technical conditions of projection? (gauge, masking, variable speed, sound systems etc)?

II. FINANCING OF THE SCREENINGS

1. Taking into account all the costs involved in the screenings, are they still a source of revenue or, on the contrary, do you lose money by them?
2. Do you have a subscription system for the audience?

III. MAKING UP THE PROGRAMMES

1. Are your programmes focused entirely on themes? (Homage rendered to directors, historical themes, sociological topics etc?)
2. Do you preview recent films or completely unreleased films?

3. Do you organise your programming in relation to current events? (political events, festival awards, death of motion picture personalities, etc?)
4. Do you sometimes work with other cultural organisations for your regular screenings?
5. In relation to the total number of screenings, what approximate percentage are silent films?
6. Do silent films have musical accompaniment?
7. What is the general philosophy of your programming? (Proportion by country and period of production, importance of national production, systematic showing of classics, etc.)
8. Does your programming try to make up for the deficiencies in local distribution and exhibition?

IV. ORIGIN OF THE COPIES

1. In your annual programming, what is the approximate percentage of copies:
 - coming from your own collections?
 - coming from other archives?
 - coming from other cultural organisations?
(embassies, institutions, cultural centres, etc)
 - coming from distributors or producers?
2. Do you have a general agreement with the producers or distributors of your country to show the films without asking for permission?
3. If not, do you ask for screening authorisation to the copyright owners?
 - for every single film?
 - for some films?

V. AUDIENCE INFORMATION

1. What means of advertising do you use?
Press releases, posters, programme bulletins (how frequent?), introductory leaflets on each film, information booklets on certain themes or tribute etc.)

VI. THE PUBLIC

1. What is the average attendance per screening for the last five years? Please point out disparities in the figures and the general tendency.

VII. ACCESS TO RESEARCHERS

1. Do you give access to individual researchers on your premises?
2. If yes, are you selective? On what criteria?
3. Do you restrict access to national production and/or to other specific collections from your archive?
4. Do researchers have access to preservation copies or only to projection copies?
5. What are the technical conditions for viewing?
(room, table, video, acetate, nitrate, etc.)
6. What are the financial conditions?
(for free, special price for researchers, difference between national and foreigners)
7. Is preliminary work (research on selected titles) free of charge or charged for?
8. How many researchers visit you each year? How many films are shown per year?

VIII. ACCESS TO FIAF ARCHIVES

1. Do you lend copies to other FIAF archives?
On what conditions?
2. Do you have reservations in regard to some? For what kind of reasons?
3. Do you require copyright owners' permission?
4. Do you lend films of the national collection or do you also lend other titles?
5. Do you only lend your projection copies or do you also lend unique copies in the context of your archive or your country?

IX. DIFFUSION

1. Do you make distribution? Commercial? Non commercial?

Name of Archive:

Name of responsible for programming:

Name of responsible for access questions:

Name of person(s) who answered the questionnaire:

FIAF COMMISSION FOR PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS TO THE COLLECTIONS

Survey on Programming and Access in FIAF Archives. 1992-1993
(Based on the 1992 Questionnaire sent to 92 FIAF members and FIAF Annual Reports)

Index

- 1.- Regular Public Screenings per year and Average Attendance per screening. Number of theatres (same building) or locations (in the same city or country). Financing of the screenings. (56 archives)
- 2.- FIAF Archives which have no On site Regular Public Screenings. (21 archives)
- 3.- % Silent films per year and Music accompaniment. (55 archives)
- 4.- % Origins of the copies (Regular Public Screenings): Own collection, Other archives, Cultural organisms, Distribution/Production. (55 archives)
- 5.- Technical facilities for Viewing: Room, Table, Video and Nitrate. (76 archives) (2 pages)
- 6.- Financial conditions for access to researchers: Fee (for viewings), Research work (fee for preliminary work) and number of Films and Researchers per year. (76 archives) (2 pages)
- 7.- Relations with copyright owners: General agreement, Screening permission and FIAF loans permission. (76 archives) (2 pages)
- 8.- Archives which have not yet replied. Some information and figures about their programming and access activities. (17 archives)
- 9.- Persons responsible for Programming and Access in FIAF archives.

(Revised version 1994)

SURVEY ON PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS IN FIAF ARCHIVES

DOC. 1

Regular Public Screenings/year

Average Attendance

Amsterdam	1.100 (2 theatres)	35 (-) S
Athinaï	230	35 (-) S
Bangkok	57	84 *
Barcelona	1.000	75 (-) S
Beograd	1.000	65 ** S in project
Berkeley	750	90 ***
Bologna	1.150	70 ** S
Bogota FP	1.000	100 ** S members
Bruxelles	1.825 (2 theatres)	89 (-)
Budapest	1.300	60 * S members
Buenos Aires	2.000 (2 locations)	72 ***
Gemonà	100	70 (-)
Habana	372 (2 locations)	200 *
Helsinki	850	65 (-) S
Istanbul	150	50 * S members
Jer IFA	1.500	87 *** S
Kobenhavn	500	35 (-) S
La Paz	720	87 *** S
Lausanne	1.100 (2 theatres)	40 (-) S
Lima	720	130 **
Lisboa	600	90 (-) S members
London IWM	550	35 free admission
L.A. AFI	400 (2 locations)	--- (-)
L.A. UCLA	400	125 (-)
Luxembourg	500	35 (-) S
Madrid	1.200 (2 theatres)	90 (-) S
México UNAM	4.000 (9 locations)	160 occasionally free S
México CN	4.500 (6 theatres)	250 ***
Montevideo CU	4.250 (4 locations)	60 *** S
Montevideo SO	40	90 *
Montreal	500	70 (-)
Moskva	3.000 (2 locations)	160 (-) S
München	850	65 (-) S members
NY ANTHOLOGY	650 (3 theatres)	30 ** S members
NY MOMA	1.250 (2 theatres)	200 Museum admission
Oslo	450	45 * S members
Paris CF	1.800 (2 locations)	60 (-) S
Praha	200	--- (-) S
Quito	100	170 *
Rio Janeiro	500	100 **
Rochester	300 (2 theatres)	30 (-) S
Seoul	400	75 (-) S
Sao Paulo	1.100	40 * S members
Sofia	1.100	75 (-)
Stockholm	1.000 (2 locations)	62 (-) S members
Tokyo	200	100 *
Torino	2.200 (3 theatres)	50 (-) S
Toulouse	240	100 * S
Valencia	800	50 (-) S
Warszawa	1.100	--- *** S
Wash AFI	625	95 (-)
Wash LOC	170	55 free admission
Wash NA	80	130 free admission
Wellington	30	100 (-) S in project
Wien FA	35 (2 locations)	--- (-)
Wien FM	400	65 (-)
Wiesbaden	150	65 (-) S
*** source of revenue	** small source of revenue	* balance (-) loss S suscription

FIAF Archives which have no On Site Regular Public Screenings

Beijing	Occasional screenings restricted to films professionals
Berlin	Organizes 120 screenings per year for the Berlin Festival Retro and other events.
Beverly H.	24 public screenings. Tributes, Academy Award winners and nominees
B. d'Arcy	Promotes and supports 60 screenings in other institutions.
Camberra	No programming activities. Participates in events outside the archive.
Den Haag	No programming activities.
Dublin	15 occasional public screenings programmed by parent organisation
Glasgow	Occasional screenings in Regional Theatres.
Harare	Organizes screenings in other institutions. On site programming in project.
Koblenz	No programming activities.
London NFA	Presents 200 archive prints at NFT and MOMI per year: British and classic features.
Madison	Screenings restricted to students.
Ottawa	No programming activities. Participates in events outside the archive.
Perth	No programming activities. Occasional video showings.
Reykjavik	Stopped programming in 1991.
Roma	Promotes and co-organize public screenings since 1991 with the Municipality and supports many other events.
Skopje	Promotes public screenings in other institutions. of the Republic.
Tehran	Occasional screenings restricted to film students.
Vaticano	Occasional screenings restricted to visitors.
Wash HSFA	Occasional screenings restricted to the Museum and external events.

SURVEY ON PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS IN FIAF ARCHIVES

DOC. 3

	Silent films per year	%	Musical accompaniment	
			Yes	Some No
Amsterdam	35		X	
Athinaï	10			X
Bangkok	1		X	
Barcelona	7			X
Beograd	5			X
Berkeley	25	95%		
Bologna	15			50%
Bogota FP	10			X
Bruxelles	40	X		
Budapest	10			X
Buenos Aires	10			X
Gemona	20			X
Habana	6			X
Helsinki	7			X
Istanbul	10			X
Jer IFA	2			often
Kobenhavn	20			X
La Paz	7			X
Lausanne	10			X
Lima	10			X
Lisboa	10			X
London IWM	5	X		
L.A. UCLA	10	X		
Luxembourg	15			X
Madrid	12			40%
México CN	7			X
MéxicoUNAM	15			X
MontevideoCU	7			rarely
MontevideoSO	35	X		
Montreal	10			X
Moskva	10	X		
München	10			X
NY ANTHOLOGY	30			X
NY MOMA	17			60%
Oslo	5			exceptional
Paris CF	20			X
Praha	5			X
Quito	--			
Rio Janeiro	20	X		
Rochester	10	X		
São Paulo	10			X
Seoul	0			
Sofia	8	X		
Stockholm	5			X
Tokyo	25			X
Torino	18			X
Toulouse	18			X
Valencia	25			X
Warszawa	10			X
Wash/L.A. AFI	1			X
Wash LOC	23			X
Wash NA	1	X		
Wellington	80 (20 films)	X		
Wien FA	60	X		
Wien FM	--			never
Wiesbaden	20	always		

Origin of the copies (Regular Public Screenings)

	% Own collection	Other archives	Cultural org.	Dist./Prod.
Amsterdam	40	15	5	40
Athinaï	75	5	5	15
Bangkok	20	0	10	70
Barcelona	3	50	10	47
Beograd	75	10	10	5
Berkeley	5	15	30	50
Bologna	20	20	10	50
BogotaFP	1	10	30	59
Bruxelles	75	5	5	20
Budapest	40	10	25	25
B.Aires	20	5	15	60
Gemona	30	5	5	60
Habana	67	0	20	13
Helsinki	50	25	10	15
Istanbul	Most	Some	Some	Some
Jer IFA	25	10	30	35
Kobenhavn	80	5	5	10
La Paz	10	10	25	55
Lausanne	Most	Some	Some	Some
Lima	20	5	60	20
Lisboa	25	35	10	30
LondonIWM	90	5	0	5
L.A. UCLA	25	20	35	20
Luxembourg	95	3	2	0
Madrid	20	30	20	35
México CN	35	15	20	30
MéxicoUNAM	25	10	20	45
Montev.CU	85	5	7	3
Montev.SO	10	50 (C.U)	0	40
Montreal	50	10	10	30
Moskva	95	4	1	0
München	20	30	10	40
NY ANTHOLOGY	50	5	5	40
NY MOMA	30	15	15	40
Oslo	40	40	10	10
Paris CF	60	15	10	15
Praha	95	2	2	0
Quito	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
R.Janeiro	80	10	10	2
Rochester	35	10	10	45
São Paulo	10	30	30	30
Seoul	50	5	45	0
Sofia	40	40	10	10
Stockholm	65	10	10	15
Tokyo	99	1	0	0
Torino	20	15	25	40
Toulouse	60	20	15	5
Valencia	1	34	45	20
Warszawa	90	2	3	5
Wash/L.A AFI	1	1	10	88
Wash LOC	96	2	1	1
Wash NA	35	5	10	50
Wellington	95	5	0	5
Wien FA	90	10	0	0
Wien FM	25	60	5	10
Wiesbaden	40	20	20	20

SURVEY ON PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS IN FIAF ARCHIVES

DOC. 5

Technical Facilities For Viewing

	Room	Table	Video	Nitrate
Amsterdam	X	X	students	X
Athinaï	X	X	--	--
Bangkok	X	X	X	X
Barcelona	---	X	X	---
Beijing	X	X	X	X
Beograd	X	X	X	X
Berkeley	X	X	X	X supervised
Berlin	X	X	X	---
Beverly H.	---	X	X	---
Bogotá FP	X	X	X	---
Bois d'Arcy	X	X	X	X
Bologna	---	X	X	X
Bruxelles	X some	X	---	X some
Budapest	X	X	X	X
Buenos Aires	X	X	X	---
Camberra	---	X	X most	---
Den Haag	---	X some	X	---
Dublin	---	X	X	---
Gemona	X	X	X	---
Glasgow	X	X	X	---
Habana	X	X	---	---
Harare	---	X	X	---
Helsinki	X some	X	X	X some
Istanbul	X	X	X cinema	---
Jer IFA	---	X	X	---
Kobenhavn	X	X some	X	X in cinema
Koblenz	---	X	X	---
La Paz	X some	X	X	X
Lausanne	X	X	X	---
Lima	X	---	---	---
Lisboa	X most	X	X some	---
London IWM	X	X	X	X supervised
London NFA	X	X	X	X
L.A. UCLA	X	X	X	X
Luxembourg	X	X	---	---
Madison	---	X	X	---
Madrid	X	X	X	X supervised
México CN	---	---	X	---
México UNAM	X	X	X	---
Montevideo CU	X	X	---	---
Montevideo SO	X	X	---	X
Montreal	X	X most	X some	---
Moskva	X	X	---	X
München	X	---	X	X in cinema
NY ANTHOLOGY	X	X	X	---
NY MOMA	X	X	---	---
Oslo	X	X	X	X
Ottawa	---	---	X	---
Paris CF	X	X	---	X in cinema
Perth	X	X	X	---
Praha	X	X	X	X
Quito	---	----	X	---
Reykjavik	---	X	X	---
Rio Janeiro	X	X	---	---
Rochester	X	X	X	X in cinema
Roma	---	X	---	---
Sao Paulo	---	X	X most	X rarely
Seoul	X	X	X	---

	Room	Table	Video	Nitrate
Skopje	---	X	X	---
Sofia	X	---	X	---
Stockholm	X	---	X	---
Tehran	X	X	X	---
Tokyo	X	---	---	---
Torino	---	X	X	X supervised
Toulouse	---	X	X	---
Valencia	---	X	X	---
Vaticano	X	---	X	---
Warszawa	X	X	---	X
Wash AFI	Access at LOC premises and other US archives			
Wash HSFA	---	X	X	---
Wash LOC	X	X	X	---
Wash NA	---	X	X	---
Wellington	X	X	X	---
Wien FA	---	X	---	---
Wien FM	X	X	X	X
Wiesbaden	---	X	X	---

SURVEY ON PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS IN FIAF ARCHIVES
Financial conditions for access to researchers

DOC. 6

	Fee	Research work	Films/Researchers (Number per year)
Amsterdam	\$25 to \$50/hour	Free	250/125
Athina	Variable	Free	25/65
Bangkok	Charge/Free	Free	120/70
Barna.	----	----	-----
Beijing	Free	Free	300/100
Beograd	Generally free	Free	50/20
Berkeley	Scale fee	Charge/free	900/779
Berlin	Free for students/charge	Charge commercial	97/33
Beverly H.	Generally free	Generally free	---/50
BogotáFP	Small charge/50% students	Free	1000/500
B.d'Arcy	Charge/Free	Charge/Free	239 hours/year
Bologna	Charge/50% students	Free	750/400
Bruxelles	Charge/Discounts/Free	Free	250/---
Budapest	Generally free	Generally free	500/170
B. Aires	Charge/Discounts	Free	250/1200
Camberra	Charge	Free	200/50
Den Haag	Charge re-use/Free	Free	-----
Dublin	Charge/Discounts	Free	200/150
Gemona	Free	Free	50/40
Glasgow	Charge commercial/Free	Free/charge	550/150
Habana	Charge except ICAIC	Free	---/40
Harare	Under consideration	Free	---/200
Helsinki	Charge/Discounts	Generally charge	3000/800
Istanbul	Charge re-use/Free	Charge re-use	100/65
Jer IFA	\$ 10/hour	Free	---/125
Kobenhavn	Charge/Free	Free	1600/6000
Koblenz	15DM-hour/Free students	30DM hour	5000 reels/380
La Paz	Charge	Charge	---/15
Lausanne	Charge	Free	---/50
Lima	Free national researchers	Free	-----
Lisboa	Free	Free	64/30
LondonIWM	Charge except students	Generally free	6000reels/1500
LondonNFA	Charge/50% students	Free/Charge re-use	5000/750
L.A. UCLA	Charge flatbeds view./Free	Free	3100/2200
Luxembourg	Free	Free	150/20
Madison	Free	Free	2500/1500
Madrid	Free	Free	600/120
México CN	Free	Free	60/15
MéxicoUNAM	Free	Free	210/190
MontevCU	Variable fee	Free	50/30
MontevSO	Free/Charge	Free	30/7
Montreal	Free/Variable charge	Free	150/50
Moskva	Free/\$ 100/day foreigners	Minimum Charge	350/55
München	Free	Free	30/10
NY ANTHOL.	Charge/Free	Free	250/100
NY MOMA	Small charge/Free	Free	1500/---
Oslo	Charge/Discounts	Free	100/20
Ottawa	Free	Free	1125 hours/900
Paris CF	Free/Charge under study	Free	70/20
Perth	Free	Free	500/200
Praha	Variable charge	Variable charge	300/200
Quito	Free	Free	Small number
Reykjavik	Free	Free	---/25
R. Janeiro	Free	Free	40/20

	Fee	Research work	Films/Researchers (Number per year)
Rochester	Free/\$5-\$15 for commercial	Free(titles lists)	400/120
Roma	Charge/Discounts	Free	400/100
S.Paulo	Charge/Discounts	Free	470/90
Seoul	Free for video,\$ 1./minute commercial/use		15/30
Skopje	Free	Free	---/18
Sofia	Free	Free	120/58
Stockholm	Free	Free	400/100
Tehran	Free	Free	600/200
Tokyo	Charge/Discounts	Free	40/20
Torino	Discounts/Free	Free	---/15
Toulouse	Charge/Exceptionally	----	---/25
Valencia	Free	Free	---/4
Vaticano	Free	Free	20/15
Warszawa	Free/Discounts	Free	-----
WashAFI	-Access at LOC premises and other US Archives-		
WashHSFA	Free	Free	---/50
WashLOC	Free	Free	6000/1700
WashNA	Free	Free	---/6000
Wellington	Charge commercial	Free	200/50
WienFA	Free	Free	---/65
WienFM	Discounts/Free	Charge	400/200
Wiesbaden	Charge/Discounts	Charge	---/100

SURVEY SURVEY ON PROGRAMMING AND ACCESS IN FIAF ARCHIVES
Relations with copyright owners

DOC. 7

	General agreement	Screening permission	FIAF loans permission
Amsterdam	Sometimes	Some	by borrower
Athina	No	Some	Some
Bangkok	No	All	No
Barna.	No	All	---
Beijing	---	---	No
Beograd	Yes	---	No
Berkeley	Some (deposits)	All	Yes
Berlin	No	All	Yes
Beverly H.	No	Yes	Yes if public
Bogotá FP	Some (deposits)	---	Included by deposits
B. d'Arcy	No	All (exceptions)	Yes
Bologna	No	Some	Some
Bruxelles	Tacit consent	None	Some
Budapest	No	---	No
B. Aires	No	Some	Yes
Camberra	On site only	Yes	Yes
Den Haag	---	---	---
Dublin	No	Yes	Yes
Gemona	No	None	No
Glasgow	No	Some	Some
Habana	No	All	No
Harare	No	---	Yes
Helsinki	No	Almost all	Yes
Istanbul	Some (deposits)	Some	Some
Jer IFA	Sometimes	Some	Yes
Kobenhavn	No	Some	Yes
Koblenz	---	---	Yes
La Paz	Yes	---	Yes
Lausanne	Tacit consent	Some	Yes
Lima	No	Some (rentals)	Never been asked
Lisboa	Some (deposits)	Some	Some
LondonIWM	Sometimes	Some	Yes
LondonNFA	No	All	Yes
L.A. UCLA	No	All	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes	---	By borrower
Madison	No	All	Yes
Madrid	Some/Tacit	When necessary	When necessary
México CN	No	Yes	Yes
MéxicoUNAM	No	All	Yes
Montev.CU	Tacit	Some	Yes
Montev.SO	No	Some (Distribution)	No (most pub.domain)
Montreal	Tacit consent	Some	When necessary
Moskva	Yes	---	Some
München	Sometimes	Some	Yes
NY ANTHOL.	No	Most	Yes
NY MOMA	No	---	Yes
Oslo	Deposits	Some	Yes
Ottawa	No	Yes	Yes
Paris CF	No	Almost all	When necessary
Perth	Under negotiation	All	Never been asked
Praha	No	None	For national prod.
Quito	No	---	No

	General agreement	Screening permission	FIAF loans permission
Skopje	Yes	None	Recent production
Sofia	Under project	Some	In project
Stockholm	No	Some	Yes
Tehran	Yes	---	Except national prod
Tokyo	Yes	---	Yes
Torino	No	Some	When necessary
Toulouse	Under project	Some	By borrower
Valencia	No	All	No/rarely been asked
Vaticano	No	---	---
Warszawa	Yes	---	No
Wash AFI	No	All	See LOC/US archives
WashHSFA	No	Some	Never been asked
WashLOC	No	All	Yes
WashNA	No	All except pub.domain	Yes
Wellington	No	All	Yes
WienFA	No	Some	Yes
WienFM	No	All	Yes
Wiesbaden	No	All	Yes

17 Archives which have not yet replied:

BUCURESTI	Stopped programming activities in 1991
CAIRO	26 occasional screenings in Cultural Center of cinema
CARACAS AA	24 occasional screenings
DHAKA	Programs for other institutions -own auditorium in proyect.
FRANKFURT FM	1200 regular public screenings.Average audience: 42
HANOI	Regular public screenings (+300.000 spectators)
JAKARTA	Organizes screenings and events outside the archive
JER SPIELBERG	No programming activities
LUANDA	No programming activities
LYON	Organizes events outside the archive
MANAGUA	Regular screenings
MILANO	Occasional public screenings
PARIS CU	Occasional screenings restricted to film students
POONA	350 circulating programs in 8 Indian cities. Own auditorium in project.
PYONGYANG	400 regular public screenings. Average audience: 105
SAN JUAN	-----
TIRANA	No programming activities

PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROGRAMMING (P) OR ACCESS (A)
WHO ANSWERED THE QUESTIONNAIRE (Q)

DOC. 9

Amsterdam

P:Peter Delpeut/ A:Hoos Blotkamp/Q:P.Delpeut

Athinaí

P/A/Q: Theodoros Adamopoulos

Bangkok

Q:Adisak Sekrattana (Head)

Barcelona

P:Ramón Font/ A:Anton Giménez/ Q:Ramón Font

Beijing

Q:Chen Jinglian (Director) entrevista en Mo I Rana

Beograd

P: Dinko Tucakovic/ A/Q:Zoran Sinobad

Berkeley

P: Edith Kramer/A:Nancy Goldman; Mona Nagai/ Q:Edith Kramer; Nancy Goldman

Berlin

P:Wolfgang Jacobsen/ A/Q: Eva Orbanz

Beverly H.

P:Ellen Hallington/ A/Q: Michaël Friend

Bogotá FP

P:Diego Rojas/ A:Nelly Ladino;Mónica Gaitán/ Q:Jorge Nieto

B. d'Arcy

P/A:Eric Le Roy/ Q: Michelle Aubert

Bologna

P:Andrea Morini/A/Q:Gian Luca Farinelli

Bruxelles

P: Ludo Bettens/ A/Q:Gabrielle Claes

Budapest

P/A/Q:Gábor Kovesdy; Vera Gyürey; Gyorgy Horváth

B. Aires

P:Carlos Landini; Luciano Monteagudo

A:Nicanor Bornia; Alejandro Sisco

Q:Paulina Fernández Jurado

Camberra

A/Q:Richard Keyes/ FIAF Contact:Ann Baylis

Den Haag

Q:Robert H.J.Egeter van Kuyk (Head)

Dublin

P/A:Liam WyLie/ Q:Sunniva O'Flynn

Gemona

P/A/Q:Livio Jacob

Glasgow

P/A/Q:Janet McBain

Habana

P:Antonio Mazón/A:Humiliana Gorostiaga;Reynaldo González/ Q:A.Mazón;J.Vega

Harare

P/A/Q:Tendai Kufa

Helsinki

P:Antti Alanen/ A:Timo Muinonen/ Q:A.Alanen y 5 otros

Istambul

P:Alev Idrisoglu/ A/Q:Prof.Sami Sekeroglu

Jerusalem IFA

Amy Kronish

Kobenhavn

P/A/Q:Ib Monty; Dan Nissen

Koblenz

A/Q:Helmut Regel

La Paz

P/A/Q:Pedro Susz

Lausanne

P/A/Q:Freddy Buache

Lima

P/A/Q:Isaac León Frías

Lisboa

P:Joao Bénard da Costa/ A:José Manuel Costa/Q:J.B.C.;J.M.C.

London IWM

P:Brad King/ A:Paul Sargent/ Q:Bradlem M.King

London NFTVA

P:Elaine Burrows;Luke Mckernan;James Patterson;Steve Bryant

A:Elaine Burrows;Christine Kirby;Jane Hockings

Q:Clyde Jeavons;Elaine Burrows

L:A. UCLA

P:Geoffrey Gilmore/ A:Steven Ricci/ Q:Steven Ricci;G.Gilmore

Luxembourg

P:Fred Junck/ A:Jean Defrang/ Q:Viviane Thill

Madison

P/A/Q:Maxine Fleckner Ducey

Madrid

P:Catherine Gautier/ A:Maria García Barquero/ Q:C.Gautier

México CN

P:Gerardo Salcedo/ A:Ma.del Carmen Figueroa/ Q:Guadalupe Ferrer

México UNAM

P:Moises Jimenez/ A:Alicia Huerta/ Q:Moises Jimenez

Montevideo CU

P:Manuel Martínez Carril;Guillermo Zapiola/ A/Q:Manuel Martínez Carril

Montevideo SODRE

P/A/Q:Juan José Mugni

Montreal

P/A/Q:Robert Daudelin

Moskva

P:Vladimir Soloviev/ A:Vladimir Dmitriev/ Q:Valeri Bossenko

München

P/A/Q:Enno Patalas

NY MOMA

P:Larry Kardish/ A/Q:Charles Silver

Oslo

P:Kjell Billing/ A:Arne Pedersen/Kjell Billing/ Q:Kjell Billing

Ottawa

A:Andris Kesteris/ Q:Jana Vosikovska

Paris CF

P:Jean Hernandez/ A/Q:Alain Marchand (1994. P.Jean François Rauger)

Perth

P/A/Q:Robin Faulkner

Praha

P:Vladimír Hendrich/ A/Q:Vladimír Opela

Quito

P:Ulises Estrella/ A:Wilma Granda/ Q:Pilar Loyo

Reykjavik

P/A/Q:Gudmundur Björnsson

R. Janeiro

P: Cosme Alves Netto; José Carlos Avellar/ A/Q: Cosme Alves Netto

Rochester

P: Jan-Christopher Horak; Paolo Cherchi Usai/ A: Horak; Cherchi Usai/ Q: Horak

Roma

P/A: Laura Argento; Paola Castagna/ Q: Mario Musumeci

São Paulo

P: Carlos Augusto Calil/ A: Ricardo Soares/ Q: Luis Gonzaga; Ricardo Soares

Seoul

P: Haeju Muhn/ A: Jinhoi Hur/ Q: Haeju Muhn

Skopje

P: Marko Kovacevski/ A: M. Kovacevski; V. Maslovaric/ Q: Vesna Maslovaric

Sofia

P: Yanko Terziev/ A: Ivo Draganov/ Q: Yanko Terziev

Stockholm

P: Gunnar Almér/ A: Rolf Lindfors/ Q: G.A.; R.L.

Tehran

P: M.H. Khoshnevis/ A: Ladan Taheri/ Q: Fereydoun Khameneipour

Tokyo

P/A/Q: Masatoshi Ohba

Torino

P: Sergio Toffetti/ A: Sergio Toffetti; Paolo Bertetto/ Q: Sergio Toffetti

Toulouse

P/A/Q: Jean Paul Gorce

Valencia

P/A/Q: Joan Alvarez (1994: P: Juan Antonio Hurtado)

Vaticano

Q: Mgr P. Pastore; Mgr E. Planas

Warszawa

P: Anna Kozanecka/ A: Danuta Zielinska/ Q: Jan Slodowski

Washington AFI

P: Ken Wlashin (LA); Eddie Cockell

A: Susan Dalton (Wash)

Q: Gregory Lukow; K: Wlashin

Wash HSFA

P/A: John P. Homiak/ Q: Pamela Wintle

Washington LOC

P: Patrick Loughney/ A: David Francis/ Q: Patrick Loughney

Washington NA

P: Bill Blakefield/ A: Bill Murphy/ Q: Bill Blakefield

Wellington

P/A/Q: Lynne Carruthers

Wien FA

P/A: Helmut Pflügl/ Q: Josef Schuchnig

Wien FM

P/A/Q: Peter Konlechner; Peter Kubelka

Wiesbaden

P/A/Q: Matthias Knop