

**COUNCIL OF EUROPE  
FILM POLICY FORUM:  
SHAPING POLICIES FOR THE  
CINEMA OF TOMORROW**

---

**THE  
KRAKÓW  
REPORT  
2008**

---

**PARTNERS:  
COUNCIL OF EUROPE  
EUROPEAN THINK TANK ON FILM AND FILM POLICY  
POLISH FILM INSTITUTE**

---

## CONTENTS

---

**INTRODUCTION / 3**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / 4**

**PROGRAMME / 5**

**THE PRESENTATIONS / THE OPENING / 7**

**INTRODUCTORY PLENARY / FILMMAKING BETWEEN ART, SOCIAL  
COMMITMENT AND COMMERCE / 9**

**PLENARY / PRESENTATION OF BACKGROUND PAPERS:  
PUBLIC POLICIES FOR FILM – CHALLENGES / 11**

**PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE I / 15**

**PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE II / 18**

**THE GROUP SESSIONS / 22**

**SUMMARY OF THE GROUP SESSIONS / 23**

**THEMES OF THE KRAKOW FILM FORUM / 25**

**OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS / 28**

**RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE FORUM TO NATIONAL AND  
EUROPEAN POLICY-MAKERS / 31**

**NEXT STEPS / 32**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / 34**

**CONTRIBUTORS / 36**



**THINK TANK...**  
ON FILM AND FILM POLICY



POLISH FILM INSTITUTE



magiczny  
**KRAKOW**  
www.krakow.pl

**MKIDN**  
Ministerstwo  
Kultury  
i Dziedzictwa  
Narodowego

## INTRODUCTION

---

The Council of Europe initiated a review of film policies from the perspective of their impact on diversity of cultural identities and expressions in the summer of 2007. They desired to hold a Forum that would provide a platform for governments and the film community to be drawn into a fresh debate about underlying principles of Film Policy. Furthermore, the goal was to address the effectiveness and efficiency of methods of public support for film in times when globalisation threatens diversity through homogenisation, when digital technologies redefine the nature of film production and when distribution is forcibly altered by new consumption patterns.

Prompted by the UNESCO Diversity convention, the Council desired to encourage film policies to focus on the cultural nature of film, and return culture, creativity and citizenship to the equation and so not only focus on employment and market share.

The Forum sought to highlight fundamental issues about state support for film such as the cultural impact of film and how it could be measured. Furthermore, a goal was to underline the importance of film's contribution to mutual understanding through "human stories" in times of tension between majorities and minorities, north and south and engaged and disenfranchised. These aspects of the Film Policy debate have seemingly been lost due to a tradition of conflict between various vested interests.

The Forum aimed to counterbalance the tendency in film circles to focus on financial matters and forget about art and overcome the fear that if questions about artistic qualities of films were raised the fragile agreements upon which the system is based might be compromised. However, these agreements can be compromised even more quickly if film communities are not prepared to answer questions about impact and efficiency.

In response to the Council's initiative, the Polish Film Institute, together with the Polish Ministry of Culture and the City of Kraków, generously hosted the event and engaged the Kraków Film Foundation to provide logistic support.

The design and implementation of the event was entrusted to the European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy, a body that had only been formally established in June 2007. Created by the Danish Film Institute with the support of the national film agencies of France, Spain, Poland and the UK, the main purpose of the ThinkTank is to help make public film policy more effective in its efforts to promote and strengthen a vibrant film industry and film culture in Europe.

This written report is complemented by a set of materials on the ThinkTank's website ([www.filmthinktank.org](http://www.filmthinktank.org)). The report and the accompanying materials are intended not only to be a record of the Forum but also a stimulus to further debate and to action: the value of the Forum and the value of this report will be a function of the extent to which film policy and the film industry are assisted and encouraged to change.

*This document is in three sections:*

- The first section describes the event itself - the programme and the presentations.
- The second section sets out the results of the Forum
- The third section pulls together the conclusions and recommendations.

*Annex:*

- List of participants
- CVs of speakers, moderators and rapporteurs

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

**150 industry leaders from 35 countries, representing the entire film value chain – writers, directors, producers, distributors, exhibitors, broadcasters, decision- and policy-makers – had gathered in Kraków to examine the big issues in European film policy under a shared feeling of urgency.**

While the diversity of European film production was saluted, it was established that the diversity had little to show in terms of market penetration across European countries.

It was established that the conditions under which European cinema was being financed, produced and consumed were facing massive changes. A review of national and European film policies taking into account market and technology changes would be needed to inform policy decisions that in turn would determine whether the changes would be beneficial or at the expense of the specificity and quality of European film.

Both the industries and the public national and European bodies would have to adapt to new conditions and aim at leading rather than following the transitional turmoil.

While public subsidies were needed in all countries to maintain a national production, the negative effects of financial cushions were emphasised. The general attitude was to focus on film-makers responsibilities towards audiences in return for the public support.

Improved collaboration at European level called for better co-ordination of national and European film policy measures. An overhaul of the European Convention on Co-production was considered essential.

The need for comprehensive, comparable data from across Europe to help inform policy decisions was unanimously requested. National film bodies (EFAD and EFARN) and the European Audiovisual Observatory would have to define the data needed and the film agencies would be responsible for delivering the data to EAO.

The clash between industrial and cultural policies was obvious when examining the objectives of the various support schemes. But it was generally agreed that the gap between artistic endeavors and commercial ambition and viability could and should be narrowed or closed.

The role of broadcasters and the change in their policies towards cinema caused major concern. While theatrical exhibition was important as a front window for film, it was widely recognised that future audiences would decide how and when they wanted to see a film. Television and broadband distribution were therefore increasingly important to reach wider audiences and as indispensable sources of revenue.

A great number of conclusions and recommendations were made. The overall digitisation in production and distribution were seen as an opportunity for progress and for strengthening the circulation and consumption of European films in Europe and in the World. The need for public intervention and European coordination was widely voiced.

There was concern, however, about the dominating European trend to favour small production and distribution entities and their ability to secure access to market and audiences under the new world order. The lack of scale, policy harmonisation, coherent strategies, simpler co-production rules and much bigger emphasis on marketing and distribution seemed to present the major obstacles to progress.

A special concern shared by everybody was film and media education. Film agencies were encouraged to form networks and spearhead national initiatives to develop media literacy education in schools. This was also seen as a way to bring up new generations of critical audiences.

## PROGRAMME

---

### THURSDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 2008

#### 17:00/ Opening and welcome addresses by:

Ms. Monika Smolen, Deputy Minister – Ministry of Culture and National Heritage  
Mr. Robert Palmer, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage Council of Europe  
Mr. Kazimierz Bujakowski, Deputy Mayor of Kraków  
Ms. Agnieszka Odorowicz, Director, Polish Film Institute  
Ms. Adelina von Fürstenberg, Director, Art for the World – introducing “Stories on Human Rights”

#### 17:30/ Stories on Human Rights

An ‘Art for the World’ project in celebration of the 60th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights  
Ten 3 min. films by directors from all over the world

#### 18:15/ Break

#### 19:00/ Plenary – Filmmaking between art and social commitment

**Moderator:** Jacques Toubon, MEP, President of Eurimages

**Panellists:** Siddiq Barmak, Film Director, Afghanistan; Tadeusz Lubelski, Professor, Kraków University; Don Ranvaud, Producer, Italy/Brasil; Krzysztof Zanussi, Film Director, Poland

#### 21:00 Reception hosted by the Mayor of Kraków

### FRIDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2008

#### 09:30/ Plenary – presentation of background papers:

##### Public policies for film – challenges in a changing context

Henning Camre, Executive Director, European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy;  
Jonathan Davis, Consultant, European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy

##### The digital future of European cinema

Anna Herold and Emmanuel Coq EU Commission, DG Information Society and Media

##### Uses and misuses of statistics in the evaluation of film policies

André Lange, Head of Department Information on Markets and Financing, European Audiovisual Observatory

#### 11:00/ Break

#### 11:30/ Plenary – Panel discussion

**Moderator:** Peter Dinges, Director FFA, Germany

**Panellists:** Henning Camre, European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy; Jonathan Davis, European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy; Anna Herold and Emmanuel Cocq, European Commission; André Lange, European Audiovisual Observatory; Alain Modot, Director, Media Consulting Group; Thomas Stenderup, producer, Final Cut Productions

#### 12:30/ Lunch

#### 14:00/ Plenary – Main Debate I

**Moderator:** Peter Dinges, Director FFA, Germany

##### The Big issues in European Film Policy

- What are the main challenges for the European film today and tomorrow?
- What have the national, regional and European support schemes achieved to strengthen European film and what strategies need to be developed to address the remaining weaknesses?
- What are the threats and the opportunities?

**Panellists:** Philippe Kern, Director KEA, European Affairs; Philipp Kreuzer, Deputy MD Bavaria Pictures, Head of Coproduction and Production Finance; Roberto Olla, Executive Secretary, Eurimages; Philippe Reynaert, Director, Wallimage; Thomas Stenderup, Producer, Final Cut Productions; Maciej Strzembosz, Producer, President Audiovisual Producers’ Chamber of Commerce

## PROGRAMME (CONTINUED)

---

**15:30/ Break**

**16:00/ Group Sessions addressing questions raised in previous presentations and Main Debate I**

The groups are asked to address a number of specific questions, suggest solutions, articulate visions, take up challenges.

**17:30/ Break**

**18:00/ Plenary – Andrzej Wajda and Wojciech Marczewski in debate:**

**Film as an inspiration and a means of expression in the struggle for democracy**

**21:00 Reception in the Centre of Japanese Art and Technology “Manggha” hosted by Andrzej Wajda**

**SATURDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2008**

**09:30/ Plenary – Main Debate II**

**Moderator:** Alain Modot, Director, Media Consulting Group

**Cultural diversity – whose responsibility is it?**

- Access to produce films – access to enjoy the works
- Distribution and exhibition in transition, new avenues to the public
- The role of public intervention in securing diversity and pluralism

**Panellists:** Ahmet Boyacioglu, General Secretary, Festival on Wheels, Ankara; Prof. Ian Christie, VP Europa Cinemas; Felice Farine, Film Director, Italy; Thomas Mai, Head of New Business, TrustNordisk; Bertrand Moullier, Consultant, Narval, UK; Jérôme Paillard, Directeur Délégué, Marché du Film, Cannes; Thomas Stenderup, Producer, Final Cut Productions; Yvon Thiec, General Delegate, Eurocinema

**11:00/ Break**

**11:30/ Group sessions addressing questions raised in the plenary introduction to debate II**

The groups are asked to address a number of specific questions, suggest solutions, articulate visions, take up challenges.

**13:30/ Lunch**

**15:00/ Presentation of group reports by the moderators and rapporteurs**

(The moderators of the two times four groups will have prepared a synthesis of the discussions, replies and recommendations relating to the two main debates)

Nils Klevjer Aas, Senior Advisor for research and policy, Norwegian Film Institute; Peter Dinges, Director, FFA, Germany; Philippe Kern, Director, KEA European Affairs; Philipp Kreuzer, Deputy MD Bavaria Pictures, Head of Coproduction and Production Finance; Alain Modot, Director, Media Consulting Group; Agnieszka Moody, UK Media Desk; Alessandra Priante, Head of Research and Statistics Unit, Cinecittà, Italy; Thomas Stenderup, Producer, Denmark; Maciej Strzembosz, Producer, Poland; Dr. Carole Tongue, Director, Sovereign Strategy.

**Overall conclusions and recommendations regarding national and European film policies in the face of massive change in production, distribution and consumption conditions**

Henning Camre, European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy; Irena Guidikova, Council of Europe.

**17:30/ Closing of the Forum**

**18:00/ “60 years of Polish animated films” – a retrospective**

**20:00/ Closing dinner hosted by the Polish Film Institute**

## THE PRESENTATIONS / THE OPENING

### SUMMARIES OF PRESENTATIONS BY MONIKA SMOLEN, ROBERT PALMER, AGNIESZKA ODOROWICZ, ADELINA VON FÜRSTENBERG

---

#### **MONIKA SMOLEN**

*Deputy Minister of Culture*

*Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, Poland*

Deputy Minister Smolen, on behalf of the Polish Minister of Culture, Bogdan Zdrojewski, welcomed participants to the Council of Europe Film Forum in Kraków. She suggested that the theme of the Forum, "Policies that Shape Tomorrow's Cinema", was not only tremendously important and topical, but also extremely difficult. The difficulty, she suggested, lay not only in the cinema being a multifaceted phenomena, due to the progressing process of globalization and its technological development, but also in the fact that cinema was both one of the most important cultural aspect of our lives and one of the most powerful cultural industries today. Therefore, she hoped that the three-day-long discussion would not only serve the reflection on the cinema of tomorrow, but would also allow for an in-depth analysis of the problems faced by all those who were responsible for putting into effect the policies that, with the help of public funds, would shape the cinema.

The discussion on policies that influenced cinematography, Deputy Minister Smolen ventured, could not but raise some meaningful questions. One of the most essential ones was how to reach a compromise between the widely-understood economic aspect of the film industry and the interest of the society, the role that cinema was to play in social development, in promoting cultural diversity and in portraying our time. One challenge that was especially crucial and meaningful today, on the 60th anniversary of signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that fought for democracy and human rights' protection in the context of international relations, was how to strengthen the current commitment to international collaboration in the field of film-making and distribution, in order to increase the number of international co-productions.

Deputy Minister Smolen was aware that these were only a few of the questions that we all asked ourselves. Therefore, she hoped the forum would not only be the place to have discussions but also to draw conclusions and make recommendations, which at least to a certain extent, would lead to solid actions both internationally and locally. Deputy Minister Smolen concluded by thanking all the contributors: the European Council, the Polish Film Institute, the ThinkTank and all of those who had made their high substantial contributions to furthering the discussions on tomorrow's cinema.

#### **ROBERT PALMER**

*Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage*

*Council of Europe*

Robert Palmer proposed that the importance of creative expression was as a response to repression. This was why the Council of Europe devoted so much effort to upholding the important values that formed Europe's common heritage. However, so often these days, when people spoke of creativity, art or culture, the judgement was likely to be in terms of their economic value. We needed, therefore, to reassert that societies which progress were the ones in which artists were free to challenge. Democracy could be judged by the freedom artists had to create.

Market forces did not guarantee this freedom, which was why, in developed societies; the creative industries were seen as an essential prerequisite for cultural democracy. This principle was not questioned in Europe but the way in which it was applied needed to be regularly reviewed. We had now entered a critical phase of change which demanded a radical reassessment of existing paradigms of public policy in all fields – not just in culture. So the Council of Europe was seeking to provoke a debate for governments and civil society to reconsider their approaches. It was also why the Council, in partnership with the Polish Film Institute and the ThinkTank, had decided to support this event.

It was as important for the Council as for the film industry because of its commitment to cultural diversity. Robert Palmer wanted to know, however, what cultural diversity meant in film and how it could be measured. In the run-up to the adoption of the UNESCO Cultural Diversity Convention, Europe's national film agencies through the EFADs (i.e. European Film Agency Directors), along with the European Commission, had given their unqualified support. But the fine words could not escape the realities of political interest. The weight given to cultural diversity varied across Europe, and cultural diversity also had different meanings in different countries. But the reality was that public policy was as marked by a fear of cultural diversity as by

## THE PRESENTATIONS / THE OPENING (CONTINUED)

---

its celebration. It would be paradoxical, even tragic, Palmer suggested, if European states were to pursue policies at a national level that contradicted the policies they pursued at a European or an international level. However, some countries were happy to cite cultural diversity when they were negotiating with other countries but they were ambivalent about such diversity internally. A limitation of the UNESCO Convention was that it did not confront the conflict that often existed around cultural identities. In order to confront that conflict, we needed to fight to create spaces in the media and in film worlds where people were given opportunities to meet and to interact.

Robert Palmer proposed that the prevailing perspective of most states was that a stronger, more competitive national film production system would give national culture the biggest resonance both at home and abroad. If this were pursued in all countries, it would produce in aggregate the best culture and protect and enhance cultural diversity. This was the theory. The trouble was that it was very difficult to know if such a theory worked in practice: we lacked the data about the cultural impact of film. The measurement of cultural value was still extremely vague. If the notion of cultural value was to become the basis of public support for film, we needed to be more specific about what cultural value meant.

It was politically hard to take a step back and examine policies and tools. The Film Forum represented an occasion to have a debate from a longer term perspective, outside of the daily struggles. A forum like this was quite risky: the way it had been organised was to invite differences of opinion. And yet what we needed was to make sure that there was an exchange of views. This was why we were asking critical questions: about transparency, the evidence base for policies, about the availability of quantitative information. We were also asking how the public could be brought into the equation and whether film policies were adapted to promote diversity especially in a rapidly changing technological and social environment. Were we optimising co-productions, Palmer asked? How to maximise the role of film in relation to citizenship and education, and in nurturing audiences towards a better understanding of film. These were some of the questions which were to be addressed in the coming two days of the Forum.

Sometimes it was argued that European film's weak industrial base was good for film art. This was because a strong industry had a sanitising effect on art. But if artistic films could not appeal to mass audiences, was cultural diversity simply a statistical abstraction, the privilege of a handful of connoisseurs?

The Forum might result in an affirmation that everything was alright in the world, or it might conclude that drastic adjustments were required for film policies to meet challenges: we would see. But the results had to emerge from open, honest, competent debate that would help everyone to make better choices at European and national levels. Robert Palmer concluded by thanking the ThinkTank for helping the Council of Europe to prepare the event and the City of Kraków, the Polish Ministry of Culture and the Polish Film Institute for their hospitality and support. He hoped that the result would be an event that would provoke change.

In a short welcome speech, **AGNIESZKA ODOROWICZ**, Director of the Polish Film Institute, spoke of how the Forum came at a time when we were faced by great challenges and opportunities.

For the last part of the opening session, **ADELINA VON FÜRSTENBERG**, President and Founder of 'Art for the World' introduced 'Stories on Human Rights' a film project produced in celebration of the 60th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 22 filmmakers and artists from 20 countries had been invited to produce a series of short films of three minutes length, conveying the significance of aspects of human rights, to be distributed freely by all possible means to audiences worldwide. The films presented in Kraków were an avant, avant-première. The first ten films had been received at the end of August. The other films were still in post-production. Everything was to be ready for the Anniversary day 10 December. While other 'Art for the World' projects had used different art forms it had been agreed with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights that cinema had the largest potential for reaching out to people globally.

## INTRODUCTORY PLENARY / FILMMAKING BETWEEN ART, SOCIAL COMMITMENT AND COMMERCE CONTRIBUTIONS BY JACQUES TOUBON (CHAIR) SIDDIQ BARMAK, TADEUSZ LUBELSKI, DON RANVAUD, KRZYSZTOF ZANUSSI

---

**JACQUES TOUBON**, (MEP and President, Eurimages) introducing the panel, described it as a prelude for the two days of the Forum. He said that the Council of Europe had been inspired to organise the event in Kraków, the cradle of the glory of Polish cinema. Toubon applauded the efforts by Poland to nourish cinema.

In Europe he saw that many things were happening but asked if the changes were positive for European cinema; he wondered if they were going to be to the benefit or at the expense of the specificity and the quality of European cinema. We just had to think about the role of television, of the new technologies and the changes taking place in the audience: these changes were incontestable and they were global.

But there was a constraint, Toubon suggested: that was art, to be precise the rarity of talent and the exceptional nature of art. It was not like the transition from a society organised around manufacture to one organised around services; it was ineffable and could not be reduced to questions of organisation. Cinema, like the other arts, could not be treated in terms of the laws of supply and demand. This was the fundamental nature of art which was underlain by four principles, four principles that needed to be re-affirmed:

- The freedom of creation in relation to all powers.
- Intellectual property rights, the economic basis of the whole value chain of the sector and the basis of artists' independence. Intellectual property rights could not be replaced by salaries for artists, as had happened in the Soviet Union. This was the case for Beaumarchais and was still the case today.
- Art as modernity, announcing the changes. The new technologies were to be taken into account by art; art would take advantage of them but would not sell its soul.
- As Robert Palmer had evoked, public policies were not just about money; there was also regulation to ensure and protect art's independence.

Toubon also wanted to evoke co-production which he considered to be the best response to the question of how films could circulate. The only films all Europeans got to see were American films. Co-production was a way to contest this: half of the films that came to Europe from South America, Asia or Africa were co-productions and real cultural diversity was there. Diversity was at the heart of solidarity between people and of the beauty of art. Europe, Toubon concluded, had a duty towards film.

The first panellist was **SIDDIQ BARMAK** (Film Director, Afghanistan). He described how he had learned about the world through cinema. This used, in the case of his native Afghanistan, to include Egyptian cinema, but today it was restricted to Indian and American cinema. Cinema ought to be based on cultural identity but today, under pressure from Hollywood and Bollywood, on DVD and television, as well as in the cinema, that identity was dying. There was no space for Afghan cinema.

Afghan filmmakers were emigrating in search for space for their art. At home, they faced the problem of how to finance a film: the Afghan government said that cinema was for the private sector. This meant that Afghan cinema had been reduced to low-budget action, dance and music. Nevertheless, there were long-term artistic, creative and philosophical aspects of cinema. The politics of cinema in a country like Afghanistan were about low rates of literacy, but cinema had been setting a bad example, with lots of violence.

Siddiq Barmak was followed by **TADEUSZ LUBELSKI** (Professor, Jagiellonian University, Poland). He wanted to speak about the purposes and misuses of film. In France, film was about art and about documentary. It was also about *Astérix* and *Obélix*. It was the same for Poland. Poland would like artistic films to have more success but, today, it was romantic comedies that made money, and these were not good.

Lubelski ventured that film was not about the co-existence of three elements – the commercial, the socially-engaged and the art – but about their combination: we would like to see new *Citizen Kanes*. And to have such cinema, we needed the technical conditions that Jacques Toubon had described, notably solidarity and co-production, but, first and foremost, we needed a culture in which people wanted such a cinema.

Four years ago, Michael Moore had won his *Palme d'Or*. Lubelski was not sure that this was an ideal film, an expression of desire. Rather it was one of those films that draw crowds and change

## INTRODUCTORY PLENARY / FILMMAKING BETWEEN ART, SOCIAL COMMITMENT AND COMMERCE (CONTINUED)

---

them, that win elections. Look at Alejandro Iñárritu (*Amores perros*): socially conscious, using new possibilities of artistic expression and commercially successful. Babel was not as good: it lacked artistic freshness. We want a culture that enables Iñárritu to make *Amores perros*.

**DON RANVAUD** (International Producer) proposed that, more urgent than the question of 'art' was distribution. The traditional channels, he said, had collapsed. Very few films in competition in Cannes had been sold. Only few sales agents could survive. We needed new paradigms.

One such paradigm was to be found in Brazil and its digital cinema network. There would soon be 240 screens in this, The Rain Network, by the end of 2008. (we need to describe what this network is about, he did not really do it, but the issue is so important that we need to give more info). It meant that audiences could see high quality film that were released digitally, day-and-date, and so had re-built the art-house audience in Brazil. Non-conventional cinemas had emerged - in restaurants etc. A big stroke of luck was that the US companies had refused to supply their films, creating space for Brazilian films, and now almost every Brazilian documentary was also shown on the network.

Ranvaud suggested that people go to the cinema to meet other people: they are afraid to go out except to their community. There was consequently an interest about building communities. The new distributors, he continued, were the film festivals; the local distributors were dead. They depended on television revenues to pay for theatrical releases. Today, the Rain Network was talking to Unifrance about Unifrance paying to encode their films. The choice of film, therefore, was being made abroad. 'Rain', meanwhile, offered transparency. This allowed festivals to discover films. Under this paradigm, art equalled the choices made by the festivals.

Today, it was possible for a filmmaker to get \$100,000 from festivals in screening fees. This was more than he or she could earn from commercial distribution and the filmmaker got to keep the rights.

Another paradigm was the film, *Inganno globale* (Global trick) by Marco Mazzuco. This was being given for free to the 780,000 people who had registered online. The film was paid for by the 7,000 people who contributed to its creation. The Brazilian director, Fernando Mereilles, had bought the rights in order to show it in his own cinemas; He used the Mereilles brand for the films he liked. Wim Wenders was also championing *Inganno globale* as was Costa Gavras in France: all established filmmakers who were concerned citizens. On 23 October, the film was being released day-and-date. The group who made the film would receive €1 for each ticket sold. This money was to be used to make a new film. This is what cinema meant today. Less money was needed. The medium was opened up to independent filmmakers and to communities: sometimes churches might decide to organise a showing. If a film was well received at a festival, it could be on the network the next day. The filmmakers kept the rights and kept people's attention. In the case of *Inganno globale*, they finished up with 780,000 viewers and 7000 people who had paid €34 each to receive the updates and be part of the community.

The last contribution from the panel came from **KRZYSZTOF ZANUSSI** (Film Director, Poland). He explained that he had spent the last two days talking about abstract problems with the Russians: the future of the planet and modernity. Did globalisation mean modernisation? Did it mean one model? The answer was yes, only one model. Diversity was a nice thing but it was not essential. In art, Zanussi said, he looked for excellence. One good piece of art would do.

In Europe, diversity meant we didn't have our values. The problem in the Council of Europe was that we were facing mass society for the first time. In the past, the cinema used to address the intelligentsia. The others followed. Today, under capitalism, there was a middle class. It was making progress through better access to lower quality education. So the problem was the public we were facing. The large-scale audience rejected artistic film. They were insecure and looking for affirmation in romantic comedies. Real artists expressed doubts, and this bothered people. This was not desirable today. Don Ranvaud had offered the hope of the emergence of a new avant-garde. Such people were showing films for free. There was a huge audience that wanted to see the films in festivals. But this was not economic. If the film performed well they had justified their cause.

## PLENARY / PRESENTATION OF BACKGROUND PAPERS: PUBLIC POLICIES FOR FILM – CHALLENGES FRIDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER, 09:30 -12:30

---

**The plenary began with a presentation by HENNING CAMRE, the Executive Director of the European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy, setting out the context, process and objectives of the Forum.**

The Forum, Henning Camre proposed, was about change: changes in national and European film policies that were needed in the face of new challenges; changes in industrial structures necessary to build scale and coordinated market strategies; and changes needed to take full advantage of digital technologies. The Forum was therefore about national and European film policies and how these have created the current conditions for filmmaking and, first and foremost about how, if we, the industry and the public bodies work together to develop our policies, we could strengthen the position of European film in our countries, in Europe and in the world.

The oft-heard solution was more money – more public money. That might be a partial solution in some countries that needed to establish a stable national industry, but, as a whole in Europe, it did not seem realistic to raise substantial additional public money without first solving our fundamental problems and unmasking the issues we should have already addressed some time ago.

While understanding the past and present, the Forum had ambitions to look forward and to be brave in suggesting new approaches and new solutions. To this end it was essential that all participants contributed actively.

A background paper has been prepared, a survey of national film policies had been conducted and we had brought together a large number of highly qualified moderators and speakers to give their views. What was new was the way all participants would be involved in discussion and in identifying new approaches and solutions.

The group work that would follow the plenary debates was organised in small groups of 5-6 people, all would be asked the same questions and, employing a computer aided system, all replies and ideas would be shared and expanded upon by everybody. Thus at the end of the Forum there would be a multitude of responses and the outline of a report.

### **Mr Camre also outlined the big Issues in European Film Policy:**

- Were national and European film policies successful? Did the huge quantity of films produced each year and growing cross-border collaboration qualify as success? Or, did the difficulty in maintaining a bare minimum at the domestic box-office for national films and a miniscule non-National, non-Studio box-office share indicate that we fail in our diversity aims?
- Were national policies based on tradition or evidence? How could the existing systems be improved without making any change dependent on raising additional funds? Had film policy neglected all other aspects of the value chain in order to fund production?
- Did co-productions actually work in the sense of exchange of films and culture or were they primarily a financing mechanism? Did co-production foster a more European film industry? How could we make sure that co-production fosters better films rather than just more films? Would a harmonisation of film funding schemes avoid the hassle and negative effect of money chasing? Was territorialisation productive in terms of better films?
- What needed to be incorporated in the national institutes' success parameters? Were policies sufficiently transparent and evidence-based? What could be done to improve availability of data for the entire value chain, not only on production but across all policy domains? Were the methodologies for monitoring and reviewing national film policies adequate?
- What had national, regional and European support schemes achieved and what strategies should be maintained and what should be changed? Should criteria include an industrial policy: forcing support through larger companies to avoid further fragmentation of the production and distribution sectors?

Henning Camre then asked about the new avenues to reach the public. Where was the relationship between public service broadcasters and film heading? How would the increasing preference for drama series and made-for-television films affect audience's perception of less conformist and predictable feature films? With 900-plus European titles, it seemed that there were just not enough window possibilities for these films to be seen. Were a sufficient number of those 900 films made with an audience in mind? It was taken for granted that the European

## PLENARY / PRESENTATION OF BACKGROUND PAPERS: PUBLIC POLICIES FOR FILM – CHALLENGES (CONTINUED)

---

film industry would always need and have public support, but how could we avoid the public comfort pillow leading to a disregard of the market? How could support schemes be improved so as to ensure a sufficient balance between the opportunity to create artistic works and the opportunities for people to enjoy these artistic works? Were film support policies and industrial policies good enough to ensure adequate access to films across all media? If VoD was the only answer left to ensure a measure of cultural diversity, what policies could be enacted to ensure its viability? Were film policies sufficiently adapted to preserve and promote diversity in the face of evolving distribution methods and consumption practices? And how were we to address, through policy measures, the dominance of Studio product: in the cinema and multiplex; on the television and on broadband?

There was then a summary of some key findings of the background research for the Forum. The assumption in public support schemes seemed to be that getting films financed and produced was the main problem. Therefore 86% of all support on average went to development and production; 14% went to distribution and promotion (ranging from 3% to 30% in the Think-Tank survey). Only part of this went to promoting films in their primary market(s). With the decline in the established distribution and exhibition system, new avenues to the audience needed to be established. The exploitation of broadband depended on scale and coordination. The distributor as known today would disappear or change their approach to navigation and promotion of films.

### Steps to change the landscape

- In public film policy change priorities towards support of promotion and distribution;
- build scale in production in Europe and to prepare the market for a continuous and diverse production output;
- coordinate distribution on a multi-territory scale;
- support digitisation of cinemas, digital prints, and satellite distribution;
- support large-scale broadband platforms that secure easy navigation and access;
- make the audience a priority for European film; this includes on one hand research in consumer behaviour and interests on the other a stronger desire and ability among filmmakers to tell stories that touch and entertain audiences.

**ANNA HEROLD** and **EMMANUEL COCQ** of the European Commission, Directorate General Information Society and Media, then set out the terms of European audiovisual policy.

Anna Herold described the scope of European audiovisual policy and of the instruments used to implement that policy. In doing so, she focused on the initiatives that came under the aegis of the Directorate General where she worked, although she did refer to initiatives undertaken by some of the other directorates general, for example DG Competition, DG Internal Market and DG External Trade. She did not refer to actions by DG Culture, DG Enterprise, DG Regions or DG Employment. Thus Ms Herold covered competition policy, the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, the established MEDIA Programme and its extension programme, MEDIA Mundus, which was in turn reinforced by the bilateral trading agreements being negotiated between the European Commission and countries and regions around the world. Ms Herold also mentioned initiatives around digital, notably content online, and around the audiovisual heritage.

Anna Herold handed over to Emmanuel Cocq, her colleague in the MEDIA Programme. Mr. Cocq focused on how the MEDIA programme had set the standard for initiatives to promote the circulation of non-national European works, and for adapting and evolving support mechanisms to respond to the challenges and opportunities of digitisation. He advised the Forum that the Commission would, towards the end of 2008, be publishing a communication relating specifically to actions assisting the digitisation of theatrical exhibition and distribution.

The final introductory presentation was by **ANDRÉ LANGE** on behalf of the European Audiovisual Observatory, on the uses and misuses of statistics in the evaluation of film policies.

Mr. Lange began by reminding participants that statistics were mainly a tool for economic evaluation. For the evaluation of cultural policies, we need more qualitative frameworks. His second main proposition was that transparency of the economy of the film sector would become more and more necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the legitimacy and efficiency of public policies, both economic and cultural; however the current level of transparency of the

## PLENARY / PRESENTATION OF BACKGROUND PAPERS: PUBLIC POLICIES FOR FILM – CHALLENGES (CONTINUED)

---

European film industry was, André Lange suggested, unsatisfactory and needed to be given much more attention by both the industry and the public authorities. Only in this way could we achieve a dynamic and competitive European film sector that was able – and could be seen – to advance public policy objectives.

The second part of Mr. Lange's presentation described the analysis prepared for the Forum by the European Audiovisual Observatory on the circulation of European co-productions: this analysis, André Lange indicated, was probably the most comprehensive analysis of co-production circulation and performance ever attempted at a European level. However, it was only at a first stage – looking at theatrical markets – and would need to be complemented by analyses of other release windows – DVD, broadcast and video-on-demand – as well as by a more in-depth analysis of the economics of co-production that also looked at the attitudes of professionals towards co-production as well as the aesthetic and cultural impact of co-production. In this way, it would be possible to understand why it was – as the analysis demonstrated – that co-productions, on average, circulated better than 100% national productions, and how the lessons derived from looking at co-productions could be applied.

### PANEL DISCUSSION

Leading off the panel discussion, the chairperson, **PETER DINGES**, Director of the Filmförderungsanstalt (German Federal Film Board) asked whether we had a problem in accessing all the different ice cream flavours in the ice cream parlour, and did we really need all those flavours?

**ALAIN MODOT** (VP, Media Consulting Group, France) stated that the major part of the revenues of the films from the US majors came from abroad: from 2002 to 2007, this had risen from \$8.6 billion to \$17.1 billion, from 51% to 64% of total revenues.

A study on the profitability of investing into Europe films found that one fourth of films in Europe recouped their investments; half of the films lost money; and one quarter broke even. Profitability was assessed only from the executive producers' point of view. 10% of the revenues were coming from international sales. The real money losers were the public funds.

TV did not believe in films as a profitable product and therefore was investing more on fiction, sport, TV series and reality shows.

Today the real deal was the change in the business model from a system based on pre-financing of films to a system where the market led the revenue stream.

**THOMAS STENDERUP** (Producer, Final Cut Productions, Denmark) said that he had a feeling of sadness as he looked at the figures. Cultural diversity was not achieved. The efforts of the institutions were definitely worth the cause of the survival of European films. But this did not change the prospect.

Just returning from Toronto, he had recorded that around 70 films from around the world were going to be released in the North American Market. If thinking about the figures of films produced in Europe, it was nothing.

Even Focus Features – a large specialised production and distribution company in the US – had also troubles in releasing some of the biggest independent films.

He saw new light coming from digital distribution but did not trust the long tail model, because he could not see when - and how much - the producer would be able to make out of this model.

**HENNING CAMRE** said that the main problem was not that the public funds lost money, but that the incitement among producers to make profits by bringing their films to the market was limited. We needed to overcome the prejudice that film should be only art and therefore should not be concerned about making money. Film was something in between art and mass-consumed products. Films were part of an economy that not only generated products but also created employment.

## PLENARY / PRESENTATION OF BACKGROUND PAPERS: PUBLIC POLICIES FOR FILM – CHALLENGES (CONTINUED)

---

**ANNA HEROLD** said that rather than concentrate on harmonisation, the emphasis should be on the synergies between the different types of interventions included those designed by the European Commission. There should be a dialogue between the funding systems in Europe about effecting a common shift in the ways funding was allocated. All recognized the importance of distribution. There was no contradiction between funding for popular films with high production value and the artistically ambitious films, the so-called difficult films.

Thomas Stenderup offered the advice to keep money in production because there was no certainty on how the film was going to perform and there was a critical mass issue.

Anna Herold suggested that there needed to be more concern over the behaviour of US majors in Europe. Everyone complained but no one ever provided evidence.

Henning Camre explained that his call for harmonisation was a provocation but what was clear was that it was necessary to smooth the frictions between the individual countries' policies and Brussels' approach. We did not have to look at our feet, we should share visions in order to learn from our mistakes and improve.

Alain Modot added that a great proportion of co productions were not really travelling so much outside the co-producing countries. Going back to the issue of the market model vs. the pre-financing model, all value creators were shifting attention from traditional sources of finance, such as guarantees paid by theatrical distributors and rights deals with broadcasters to new sources such as revenue-sharing arrangements with Video-on-Demand operators. The audiovisual market (free-to-air pay and IPTV, etc) needed content.

Going back to Peter Dinges' original question – whether we could afford all this variety and whether we needed it, **JONATHAN DAVIS** said that the question was really this: could we or could we not fund 900 European films per year? He said that he used to think that producers were not investing in films since all the money came from public funds, guaranteed bank loans and discounted contracts. Recently, looking at the situation in Austria, he had seen that producers, especially producers of documentaries, were willing to invest significantly in projects about which they cared. But the producer's contribution represented a form of deferred payment, in expectation of the public funds, and it meant them holding their breath; this was a valuable and important element in film financing.

André Lange thought that we could not say whether there were too many or too few films. Maybe there was a direct relation between numbers of films applied and market share. There had not yet been a review of the audience yet or an analysis of the profile of the spectator. There was the piracy problem which always came up when analyzing the audience. Culturally the battle for copyright was already lost. Information and transparency were of strategic importance. Self-regulation had not produced the right outcomes. There should be an effort in regulating the information market to make the provision of some data mandatory. There should be a minimal harmonisation of the general rules relating to the provision of public funding for the sector.

Alain Modot said that the problem with children films for example was access: most of the ones from Europe were subtitled whilst the ones from the US were always dubbed. The hope for the future came from the fact that families, on average, had 6 screens at home, including the TV, the laptop, the mobile and the iPod. He said that the emphasis needed to be on education in schools.

To add to the "depression", André Lange invoked a Harvard study that had shown that the long tail theory was not so profitable in terms of revenue for producers. It did not do much to change the logic of blockbusters.

In conclusion, and going back to Alain Modot's first point about the profitability of films, Thomas Stenderup said that the profitability of a production was defined by the amount of money that could be drawn from public funding and the amount of dreaming activity. There should be an emphasis on slate funding not just single project funding, he proposed.

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE I

### FRIDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER, 14:00 – 15:30

---

#### The Big issues in European Film Policy

- *What are the main challenges for the European film today and tomorrow?*
- *What have the national, regional and European support schemes achieved to strengthen European film and what strategies need to be developed to address the remaining weaknesses?*
- *What are the threats and the opportunities?*

#### Moderator: Peter Dinges, Director, German Federal Film Board

The contributions in this session were provided by a consultant, two public funders, one pan-European and one regional; two producers and an operator in digital distribution. Delegates were given a flavour of developments on a different continent: South America.

**PHILIPPE KERN** (Director KEA, European Affairs) specialist in matters relating to the European Commission opened the debate by stating that the European film industry assets were its talent: the well-known, exportable directors and actors who had the ability to attract audiences from across the world. We had the raw material; however the issue was that we might not be doing it justice by failing to bring that material to the market. We did have a competitive edge as we could make films on a shoe-string budget.

Mr. Kern warned the delegates that the film industry was not vocal enough about its interests via regulatory channels in Brussels, whereas there were gains to be had. He offered several examples: in the ongoing debate on regulation of telecoms, the film industry needed to ensure that the European Commission put in place monitoring of the internet to effectively fight against film theft; copyright protection terms were being extended for music recordings but not for film; there was revenue in private copying and the film industry should not miss the opportunity here; the AVMS Directive implementation stipulated that the majority of content broadcast should be European; indeed, 70% of what was broadcast was indeed European, but the film industry did not raise the issue that very little of this content was actually film.

The film industry needed to take account of the changing economy and in particular Video on Demand and digital distribution. Technology offered new opportunities but prompted us to reassess the market position. There were new opportunities offered by the internet and new platforms, but producers needed to take greater risks in order to explore these new markets even if they were not yet lucrative. The window of opportunity was there only for a short while: if European producers did not fill this gap, somebody or something else would. It was very positive that there were initiatives emerging in several countries where producers were getting together to collectively exploit their rights. Access was key: we needed a clearly-signposted place where any distributor, or VoD platform, from anywhere in the world could go and find European films, rather than sifting through tens or hundreds of websites of individual rights-holders. We needed to secure access of European content to as many VoD platforms, both national and international, as possible.

We must not think it was business as usual because it was not. We should encourage the taking of risk. We needed to try and keep our knowledge abreast of technological change. We needed to take the time to stop and think about what was happening around us. The future was all about market access.

Philippe Kern was followed by **DON RANVAUD** (International producer). In a quick fire round of inspiring comments, Mr. Ranvaud evoked and added to the ideas he had introduced at the session the previous evening about filmmaking between art, social commitment and commerce. He turned the delegates' attention to several significant developments outside Europe:

- The decline of some US distributors that were interested in EU product made space for the new generation of new, perhaps smaller companies, with whom Europe could do viable business.
- Latin film could claim some success in breaking into the North American market by embracing new technologies.

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE I (CONTINUED)

---

- There was also an example of Argentina and Brazil swapping films: no transactions, no accounting.
- Puerto Rico had introduced a simple and user-friendly public support system, which invigorated its film industry.
- There was even some success in fighting piracy in Bolivia: a legal offer was invented which seemed to work whereby the pirates paid a modest fee upfront; users agreed to respect the theatrical release date and, in return, the morning after would receive a top-quality DVD with extras for distribution.

Mr. Ranvaud emphasized that in digital distribution reporting, accounting and information flow is much more transparent, which ultimately means a better return for rights holder.

**ROBERTO OLLA** (General Secretary of Eurimages) then spoke about the risk of confusing cultural and industrial policy. The Eurimages agenda was cultural. Therefore, he appealed to the delegates to judge its performance not against box office but against Eurimages specific criteria, in particular trans-national circulation.

Since circulation and international collaboration were high on the Eurimages agenda, Mr. Olla stated that it might be worthwhile exploring whether its support could be distributed in the form of slate funding, which would have an effect of strengthening co-producing structures beyond the life of one project.

On the regulatory level Mr. Olla claimed that the European Convention on Co-production has been very successful and a good constructive example of harmonization. Moreover it provided an instrument for multilateral co-production. However with the digital revolution around the corner we could not afford to leave the Convention as it was, reflecting the 35 mm world of the past. The traditional minimum co-producer contributions did not necessarily work in the digital world where films could cost much less.

Finally, Roberto Olla raised the issue of transparency. Eurimages recouped 5% of its funds, but information on revenues other than cinema box office was very difficult to obtain. As a result the performance of Eurimages-funded films was not fully accounted for.

**PHILIPPE REYNAERT**'s presentation showed how industrial and cultural policy could work hand-in-hand. Even though Wallimage was a fund 100% based on economic objectives, it managed to also tick the critical acclaim boxes. It supported the Dardenne brothers and had no less than five films in Cannes last year. The fund's priority was not tickets sold but the economic impact on the region: job and wealth creation, and the region's image. Mr. Reynaert stated that there could be no diversity if there were not the tools to create it. Until the fund was established, Wallonie was a blank spot on Europe's film map. Now it had a thriving post production industry. They had a policy of co-production because they were small. Territorialisation, according to Mr. Reynaert, might also not be such a bad principle: Wallonie could work together with its neighbouring region of Nord-Pas-de-Calais precisely because they had different objectives and priorities.

**PHILIPP KREUZER** (Deputy MD, Bavaria Pictures) then focused on the question of slate funding raised in the previous session by Thomas Stenderup and a little earlier in this session by Roberto Olla. He spoke from the position of a sizeable established European film company, the Bavaria Film group. He underlined the importance of companies of Bavaria's size engaging in partnerships with smaller players to mutual benefit. He suggested that the main drive for co-production was money and talent; distribution would come on top of that. Thanks to various co-production structures, short-lasting as they were, relations between producers had been built and public policy should reinforce these structures, by, for example, funding slates of films. Also public policy should share the distribution risk with the producer and more consequently support films throughout the production – distribution continuum. This was particularly important with regards to distribution support for films in the country of the minority co-producer.

The last panellist in this session was **MACIEJ STRZEMBOSZ** (Film producer, Poland). He spoke about the audience of the future. Maciej opened the delegates' eyes to the fact that the real challenge was further a field and that we could not ever lose the global perspective. The US was now quite aggressively applying public funding to its films through generous tax breaks

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE I (CONTINUED)

---

and the idea of free market in the US was a myth. The US was also relentlessly lobbying all major international institutions and national governments in the pursuit of its interests. It applied pressure on the exhibition market by imposing pre-booking of screens. This was exacerbated by the shortage of screens in Europe.

Mr. Strzembosz was not concerned by the staggering 900+ films produced in Europe as he brought the delegates' attention to the fact that in most large markets everywhere else in the world (China, India), production was up. Also he claimed that we needed this volume of films to produce a few really good ones. He proposed an analogy with new enterprises: half of them failed in their first year, and nobody would consider this a problem, but rather a characteristic feature. He reminded delegates that in any discussion on profitability we needed to take into account other revenue streams than just cinema box office alone. He reminded the forum not to forget about the contribution of the film industry to the treasury. As many studies have proposed in countries around the world, there is an important 'multiplier effect' associated with film production in terms of both incremental investment and incremental employment. The receipts that flow to the Treasury relating to these multiplier effects are often greater than the costs to the Treasury of production subsidies. The government was in fact the investor who was always guaranteed to make money (through tax).

But his starkest warning was about the spectators of tomorrow. All our efforts to increase or even safeguard the European market share would be futile if we did not put emphasis on audience development and media literacy. US product was not only consumed but eagerly anticipated by European young audiences, extensively groomed and developed to receive – and pay for – the US content from the age of being able to sit upright, i.e. 6 months. If we did not expose them early on to a more diverse range of films, there would not be enough viewers (or eyeballs, to use a more contemporary term) to see the nearly thousand European films being produced each year.

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE II

### SATURDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER, 9:30 – 11:00

---

#### Cultural diversity – whose responsibility is it?

- Access to produce films – access to enjoy the works
- Distribution and exhibition in transition, new avenues to the public
- The role of public intervention in securing diversity and pluralism

#### Moderator: Alain Modot, VP of Media Consulting Group, France

**ALAIN MODOT** opened the session by reminding panellists and conference participants that the topic of the day was Cultural Diversity, and that this topic would be explored in relation to distribution, promotion and marketing, i.e. how to implement cultural diversity vis-à-vis the cinema audience.

**YVON THIEC** (General Delegate, Eurocinema) opened by posing the question of what impact the UNESCO Convention on protection and promotion of expressions of cultural diversity had on cinema. Recalling the objectives of the Convention, Mr. Thiec observed that there existed a particular European affinity to the concepts of the Convention, as it provided for the employment of legal provisions as well as public financial support in order to achieve its objectives. The fact that the Convention also used the concept of free exchange as a means to promote cultural diversity completely changed perspectives of this trade-related term. While underlining the need to speed up the process of securing signatures for the Convention, Mr. Thiec saw cinema as an absolute means of cultural diversity. And although international cooperation was feeble and fragmented in the cultural sector, there were structures in place, networks that were of great interest. Building and nurturing networks was fundamental to the implementation of cultural diversity, and the Council of Europe had an important role to play in focusing on and informing about best practices in regard to cultural diversity. Among relevant fields of intervention Mr. Thiec pointed to education and training, particularly among school pupils and young people, and to the role of NGOs as facilitators and avenues for cooperation. The Convention also evoked co-production of films as a means for promoting cultural diversity, which Mr. Thiec found very interesting. "Cinema" thus went beyond the mere production of films, he observed. The Convention opened up possibilities for actions and initiatives, and it remained for the stakeholders in this enlarged concept of cinema to step up to the possibilities and challenges.

The moderator, by way of extending Mr. Thiec's examples and line of reasoning, pointed out that the European Union was about to launch the MEDIA International/MEDIA Mundus programme, which was intended to involve third countries in European audiovisual production and practices.

Professor **IAN CHRISTIE** (Vice President, Europa Cinemas) recalled that his personal first encounter with cultural diversity in cinema was learning about other countries and cultures through films, as exemplified in how the films of Wajda and Kieslowski had allowed him a view of Polish society. Such exposure to foreign culture was much less readily available today, Prof. Christie observed; there was a lack of investment in cinemas that could screen such films, he said, citing the city of Leeds as an example: in the whole city there was only one screen devoted to the screening of European films. In Krakow, a city of the same size as Leeds, there were seven such screens – and they were all members of Europa Cinemas. Screens were essential, European audiences were still consuming films in cinema theatres, and the cinema was a concrete experience. US players certainly had not discounted the cinema: they were building cinemas across Europe. Unfortunately there was no parallel European brick-and-mortar policy. Future film policy should therefore be more spectator-oriented and less production-oriented. Cinema was becoming digital, and Europa Cinemas had made efforts to help this development along. But the big change-over had not materialised. Players were mimicking traditional 35mm exhibition in business models for digital exhibition; in the UK digital screenings were in fact more expensive than using 35mm prints. Digital exhibition could liberate cinema, propelling them to become virtual and an actual cultural and cinematic centres. Prof. Christie added that he had recently been working on a study of the cultural impact of cinema, commissioned by the UK Film Council. The hope was to be able to measure the lasting impact of the cinema experience. This exercise was necessary in order to demonstrate the relevance of the cinema to current society to its paymasters and political authorities.

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE II (CONTINUED)

**BERTRAND MOUILLIER** (UK consultant) presented a number of European initiatives in promoting cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue in Europe. These actions are collected under the umbrella Rainbow Project and will soon be available as a website. Moullier exemplified the project through four different initiatives:

- The title of the film “166 kilometres” (Estonia) referred to the breadth of the country, caught between two behemoths, Hollywood and Russia. Two young filmmakers and an actor have made a punk road-movie that reflects and makes comments on current Estonian society, and goes to show that cultural diversity begins at home.
- The Polish Film Club was – in Ireland. With an estimated 250,000 Poles living or studying in Ireland, the Film Club aimed to bring the best of the crop of current Polish films to ex-patriots, and to expose the Irish audience to those same films. In relation to the ex-pat community, the Polish Film Club helped them acclimatise to their new homeland, while retaining their ties with their homeland.
- “La Zona” was a Mexican feature film, partly funded by Spain’s ICAA (the film and audiovisual institute) and sales agent/distributor Wild Bunch, which allowed the project to be funded above the level of the average Mexican film and to achieve screen values commensurate with its aims to be an audience-attractive film. The story centred on two young men from very different backgrounds confronting each other inside an enclosed residential area (the “zone” of the title) and was being marketed as a thriller about social issues.
- dVoted.org was a website addressing young filmmakers in the Nordic countries, helping them to develop their projects, offering technical advice and suggestions on how to get exposure for their films, and encouraging networking with peers and professional advisors.

**AHMET BOYACIOGLU** (Director, Festival on Wheels, Ankara) took as his point of departure the Turkish cinema in the 1960s and 70s when 200 films were made each year, and where, in 1970, 61 million cinema tickets were sold in Istanbul, a city of some 3 million inhabitants. Crises of an economic and political nature resulted in disaster for Turkish cinema, and in 1989 US players, using President George Bush sr. as vehicle, in practice took over Turkish cinema, swamping the theatres with American studio films. In 2002 nine Turkish films were made, with a national market share of 13 per cent. US dominance was only broken from 2004, when the Turkish audience turned their backs on the Americans, in no small degree due to the war in Iraq. However, a young generation of filmmakers stepped up to fill the void. In 2005 the market share for national films was 40 per cent, in 2006 51 per cent, in 2007 38 per cent, with non-national European films achieving 13 per cent of the market. Turkish cinema had become a national project, and Turkish filmmakers are taking chances, investing in films – and with passion, very different from the generous European support system: “Is European cinema a handicapped child?” Mr Boyacioglu asked provocatively, citing his experience as a festival director and how he often felt exasperated by over-ambitious, esoteric art films from Europe, and how his own first question to young and hopeful Turkish filmmakers was “Who is going to watch this film of yours?” Quoting a Turkish filmmaker, Mr Boyacioglu observed that “if you lose your cinema, you lose your face ... when your cinema is gone, you’re going to watch the faces of other people ... and you’re lost”.

**THOMAS STENDERUP** (Producer, Final Cut Productions) opened by screening a two-minute trailer for Maria Larssons eviga ögonblick (Everlasting Moments), Jan Troell’s latest film, a Danish-Swedish-Norwegian-Finnish-German co-production involving 26 financiers putting up €5 million. The distributor’s initial estimate was for 300.000-plus admissions in Sweden, but when Stenderup asked for concrete plans for the launching of the film in the Nordic countries, the response was shockingly passive. The distributor claimed there was not enough screen space for the film, US studio products having been pre-booked into all available screens. As buzz for the film mounted, with sales to the US, Canada and Ireland, among others, the distributor finally upped the initial print run fourfold. The story about Jan Troell’s maybe finest film ever was, insisted Stenderup, indication of a serious problem, where US blockbusters were “crowding out” European films in the cinemas.

**THOMAS MAI** (Head of New Business, TrustNordisk) handled 60 to 90 Danish, Swedish and Norwegian films through Nordisk Film. It was getting harder and harder to get films into

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE II (CONTINUED)

---

cinemas, he observed. In Toronto recently, there were 80 or 90 world premieres, and buyers did not even have time to see the films. But there was hope in VoD. With a catalogue of 500 films TrustNordisk had signed up with one platform; even with a modest 1-2 downloads per film per day this could be profitable – if duplicated over 200 platforms. VoD was also more transparent than traditional distribution contracts, as VoD delivery generated automatic reports that were secure and reliable. Mai cited Brazil as an outstanding example of VoD delivery networking (see Don Ranvaud's contributions in earlier panels). Mai's advice to policy-makers was to make available subtitles to all films produced in all European languages - an outlay of €27,000 per title would make them easily accessible to everybody.

**JÉRÔME PAILLARD** (CEO, Marché du film, Cannes) reminded the audience of the need to be aware of the vast difference between commercial films and art-house films. The latter category might indeed benefit from the internet both as a distribution platform and a marketing tool. Looking at the value chain of cinema, Paillard observed that once the waterfall of revenue had run its course, precious little, if anything, trickled down to the producer. Digital distribution via the Internet could change this by eliminating a number of middlemen, but this would require a series of new functions and competencies to be developed and implemented in the value chain (it would be interesting to explore this with a view to the future recommendation). Paillard cited a palette of means available to renew the process of marketing, distribution and exhibition, from blog-on-set and early previews on-line, to peer companies and social networking programming in cinema theatres as examples of how to organise promotion and distribution in ways adapted to the Internet. While admitting the importance of the cinema experience, Mr Paillard also referred to the social networking in Brazil, adding a US trial with a similar model in 2007 to the list of examples. He felt that Europa Cinemas might play an important part in such a restructuring of the delivery end of the value chain.

**FELICE FARINE** (Film director, Italy) saw cultural diversity as particularly pertinent in regard to Italian cinema, where, during the 1950s, cultural diversity was transformed into cultural identity through the works of talented filmmakers. The disintegration since the 1980s of this tradition, and indeed of the strong and vibrant film industry, was almost unimaginable. In Italy, a confederation of directors of all ages has sprung up spontaneously in response to the current situation, which has presented a series of demands to the authorities, of which Mr Farine wished to emphasise two:

- The rights of cinema-goers: the state has an obligation to ensure that the citizen has access to the widest possible choice of works
- Liberating the cinema from politics. The point may be particularly poignant in Italy, but also embodies initiatives like demands for an antitrust law and for a mandatory investment obligation on broadcasters.

*Following the panel debate, the following comments were received from the audience:*

Summarising some of the panel's contributions, a delegate warned about coddling European films to death, encouraged investment in films, and in distribution in particular, advised to look for programming practices and seek best practices in this area, as well as expressing a wish for a database of films and rights in order to facilitate accessing these through the Internet.

**CAROLE TONGUE** (UK Coalition for Cultural Diversity) promised that the 45 coalitions for cultural diversity worldwide would start collecting evidence against US crowding-out practices in exhibition, with a view to collecting sufficient evidence to raise complaints with the European Commission.

**HOLLY AYLETT** (UK Coalition for Cultural Diversity) pointed out the connection between the UNESCO Convention and development. Audiovisual should be at the centre of development, not only abroad but at home, in relation to social cohesion and other relevant agendas. She also expressed concern that the Council of Europe did not have an officer in charge of film policy matters. The age level and composition of the delegates to the conference also was a matter of concern to Ms Aylett, who asked "Where are the young people?"

## PLENARY / MAIN DEBATE II (CONTINUED)

---

Emmanuel Cocq emphasised that he was speaking as a private citizen when he related that the day before he had visited a Krakow cinema dedicated to European films, and found the cinema itself, as well as the print being screened, to be in a deplorable state. Mr Cocq felt it was high time to think about how to renovate cinema theatres and make them more welcoming to audiences.

Jacques Toubon warned that support for distribution should not come about at the expense of support for production. He furthermore agreed that the future was digital, but policy must rest on two feet, and it was necessary also to fight piracy and to ensure the rights of creators.

Yvon Thiec picked up the thread of cultural diversity by calling for the fostering of links along the north-south axis in the world, and the encouragement of co-operation with professionals in third countries.

## THE GROUP SESSIONS

---

In order to engage the community in articulating policy measures, the presentations and the panel discussions were complemented by the Group sessions. This provided the basis for the Forum's conclusions and recommendations.

Forum participants worked in groups of around five, each sitting around a PC in a large-scale, live chat room. In the first group session, the groups were asked four questions and had 20 minutes in which to discuss, agree and present their answers which were immediately available to all the other groups. The four questions were:

- The current prioritising of production support has not improved the market position of European film. How could support allocation practices be improved?
- How could policy measures strengthen the position of European films and curb the dominance of US studio product – in cinemas and in television?
- How can a new cinema culture be promoted to raise awareness of films unique potential of conveying cultural and social understanding?
- How can public film policy help facilitate a coherent industrial structure to meet the challenges in the short and long term?

In this way, Forum participants were being asked to engage with, comment on and react to the ideas and propositions that had emerged from the presentations and panel discussions, as well as from the background paper and the European Policy Survey, not to mention their own experiences.

In the second group session, Forum participants, again working in small groups, were asked to prioritise issues and initiatives that had emerged in the debates and the first group session to be put into action. They were also asked to specify the interventions required by:

- the European Commission
- the Council of Europe
- the national film bodies/institutes
- the different parts of the film industry (the producers, the distributors, the broadcasters etc.) itself.

## SUMMARY OF THE GROUP SESSIONS

### BY PHILIPP KREUZER

---

#### The Current status quo of the audiovisual sector in Europe

- **Clear awareness that the “classic” economic model of making and distributing films is changing:**
  - Less market-money available upfront for production.
  - More monies to be recouped from a changing market which is currently not mature (VoD-sector still underdeveloped, insufficient screen coverage/access, less relevance of feature films for main-stream television) Ð expertise and strategy in using new means is the opportunity.
- **Recognising the following priorities:**
  - Production support is vital but there is a clear need to enforce policy measures on development, distribution, marketing in the new digital world (incl. build awareness and expertise).
  - Closer cooperation in developing common film policy objectives, synergies and measures.
  - Clear need to enhance film education in all media.
  - Promote circulation of youth programming in Europe.
  - Continue to reinforce links between European professionals at different levels of the value chain.
  - Support and strengthening of companies through slate funding.
  - Transparency and availability / quality of data.

#### Concrete Measures and Ideas discussed and proposed in the Working Groups and Debates

- **On a European Policy Level:**
  - **Regulatory Measures:**
    - Broad implementation of UNESCO Convention, especially in policies by DG Competition and DG Internal Market, DG InfoSoc and MEDIA-Programme
    - Include new delivery channels’ commitment to and investment in European content e.g. telecoms as well as other new players using film
    - Better apply anti trust regulations
    - A more flexible approach to the way rights are allocated and exploited that reflects the importance of author’s rights as well as the evolution in the commercial landscape
  - **Other Measures:**
    - Develop common strategies to promote European Cinema inside Europe and third countries. “European Motion Pictures Association” to promote European product in local and global markets.
    - Develop best practices for all member states about film education in schools (▪ Council of Europe).
    - Convene local government representatives to discuss their role in cinema and exchange best practice in supporting exhibition. Raise awareness at highest political level that cinema is an important role in society and in development policy and in culture and economic areas (Ð Council of Europe and EU).
    - Convene culture and education ministers responsible for intercultural dialogue to discuss role of cinema in society.
    - Provide resources for developing cultural indicators necessary to convince departments of economy that the audiovisual sector has a role to play beside its important cultural contribution.
    - Looking into further synergies between Eurimages co-production support and MEDIA distribution support.
    - Review the regulatory framework for co-production.
- **On a National/Regional Policy Level:**
  - Develop best practices in public funding (synergies / common objectives)
  - Implementation of the AVMS Directive to encourage investment and circulation in European content.
  - More focus on development as well as on promotion/distribution and a production scheme, a better balance between production and promotion in the schemes, films which receive public funds must include a fixed budget element for marketing of at least 20 % plus “broadcasting vouchers”.

## SUMMARY OF THE GROUP SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

---

- Reserve funding for minority co-productions on reciprocal basis.
- More automatic and success driven funding.
- Accountability for funding decisions?
- Ensure all national organisations to support industry to plan for new strategies.
- **In the Industry:**
  - Make good films, not every film finds audience through screens only.
  - All segments of film industry need to think harder about their respective responsibilities, threats and opportunities in the “digital world”.
  - Producers must have interest in their films finding the audience. They must become more aware of how distribution (old and new emerging models) works to be able to deliver to the distributors what they need to promote the film.
  - Improve competencies of film professionals in new media and vice versa.
  - Broadcasters should reserve more and better time-slot for European content.

## THEMES OF THE KRAKOW FILM FORUM

---

### **How is the term 'cultural diversity' understood in the sector of film production?**

<sup>1</sup> Reference

As Yvon Thiec wrote in the paper he prepared for the Forum about film and the UNESCO Convention<sup>1</sup>, cultural diversity is about “the development of the cinema by promoting exchanges between the world’s film industries. Because in a globalised world ... the power of images is key to cultural expressions, an essential delivery system for creative output and a means of understanding the world ...”

In this context, film production is about creating the “images” and telling the stories that communities and societies exchange. The linking together of “cultural diversity” and the exchange between communities underpins film’s contribution to intercultural dialogue.”

### **The role of national film policies in contributing towards pluralism and diversity**

One major theme of the Forum was captured by Philipp Kreuzer in the summary he presented at the end of the event. There was, he proposed, a clear awareness that the “classic” economic model of making and distributing films was changing, with less commercial investment available up front to finance production. Public financial support was vital.

Equally, public financial support should not be restricted to support for production. In practice, public resources are concentrated on supporting production but, as Philipp pointed out, there was a “clear need to enforce policy measures on development, distribution, marketing in the new digital world (including building awareness and expertise). Philipp also referred to the clear need to enhance film education in all media and to promote the circulation of youth programming in Europe.

So, without financial public support, pluralism and diversity would be reduced – or worse. But national film policies are not – or at least should not – be confined to providing financial support. There is also an important regulatory role. The forms this regulatory role takes were described by Anna Herold, speaking on behalf of the European Commission. Anna Herold described the sector specific regulation of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, on the one hand, and the Cinema Communication 2001 on the other, and also the general, competition policy.

A vital area of regulation was the contribution of television broadcasters to making available and giving visibility to a diversity of films.

André Lange in his interventions drew the Forum’s attention to the importance of transparency of public support and for a sector in which public support played such an important role. Transparency meant better availability and quality of data. This, like pluralism and diversity generally, was only likely to be achieved through effective public policy and regulation.

### **Criteria and tools for measuring the diversity of film production and consumption, the balance between film as art and film as a commodity**

The background of the measurement of diversity of film production and consumption is the dominance of the Hollywood studios in terms of what films audiences in Europe get to see. Introduced by Thomas Stenderup and echoed in contributions throughout the event was the problem of access by audiences to a diversity of films when cinema screens, shop shelves and television services were filled to such a big extent by films produced and distributed by the Hollywood studios.

What little space was not taken by Hollywood was almost completely filled by national films: the European film that was seen in other European countries, let alone the film from another part of the world, was a rarity. Therefore a key criterion and tool for the measurement of diversity were the access to and audiences for films from other countries.

If by “film as commodity” we refer to films that are created and circulate through the operation of the market, and by “film as art” we mean films that are made and watched for reasons that cannot be reduced to the operation of that market, the view that emerged from the Forum, starting with a reflection on how Polish cinema and the Polish cinema audience had evolved, notably since the beginning of the 1990s, was that it had become more difficult to get “film as art” before an audience. The Forum recognised the new opportunities – and the challenges – represented by the emergence of the new, digital platforms; as Alain Modot pointed out, people have more and more (and bigger, and better) screens in their homes. But it could not be assumed that more screens automatically meant more diversity.

## THEMES OF THE KRAKOW FILM FORUM (CONTINUED)

---

Hence a generally-shared view was that another criterion or tool for measurement related to the strengthening of the audience for a diversity of film, beginning with young audiences and paying close attention to film in education.

In general, the focus of measurement needed to be broadened beyond what people got to see in the cinema, and to take in what they got to see via, DVD, broadcast television and on-demand services.

### **The balance in film policies between the opportunity to create artistic works and the opportunities for the public to enjoy these works;**

The view that emerged from the Forum was that more emphasis needed to be given to the opportunities for the public to enjoy artistic works; of course, this could not be at the expense of the opportunity for these works to be created but there was, it could be argued, little point in creating these works if people then did not have the opportunity to watch them.

This means that the balance of public policy needed to be shifted, notably to take into account the opportunities and problems associated with the decline of the “classic” business models and the proliferation of ways of distributing, marketing and watching films, away from pumping money into production and towards ensuring that the conditions were present for the films that were made – in all their diversity – to be available to audiences. One option would be to allocate a bigger share of the public funding to promotion and distribution, but that would probably only create problems for production finance. A better way would be to insist on a secured minimum/distribution budget and distribution guarantees at the time when the production support was being decided upon.

### **Adapting film policies to preserve and promote diversity in a changing technological and social environment**

In general, the focus of measurement needed to be broadened beyond what people got to see in the cinema, and to take in what they got to see via, DVD, broadcast television and on-demand services.

### **Conditions under which co-productions contribute to the promotion of diversity**

The Forum devoted a good deal of attention to the role of co-productions in the attainment of diversity goals. Common sense dictated that, with conditions in the market place changing so much, the regulatory framework for co-production needed to be reviewed. However the nature of co-productions' contribution was not clear-cut because of the absence of information and analysis about the performance of co-productions. The European Audiovisual Observatory prepared for the Forum a report on the circulation of European co-productions<sup>2</sup> that was a first attempt to answer the question of whether co-productions were more likely to circulate in more countries than entirely national films. The answer given in the report was emphatically positive; the report set out some hypotheses as to why co-production should travel more and therefore contribute more to diversity. These hypotheses need to be the subject of subsequent analysis. At the moment, the analysis of the circulation of co-productions, like the analysis of the circulation of films generally, is limited by the level and quality of data available. It is not possible, for example, to consider systematically how films perform on DVD or the audiences for film on broadcast television services, let alone through on-demand services. Data are also limited regarding how much it costs to make the films, to distribute and market them, to how many territories they are sold (and for how much) – in short to build up a comprehensive picture of how films perform.

In the absence of such data, the scope for effective policy making, whether it is about co-productions or film in general, is limited. Better data would help inform the improvement of regulatory frameworks for co-production.

<sup>2</sup> Reference

## THEMES OF THE KRAKOW FILM FORUM (CONTINUED)

---

### **The adaptation of film industry structures to the new patterns and distribution of revenues**

In the Forum's view, there was extensive work to be done associated with the adaptation of film industry structures to the new patterns and distribution of revenues. As Philipp Kreuzer summarised it, more monies had to be recouped from a market which was not mature: the Video-on-Demand sector was still under-developed, screen coverage/access was insufficient, and feature films had less and less relevance for mainstream television. This gave rise to the need for expertise and strategies in using the new means.

### **The role of public service and commercial broadcasters in the promotion of film culture**

The "classic model" for film in Europe placed a very great emphasis on the broadcaster, especially the public service broadcaster, when it came to financing and showing the film. The new patterns meant that this emphasis might not be so effective. Recognising this, the Forum reiterated the need for broadcasters to be actively engaged in providing more and better slots for European content, in being active in film education and the development of young audiences. Given the immaturity of the changing market, the broadcasters were set to continue to occupy a central position in any effective public film policy.

## OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS

### PRESENTATION BY IRENA GUIDIKOVA AND HENNING CAMRE: SUMMING UP AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE FORUM

---

#### **The role of film**

Public policy should seek to help films achieve their artistic and social responsibility goals which means both enabling a variety of films to be produced reflecting the diversity of artistic choices and cultural expressions, and ensuring adequate access for these films to audiences.

#### **Scope of film policy**

1. Develop comprehensive film policies to include areas such as film education and audience development. Involve all stakeholders in defining the objectives and the means of effective film policies. The film agencies should become more specific, transparent and articulate about what they are trying to achieve.
2. Film policies should take into account constraints and opportunities stemming from technological development, as well as the changing behaviours and expectations of the public.

Public film policy should foster the objective of a healthy industrial framework for the film industry. Multiplication of small and fragile enterprises is not a form of strength of the European film industry.

3. The film industry does not speak in one voice vis-à-vis European institutions and international markets: there is a need for a common platform ("Motion Pictures Europe") both to lobby and to promote European films on international markets.

#### **Regulation**

4. Policy-makers should consider the importance of regulation, objective-setting and evaluation as essential elements of film policies, along with funding.
5. Transparency is a basic requirement of the public support to the film industry to ensure its legitimacy and efficiency. Transparency should be a common priority for public authorities and for companies. Stakeholders taking advantage of public support should provide their data and respect their obligations in this regard. If co-regulation and self-regulation are not advancing this objective, then it is the duty of the public bodies to regulate the flows of data. The main objectives should be to protect the right owners in their relations with the distributors (in the large sense of the term), to ensure the normal reimbursement of the loans of public money and to allow a precise understanding of the evolution of the markets and effects of public policies.
6. The "interoperability" of national film support systems should be improved in order to facilitate film circulation and co-productions. "Policy harmonisation" is necessary in the understanding that an agreement on the core policy objectives and the processes should be made.
7. Co-productions have been identified as an important factor of the circulation of European films. The impact and continuous effectiveness of the European convention on co-productions should be assessed and if necessary, the convention should be revised.
8. More dramatic intervention on the market such as quotas would help secure a bigger share of the market for European films.
9. Reform the way films are licensed to reflect the global, demand-led character of the use of film.
10. The possibility of multi-territorial licensing should be introduced.
11. There should be a common European system of tax breaks for investment in film.

#### **Knowledge and information**

12. There is very little knowledge about digitisation in the European film industry and general public policies to help the industry come to terms with the challenges of digitisation are absent.
13. Attention should be paid to the quality and coverage of film journalism and criticism that should serve to help build the audience for film, not to kill the industry.
14. Improve public data collection, market data research, research on consumer behaviour and on the impact of technology.

## OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS (CONTINUED)

---

### Production and development

15. More attention should be paid to how films are developed and the resources, support and expertise available for development. Development is as much about developing talent as it is about developing ideas and concrete projects.
16. Public authorities should look into supporting portfolios of films rather than individual films. This means funding bodies working closely with producers to put in place strategies and plans both at national and European levels for them to progress.  
Film policies are over-preoccupied with the production of films. A better balance is needed towards a greater effort in marketing, distribution and exhibition.
17. Provide incentives for digital film production.
18. We should have one standard, a European co-production instrument instead of series of bilateral treaties which create barriers and complicate the rules.
19. Co-production instruments should include clauses which make the release of films in co-producing countries mandatory, where this is not already the case.

### Exhibition and distribution

20. Enable cinemas to become virtual and actual cultural and cinematographic centres, for instance through developing digital cinema-on-demand.
21. Put in place policies to increase the overall number of screens – fixed and mobile – to ensure that there is a space for less commercial productions. Access to screens for European films is a key problem.
22. Accelerate investment in the digitalisation of cinemas, including through raising awareness among local authorities about their role in this respect.
23. The clarification of the role and responsibility of cinema owners and operators is a basic element of public policy.
24. Reconsider the business models for distribution to adapt to the digital reality and create a European B to B electronic film distribution platform.
25. Develop new platforms and services for European cinema. The technology has created a narrow window of opportunity and could help us improve the position of European films if Europe is proactive and does leave it to others to invent the new business models.
26. Support schemes should include automatically 20% of the budget for promotion which is conditional on the project having a compelling market and distribution strategy. Expert help with promotion and distribution strategies should be provided. Schemes should be considered to give broadcasting promotion vouchers for producers to enable them to buy advertising space.
27. Festivals have proliferated in Europe (there are over 700 of them a year) and have become an essential means for films' access to audiences. However, they should be encouraged to reach out beyond their usual audiences; they should involve not only the usual sales agents but also the VoD platforms and TV channels (and not only the mainstream ones – there are thematic and satellite chains which don't pay much but could help films circulate). Digitalisation could help festivals select their films from a bigger pool, from a distance, with fewer filters.
28. Invest in the renovation of 'Europa Cinemas' to enable them to offer the same quality of screening and comfort as commercial theatres.
29. Include a clause in Eurimages contracts enabling automatic world-wide licensing of films for school use.

### Broadcasters

30. Broadcasters need to be closely involved in the promotion and distribution of European films, helping to build audiences for those films and satisfying viewers' interest in seeing a rich range of films, notably films from other countries.

## OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS (CONTINUED)

---

**31.** There needs to be a scheme to encourage television to show a broad range of foreign and domestic films.

### **Children and the young audience**

**32.** Develop support schemes for the production and distribution of children's films in order to generate audience for European films. Develop measures to dub European children's films to allow them to travel across Europe.

**33.** Provide free licensing for school use of all European films.

**34.** Encourage the creation of national or European public service channels like Kinderkanal in Germany, with European content for children.

**35.** The national authorities should apply the cultural objectives of the recently adopted AVMS directive to all existing channels and audiovisual media services and not only to the leading terrestrial channels.

## RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE FORUM TO NATIONAL AND EUROPEAN POLICY-MAKERS

---

1. National and regional policy-makers and film bodies are responsible for putting in place policies that cover not just production but all aspects of the film “food chain” – distribution and marketing, education, audience development and film heritage.
2. Digitisation is a fundamental factor in the ways that film is made, distributed and accessed. Film policies need to take digitalisation fully into account, enabling the speedy adoption of new distribution and exhibition structures that are possible and necessary to get European films to audiences. In particular, urgent attention needs to be paid to the financing of digitisation of cinemas, especially those which, unlike the multiplexes, are unlikely to benefit from “virtual print fee” arrangements with the US majors (this is the situation for the majority of cinemas that show European and independent films), which requires significant co-ordination as well as access to finance and public subsidy.
3. The role of film policy is to facilitate this transition, not to preserve the old structures and ways of operating that are being swept away.
4. There need to be European companies – in production, distribution and exhibition – that are strong enough to carry through effective strategies and to enable European film to flourish on the global stage. And these companies need to work more closely together, as well as with public film bodies, to improve understanding and awareness of the challenges and opportunities for European cinema, possibly through a body equivalent to the US studio’s Motion Picture Alliance (MPA).
5. Established broadcasters and the platform/service providers are integral to the delivery of film policy objectives and they need to articulate and implement clear strategies whereby they contribute to film policy goals relating not just to the financing of production but to the promotion of films and of film culture.
6. Particular attention needs to be paid to measures aimed at children and young people: the films they watch, how they get to watch them and how they engage with film culture. This is the key to the success of European film. Very basic forms of intervention, such as supporting the dubbing and sub-titling of films, are vital, not to mention the support of organisations such as Film Education in the UK and Vision Kino in Germany which are dedicated to the interaction between cinema and schools.
7. Sustain freedom of artistic expression while developing new ways for reaching out to audiences. In the framework of digital content provision, the public is increasingly determining what films they watch, when and how they watch them whether it is using video-on-demand or (more commonly at present) streaming and downloading illegal copies.
8. It is through audiences that film fulfils its artistic and social responsibilities, in particular in relation to cultural diversity. Public policies should promote the accessibility to the films, which does not mean supporting only films for large audience but also supporting ambitious, original and demanding creations.
9. Some of the key elements of effective policy-making are transparency and accountability. Evaluation of performance and the results obtained, both cultural and economic, provides the basis for demonstrating the value of public policies and the basis upon which those policies can be improved. Both the providers and the recipients of public support have a duty to ensure that the information is available to permit proper evaluation, fair remuneration of rights owners and repayment of the public loans.
10. The Council of Europe has a critical role to play in disseminating and encouraging best practice in activities to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expression and should put in place the resources and personnel to fulfil this role.

## NEXT STEPS

---

On the basis of the discussions held at the European Film Policy Forum in Kraków, the following five sets of tasks have been identified to be taken forward in the short term:

### **1. Communicating the Forum Conclusions and Recommendations**

The Forum Report, Conclusions and Recommendations set out in this document will be circulated to the people who took part in the Forum, and made available to national and European public bodies, decision makers and organisations.

### **2. European cinema and young people**

The Forum unanimously acknowledged the need to prioritise initiatives aimed at building the interest of young people in European cinema and their engagement with it. At the same time, few countries have coherent strategies to advance this objective. Two actions are proposed:

#### ***a. Establishing a European film education network***

Film agencies should encourage bodies they support to promote film in education to participate in a network whose aim is to exchange information, ideas and best practice relating to cinema and schools. This network would become a point of reference in developing media literacy initiatives in Europe and in assisting those countries that are not currently active in this area to become so. Through European institutions and national governments, the network would lobby to raise the profile of film education.

An early opportunity to take forward this work would be the conference on media literacy being convened by the Czech EU presidency in March 2009.

#### ***b. Pushing children's film up the policy agenda***

The business of circulating children's film around Europe has been entrusted almost exclusively to the US majors. It is their films that constitute a basis for shared identity in Europe. Few countries are actively supporting the production and distribution of films even for young national audiences, let alone of films that could be taken up by young audiences in other countries.

### **3. Digitising cinema exhibition**

Digitising cinema exhibition offers to improve audience's access to a wide range of films and European filmmakers' access to audiences both in their own country and in other countries. The Communication on digital cinema, about to be published by the European Commission, offers a basis on which to address the challenges of digitising cinema exhibition in Europe. Public film bodies should liaise closely with the European Commission around the Communication and its implementation, notably in relation to the infrastructural challenges to ensure that films from one country are accessible to the digital networks in other countries.

### **4. Overhaul of the European Co-Production Convention**

The Forum recommended the simplification of co-production rules in Europe to ensure that those rules did not present obstacles to films' artistic aims and that they genuinely contributed to films crossing borders. A revised European Co-Production Convention could advance these two sets of objectives. In addition it would need to take fully into account the changes that have taken place – and are taking place – in how films are made, distributed and watched as well as take into account the wider objectives of film policy. Film agencies and industry should actively contribute to the Council of Europe's work to prepare a new Convention.

### **5. Transparency and accountability**

Standards of transparency and accountability – the bedrock of effective film policies – need to be raised substantially. They constitute the basis of the legitimacy of public funding for film. They relate to the conduct of both the film agencies – the decisions they make and the projects they support (how much funding they provide, to whom and with what results) and to the industry. This requires the wide availability of reliable market data, also data about companies, for example, their finances and how many people they employ. The current arrangements based on voluntary disclosure have proved inadequate. Vital data, such as those relating to films on DVD, on television and on the new on-demand platforms and services, are either too limited or not

## NEXT STEPS (CONTINUED)

---

available at all. Regulatory intervention may be required to ensure the coverage, accuracy and disclosure of data.

The European Film Agencies Research Network (EFARN) should be encouraged to prepare a proposal that sets out indicators relating both to film funding and to film markets that are to be implemented at national, regional and European levels along with a critical path for their implementation. The EFARN could also help identify where regulatory intervention might be required. ■

## PARTICIPANTS

COUNTRY	NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	EMAIL
Afghanistan	Siddiq	Barmak	Director	barmakfilm@gmail.com
Argentina	Rolando	Santos Pesaresi	FEDALA Coordinator (Fed. de Escritores y Directores Latinoamericanos)	
Armenia	Susanna	Harutyunyan	Golden Apricot Yerevan International Film Festival	aafccj@arminco.com
Austria	Barbara	Franzen	Fed. Ministry of Culture, Education and the Arts - Head of Film Div.	/barbara.fraenzen@bmukk.gv.at
Austria	Yvonne	Gimpel	EUXXL Forum	yvonne.gimpel@eu-xxl.at
Azerbaijan	Vasif	Eyvazzade	Ministry of Culture and Tourism	vasif_mct@hotmail.com
Azerbaijan	Jahangir	Mammadov	Ministry of Culture and Tourism	djmammadov@yahoo.com
Belgium	Jean-Pierre	Berckmans	Cineaste	icebergcom@skynet.be
Belgium	Jeanne	Brunfaut	Audiovisuel et Multimedias Communauté Française de Belgique	jeanne.brunfaut@cfwb.be
Belgium	Joao	Correa	General Delegate - World Cinema Alliance	joao.correa@cinema-alliance.org
Belgium	Angela	De Luisi	Deputy CEO - World Cinema Alliance	angela.deluisi@cinema-alliance.org
Belgium	Cecile	Despringre	CEO of FERA	cecile.despringre@sacd.fr
Belgium	Philippe	Kern	KEA European Affairs	pkern@keanet.eu
Belgium	Philippe	Reynaert	Wallimage	phr@wallimage.be
Belgium	Henri	Seroka	Composer - World Cinema Alliance	
Belgium	Elodie	Vaisberg	KEA/EFCA	evaisberg@keanet.eu
Cyprus	Kyriacos	Tofarides	Cyprus Directors Guild	avrafilm@gmail.com
Czech	Katerina	Besserova	Ministry of Culture - Head of Cinematography Section	katerina.besserova@mkcr.cz
Czech	Magdalena	Bouckova	Ministry of Culture - Department of EU	Magdalena.Bouckova@mkcr.cz
Denmark	Henrik	Bo Nielsen	CEO, Danish Film Institute	hbn@dfi.dk
Denmark	Henning	Camre	Exec. Director - Think Tank on Film and Film Policy	henning.camre@filmthinktank.org
Denmark	Thomas	Mai	TrustNordisk - Head of New Business	Thomas@TrustNordisk.com
Denmark	Chris	Sanger	Consultant, ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy	chris.sanger@filmthinktank.org
Denmark	Thomas	Stenderup	Final Cut Productions - Producer	Stenderup@final-cut.dk
Estonia	Marge	Liske	Estonian Film Foundation - Managing Director	marge@efsa.ee
EU	Emmanuel	Cocq	European Commission	emmanuel.cocq@ec.europa.eu
EU	Anna	Herold	European Commission	anna.herold@ec.europa.eu
Finland	Kimmo	Aulake	Adviser, Ministry of Education and Culture	
Finland	Petri	Kemppinen	Finnish Film Foundation - Head of Int. Affairs and Development	petri.kemppinen@ses.fi
Finland	Irina	Krohn	Finnish Film Foundation - Managing Director	irina.krohn@ses.fi
Finland	Leena	Laaksonen	Ministry of Education and Culture	
Finland	Niina	Otva	Finnish Film Foundation	niina.otva@ses.fi
France	Wolfgang	Closs	European Audiovisual Observatory of the Council of Europe	wolfgang.closs@coe.int
France	Irena	Guidikova	Council of Europe	Irena.GUIDIKOVA@coe.int
France	Roland	Husson	CNC - Director of European and Int. Affairs	Roland.Husson@cnc.fr
France	Andre	Lange	European Audiovisual Observatory	andre.lange@coe.int
France	Alain	Modot	Media Consulting Group	am@mediacg.tv
France	Roberto	Olla	General Secretary, Eurimages	roberto.olla@coe.int
France	Jerome	Paillard	Marche du Film, Cannes	
France	Robert	Palmer	Dir. of Culture and Cultural and Nat. Heritage, Council of Europe	robert.palmer@coe.int
France	Yvon	Thiec	General Delegate, Eurocinema	eurocinema@eurocinema.be
France	Lise	Toubon	Observer	
France	Jacques	Toubon	Eurimages - Chairman	b.moal@free.fr (Sabine Evrard -as)
France	Anna	Trigona	Council of Europe	
FYROM	Mimi	Gjorgoska-Ilievska	Director - Cinematheque of Macedonia	mimig@maccinema.com
Georgia	Nino	Anjapharidze	Georgian National Film Center	office@filmcenter.ge, ninoanj@hotmail.com
Germany	Peter	Dinges	German Federal Filmboard	riecck@ffa.de
Germany	Philipp	Kreuzer	Deputy MG and Head of Co-prod., Bavaria Pictures GmbH	philipp.kreuzer@bavaria-film.de
Germany	Frank	Stehling	P.R.I.M.E. - Director	f.stehling@prime-net.biz
Greece	Ntinos	Giotis	World Cinema Alliance	
Greece	Alexandre	Kakavas	World Cinema Alliance	
Hungary	Tamás	Joó	Eurimages rep. - consultant	tamas.joo@filmunio.hu
Hungary	Janos	Reichenberger	Ministry of Education and Culture	janos.reichenberger@okm.gov.hu
Hungary	Judit	Varadi-Bor	Min. of Education and Culture - Deputy Head of Dept. of Arts	judit.bor@okm.gov.hu
Hungary	Eva	Vezer	Hungarian Film Union	eva.vezer@filmunio.hu
Ireland	Seamas	McSwiney	Duckling Development	smsparis@hotmail.com
Ireland	Simon	Perry	Irish Film Board	simon.perry@irishfilmboard.ie
Italy	Paul	Baboudjian	Arab Media Group	pbaboudjian@arabmediagrouponline.com
Italy	Ugo	Gregoretti	World Cinema Alliance	
Italy	Peter	Kruger	ICT and New Media Advisor	pkruiger@gmail.com
Italy	Alessandra	Priante	Cinecitta Holding	a.priante@cinecitta.it
Italy	Don	Ranvaud	Producer	dranvaud@gmail.com
Italy	Massimo	Sani	Associazione Produttori Italiani (API)	
Korea	Naria	Chung	Cultural Diversity in Moving Images	
Korea	Gi-Hwan	Yang	General Director - Cultural Diversity in Moving Images	
Lithuania	Gerda	Butkuvieni	Ministry of Culture	g.butkuvieni@lrkm.lt
Moldova	Dumitru	Marian	OWH TV Studio	d.t.marian@gmail.com
Netherlands	Toine	Berbers	CEO Netherlands Filmfund	
Norway	Dag	Asbjornsen	Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs	dag.asbjornsen@kkd.dep.no
Norway	Nils	Klevjer Aas	Norwegian Film Institute	nils.klevjer.aas@nfi.no
Norway	Ivar	Kohn	Norwegian Film Institute	ivar.kohn@nfi.no
Poland	Barbara	Babula	KRRiT - National Broadcasting Council	bubula@krrit.gov.pl
Poland	Piotr	Boron	KRRiT - National Broadcasting Council	boron@krrit.gov.pl
Poland	Jacek	Bromski	Polish Filmmakers Association	jacek.bromski@sfp.org.pl
Poland	Agnieszka	Debogórska	Stopklatka.pl	jasnogorska@gmail.com
Poland	Piotr	Dzieciol	Opus Film Studio	prezes@opusfilm.com
Poland	Bogumil	Foland	Polish Television	bogumil.foland@tvpp.pl

## PARTICIPANTS (CONTINUED)

COUNTRY	NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	EMAIL
Poland	Jacek	Fuksiewicz	Polish Film Institute	jacek.fuksiewicz@pifsf.pl
Poland	Cecylia	Gasz-Ploska	Silesia Film - Head	info@silesiafilm.com.pl
Poland	Krzysztof	Gierat	Polish Film Promotion Foundation	krzysztof.gierat@filmipolski.com.pl
Poland	Maciej	Gil	Film Society	sekretarz@pfdkf.pl
Poland	Jadwiga	Głowa	Jagellonian University	jadwiga_glowa@tlen.pl
Poland	Dawid	Janicki	Vostok Films	janicki@vostokfilms.co.uk
Poland	Andrzej	Jasiewicz	Polish Filmmakers Association	arj@sfp.org.pl
Poland	Maciej	Karpinski	Polish Film Institute	maciej.karpinski@pifsf.pl
Poland	Tadeusz	Kowalski	National Film Archive, Director	tkowalski@fn.org.pl
Poland	Andrzej	Kucharczyk	Apropos Kino s.j	ak@ars.pl
Poland	Jerzy	Kucia	Academy of Fine Arts	jkucia@interia.pl
Poland	Artur	Majer	Polish Film Institute	artur.majer@pifsf.pl
Poland	Wojciech	Marczewski	Film Director, Director, A. Wajda Master Sch. of Film Dir.	film@poczta.onet.pl
Poland	Krzysztof	Markiel	Krakow Municipality	kmar@malopolska.mw.gov.pl
Poland	Anna	Minkiewicz	Afghan Film Festival	annamink@mp.pl
Poland	Marek	Nawracaj	Markus Media Production	mrkstudio@o2.pl
Poland	Włodzimierz	Niderhaus	Film Studio - Head	kipa@kipa.pl
Poland	Agnieszka	Odorowicz	Director of Polish Film Institute	agnieszka.odorowicz@pifsf.pl
Poland	Jacek	Ostaszewski	Jagellonian University	ostaszfamily@interia.pl
Poland	Anita	Piotrowska	Tygodnik Powszechny	piotrowska@tygodnik.com.pl
Poland	Ewa	Puszczynska	Opus Film Studio	ewa@opusfilm.com
Poland	Małgorzata	Retei	Paissa Film Studio	malgorzaretai@paisafilms.pl
Poland	Jerzy	Ridan	Polish Filmmakers Association	erfilm@poczta.onet.pl
Poland	Dorota	Roszkowska	Arkana Studio	doro@arkanastudio.pl
Poland	Jarosław	Sander	Polsat Television	jsander@polsat.com.pl
Poland	Joanna	Skierska	TV-Director of the Int. Cooperation Dept.	joanna.skierska@waw.tvp.pl
Poland	Iwona	Sledzinska-Katarasinska	Parliament Committee of Culture - President	ewa.sarnecka@sejm.gov.pl
Poland	Katarzyna	Ślesicka	Andrzej Wajda Directing School	info@wajdaschool.pl
Poland	Monika	SmoleD	Deputy Minister of Culture	podsekretarz_smolen@mkidn.gov.pl
Poland	Jerzy	Strama	Markus Media Production	jurek3d@gmail.com
Poland	Irena	Strzałkowska	TOR Studio	tor@tor.com.pl
Poland	Maciej	Strzembosz	President of Chamber of Polish Audiovisual Producers	maciejs@it.pl, kipa@kipa.pl
Poland	Aleksandra	Szczerbak	Chamber of Polish Audiovisual Producers	aleksandra.szczerbak@kipa.pl
Poland	Joanna	Szymańska	Appetite Production	joanna@appetiteproduction.com
Poland	Andrzej	Wajda	Film Director	
Poland	Joanna	Wendorff	Media Desk - Head	joanna.wendorff@mediadesk.com.pl
Poland	Jacek	Wilczyński	Chamber of Audiovisual Producers	jacek.wilczynski@kipa.pl
Poland	Lesław	Wilk	Polish Filmmakers Association	pppppp361@wp.pl
Poland	Krzysztof	Zanussi	Film Director	tor@tor.com.pl
Portugal	Antonio Pedro	De Vasconcelos	Sociedade Portuguesa de Autores (SPA)	
Portugal	Nuno	Fonseca	ICA, Portuguese Film Institute	nuno.fonseca@ica-ip.pt
Portugal	Jorge	Paixão da Costa	World Cinema Alliance	
Romania	Eugen	Serbanescu	Romanian Film Center - General Manager	cnc@cncinema.ro,
Russia	Valery	Pendrakovsky	Film Director	perval@yandex.ru
Russia	Anna	Pendraakovskaya	Producer, scriptwriter	moskino-fest@yandex.ru
Slovak Rep.	Zuzana	Mistikova	Slovak Film and Television Academy	zuzana@radionet.sk
Slovak Rep.	Martin	Smatlak	Slovak Film Institute	smatlak@sfu.sk
Slovak Rep.	Alexandra	Strelkova	Slovak Film Institute	strelkova@sfu.sk
Spain	Francisco	Aguilera	Dir. Int. Affairs – Sociedad Gen. de Autores de Espana	francisco.aguilera@cinema-alliance.org
Spain	Rosario	Alburquerque	Spanish Film Institute	rosario.alburquerque@icaa.mcu.es
Spain	Consolacion	Pelaez	Spanish Film Institute	consolacion.pelaez@icaa.mcu.es
Sweden	Charlotte	Appelgren	Secretary General Cine Regio	ca@cineregio.org
Switzerl.	Pierre-Henri	Dumont	World Cinema Alliance	
Switzerl.	Laurent	Steiert	Chief Success-linked Film Promotion	laurent.steiert@bak.admin.ch
Switzerl.	Gaetano	Stucchi	Media Consultant	stucci_g@bluewin.ch
Switzerl.	Adelina	von Fürstenberg	Director, Art for the World	adelina@artfortheworld.net
Turkey	Ahmet	Boyacioglu	Festival on Wheels - Ankara	ahmet@festivalonwheels.org
UK	Tim	Adler	Screen Finance	tim.adler@informa.com
UK	Holly	Aylett	UK Coalition for Cultural Diversity	ayleth@gmail.com
UK	Ivor	Benjamin	World Cinema Alliance	ivor@ivorbenjamin.co.uk
UK	Ian	Christie	Europa Cinemas	ianchristi@gmail.com
UK	Carol	Comley	UK Film Council	carol.comley@ukfilmcouncil.org.uk
UK	Jonathan	Davis	Senior Adviser, ThinkTank	
UK	John	Durie	Strategic Film Marketing	john@strategicfilm.com
UK	Richard	Miller	Olsberg/SPI	richard@o-spi.com
UK	Agnieszka	Moody	UK Film Council	Agnieszka.moody@ukfilmcouncil.org.uk
UK	Bertrand	Moullier	Consultant	bertrandmoullier@yahoo.co.uk
UK	Jonathan	Olsberg	Olsberg/SPI	jonathan@o-spi.com
UK	Carole	Tongue	Director, Sovereign Strategy	Carole.Tongue@sovereignstrategy.com
USA	Michael	Georgiades		
USA	David	Pina	World Cinema Alliance	
USA	Fabien	Tordjman Dahlen	F.T. Productions - President	

## CONTRIBUTORS

---

### SIDDIQ BARMAK

Film director, Afghanistan, born 1962. Earned his degree in film directing from the Moscow University. His feature-length debut entitled "Osama" (2003) has won prizes at festivals all over the world, including Cannes, Bratislava and Miami and his latest film, Opium War, will be released in 2008.

---

### AHMET BOYACIOGLU

Born 1953, Turkey. Chairman of the Ankara Cinema Association, General Secretary of the Festival on Wheels. He has been Executive Board member at Ankara International Film Festival (1988-1995), and founding member of World Mass Communication Research Foundation (1991) and TÜRSAK (Turkish Foundation of Cinema and Audiovisual Culture – 1991). Since 1995, he has been a founding member, executive board member and general secretary of the Festival on Wheels. Turkish representative at Eurimages 2005 – 2007.

---

### HENNING CAMRE

Henning Camre is Cinematographer by training, after a career in the Danish film industry he was appointed Director of Danish National Film School with the task of re-establishing the School after its demise in the early seventies. Camre was Director of the School from 1975-1992. Then from 1992-1995 he became the Director of the UK National Film and Television School, from 1995-1998 also Chief Executive, the NFTS Group, comprising: National Film & Television School; NFTS Ealing Studios Limited; NFTS Distribution Company; CREATEC – Creative Arts and Technologies Centre and the NFTS Foundation. Returned to Denmark in 1998 to become the Founding Director and CEO of the new Danish Film Institute, leaving in 2007 to establish the 'European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy' of which he is now Executive Director.

---

### IAN CHRISTIE

Ian Christie joined the School of History of Art, Film and Visual Media at Birkbeck, University of London, in Autumn 1999, as Anniversary Professor of Film and Media History, having previously been Professor of Film Studies at the University of Kent (1997-9) and Visiting Lecturer in Film at Oxford University (1995-8). Earlier, he worked at the British Film Institute from 1976-96 in various capacities, as head of Distribution, Exhibition, Video Publishing and, finally, Special Projects. This last involved co-producing a television series on early cinema for BBC2, The Last Machine presented by Terry Gilliam (1995); and co-curating an exhibition at the Hayward Gallery, Spellbound: Art and Film (1996), which included work by Gilliam, Greenaway and two subsequent Turner Prize winners, Douglas Gordon and Steve McQueen. He advised on the exhibition Modernism: Designing a New World at the V&A in 2006 and in the same year was Slade Professor of Fine Art at Cambridge University. Director of the AHRB Centre for British Film and Television Studies, with its headquarters at Birkbeck, from 2003-05, he also directed its London Project and is currently director of the London Screen Study Collection. Christie is Vice President of Europa Cinemas, an EU funded organisation which supports exhibitors throughout Europe who show European films, and a Trustee of the Independent Film Parliament. He is also a regular reviewer and broadcaster on film matters.

---

### JONATHAN DAVIS

Consultant, European ThinkTank on Film and Film Policy. Born in London in 1957, Jonathan is a graduate of the University of Bristol and New York University. On completing his Masters in Film History and Theory, Jonathan served his apprenticeship at Columbia Pictures, at the London-based research company, Knowledge Research, and at the economic consultancy, London Economics. Jonathan Davis has been an advisor to the ThinkTank since 2005, working on the preparation of the Copenhagen ThinkTank which took place in June 2006. He subsequently assisted Henning Camre in the establishment of the ThinkTank. Since 2002, he has been a strategy advisor to the UK Film Council, focusing on film policy at the European level, and, since 2001, a director of the British Screen Advisory Council.

---

### PETER DINGES

CEO of the German Federal Film Board (FFA). Since 1st of April 2004 Peter Dinges is CEO of the German Federal Film Board (FFA). Dinges was born in Saarbrücken in 1961 and studied law at the University of Freiburg where he graduated as a lawyer in 1991. In the following he gained his first business experiences among others as lecturer in commercial right in Magdeburg and as an attorney at law in Arnstadt. Before he became Deputy Managing Director at TeleTaurusFilm in 1994 Dinges worked as a lawyer for Telepool in Munich. In 1995 he returned to Telepool as "Head of Business & Legal Affairs" where he became member of the managing board in 1999.

---

### FELICE FARINA

Film writer, director and inventor. Born in Rome 53 years ago, he began his career in animation and special FX, working mainly for the national broadcaster, RAI. Since his first feature in 1987, he has never withdrawn from the cinema or film-making. He is also among the founders of the artistic lobby, Cento autori, set up to defend authors' rights and opinions in the never-ending political debate for public funding, quality and cultural diversity.

---

### IRENA GUIDIKOVA

A graduate of Political Science and Political Philosophy from the Universities of Sofia (BG) and York (UK), Irena has been working at the Council of Europe since 1994. Her career has taken her from the Directorate of Youth and Sport where she developed and carried out a large research programme, through a transversal three-year project on the future of democracy in Europe, to the Private Office of the Secretary General where she was a policy advisor, to her present job as Head of Division of Cultural Policy, Diversity and Dialogue. Guidikova's professional interests in all of the above fields cover areas at the intersection of public institutions and society: public policies and social change, technological development and policy innovation, policy review and advice, strategy development and implementation.

---

### ANNA HEROLD

Anna Herold holds a Ph.D. from the European University Institute in Florence, and currently serves as an official in the Audiovisual and Media Policies Unit of the Directorate-General for Information Society and Media of the European Commission, where she is dealing with the implementation and development of the European regulatory policy in the audiovisual field. She has previously dealt with antitrust issues in the media sector in the Competition Directorate-General of the Commission. She has published widely on issues related to audiovisual policy, cultural diversity, competition law and international trade law. Her book entitled "European Film Policies in the Context of EU and International Law. A Misalliance of Culture and Free Market?" is forthcoming in 2009 from Europa Law Publishing.

## CONTRIBUTORS (CONTINUED)

---

### MACIEJ KARPINSKI

Born in Warsaw in 1950, Maciej Karpinski graduated in Art History from University of Warsaw. He made his literary debut as dramatist in 1969 at the age of 19. He was a scriptwriter for a number of internationally acclaimed films, including "Solitary Woman" directed by Agnieszka Holland, "The Ring with the Crowned Eagle" and "Nastassya" by Andrzej Wajda, "Daughters of Luck" by Marta Meszaros, and "The Purim Miracle" by Izabella Cywinska. For many years he was professor of scriptwriting at the Łódź Film Academy, publishing "The Imperfect Reflection: on the Art of Screenwriting", a book which confirmed his position as an authority in this field.

Between 1982 to 1987 Mr. Karpinski lived in United States, teaching film, drama and literature at American universities. He continues as visiting professor. At present, he is a professor of screenwriting at Łódź.

After many years spent as the vice-president for script development at the Perspektywa Film Studios and the Head of Project Development at the Film Production Department of Polish National Television, he was appointed Deputy Director of newly-formed Polish Film Institute in 2005.

---

### PHILIPPE KERN

Philippe KERN is the founder and managing director of KEA European Affairs. He has 20 years' experience in the world of creative industries. He is a specialist in copyright, anti-trust and trade law. Philippe Kern has led a range of research and strategy programs at European level on creative issues, notably for the European Commission and the European Parliament. He is advising numerous public and private bodies on the formulation of a European strategy including access to finance. Philippe Kern has an unparalleled network of contacts in the cultural/creative field at international level. He was former Director of Public and Legal Affairs of PolyGram and head of the IFPI Brussels office. He is the founder and secretary general of the European Film Companies Alliance (EFCA) as well as the founder of the Independent Music Companies Association (IMPALA) and e-films. Kern is a member of the board of the European Film College. Kern graduated in law from the universities of Strasbourg and Paris as well as the College of Europe in Bruges. Philippe Kern is an established speaker at international conferences, managing seminars and workshops.

---

### NILS KLEVJER AAS

Nils Klevjer Aas is Senior Advisor for research and policy to the Norwegian Film Institute. Trained as a journalist and teacher, and holding a Master's degree in film studies, he has served in a variety of executive positions in the exhibition and the public film administration sector, in Norway as well as abroad, since 1978 – among them artistic director of the Norwegian Film Festival and co-founder of the Tromsø Film Festival, Head of Archives of the Norwegian Film Institute, Director General of the National Film Board of Norway and Executive Director of the European Audiovisual Observatory. He has published and lectured extensively on film appreciation, film history and audiovisual policy. Nils Klevjer Aas currently represents Norway on the EURIMAGES Board of Management, the EAO Executive Council, and the MEDIA 2007 committee. He has also served on juries for several film festivals and film awards, and in various national support allocation committees.

---

### PHILIPP KREUZER

Philipp Kreuzer is a lawyer and has a master in audiovisual production and management. He practiced entertainment and copyright law in Germany and the USA prior to engaging into feature film production and finance first in the UK, then in Germany as Head of Production and Business Affairs of MFP Munich Film Partners GmbH, a production company backed by one of the major private equity investment funds and producing, amongst others, a slate of feature films with a major US-studio (1999-2001). From 2001 until 2004 he was project administrator at Eurimages, the pan-European film and cinema support fund of the Council of Europe, where he was responsible for a large number of European feature film co-productions co-financed by the fund. In 2005 he joined Bavaria Film GmbH as Head of Film- and TV financing responsible for the financing of various TV productions including TV-event mini-series. In 2007 he was appointed Deputy Managing Director and Head of Co-production of Bavaria Pictures GmbH, a feature film production company of the Bavaria Film Group. In 2007 he produced Jan Stahlberg's and Marcus Mittermeier's "Short Cut to Hollywood" and financed Heinrich Breloer's feature film "Buddenbrooks". Next to being an expert for public funding institutions, he also lectures on film and copyright law, co-production, structured film finance and business planning.

---

### ANDRE LANGE

Head of the Department for Information on Markets and Financing. Scientific editor of the Yearbook - Film, Television and Video in Europe and coordinator of the LUMIERE and KORDA databases. Prior to joining the Observatory in 1993 as part of the initial team, had a distinguished international career as a researcher, specialising in socio-economic aspects of the European media sector. Worked as university lecturer and researcher at the University of Liège, the European Institute for the Media in Manchester, the University of Paris-Dauphine and the Free University of Brussels, and held a lecturer traineeship (1988-89) with the Directorate of Human Rights at the Council of Europe. Headed the Audiovisual and Cultural Industries Department of the French research institute IDATE (1989-1993) before joining the Observatory. Lange has published a large number of books, studies and scientific papers for international bodies, national ministries, professional organisations and research institutes. Formerly was lecturer on the History of television at the Free University of Brussels. Doctorate in Communications Studies from the University of Liège (1986). Member of the ORBICOM network and the scientific committee of the journal Communications et stratégies (France) and in 2003 member of the Jury of the Kraszna Krausz Awards for Best Books on Moving Picture. His book, The Future of the European Audiovisual Industry (1988), received the Emile Bernheim Prize for European Integration. Editor of the website "History of Television" (<http://histv.free.fr>).

---

### TADEUSZ LUBELSKI

Professor, Jagiellonian University, Poland. Born in 1949 in Gliwice, Poland. He obtained a Master's degree in Polish Philology from the Jagiellonian University. In 1979 he defended a PhD thesis in which he discussed the works of Tadeusz Konwicki. His post-doctoral paper of 1992 was entitled 'The Strategies of Polish Feature Film Authors 1945-1961'. Currently, he is a professor of humanities and one of the most eminent historians of the Polish cinema. He works as a lecturer at, among others, the Film Studies Department of Krakow University. His interests involve French cinematography and he has published a book on the subject entitled Nowa Fala. O pewnej przygodzie kina francuskiego. As a film critic he has been associated for many years with 'Kino', a reputable Polish monthly devoted to cinema issues, where he is a deputy editor-in-chief. He currently serves as a Director of the Institute of Audiovisual Arts at the Jagiellonian University.

## CONTRIBUTORS (CONTINUED)

---

### THOMAS MAI

Head of New Business, TrustNordisk.

Thomas Mai has produced four feature films winning multiple awards at various film festivals and was named "10 Producers to Watch" by film trade magazine Variety in 2000. Thomas was Managing Partner and producer in Klondike Film from 1996-1998 and CEO of Trust Film Sales from 1998-2000, from 2000-2004 he was the Managing Partner and producer of ZentAmerica and CEO of Los Angeles based Katapult Film Sales from 2004-2006. Since January 2008, has Thomas been focusing exclusively on VOD for the newly merged sales company TrustNordisk.

---

### WOJCIECH MARCZEWSKI

Born in Lodz in 1944, Wojciech Marczewski studied history and philosophy at Lodz University and graduated as a film director from the Theatre and Film School in Lodz. He worked as screenwriter and director on many film and television projects. From 1972 to 1994, he was part of Film Studio TOR. From 1980 to 1983 he was the deputy president of the Polish Filmmakers' Association and, from 1984 to 1986, the head of Polish Cine Club Federation. During marshal law, he began to teach in West Germany and Denmark. Since 1984 he has worked at the National Film and Television School in Copenhagen, Denmark. Between 1992 and 1994 he was the Head of the Directing Department in the National Film and Television School in Great Britain. He has conducted many workshops for film directors, screenwriters and actors in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark and Poland. Since 1996 he has taught at the National Film School in Łódź and at the University in Katowice. His films, which include Nightmares (1978), Shivers (1981), Escape from the Liberty Cinema (1991), Time of Treachery (1997) and Weiser (2001), have been distributed in numerous countries and have been selected for and won prizes at many international film festivals. He has also directed several TV dramas.

---

### ALAIN MODOT

Alain Modot holds an Economy diploma (1973), a postgraduate degree in Management and Economy (1975) from the University Sorbonne, a Sociology diploma from the University Paris V (1975) and holds the highest qualification for teachers at secondary level in Social Sciences. He began his career teaching Social and Economic Sciences. In 1988, Alain Modot founded the USPA (the Independent Producers' Association) of which he was the chief representative until 1995. From 1993 to 1995, he chaired the European Independent Producers Association (CEPI). In 1995, he created TVFI an active body in promoting and exporting French audiovisual programmes. Finally, after being Director for Institutional Relations for the CANAL+ Group until 1999, he joined IMCA in October 1999, as Director for Institutional and European Affairs, a post he held until January 2002. Since January 2001, Alain Modot is cofounder and Vice President of MEDIA CONSULTING GROUP a strategic consultancy company advising for companies and public bodies involved in the field of cinema, audiovisual and medias (headquarters in Paris, offices in Brussels and Rome). He developed MCG's European and international business, as a consultant for several studies and evaluations for the European Commission and participated in several consultancy missions for the EU new Member States and companies acting on the global market. Alain Modot has developed an in-depth knowledge of EU and national policies with regards to the audiovisual sector.

---

### AGNIESZKA MOODY

Agnieszka Moody is the Director of the UK MEDIA Desk, a promotion and information office of the European Union funding programme MEDIA 2007, hosted by the UK Film Council. Over seven years in the post Agnieszka has helped over three hundred British companies secure funding for their projects from the EU and also organised a range of industry events and conferences fostering international collaboration.

Prior to this post, Agnieszka was running her own independent production company International Media Productions. She is a graduate of the Film Production Department of the renowned Polish National Film and Television School in Lodz. She has worked on several feature films including Schindler's List. From 1993 to 1995 she was based in Paris as Head of Production at Moon Movies, an independent French production company.

---

### BERTRAND MOULLIER

Bertrand Moullier is the former director general of the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (2002-2005), where he primarily focused on World Intellectual Property Organisation affairs and launching reform of FIAPF's regulations for international film festivals.

He earned a master's degree in history and politics at the University of Paris IV – La Sorbonne, and holds a bachelor's degree in English Literature from Geneva University. Moullier began his career in French television's TFI moving on to the UK's Channel 4 network in 1985, before joining the private commercial TV sector. He now advises companies, governments and nongovernmental organisations regarding competition strategies in the film and television industries.

---

### AGNIESZKA ODOROWICZ

Born in 1974 in Katowice, Agnieszka Odorowicz graduated from the Economic Academy in Kraków to which she remains attached as a lecturer and researcher. From 1998 to 2004, she was the vice president of the Art Institute Association in Krakow and was Artistic Director at the Student Song Festival and responsible for the Krzysztof Penderecki International Contemporary Chamber Music Competition. She has produced over 20 music programmes for television. In 2003, she was appointed by the Polish Minister of culture as representative for Structural Funds. In 2004 she became Secretary of State at the Ministry of Culture where she was responsible for legal, economic and European affairs, including copyright, media and film, drawing up and execution of budget. She oversaw various pieces of legislation for television and film. At the end of 2004 she became chair of the Committee on Development Strategy for Radio and Television, preparing the national Strategy for Electronic Media for 2005 – 2020. In October 2005 she was appointed Director General of the Polish Film Institute.

---

### ROBERTO OLLA

Roberto Olla is the Executive Secretary of Eurimages, the European Film Fund, based in Strasbourg. An Italian national, he has a law degree in public law and a Ph.D in community law (thesis in European audiovisual and media law). Roberto Olla joined Eurimages in January 2002 and first worked as an administrator responsible for co-production projects. Before this, Roberto worked as a researcher in media law at the European University Institute of Florence, worked for the MEDIA Programme of the European Union and was a legal adviser to the European Commission in Brussels. Roberto currently participates as a legal expert in several training initiatives in the cinema sector such as EAVE, MAIA Workshops and INA. Roberto has been panellist on several industry seminars and conferences concerning cinema co-production.

## CONTRIBUTORS (CONTINUED)

---

### JEROME PAILLARD

Executive Director of the Marché du Film – Festival de Cannes.  
Jérôme Paillard joined the Festival de Cannes in November 1995 as Executive Director of the Marché du Film to oversee the development and management of what is now heralded as the world's leading film market. After obtaining degrees in mathematics and music, Paillard started his career as an oboist and his talents as a professional musician led him to become a producer for the French classical record company Erato. At the same time, Paillard worked as music publisher and was responsible for starting an edition of the complete musical works of Claude Debussy. In 1984, he became CFO of Erato Records. After completing his MBA at the HEC in Paris in 1991, Paillard became General Manager of Erato Films alongside Daniel Toscan du Plantier where he executively produced over a dozen feature films by famous directors including Jean-François Amiguet, Mehdi Charef, Souleymane Cissé, Maurice Pialat, Satyajit Ray, Jean-Charles Tachella ... Jérôme Paillard is a member of several commissions of the Centre National de la Cinématographie, professor at the ESCP-EAP (Masters in communication and media), consultant for other film events and Chevalier des Arts et des Lettres.

---

### ROBERT PALMER

Robert Palmer is the Head of the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage at the Council of Europe. Formerly, he was founder and director of Palmer-Rae associates, an independent cultural consultancy working regularly on international projects and assignments. He has worked in the cultural sector for more than 20 years, and has been an adviser to several cities and regions concerning cultural development and regeneration, cultural tourism, festivals and arts policies. He also offers advice to the European Commission, Council of Europe and 10 different European Cultural Institutes on cultural matters. He is an adviser to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport in the UK, the European Cultural Foundation (Amsterdam) and a range of cultural networks.

He was the director of Brussels 2000, which involved the development and management of a large and complex programme of cultural projects to mark the designation of Brussels as European City of Culture for the year 2000. He moved to Belgium from Scotland where he had been the Director of Cultural Affairs for the city of Glasgow, with responsibility for managing a process of arts-led regeneration for the city over a ten year period, of which Glasgow's designation as Cultural Capital of Europe in 1990 formed a part. He was the Director of that programme.

Prior to this he was the Drama and Dance Director of the Scottish Arts Council, managing arts policy on a national basis. He is a member of the Boards of various arts institutions and international festivals, the Chair of European arts juries and is asked regularly to be a speaker at international cultural conferences and workshops. The main themes of his work concern creativity, cultural policy, cultural mapping and planning, cultural development in cities, festivals and events, and his projects stretch across Europe, North America and South-East Asia. He has been given various awards in recognition of his work.

---

### ALESSANDRA PRIANTE

Alessandra Priante is a business graduate at Bocconi University with an international Master in Audiovisual Management. She has worked in investment banking as financial analyst, shifting to the audiovisual industry with the role of analyst and counsellor for international affairs for the Directorate for cinema at the Italian Ministry of Culture. She has then joined Cinecittà Holding and now runs the Research and Statistics Unit at Cinecittà which, among other things, supports the Directorate for cinema in the area of public funding (reference system) and provides sector analysis for the industry as a whole.

---

### DON RANVAUD

In his early career, Donald Ranvaud taught at the Universities of Warwick (Comparative Literature) and East Anglia (Film Studies), where he became Chairman of the Department. He founded the independent film magazine, Framework, in 1975, and freelanced for Monthly Film Bulletin, Sight and Sound, The Guardian, La Repubblica, Cahiers du Cinema, and American Film. He has directed documentaries and magazine programmes for Channel Four and RAI Uno, including portraits of Paul Schrader, Raul Ruiz, Cui Jian, Laurie Anderson and David Mamet, as well as co-directed a feature, Visioni Private. In 1989, Ranvaud joined Renee Goddard to kickstart the European SCRIPT Fund.

As a producer, Ranvaud worked with many countries before they became fashionable, like China (Life on a String and Farewell my Concubine) and South America (Central do Brasil, Vagon Fumador, Lavoura Arcaica, Babilonia 2000, Madame Sata, and Cidade de Deus, nominated for four Oscars in 2004). He acted as Executive Producer on The Constant Gardener, directed by Fernando Meirelles. Most recently he has been producing films in Central America, including Gasolina (2007).

As Buena Onda's President and Chief Vision Officer, Ranvaud was devoted to discovering and empowering filmmakers. He is a tireless and ubiquitous ambassador for Latin American cinema, raising the profile of lesser-known film industries throughout the region. Since early 2005, he has acted as Head Of International Relations with RAIN NETWORKS of Brazil.

---

### PHILIPPE REYNAERT

After studies of Letters, Philippe Reynaert taught during two years literature and in a big technical institute. Caught up by his temperament of film-lover, he started becoming a journalist and he created, with as much seriousness as pleasure, the magazine "Visions" of which he was Chief Editor from 1982 to 1988. He started in television in 1983 while taking over the presentation of the Midnight Film club on the RTBF.

Since, his collaboration with the public service channel has been permanent and if the RTBF celebrates this year its 50 years, let's note that it has more of 25 of them in company of the Man with the White Glasses ...

Ad-man in the 90's, Philippe Reynaert now dedicates himself henceforth full-time to his passion for the 7th Art and since February 2001, he assumed the direction of Wallimage, the regional audiovisual of investment fund, created by the Walloon Region on the initiative of the Minister of the Economy.

Philippe is a member of the Board of Directors of the French-Speaking Public TV (RTBF) and Administrator of the Media library of the French Community of Belgium. He is on the initiative of to create the European Coordination of the Regional Funds of investments in the audiovisual CINE-RE.

---

### THOMAS STENDERUP

Master degree in Economics, University of Copenhagen (1981). Began as a teacher at the University of Copenhagen, University of Roskilde and Copenhagen Business School (1981-1987). Secretary General of EU's Media Project for the Creative Documentary that was an initiative of the MEDIA Programme of the European Community (1991-1993). Created FINAL CUT PRODUCTIONS (1993) and was a producer / director of international documentaries, shorts- and feature films. Head of Department, Danish Film Institute 1998 – 2001, where he was responsible for financial support of feature films and documentaries. Produced "The Art of Crying" (2006); director Peter Schønau Fog that won 26 international awards and was the Danish entry for Oscar 2007. Thomas has been member of the board of: Danish Producers Association (1993-1995), EURIMAGES (1998-2001) and Nordic Film- and Television Fund (1998-2001)

## CONTRIBUTORS (CONTINUED)

---

### MONIKA SMOLEŃ

In February 2008, Monika SmoleŃ was appointed under-secretary of State at the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, Poland. She graduated in socio-economic geography at the Jagiellonian University. In 2003 she received her doctorate, also at the Jagiellonian University; her thesis was on cultural industries and their impact on the development of cities. From 1998 to 2007 she taught at the Jagiellonian University Institute of Public Affairs. She is co-author of the National Strategy for the Development of Culture, author of several academic articles and expert's opinions on the culture management and financing from the European funds. In 2004, she joined the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, first as the Head of the Department of Cooperation with Local Governments, later becoming the Head of the Department of Cultural Strategy and European Affairs. At that time she was responsible for, inter alia, coordination of the implementation of the National Strategy for the Development of Culture, planning and implementation of the EEA Financial Mechanism and the Norwegian Financial Mechanism, programming of the EU Structural Funds in the field of culture, operation of the Culture Contact Point, as well as for European affairs. She represented the Ministry in teams responsible for monitoring of the cohesion policy, implementing the Lisbon Strategy, and implementing Structural Funds at the central and regional level.

---

### MACIEJ STRZEMBOSZ

Maciej Strzembosz is a film and television producer as well as a script writer who used to work as a journalist and film critic. He is a co-owner of Studio A, a film production company. Since 2004 he has been the President of the National Chamber of Audiovisual Producers. He has co-founded the Association of Independent Film and Television Producers. He is a member of the Association of Polish Filmmakers and the Administrative Council of the Union of Audiovisual Authors and Producers.

---

### YVON THIEC

General delegate of EUROKINEMA, Association of Film and Television Producers, based in Brussels. The aim of EUROKINEMA is to promote genuine Community policy for the film and television industry. Mr Thiec, a former European Union official, has a doctorate in politics from the European University Institute (Florence) and awarded the order of "Arts and Letters" (France). Furthermore, Mr Yvon Thiec is the general secretary of the EASS (European Audiovisual Seminars; general delegate of CICCE (Comité des Industries Cinématographiques des Communautés européennes), Vice-President of the International Network for Cultural Diversity (INCD).

---

### DR CAROLE TONGUE

Carol Tongue was Member of the European Parliament (EP) 1984 – 1999, acting as spokesperson on Culture and Media for the EP Socialist Group 1994-1999 and European Parliament spokesperson for public service broadcasting 1994-1999. She was the author of the TONGUE report on the Future of Public Service Broadcasting in the Digital Age adopted in 1996 by the European Parliament which led to the inclusion of the public service broadcasting protocol in the 1997 EU Amsterdam Treaty. Carole chaired the EP Audiovisual Intergroup, 1997-1999. In 2005 she founded and became chairperson of the UK Coalition for Cultural Diversity. She was awarded an Honorary Doctorate for services to the public interest in broadcasting from University of Lincoln 2006. Since 2003 Carole has been Associate Director at public affairs company, Sovereign Strategy.

---

### JACQUES TOUBON

Jacques Toubon was born in Nice (Alpes-Maritimes) on 29 June 1941. After graduating from the National School of Administration he worked in locally based central administration, then (1971-76) held a number of private-office posts with Jacques Chirac when the latter was, successively, parliamentary relations minister, agriculture minister, internal affairs minister and prime minister. He was a member of parliament for Paris from 1981 to 1993 and mayor of Paris' 13th district from 1983 to 2001. He is a member of Paris city council. He was secretary general of the RPR party from 1984 to 1988. He was Minister of Culture and French-speaking Communities from April 1993 to May 1995, Minister of Justice from May 1995 to June 1997, and an adviser to President Chirac in 1997 and 1998. Since 2002 he has been a member of the State Council. Elected to the European Parliament in June 2004. The French government has put him in charge of setting up the National Centre for Immigration History, which is due to open in spring 2007. He has chaired the Council of Europe's Eurimages fund since November 2002.

---

### ADELINA von FÜRSTENBERG

Director, Art for the World.

Adelina von Fürstenberg is a Swiss citizen but of Armenian origin. From when she studied Political Science at the University of Geneva until 1989, she founded and directed the Geneva Center of Contemporary Art, working with leading artists, architects and performers such as, for example, Andy Warhol, Daniel Libeskind and Philip Glass. From 1989 to 1994, she directed Le Magasin, National Center of Contemporary Art of Grenoble (France), for which she was awarded a prize from the 45th Venice Biennale's International Jury.

In 1995, for the 50th Anniversary of the United Nations, she curated Dialogues of Peace with some 60 artists from five continents. In 1996, she founded ART for The World (Geneva-Milan), an NGO associated to the UN Dept. of Public Information, and organized a series of international art projects for the World Health Organization (The Edge of Awareness, 1998-1999) and for the High Commissioner for the Refugees (Playgrounds & Toys for Refugee Children, 2000-2005). Between 2006 and 2008, she curated large video installations in Milan and Sao Paulo, Brazil, including Balkan Erotic Epic by Marina Abramovic, Collateral/when Art looks to Cinema, and the Voom Portraits by Robert Wilson. In 2007, during the 52nd Venice Biennale, she organized Joseph Kosuth's spectacular neon lights installations, visible from all over Venice in Milan from San Lazzaro Island. In 2008, she created and produced "Stories on Human Rights", a feature length film involving 22 shorts from independent filmmakers and artists for the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Currently, she is working on 2 new film productions: a long feature film by the filmmaker Idrissa Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), and another one composed by 7 filmmakers from East Europe, Middle East and Central Asia on the themes of tolerance and difference.

## CONTRIBUTORS (CONTINUED)

---

### Andrzej Wajda

Andrzej Wajda, born 6 March 1926 in Suwałki, Poland, and is the son of a Polish cavalry officer murdered by the Soviets in 1940 in what became to be known as the Katyn massacre. In the beginning, he studied to be a painter at Kraków's Academy of Fine Arts before entering the Łódź Film School. Thereafter he was apprenticeship to director Aleksander Ford, and was given the opportunity to direct his own film, *A Generation* (1954) starring Zbigniew Cybulski. Wajda went on to make two more anti-war themed films: *Kanal* (1956) (The Silver Palm Award at Cannes Film Festival in 1957, ex aequo with Ingmar Bergman's *The Seventh Seal*) and *Ashes and Diamonds* (1958).

The 1970s were the most prolific period as he made over ten films: *Pilate and Others*, *Landscape After the Battle*, *The Wedding*, *The Promised Land*, *Man of Marble*, *The Orchestra Conductor* - starring John Gielgud, *Rough Treatment*, *The Birch Wood and Maids of Wilko*.

In *Man of Iron* (1981) (Palme d'Or at the Cannes Film Festival), Solidarity leader Lech Wałęsa appeared as himself in the film. Furthermore Wajda's involvement in Solidarity led the Polish government to force his production company out of business. In the early 1990s, he was elected a senator and also appointed artistic director of Warsaw's Teatr Powszechny. He continued to make films, addressing the topic of World War II in 1993's *The Ring with a Crowned Eagle* and 1996's *Holy Week*. In 1999 he had a big artistic and box office success with *Pan Tadeusz*. After that, Wajda made a television spectacle *Bigda's Coming*, and later *Zemsta* (The Revenge), starring Roman Polański and Janusz Gajos. Wajda's very personal project, the film *Katyn* (2007), concerns the Katyn massacre, in which his father lost his life. At the 2000 Academy Awards, Wajda was presented with an honorary Oscar for his numerous contributions to cinema and in February 2006, Wajda received an honorary Golden Bear for lifetime achievement at the Berlin International Film Festival.

In 2001, he opened the Andrzej Wajda Master School of Film Directing and later founded Manggha Museum of Japanese Art and Technology in Kraków. In August 2008, he started on "Sweet Rush" that will premiere during 59th Berlin International Film Festival in February 2009.

---

### KRYSZTOF ZANUSSI

Film director, Poland.

A film director, script writer and film producer, Krzysztof Zanussi studied physics at Warsaw University (1955-1959) and philosophy at the Jagiellonian University (1959-1962). At that time, he was an active member of an amateur film movement and made eleven films, out of which nine won awards at international festivals. He has made 30 big-screen pictures and many television films. He is a recipient of numerous awards including the Golden Lion (1984), the Special Jury Award in Venice (1982) as well as the Best Director Award in Cannes (1980). In 1980, he was appointed artistic director, and later general director of the Tor Film Studio. In 1971-1983, he was the Vice-President of the Association of Polish Filmmakers and in 1975-77 the President of the Council of the Polish Federation of Film Discussion Clubs. He became a member of the Cinematography Committee in 1987. He has been a visiting professor at many film schools including the Film School in Łódź and the National Film School in the UK. He also directs theatre plays, many of which have been staged in Milan, Palermo, Bonn, Krakow, Bremen, Basel and elsewhere. He is the author of two books on amateur filmmaking entitled *O montażu w filmie amatorskim* (1968) and *Rozmowy o filmie amatorskim* (1978). In 1990, he was elected President of the Federation of European Film Directors (FERA). He is also a Consultant to the Pontifical Council for Culture in the Vatican. He is a former Vice-President of the Programme Council of the Polish Television and a former deputy Chair of the EUROVISIONI Association. Krzysztof Zanussi is a member of the European Film Academy.