



VIEWS



NO. 2 • VIDEO IN LONDON • SUMMER '85



=====
V I D E O I N L O N D O N - A S U R V E Y
=====

This report was commissioned by the London Region of the Independent Film & Video Makers Association on behalf of the London Video Forum.

The survey work and drafting of the Report was done by Andy Lipman. The conclusions & recommendations were written by Andy Lipman and Simon Blanchard, after discussion of the draft report at the IFVA AGM in April, and at a meeting of the London Video Forum in June.

Comments on the Report should be sent to: IFVA London Region [Video Forum], 79 Wardour Street, London W1, (tel 439 0460).

Further copies of the Report are available [price #1.25p,p&p inc] from the above address. Cheques to be made payable to "VIEWS".

[c] Copyright VIEWS/IFVA, July 1985.

(ISSN 0265 3397)

V I D E O I N L O N D O N - A S U R V E Y

C O N T E N T S:

Background

Types of Project

Location

Activities

Funding Crisis

Analysis of Funding Sources

Working in Video Access

Production

Conclusions

Recommendations

Appendices

A Note on the IFVA & Views

LONDON VIDEO FORUM - FUNDING CRISIS/STRATEGY REPORT

BACKGROUND: The London Video Forum conducted a survey of independent video projects and workshops in the Greater London area in February 1985 to find out the range of activities undertaken and the effect of current funding threats to the sector as a whole.

The demand for independent (non-commercial) video production and access facilities is clearly demonstrated by the number of groups, over 50 in London, which have emerged in recent years. Many exist without any regular sources of funding whatever. Undoubtedly video has established itself as a natural and popular tool for local communication and creative expression. Its continuing development, however, is directly put at risk by central government policies to abolish the GLC and by other relevant funding cut-backs.

The sector in London does not fit any neat definition. Groups have formed simply to use the medium in a practical way, not as a result of any coordinated policy, or any one theory of cultural practice. The diversity of work reflects the expanding potential of the medium, and its growing cultural significance. This survey outlines the varied structure of video group work in London, the fragile funding branch on which it rests, and suggests some directions for future policy.

[It does not cover the hundreds of individual videomakers who produce work (and attempt to get finance from the few bodies who support individual artists such as the Arts Council and Greater London Arts Association), nor the video resources and training courses run by colleges and further education institutes. Indeed it is to the independent sector that many ex-students must turn once their course at a formal institution has been completed.]

The sector functions outside the formal educational and commercial spheres by providing equipment, training, production and exhibition resources for all sections of the community. It encourages participation in a medium dominated by professional and inaccessible institutions - and consequently has attracted many who feel ignored or misrepresented in the mainstream culture. The goals of video access are far wider than simply providing a leisure pursuit for ordinary people. It is arguably one of the essential elements in a modern cultural democracy, allowing new and different voices to be heard in the central medium of our time.

2. TYPES OF PROJECT: The survey revealed four principal types of video group in London.

a) **The Production group** provides technical skills (but not equipment hire) for local groups, trade unions, local councils, campaigning projects and so on, to make tapes about their activities and concerns. There are 25 such groups in London who consider production their main activity. Most of these depend on programme commissions from various sources for their funding. Such groups include **Aphra Video, Triple Vision, Smith Bundy, Annares, Films at Work, Clio Coop, Irish Video Project and Twilight Video.**

b) **The Video Workshop** provides all or most of the integrated services from training of beginners to tape distribution, including equipment hire, production units, post-production facilities, exhibition activity and information and advice giving. Ten groups fall into this category including **Tower Hamlets Arts Project, Activision, Moonshine, London Video Arts, Albany Video, Women in Sync, West London Media Workshop, Barnet Arts with Sankofa, Retake, Black Audio Film** (the black film workshops) increasingly extending into video.

c) **The Training projects** run video skills courses and workshops in the community attracting participants from children to pensioners. Eight groups in London concentrate on training, including **Connections in Hammersmith and Fulham, Merton Community Video, Islington Community Video, Pimlico Arts, Elephant Video, Women's Media Resources Group.**

d) **The Specialist groups** servicing the sector itself, from post-production facilities like **Fantasy Factory**, technical engineering and maintenance projects like **Video Engineering and Training (VET)** and information co-ordinating groups like **IFVA, WEFT, WFTVN.**

3. LOCATION: There are video groups in every inner London borough and only six outer boroughs have no project whatever (at least according to the latest GLC report.) Some boroughs, notably Camden, Hackney, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster have three or more projects within their areas.

4. ACTIVITIES:

a) **Equipment Hire - Twenty-one (21) groups in London offer this service. Nine (9) provide both VHS and low-band U-matic systems. Two (2) just offer U-matic and the remaining ten (10) only VHS.**

Eight groups have applications pending with the GLC for capital grants to buy further equipment, or start a facility from scratch. All the groups offer a sliding scale rate for hire, depending on whether the user is making a community or commercial tape, with other concessionary rates in between. Some groups depend significantly

on income from commercial users, needed to supplement low grants, but the increasing pressure to do so diverts time and energy from their main objectives of servicing the community. Moonshine, Activision, Albany Video, Annares, LVA and THAP are all facing this dilemma.

It seems obvious, but the point is often missed, that the provision of equipment at "community" (accessible) rates means a level which is less than the commercial market rate. Access video by definition, must be publicly subsidised, if ordinary people and the public/voluntary sectors are to get the opportunity to make videos.

b) Production - Thirty-seven (37) groups actively produce tapes, either as a main activity (21) or part of wider workshop practice (16).

Few are seen on broadcast TV (exceptions being tapes by the Irish Video Project and some artists connected with LVA) but are distributed widely to schools, community groups, campaigns etc by video cassette. Apart from "off-air" recordings from TV, the independent sector provides possibly the largest source of original material for the educational and social users of TV product, stimulating group activities and discussions.

c) Training - Twenty-four (24) groups offer training in video skills.

Each project is distinguished by the specific approach it takes to attracting participants and to demystifying the techniques of production. Training in workshops and small groups must achieve several difficult objectives if it is to be successful. It must create a supportive atmosphere (often by defining the group by common-interest, women only, black groups, young people or pensioners). It must provide continuing motivation (hence emphasising self-expression rather than technical exercises) and the tutors need broad social skills besides technical expertise to be able to bring a disparate group together and focus their attention. Independent workshop training is very different from vocational technical courses. It attracts those (such as the unemployed, adults seeking re-training) who are frequently distanced from the usual educational contexts and professional institutions.

d) Exhibition - Fourteen groups (14) actively undertake screenings of tapes made by themselves and other independent producers.

Groups like Sankofa, Moonshine and London Video Arts see exhibition as an important way to stimulate discussion between producers and their audience and increase awareness of the medium within their communities. Sankofa's recent series of screenings entitled 'Power and Control', for example, encouraged debate within the black community on questions of representation of the black

identity in the media. Kino-Eye, Lambeth Video, West London Media, Retake, Sankofa, Irish Video, Twilight, Black Audio, Women in Sync, Moonshine, THAP, History Workshop, LVA and Albany Video all held screenings last year.

e) Distribution - Eight (8) groups distribute their own tapes. Several, such as Albany Video and LVA, distribute many others as well.

In the absence of a central marketing and promotion agency for independent cassette distribution, the burden falls on individual groups, who often lack the administrative staff to daily take bookings and despatch tapes or the resources to successfully promote new work. London Video Arts distribute tapes internationally, whilst Albany Video have over 20 community and independent tapes on their list. THAP distribute their monthly video magazine, "Despite TV" and other community tapes through a local network of libraries, community groups and their own bookshop. The Mineworkers Defence Video group concentrated much of their energies last year successfully distributing the miners campaign tapes throughout the country. Annares, Irish Video, Films at Work and Activision also distribute tapes.

f) Information and Advice - Eight (8) groups specifically state that they regularly give help and advice to people making inquiries from where to obtain equipment or a particular tape, to how to start a production, where to seek funding, how to budget and so on.

Such work is time-consuming, and a burden on small staffs. It is reasonable to assume most of the groups in London fulfil this function even if they don't refer to it in the survey. Fantasy Factory have organised this aspect of their work by establishing a computer service providing information on people with skills, equipment resources, etc.

WFTVN provide a similar service for women film and video workers, publishing a directory of women producers, directors and technicians. Moonshine, THAP, Albany, Retake, Sankofa, Ceddo, West London Media and History Workshop give importance to this area of activity.

g) Typical Users

For an idea of the range of users of independent training workshops and equipment, the survey revealed the following broad groups as active participants - council tenants, unemployed, women, black groups, pensioners, Asians, Latin-Americans, Irish, lesbians and gays, school-leavers, children, artists, miners, the handicapped, the hard of hearing, teachers, local residents, campaigning groups, voluntary organisations, advice centres, MSC trainees, hostel dwellers, musicians, health workers, peace campaigners, claimants. In a word, a broad cross-section of London's population with something to say and the commitment to be heard.

h) Number of workers - The groups in the survey employ a total of 52 full-time and 37 part-time paid workers. Additionally, there are over 80 freelance/unpaid workers active in and around these groups. 16 of the groups surveyed do not have any regularly paid staff at all.

5. FUNDING CRISIS

In the absence of an overall, London-wide funding strategy, the independent video sector in London is very largely the product of piece-meal grant-aided confusion.

Twenty-five (25) groups have GLC applications pending for revenue or capital expenditure, whilst eleven (11) receive grants from local authorities. Reliance on these two sources provide the main support for seven groups - including Barnet Arts, Connections in Hammersmith and Fulham, and Black Audio Film. Most of the local authority subsidy is small start-up grants of between #1000-2000 and half of these came from inner city partnership funds with a non-renewable fixed term, like Annares and Lambeth Video.

Channel 4 has funded 13 groups either for capital costs or contribution to revenue, and occasionally for commissioned programmes. LVA and Albany will continue this year to receive funds but Fantasy Factory, Moonshine and West London Media Workshop have been threatened with cut-backs.

Funding by the Arts Council concentrates on small bursaries to individual artists and in running exhibition and distribution schemes (Video artists on tour), and grants have been also awarded to groups such as LVA, Fantasy Factory and Women in Sync.

Greater London Arts Association (GLAA) film/video panel contributes revenue funding to only one video group, postproduction Fantasy Factory. Otherwise it makes small production grants to newer videomakers and special grants for training and exhibition. GLAA's community arts panel however, funds three groups, Albany, THAP, and Moonshine from #12,000-20,000. This year recipients of community arts grants have accepted a 20% cut across the board on last year's grants, to free funding to newer groups.

Apart from occasional commissions, seventeen (17) groups get no regular funding, and ten (10) others depend substantially on earned income from equipment hire and tape distribution, like Albany, LVA, Moonshine and Activision.

Four groups get MSC funding on a twelve-month renewable basis to employ unemployed people on a basic wage, either full or part time, together with a contribution to running costs. Merton Community Video operate under MSC funding, having 5 people employed, (4 part-time) on a community bus project. Participants can only

stay with the project a year, and must then seek work elsewhere. It is obviously not a satisfactory way to run a project, training new personnel each year and having new trainees working with the community to pass on video "skills". It is noted that the GLC does not recognise MSC schemes, as it argues it does not provide secure employment.

Two groups get capital grants from the Gulbenkian Foundation, and one group, (Anarres) has received a #25,000 loan for equipment from the GLEB.

Clearly the independent sector exists on a very narrow financial base - a base immediately threatened by local government cuts and the proposed abolition of the GLC and Metropolitan county councils.

6. ANALYSIS OF FUNDING SOURCES.

a) GLC:

Roughly eighteen (18) video groups received funding in 84/85 for revenue and/or capital expenditure from the community arts and ethnic arts sub-committees, the Women's committee also making additional grants. The total amount exceeded #500,000.

[NB: The figures are not precise as they do not include film workshops which also undertake video work. Also the funding by other GLC committees of individual video productions is not included.]

The groups were Albany Video, Annares, Aphra Video, Connections, Fantasy Factory, London Video Arts, Sound/Video Archive, WEFT, West London Media, Women in Sync, Black Audio Film, Ceddo, Retake, Sankofa, Barnet Arts Workshop, Star Productions, Videoactive, IFVA, Moonshine.

The GLC is a main funder to black workshops: Sankofa, Retake, Ceddo and Black Audio Film. Now established, they have applications pending for video equipment, but presently, like many workshops, there is inadequate funding, after wages and equipment, for actual production budgets. The main sources for these - BFI and Channel 4 - are neither regular nor secure.

The following are some of the groups who depend substantially on the GLC: West London Media, Sound/Video Archive, Womens Media Resource Project, Aphra Video, Women in Sync.

Above this, the GLC has funded several groups by commissions to promote their services or as part of the anti-abolition campaign, including Wide Angle, Triple Vision, Annares and Films at Work.

Capital equipment funding may be seriously impaired by the limitation of the GLC's grant-giving powers by central government, and Sankofa, Southall Arts, Elephant Video, Converse, Hackney Cable and Irish Video project will all be affected.

For this year (85/86) it is hoped that arts grants by the GLC will be held at the same level as 84/85 plus 5% for inflation. There may be some play in the budget to offer new groups who have not been previously funded some hope, but any real expansion of the funded sector is unlikely. In 84/85 the total level of **applications** from London film and video workshops amounted to #1.25 million.

b) London Boroughs:

Seven (7) groups get roughly a third of their income from LB's (Lambeth and Annars from inner city partnership funds, Fantasy Factory, Barnet Arts, THAP and Connections for revenue towards wages).

West London Media and Lambeth Video are threatened now, but most groups exist within boroughs which are targeted for cuts by central government.

Mobile Media, Clio co-op, VET, Black Audio Film, Elephant Video, Converse, Hackney Cable all received start-up grants from LB's of between #1,000-2,000, but with no commitment to future funding - Islington Community Video's application to their local authority was refused.

c) GLAA:

Both the Community Arts and the Film/Video panels support video. Community arts provides revenue support to Albany Video, Moonshine, West London Media and THAP whilst the Film/Video panel supports Fantasy Factory. Such revenue funding to video from both panels amounts to #60,000.

In 85/86 the Film/video panel will give #11,000 for institutional training courses, #8,500 for exhibition and approx. #22,000 for individual film and video productions. Last year 30% of such awards went to video projects.

d) Arts Council:

The Arts Council provides small awards and bursaries for production or placements of videomakers with specific organisations. It also subsidises exhibition schemes, such as "Videomakers on Tour" and Touring Umbrella scheme, encouraging venues to hire tapes by video artists. In 84/85 #5000 was awarded to eight (8) video

artists for production and #3,000 was given as bursaries to five artists to work at London Video Arts. LVA also recieved #1,000 for equipment related to the bursaries.

e)Channel 4:

The Channel's commitment to reflecting the full variety of independent video -an area of work that should have found a regular place on 'The 11th Hour' and 'People to People' slots - has been arguably noticeable through its absence. Significantly, one of the few programmes screened on the Channel and made by a London video workshop (Albany Video's 'Beyond Our Ken')- was not only funded by C4, but also provoked sufficient feedback to merit its own edition of 'Right to Reply'. During this Paul Bonner, C4s Controller defended the programme as a good example of unconventional documentary-making, and the kind of work that the Channel was keen to carry on supporting...!

A clear instance of C4's slowness to catch up with video practices can be seen in its truly '11th Hour' engagement with video art. Some three years after the Channel went on air, it is only now planning to broadcast a short series showcasing video art, to be broadcast in September.

In 1984/85 the Channel funded the following video groups in London (not tied to specific productions): Albany Video, Fantasy Factory, Luton 33, West London Media Workshop, Moonshine, and three film/video groups, Sankofa, Retake and Ceddo. Funding for resources projects included WFTVN, LVA and VET.

This year, the following London groups have been cut: Moonshine, Fantasy Factory, and West London Media Workshop. The Albany retains its workshop funding for one more year, as do Sankofa, Retake and Ceddo. Resource funding has gone to LVA, VET, IFVA, and WFTVN. No London groups have received development funding.

Looked at overall, it is hard to avoid the impression that the Channel still does not give sufficient priority to the needs of independent video, despite the increasing shift over to video from originally film-based groups, and also despite the clear evidence of video's centrality to the extension of access/community based production.

f)British Film Institute.

To date the BFI has never formulated a "video-specific" policy. In one sense this is may be understandable: the growth of the video sector has largely coincided with an era of no-growth in the Institute's own budgets, making responses to new constituencies a much more difficult matter of re-allocation of funds within a broadly static total.

Even so, whilst this inability to address the concerns of video makers has been a long-standing problem, it has now become an issue of urgent concern. Assuming that abolition of the GLC and Mets does take place, the BFI is due to receive an extra #1 million from central government to compensate for the loss of funding these bodies represent.

To make matters worse, this will clearly represent a massive overall drop in funds (since current estimates suggest a total spend by these bodies on film and video of around #2.5 million.) In addition not all of this inadequate #1 million will be spent in London. Nor solely on video work. It will be vital to ensure that the Institute produces a clear and well-informed strategy for allocating this money, and to do this in close consultation with the independent sector.

At the IFVA's suggestion, the Funding and Development Division of the BFI has recently set out its programme for consultation (See Appendix 1 below) and independent video-workers in London will need to participate fully in this process.

g)GLEB and the London Industrial Strategy

In the current financial year, the Cultural Industries Unit at GLEB has decided to make video promotion and distribution the main part of its sector strategy. This presents opportunities for the London Video Forum to influence the Unit's investment policies. In addition, the publication of the GLC's London Industrial Strategy, which includes a substantial section on the cultural industries in London, now requires a response to its proposals from the sector. The IFVA will be organising a day seminar on the LIS and GLEBs current plans later this Summer.

7. W O R K I N G I N V I D E O A C C E S S .

The provision of video access resources is of necessity labour-intensive, many of the users are of course novices, and consequently project workers need to be multi-skilled if they are to give an efficient and effective service.

They need to be able to explain to users the possibilities and limitations of the equipment, they have to maintain the equipment and teach newcomers how to set up and protect it in operation. Day to day work includes administration, fundraising, book-keeping.

Because of limited funding and small staffs, many problems in working conditions arise. There is no career structure. No formal training for workers. No security, which leads to staff turn-over out of financial necessity.

The situation calls for long-term funding contracts, between 3-5 years, with annual reviews. Minimum staff and salary levels are required. In many cases capital expenditure has not been matched with adequate or on-going revenue funding.

Access cannot be self-supporting. By subsidising rates at less than the market rates, it necessarily requires public subsidy.

8) P R O D U C T I O N .

This section is intended to give a brief indication of the range and quality of programmes produced by the independent sector. That the quality of work is high is shown by the number of awards won by independent videomakers from London last year:

"Framed Youth" Lesbian and Gay Video Project - Grierson Award (BFI) 1984

"Circumstantial Evidence" Triple Vision - International Television Association 1985

"IOD" Jez Welsh - Tokyo Video Festival 1984

"Calling the Shots" Mark Wilcox - Toronto Video Festival 1984

"Moving On From Arlington House" - Philip O'Shea and Jim Green - Toronto Video Festival 1984.

Work covers all styles and forms, from community tapes like "Deaf Terrorists" by Scope Youth Project and Shape, THAP's "Despite TV", documentaries like Sankofa's "Territories", campaigning tapes like "The Miners Tapes", video art like the 27 artists on the current ACGB Touring scheme, 'scratch' tapes like "Death Valley Days", mixed media, performance and installation works.

9] C O N C L U S I O N S

A] It is worth stressing again the major finding of this survey: namely, the existence of a very sizeable independent video sector in the Greater London area. The survey documents, for the first time, the scale of group activity in this area, its variety, and its roots in local concerns. All those bodies concerned with the development of the independent sector will need to take account of this fact.

B] The second main finding is that this sector's cultural/economic base currently faces severe retrenchment and disorganisation if, as seems overwhelmingly likely, the GLC is abolished. As the IFVA argued in its "Strangling The Cities" paper, the loss of the Council will greatly weaken the possibilities for taking a democratic and London-wide view of cultural activity.

C] The disruption and waste which abolition will produce is compounded by the fact (which even the DOE has covertly recognised) that the GLC's function as a strategic agency will have to be continued by other means: the need for a strategic policy/resource allocation process is not going to disappear in April 1986, even if the GLC does.

D] That said, none of the options currently being canvassed (a lead borough with arts grant powers; a restructured GLAA; charitable trusts, etc.) will be adequate as replacements - even if they may help to counteract the inevitable dislocation. None of these bodies meets the democratic/electoral requirement, nor are they at all likely to have the staff or resources which are needed.

E] In view of this, the independent sector faces a double challenge:

a) In the **medium term**, political developments may well bring a re-instatement of the GLC, perhaps even in a strengthened form. The sector must address itself to such an outcome, and devise policies which ensure that any future "GLC Mark 2" takes much greater account of London's audio-visual economy. (After all, the GLC currently has only **one** full-time officer with responsibility for film and video).

b) In the **short term**, the sector needs to mount a concerted campaign aimed at making its presence felt in the many areas/ institutions which have had little or no previous contact with its work. This report is primarily intended as a basis for such lobbying. Such bodies include: the ILEA, local boroughs, the BFI, London libraries, trade-unions, voluntary organisations. Some of these are beginning to work with the sector, and to recognise what it has to offer, but the process needs to go much further.

F] Discussion and activity along the above lines is bound to continue, if not intensify, in the coming months. At present there is no firm consensus about the ways forward, especially in institutional terms. To take one key example: is it realistic (or even desirable) in a city the size of London to expect the questions of policy & resources to be 'resolved' via any one overall body? To date, cultural policy in the capital has been hammered out by ad hoc negotiations between a plurality of forums/agencies, working on a rough division of labour basis. To accept the case for much better coordination does not necessarily require that existing structures be abandoned wholesale. It may well not even be practical politics to look for such an outcome. These are difficult issues, and the existing evidence points as yet in no definite direction. To put this another way: the case for a strong 'sovereign' agency (in either policy or funding terms) has not yet been made in a way that could command broad assent, nor is it clear on what basis (and with what funds) such an entity might be set up. This issue will evidently need much more work.

10] R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S

Alongside these strategic questions, there are a variety of more immediate issues on which the independent sector can make progress, and which have the potential to strengthen the work now going on. The following list sketches out some of these - no doubt there are others.

A) Since it will remain as the major London-wide elected body, some priority will need to be given to developing closer links between the sector and the ILEA. This will need to cover such issues as commissioning programmes, tape hire, use of ILEA resources, curriculum development etc.

B) London has well over 400 libraries run by the boroughs. This provides a crucial network of cultural distribution with major implications for video. According to one recent estimate, [in the London Industrial Strategy], 50 out of 187 library authorities in the UK now lend video tapes out. The ICA's new "Videos into Libraries" scheme - backed by the GLEB - is accumulating valuable experience which will need to be drawn on much more widely in the sector.

C) The issues involved with the BFIs #1m windfall - if it arrives - have been discussed above. The London Video Forum will be taking a close interest in the allocation of this money, and the IFVA will be making a formal response to the BFIs policy paper on allocation of the #1m.

D)Both Thames TV and LWT continue,year after year,to enjoy the benefits of their government-backed television monopoly in the London area.Neither organisation has done anything much to foster the scope for Londoners to use TV's own medium,tape,in a democratic/access way.Nor have they done anything to support - financially or via promotion - the video events/screenings which happen regularly in London. On both these counts, the independent sector should bring pressure to bear.

E)Video groups in London are becoming more visible. To enhance this, they should consider holding twice-yearly screenings of new work, so as to provide an opportunity for exchange of ideas & information, and to bring the work being done to wider notice. This could be organised through the London Region of the IFVA.

F)Given the inevitable financial squeeze on independent groups, many of whom already exist on a very narrow financial base,the sector still needs to think through its transition from a largely grant-dependent economy to one in which a greater range of funding sources are involved,including the more commercial options. For example,where is the money to come from to replace equipment as it becomes worn-out or obsolete? Without more suitably framed accounting and price-structures,the only answer can be "next year's grant".....

G)As well as libraries, the sector should continue to involve itself in developments in cable TV, since these may well be a source of programme finance (if only in the long term), and also an outlet for existing work.

H)The London Grant-Aided Section of ACTT is currently drafting a "London Plan"; the GLC has issued the Cultural Industries sections of the LIS for wider consultation; the Videoactive report on Community video distribution will be available soon. Together with this survey, this represents a considerable amount of detailed thinking about the independent sector's future & prospects. The IFVA will be holding a day conference to look at this work & draw out strategic conclusions.

BFI ANNOUNCES TIMETABLE/PROCEDURE FOR "GOWRIE \$1,000,000"

The BFI's Funding & Development Division have spelt out - at the IFVA's suggestion - their plans for allocation of the \$1m. the Institute will receive in the event of the abolition of the GLC/MCCs. In a preamble to the memorandum, the Division notes that there will be a large 'funding gap' - since current spending is more like \$2.5m in these areas, and hence it will be pursuing a major consultation process in order to ensure the most rational 'spread' of the monies available. The following represents the BFI's (necessarily provisional) timetable for consultations:

1. F&D officers are currently engaged in a re-assessment of current funding policy in the attempt to produce a document which will characterise that which is distinctive within that policy and to identify broad areas of media activities which the Institute would see itself funding, should the proposed abolition take place. It is anticipated that this consultative document will be prepared by late May.
2. In June and July, the F&D Division sees its priority as consulting with film and video funding bodies - the affected RAAs, ACGB, C4 - and the two major representative organisations - IFVA and ACTT. Each consultative meeting will elicit comment on the BFI's policy document, invite specification of the organisation's funding policy, collect up-dates on financial information and lists of affected organisations, and examine proposals for the routing of funds post proposed abolition. As well as the above mentioned bodies, the policy document will also be passed thru the BFI's internal mechanisms, and will go to the RCC and the RPF.
3. In the light of these preliminary considerations, the F&D document will be re-drafted to provide a package of funding criteria understood by the funding bodies to facilitate applications from affected organisations. It is anticipated that this re-draft will go to the BFI's National Conference in September 1985. Further consultation with affected bodies is clearly desirable, and may take the form of individual or public meetings - time and the need for decisive action being the main limitations.
4. The policy and strategy paper, amended thru the foregoing processes of consultation, will be presented to the BFI Governors in October.
5. If the Bill is enacted, the BFI will invite affected organisations representing identified areas of media work to make application for funding in November/December. A period of assessment will follow, and it is anticipated that organisations will be informed of their level of grant aid by March 1986.."

APPENDIX 2:LIST OF GROUPS IN THE SURVEY

The groups listed below took part in the survey. The list includes most - but not all - of the groups working in the independent video sector in Greater London.

Albany Video,The Albany,Douglas Way,SE8.(692 0231)
Anarres,10a Bradbury Street,N16.(249 9212)
Activision,272/4 Pentonville Rd,N1.(837 7842)
Aphra Video,Unit 53,245a Coldharbour Rd,SW9.(733 7207)
Agents & Spies Prodn.,6th Floor,Arodene Hse,41/45 Perth Rd.,
Ilford,Essex.(518 6848)
Barnet Arts Workshop,Avenue Hse,East End Lane,N3.(346 7120)
Beaufoy Video Project,66 Hospital Bridge Rd,Middx.
Black Audio Film Collective,Dalston,E8.(254 9536)
Connections,16 Askew Crescent,W12.(740 7271)
Clio Coop,91c Mildmay Rd,N1.(249 2551)
Ceddo Film/Video W'shop,1st Floor,Seven Sisters School,Seaford
Rd,N15.(802 9031)
Converse Pictures,Bon Marche Building,444 Brixton Rd,SW9.(274
4000 xtn 200)
Clockwork Video,127 Gaisford St,N5.(482 0090)
Community Cable Productions,16 Dalston Lane,E8.(241 2831)
Elephant Video,34 Gerridge Court,Gerridge St,SE1.(928 8440)
Fantasy Factory,42 Theobalds Rd,WC1.(405 6862)

Films at Work,5th Floor,North Riverside,Metropolitan Wharf,Wapping
Wall,E1.(480 7078)
Fusion Productions,14 Stannard Rd,E8.(249 3512)
Haringey Media Unit,34a Geldstone Rd,Upper Clapton,E5.(806 1519)
Irish Video Project,307 Chapter Rd,NW2.(459 1036)
IFVA,79 Wardour St,W1.(439 0460)
Ivy Community Video Arts,5 Washbrook Hse,SW2.(674 8901)
Island Arts Centre,Tiller Rd,E14.(987 7925)
Kino-Eye Video,187,Makepeace Mews,Makepeace Ave,Holly Lodge,Highgate
Village,N6.(340 8234)
London Video Arts,23 Frith St,W1.(437 2786)
Lambeth Video,245a,Coldharbour Lane,SW9.(737 5903)
Moonshine,Victor Rd,NW10.(969 7959)
Merton Community Video,42,Russell Rd,SW19.(540 8791)
Mobile Media Community Arts,3,Filey Hse,York Rd,SW11.
Mineworkers Defence C'tee,67 Huntingdon St,N1.(607 9964)
Oedipus Productions,6 Windmill St.,W1 (631 4631)
Pinhole Video,44 Branksome Rd,SW2.
Pimlico Arts Media Scheme,1-3 Charlwood St.,SW1.(630 6698)
Retake,2-9 Fawley Rd,NW6.(431 2032)
Sound/Video Archive,42 Queen Square,WC1.
Star Productions,61 Thistlewaite Rd,E5.(986 4470)
Southall Arts,Havelock Centre, Havelock Rd,Southall,Middx.(571
2241 xtn 32)

Smith Bundy Video, 10a The Pavement, Clapham Common, SW4. (720 5976)
Sankofa, Unit 5, Cockpit Yard, Northington St, WC1. (831 0024)
Stoke Newington/Hackney Defence Campaign, 380 Old St, EC1. (739
8549)
Three-Quarter Inch Productions, 71 Corrance Rd, Acre Lane, SW2. (733
2123)
Tower Hamlets Arts Project, 178 Whitechapel Rd, E1. (247 0216)
Triple Vision, 40b, Greenwood Rd, E8. (254 4377)
Twilight Video, 51 Canbourne Ave, W13.
Video Engineering & Training, c/o Albany Video.
Videoactive, 4 Hertslet Rd, N4. (609 8536)
Vauxhall Video Project, 56 Bonnington Square, SW8. (582 5817)
Videocraft Promotions, 81c Streatham High Rd, SW16. (671 6252)
WFTVN, 79 Wardour St, W1. (434 2076)
West London Media, 118 Talbot Rd, W11. (221 1859)
WEFT, A12 Metropolitan Wharf, Enfield Rd, N1. (254 6536)
West London Video Project, 51 Camborne Ave, W13. (579 5483)
Women in Sync, 38 Mount Pleasant, WC1. (278 2215)
Zero One, 3 Highbury Terrace, N5. (832 6965)
