

Minutes of IOV Executive Meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2020

Present (online): Tony Manning (chair), Zulqar Cheema (Treasurer), Ian Sandall, Peter Hinkson (from 10:20)  
Also invited: Brian Rose (President *ex officio*)

1. Minutes of meeting of 27th November 2020 and any matters arising.

Minutes were agreed. TM commented that there were some actions from the minutes that he and Cheema needed to work through separately, including a date for the AGM.

2. Report on UK Weddings Taskforce event and future proposals (TM)

<https://www.guidesforbrides.co.uk/business-information/uk-weddings-taskforce>

See Circular for Members attached

All agreed that it was important for us to have a voice in promoting the visibility of the weddings industry, as well as capitalising on the potential links now evident across the industry.

3. Pilot Programme led by Alvin Burrell – feedback if any.

AB is due to pilot next week and has agreed to update us. IS commented that anything that does go out must reflect production standards that reflect well on the IOV. Preparation and chairing will be key issues.

4. The (Virtual) Photography and Video Show 2021

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aNbcTRD8vgC\\_XiOmA-DtEi\\_ByoSlCxZ6/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aNbcTRD8vgC_XiOmA-DtEi_ByoSlCxZ6/view)

Show will take place 6-7 March 2021 (Saturday and Sunday). It was felt that this was the right kind of market for us if we could get an affordable and effective package at around £500, and also if we could be ready to take advantage of the opportunity, i.e. a proper responsive promotional effort

5. MAIN ITEM Proposals for the Future of the IOV

- a) Proposal by IS -see attached brief.

- b) Comments by Chair see attached paper

See also: <http://www.iawf.org.uk/home/>

TM and ZC to go through uncompleted action points.

TM will continue to keep our members informed of UKWT initiatives.

ZC will check on progress.

Chair will speak with Richard Macey and see if we can get a bespoke deal.

“The International Association of Wildlife Film-makers (IAWF) was founded in 1982 to encourage communication and cooperation between people who are often isolated on location in the field. Our [members](#) are professional cameramen and camerawomen who earn most of their income from making wildlife films.

The IAWF was delighted to become affiliated with the [GTC \(Guild of Television Cameramen\)](#) in January 2016.”

“The International Association of Wildlife Film Makers is an association in its own right... The [GTC](#) administers membership payments on behalf of the IAWF.”

#### Discussion.

IS outlined the negative trends for the IOV – losing members, an age profile of current members with c.50% over 60 and a third over 70; a substantial proportion not earning a substantial portion of their income from video production, and a surprising number of members who do not rate their own abilities highly. What are we offering for the younger age-spectrum? True our members have vast practical experience – but has much of it at least technically been superseded? What do they know of TikTok, portrait format shooting, a 90-second max film? In ten years’ time what will people be looking for?

Right now are young video makers looking for anything in terms of an organization? Kit is relatively accessible, how-to videos are free and ubiquitous (and often not very good). There’s a whole generation of self-starters who probably don’t know what they need apart from basic kit, and who aren’t accustomed to paying for anything.

Back in the day members valued fellowship – meeting like-minded people, talking video and business, having a beer or two. Viewing some kit. They got tips and advice from each other and sometimes found colleagues to work with and some partnerships went on for decades. Discussing money was always a high priority, and helped to maintain a united front against low cost work. Some joined [PACT](#) or [BECTU](#) for similar reasons.

IOV-negotiated discounts were popular but for the most part a bit of hard individual bargaining can achieve the same result or better.

Arbitration is still useful and a USP even if rarely used.

Certification or “accreditation” was considered important, but people upload their best work and attract work that way now. Job ads are either not looking for qualifications or expect a Masters degree, e.g. a lecturing post. At the coal face they want credits, aptitude, and someone who fits in the team well.

The universities will continue to turn out more and more media graduates and even those who are fortunate enough to receive a proper practical training during their three of four years as undergraduates will find it hard to get work in the industry and many will find unrelated jobs or go back into academia. Those with better connections, social graces and wealthy indulgent parents will be able to afford to work for sandwiches to accumulate credits and get a foot on the film production/TV ladder. They won’t want to be “videographers” although many will have to become freelance producers.

The IOV began to counter poor standards in wedding video production. Over time many members moved away from weddings and developed other niche specialities, or covered a whole range of work-types. As they got established perhaps many of our more accomplished members left, no longer needing the IOV to thrive. Probably those that remain are predominantly weddings and events specialists. So having resisted being viewed as “the wedding guys” are we more or less back there?

IS asked whether, therefore, the IOV was essentially a child of its time, and that time had gone?

We are also back to the key question of our identity in 2020 and beyond. TM asked if there was a continuum from a “Broad Church” at one end and a Specialist and exclusive organization at the other, where would we want to position ourselves? The broad church would welcome everyone with any connection to video production, a general interest, hobbyists, part-timers, students, beginners, right through to seasoned professionals. No qualifications or standards required. At the other end, people would be expected to demonstrate a high level of expertise and to possess or study for a qualification; we would expect to see the quality of their work in order to vouch for it; they would be required to undertake a minimum number of hours of CPD (Continuous Professional Development) each year; to commit to a high standard of customer service and to comply with the proceedings of our Arbitration Service; and to satisfy requirements such as up-to-date Professional Liability Insurance to remain on our register. Such things are standard in established professions but can we aspire to such a level since we cannot run degree level courses and act fully as a governing body?

Having neither the prestige nor the clout our standards are a matter of voluntary compliance – our members won't seek to have their standards assessed unless they see a benefit as things stand.

Insistence on standards would not be a popular move for many members - and perhaps we lost our courage when this was first proposed. Exec members felt we ought to be at the specialist end of the continuum working with members who are, or aspire to be, professional video producers. It was suggested that we could still welcome members who would be considered "student" or some such term, members awaiting approval as full Licenciates (again terms to be debated).

TM suggested that an implication of this would be that we as an Exec would have a responsibility to provide or enable training. Ideally there would be a special Training Officer role. As part of this we would need to review and update our VideoSkills curriculum and consider how this would be delivered. (at present it provides a background for the online exam and as a template to judge submitted video entries against). In brief, if we insist on higher standards how do we assist our members to achieve those standards? Can we achieve and publicize a qualification which is seen to have both prestige and value in the real world? If so this could attract members who otherwise rely on video tutorials from e.g nofilmschool.com

Before moving to the question of an affiliation of some sort with the GTC TM suggested we pause and assess what we currently offer, what has been lost in terms of member benefits and indeed our own accountability for the current state of affairs. Joining another organization would not magically transform our fortunes, nor would this take away the need to develop and modernize. Amongst the lost benefits are: our own magazine (Focus) although a new online edition is proposed for around mid-February; Area Meetings faded away long ago with a few brave exceptions; Video of the Month was once thriving and is no more – Mike West and Phil Beaney offered to revive and run it with all members invited to vote but this was never delivered; our own show is long gone, and our participation in other shows has been limited (although we stayed with the ExCel show for several years); applications for accreditation beyond the online exam dried up and the two remaining assessors, Steve Kane and Brett Allen resigned without replacements and declined involvement in making a video about the process and how to pass. The "new" website remains a work in progress. Although many improvements have been made it is not attracting members or external visitors nearly enough. As such the site fails to generate income at present. Further development is in process but something more radical may be required.

PH offered to lead on a revised VOTM – possibly more a showcase than a competition. Need to define, set criteria, frequency, voting etc. TM will contact Mike West as a courtesy. IS will see if Holdan's might be persuaded to put up a prize.

TM asked what would be attractive to GTC to take us on? The wildlife specialists have clear identity. IS said the only way to know would be to try. It was agreed that Cheema would contact Brian Rose to begin an informal discussion. If/when we arrive at a proposal this would need to be explained to the membership and put to a vote.

Peter suggested we look at [BIPP](#) (British Institute of Professional Photography) to see what we might learn (including qualification routes and naming of awards)

6. Any other business

Amazon gift voucher (the incentive for completing the Members' Survey) went to .....Byron Jackson!

ZC reported a current balance sheet of £5093.37 plus £463 in the PPL account.

7. Arrangements for next meeting

Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 9:30 to 11:30am

Minutes taken by Tony Manning.

This version 29<sup>th</sup> December 2020.

Revised 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021

TM agreed to put together a discussion paper to examine the issues in greater detail. ZC to contact Brian Rose for an initial sounding out discussion. TM & ZC will look to set a date for the AGM, possibly early March.

ZC will notify and arrange to settle.



