

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

"Analysis and Recommendations in the wake of the 2013 Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit"

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/84p4998z>

Author

Lim, Bliss Cua

Publication Date

2013

**2013
PHILIPPINE
CINEMA
HERITAGE
SUMMIT** *a report*



Published by
National Film Archives of the Philippines
Manila, 2013

Executive Office

26th flr. Export Bank Plaza
Sen Gil Puyat Ave. cor. Chino Roces,
Makati City, Philippines 1200
Phone +63(02) 846 2496
Fax +63(02) 846 2883

Archive Operations

70C 18th Avenue
Murphy, Cubao
Quezon City, Philippines 1109
Phone +63 (02) 376 0370
Fax +63 (02) 376 0315

nfap@fdcp.ph
www.nfap.ph

The National Film Archives of the Philippines (NFAP) held the Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit to bring together stakeholders from various fields to discuss pertinent issues and concerns surrounding our cinematic heritage and plan out a collaborative path towards ensuring the sustainability of its preservation. The goal was to engage with one another, share information and points of view, and effectively plan out an inclusive roadmap towards the preservation of our cinematic heritage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

23

ROUNDTABLE
DISCUSSION 2,
COLLABORATING
TOWARDS
SUSTAINABILITY

7

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

24

NOTES ON
SUSTAINABILITY

9

OPENING REMARKS

26

ANALYSIS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
in the wake of the 2013
Philippine Cinema
Heritage Summit

10

ARCHITECTURAL
DESIGN CONCEPT

33

CLOSING REMARKS

13

NFAP REPORT
2011 & 2012

34

SUMMIT EVALUATION

14

A BRIEF HISTORY OF
ARCHIVAL ADVOCACY
FOR PHILIPPINE CINEMA

35

PARTICIPANTS

21

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION 1,
ASSESSING THE FIELD: REPORTS
FROM PHILIPPINE A/V ARCHIVES
AND STAKEHOLDERS

37

PHOTOS

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

in the wake of the 2013 Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit *Bliss Cua Lim*

Why Archive Our Films?

Why archive Filipino films? That question echoes broader ones: why foster a sense of history? Why remember the past? The historical past not only provides a sense of rootedness, it also challenges us to fulfill its unrealized expectations. The past creates the conditions of possibility for the present and continues to exert a determining force on the future. A sense of history helps us understand how the present-day Philippines was forged, what struggles we inherit, what accomplishments we take pride in, but also what dreams we failed to realize, what forces we must continually resist. We learn to recognize the larger historical processes in which our lives are entangled (the actual past), processes that we ourselves also shape (the virtual future). Being alive to the legacy of our own national culture crafts a sense, not only of identity, but also of the diversity, difference, and conflict that exist within our shared sense of being Filipino.

Our screen memories should be preserved because they vivify our sense of history. Even fiction films, as they age, become unintentional historical documents. In *Giliw Ko* (dir. Carlos Vander Tolosa, 1939), one hears the sound of a florid, poetic Tagalog spoken alongside the English slang of the Philippine elite under American colonial rule. What was Manila like in the aftermath of World War 2? People drive through the rubble of the postwar city in *Victory Joe* (dir. Manuel Silos, 1946) or eke out a living amid the ruins of Intramuros in *Anak Dalita* (dir. Lamberto Avellana, 1956). What is the back-story of today's iconic places? Contemporary viewers might be disconcerted to discover that the long, dark stretch of undeveloped road where a brutal crime occurs in *Kung Ako'y Mahal Mo* (dir. Gregorio Fernandez, 1960) is Highway 54, present-day E. de los Santos Avenue (EDSA). The rugged cliffs of Guadalupe, not yet obscured by today's billboards along EDSA, possess a kind of epic grandeur in *Genghis Khan* (dir. Manuel Conde, 1950). An archive of Filipino film and media can be a productive reservoir not only for local filmmakers striving to forge a unique cinematic style but also for Filipino spectators learning to see places, times, and even ourselves, in the new light of a rediscovered past.

The mandate of an archive is twofold: to safeguard (*preservation*) and to make available (*access*), to enrich the store of publicly accessible knowledge about the contested meanings of our past.

Analysis and Recommendations

Nearly 25 years after the closure of the last state-run audiovisual archive, the establishment of a new National Film Archives of the Philippines (NFAP) in 2011 means that we are at a turning point in the effort to preserve what survives of Filipino film and media history.

The following analysis considers the existing situation of the country's longstanding archive crisis, the internal strengths and weaknesses of the NFAP and other players in Philippine audiovisual archiving, and the external threats and opportunities relating to the archive movement's goals. The recommendations for strategic planning I propose here grapple with these factors while attempting to build on the real gains of the Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit recently convened by the NFAP in January 2013.

In what follows, recommendations are embedded in the analysis according to the following organizational principle. For a summary of recommendations arranged according to immediate/short-term priorities to long-term recommendations, please see the final section.

- A. Existing Situation of Philippine Audiovisual Archiving
- B. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
- C. Summary of Recommendations

A. EXISTING SITUATION OF PHILIPPINE AUDIOVISUAL ARCHIVING

Archive crisis. The crisis is so dire that we have only inexact approximations of how many films have been lost vis-a-vis how many survive. One widely-accepted estimate is that 3,000 titles survive out of approximately 8,000 audiovisual works produced domestically since the introduction of the cinematograph in 1897.¹ In that case, the survival rate of Filipino films is approximately 37%. However, this number is probably inaccurate: the estimate makes no distinction between survival in whole versus survival in part. It also excludes titles that originated in digital media rather than celluloid or analog tape, as well as works that were never theatrically exhibited (e.g., short films, nonfiction films, or works produced outside the commercial film industry). According to an unpublished report prepared by SOFIA (Society of Filipino Archivists for Film) in 2005, of over 350 films produced before the outbreak of World War II in the Philippines, "less than 10 titles [are] preserved in their original format", and only one nitrate

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

film, *Ibong Adarna* (1941), survives. The only systematic inventory of surviving Filipino films, undertaken by SOFIA and the National Commission for Culture and the Arts - Committee on Archives from 2002-2005, lists 3,738 titles in varying conditions (from good to deteriorating) in a wide range of media formats, from celluloid to analog tape to digital video.ⁱⁱ

State indifference to film preservation: absence of legislation, funding, and permanent archival facility. The single most decisive factor in the archive crisis has been the Philippine government's longstanding indifference to film preservation. State negligence has historically taken two forms: first, weak legislation. The NFAP is administratively subsumed under the Film Development Council of the Philippines (FDCP), a government body whose archive mandate consists of only one sentence.ⁱⁱⁱ

A crucial short-term policy recommendation is for the NFAP to pursue firm legislative support in the form of a Republic Act or Executive Order.

The second symptom of state indifference to audiovisual preservation is a perennial lack of funding. Insufficient funding means that no permanent archival storage facility has been built to house the NFAP's growing collection, despite the fact that the archive community has clamored for a permanent archival facility since the early 1990s. The new National Film Archive is currently housed in a transitory storage facility in Cubao.

An urgent short-term task is for the NFAP to build a permanent archival storage facility to house its collection. It must secure appropriate land and funding (from a combination of governmental and non-governmental sources, if necessary) so that construction can begin before a possible change in FDCP leadership in 2016.

Given the NFAP's announcement at the summit that it may potentially pursue a private-public partnership to finance the archive, I will raise a few cautionary points here.

Alongside its intention to explore partnerships with private corporations, the NFAP should also consider partnerships with non-profit organizations (NPO) or non-profit participation from private individual donors.

Second, a "private-public partnership" (PPP) is usually defined as a partnership with a private business enterprise that expects to recoup its investment and generate profits. In any private-public partnership, however, management of the archive should remain firmly within the NFAP's hands. It would be very problematic for the NFAP to enter into a partnership with a private business that regards the national film archive primarily as an investment vehicle. A deep tension exists between the profit motives of private companies and an archival mandate that sees access to film heritage as an inherent public good that serves the public interest.

Third, if a private business donates land and infrastructure for the establishment of a permanent archive facility and expects only tax breaks and the benefits of corporate social responsibility (CSR), then it would be inaccurate and unwise to term this a PPP, since that would imply that the private enterprise is expecting a certain rate of return.

Archival permanency vs. short-term government appointments. Historically, government-led film initiatives have been precarious efforts: prone to uncertainty and collapse, and extremely vulnerable to the country's volatile political culture. This sense of precariousness is the very opposite of the sense of certainty, security, and permanence that archives stand for. The foremost example of how audiovisual archiving is susceptible to changes in political fortune was the closure of the first state-funded Film Archives of the Philippines shortly after the ouster of the Marcos regime in the 1980s. Other examples can be drawn from the FDCP's recent history; projects prioritized by the FDCP under one leadership are often discontinued by the next presidential appointee.

Ray Edmondson, Curator Emeritus and former Deputy Director of Australia's National Film and Sound Archives, observes: "Archives are inherently permanent entities – other organisations, especially government instrumentalities, come and go, but archives have to go on forever. How will the Philippine National Film Archive ensure this?"^{iv} The same point is made by SOFIA President Clodualdo "Doy" del Mundo, Jr., when he states that the "foremost challenge" for the NFAP is to realize its plans for a permanent archive before the end of FDCP Chair Briccio Santos' appointment in 2016, since "Santos' tenure is coterminous with President Noynoy Aquino's administration...A new president brings with him a fresh entourage. So, it is best to see to it that a national film archive is firmly in place by then—the edifice constructed, an archive staff hired, and a long-term operations plan set in motion."^v

In order to assure the NFAP's stability and permanence, an urgent short-term policy recommendation is for the NFAP to protect itself from abrupt changes caused by government appointments and the possible change of FDCP leadership in 2016. Its strategies should involve both the legislative and financial fronts and pursue a range of possible funding sources.

Complementing this, a long-term policy recommendation is for the NFAP to explore ways to gain relative autonomy from the state, possibly by pursuing organizational models other than its current administrative chain (Office of the President— FDCP—NFAP).

At the Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit, participants raised the issue of alternative organizational models for the NFAP, such as the Cultural Center of the Philippines' status as a GOCC (government-owned and/or controlled corporation); this and other models are possible alternatives for consideration.

Decentralized privatization vs. state centralization. A crucial repercussion of the nearly 25 gap years between the closure of the Marcos era FAP and the establishment of the new NFAP is the simultaneous decentralization and privatization of archival advocacy for Philippine cinema. The state's failure to fulfill its responsibility to preserve Philippine cinema meant that a handful of private collectors, nongovernmental organizations, government and academic institutions, and players in the film industry stepped into the breach to undertake the archival efforts the state would not. These various stakeholders^{vi} in the Philippines' decentralized archival movement performed the crucial work of locating, preserving and restoring several Filipino film classics in the long years of state indifference towards audiovisual archiving.

Despite the many admirable successes and accomplishments of the decentralized Philippine archive advocacy in the years prior to the establishment of the NFAP, its efforts were understandably constrained. The main limitations of the decentralized archival advocacy for Philippine cinema from the mid-1990s onwards are as follows: First, with the exception of the film archive maintained by the ABS-CBN corporation, the majority of these under-funded archives could not afford to adopt the temperature and humidity controls required to stabilize and conserve their collection, with the result that many of their holdings have deteriorated, given the country's tropical conditions. Second, these small "pockets of archives"^{vii}, became increasingly privatized and closely-guarded. That is, stakeholders — individuals, collectors, organizations, companies, and sometimes even government administrators — behaved increasingly like private owners toward their collections, rather than stewards of our shared film heritage. In the absence of public access to their holdings and the lack of a permanent facility, access to rare films in the canon of Philippine cinema became confined to a circle of archival insiders and collectors.

Three reasons to support the state's attempt to centralize audiovisual archiving — despite the threat that the new NFAP's efforts may not be sustainable — are as follows:

A. The NFAP's stated aim is to provide "permanent access."^{viii} If it can achieve that goal, then this will rectify the present privatized nature of film archiving in the Philippines, in which several important collections are not accessible to the public.

B. The NFAP may be able to muster the requisite funding and legislative support to build a permanent archival facility, a project that the decentralized archive movement has not been able to realize.

C. The NFAP and the FDCP are potentially able to pursue film archiving on a national scale, as opposed to the primarily Manila-centric projects of the decentralized archive movement. The focus on regional cinemas allows us to recognize that Philippine cinema is not synonymous with Tagalog-language films produced in Manila. Rather, the Manila film industry exists alongside other regional film industries and vernacular film movements (Visayan filmmaking, for example), although Manila-based media production has historically been dominant.

FDCP Chair Santos plans for archiving efforts to be a component of regional cinematheques outside Manila under the Sineng Pambansa program.^{ix} If Santos' plan were to be realized, cinematheques outside Manila would not only exhibit films, they would also have an archiving arm that locates and collects regional film, radio, and television programming from provincial movie theaters, broadcast stations, and collectors. A handful of private collectors have done similar things in the past, but this is the first time that the government has expressed a clear interest in archiving regional media production. A recent find is the first Ilonggo film, *Ginauhaw ako, Ginagutom ako* (dir., Quin Baterna and Leonardo Q. Belen, 1975), which was reportedly recovered when the daughter of one of the filmmakers attended a Cinematheque in Iloilo and gave the surviving print to the NFAP. The film is being restored gratis by the French National Center for Cinematography and the Moving Image (CNC).^x

If the NFAP fails to realize these possibilities — to build a permanent archival facility, to provide permanent public access, and to pursue archival projects that encompass not only Manila-based productions but also regional audiovisual productions — then the NFAP will have failed to actualize the truly historic opportunities that are within its purview.

The need for collaboration. Given the decentralized, privatized nature of the archive movement from the 1990s onward, the NFAP's attempt to centralize stewardship of the country's film heritage, aided by a presidential decree, was initially met with resistance by other stakeholders, who viewed it as a coercive rather than collaborative move. In 2012, Philippine President Benigno "Noynoy" Aquino III signed Administrative Order 26 requiring government entities and private parties to deposit copies of their audiovisual collections to the NFAP.^{xi} Although the decree was not accompanied by a clear acquisition policy specifying the format of those copies, an acquisition policy was subsequently drafted by the NFAP in October 2012.^{xii} AO 26 was designed to fast-track the growth of the NFAP's collection but its polarizing effect may have slowed the NFAP's efforts to build support and trust in the Filipino archive community.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The real achievement of the Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit held in January 2013 was to open the door to substantive dialogue between the NFAP and longtime stakeholders alienated by AO 26. These stakeholders—government and academic bodies; private and industry-based institutions; non-governmental organizations; and private individuals—constitute the all-important “constituency” of the NFAP, which Ray Edmondson defines as the broader community that will “defend the archive when it’s threatened” but also serve as a “constructive critic”, a necessary counterbalance that keeps an archive “honest and in touch with its supporters.”^{xiii}

One policy recommendation — applicable both in the immediate future and over the long run — is that the NFAP continue on the collaborative path exemplified by the summit, allowing its broader constituency to be meaningfully involved in its projects going forward.

As del Mundo, Jr. noted in his closing remarks at the summit, “the NFAP must involve the stakeholders in shaping the national archive.” Being open to the participatory involvement of the NFAP’s broader constituency might take more time at first, but the collaborative support of experienced stakeholders is key to the NFAP’s success in the long run.

The first step towards collaboration was taken at the summit, particularly during the Q and A section of the second roundtable, “Collaborating Towards Sustainability”, where questions, concerns, and even grievances were aired in a spirit of frank exchange. Benedict “Bono” Olgado, the NFAP’s recently-appointed head, should be commended for fielding the queries and comments raised throughout the summit in a spirit of openness and candor. When asked what specific forms of collaboration he would like to see from the summit participants, Bono Olgado’s response underscored the three fronts on which the NFAP would appreciate collaborative assistance: advocacy, publicity, and “paper trails” or information that will help the NFAP properly process its collection, since the decades-long gap between the first Marcos-era FAP and the new NFAP has resulted in the loss of vital information about the whereabouts, rights issues, and the provenance of surviving Filipino films.

Prior to the NFAP, the two existing precedents for organized archiving efforts in the Philippines were the first FAP in the 1980s and the decentralized archive movement that emerged in the 1990s. The first state-run archive ended tragically, its physical collection either lost or dispersed, and the information it amassed unrecoverable due to water leaks that damaged its database system, as former FAP head Ernie de Pedro recalled in the second roundtable at the recent heritage summit. The decentralized archive movement that followed was not able to muster the political will and funding needed to build a permanent archival facility, and consequently was structurally unable to offer public access to its various collections.

Given the limitations of the NFAP’s historical precedents, a different strategy is clearly needed. The NFAP should follow neither the path of precarious state centralization nor the privatized route of decentralization. An emerging alternative that combines the strengths of both centralization under the NFAP and decentralized holdings under other stakeholders was broached by participants in the second roundtable. Some participants, for example, suggested that they would turn over their collections to the NFAP as long as the NFAP left digitized copies with them and underwrote the costs of producing these digital copies.

A crucial policy recommendation is for the NFAP to adopt a long-term strategy of decentralized redundancy alongside state centralization. If requested, the NFAP should give donors, free of charge, digital copies of titles that are turned over to the NFAP. This allows the NFAP to centralize the country’s store of audiovisual master elements, while also creating decentralized redundancies and geographic separation, since stakeholders and donors retain copies in their collections. Ideally, a consortium network would link the NFAP to these other satellite collections to allow collaboration.

A strategy of NFAP centralization alongside decentralized redundancy means that in a worst case scenario, a threat to the NFAP collection would not spell the demise of all surviving copies of rare works. In the short run, this strategy might also overcome the lingering ambivalence of stakeholders hesitant to turn their collections over to the NFAP.

B. STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS

Weakness: sustainability not guaranteed. The key problems sketched above — the NFAP’s lack of a permanent archival facility, weak legislative mandate, insufficient funding, and vulnerability to short-term government appointments — can be summarized as the absence of a clear timetable for achieving sustainability. Credit is due to the NFAP for candidly acknowledging the challenge of sustainability and working to address it. However, it is still unclear how and when the permanence of the national audiovisual archive will be absolutely assured.

A short-term recommendation is for the NFAP to vigorously pursue the multi-pronged approach it has already adopted, consisting of efforts on the following fronts:
legislation;
funding;

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

staffing strategies that gain plantilla positions to ensure that the archive has qualified people to run its operations;

partnerships with non-profit entities or the private sector, and/or bilateral agreements with international partners to provide support and keep the state from renegeing on its responsibility to the archive.

With regards to funding, some interesting suggestions raised at the second summit roundtable were to consider the creation of a development arm to raise funding for the NFAP, and the hiring of a full-time grant writer for the NFAP to apply for external/international funding.

In view of the real threats to its sustainability, I strongly recommend that the NFAP formulate a realistic contingency plan in the event that legislative support and the construction of a permanent archival facility are not achieved by 2016.

Leadership Strengths. The key resource strength of the NFAP at present lies in its personnel, particularly at the leadership level. Breaking with decades of state negligence towards our audiovisual culture, Briccio Santos is the first FDCP Chair to act on their archival mandate since the FDCP was created in 2002. Credit is due to Santos for his dynamic and committed pursuit of a broad range of initiatives: establishing the NFAP; spearheading the restoration and repatriation of various Philippine films; enlisting international support, notably from the French government; integrating archiving activities within other FDCP projects that reach beyond Manila to include other regional cinemas; and vigorously pursuing the land and financing required to build a new permanent archival facility for the NFAP, possibly in Tagaytay. In these various efforts, Santos has proven himself an adept player in political and diplomatic networks and the first FDCP leader to exhibit real foresight and commitment to film archiving. This may be a particularly opportune moment for Santos to lobby actively for government funding for the NFAP, since anti-corruption reforms under President Aquino's administration have resulted in "considerable savings" and increased government revenue.^{xiv} Santos has also successfully recruited Benedict "Bono" Olgado, the NFAP's recently-appointed Head, to run the NFAP.

From a resource perspective, Olgado represents the NFAP's chief strength. Olgado represents a unique blend: academic training at prestigious U.S. institutions (he holds a Master's Degree in Moving Image Archiving and Preservation from New York University and was the recipient of the 2011 Kodak Fellowship in Film Preservation) is combined with professional, on-the-ground experience in both national and regional archive associations (locally, with SOFIA; and regionally, with the Association for Southeast Asian Cinemas (ASEAC) and the Southeast Asia-Pacific Audio-Visual Archive Association (SEAPAVAA)). Despite his youth (he is likely the youngest national film archive head in the world), Olgado is a trusted figure in local archive circles. Roundtable participants at the summit repeatedly mentioned their degree of personal trust in Olgado as an incentive for turning over their collections to the NFAP. Trustworthy, transparent governance is a key success factor for securing the sustainability of audiovisual archives, a point to which Ray Edmondson repeatedly returned in his "Notes on Sustainability."^{xv}

Olgado is also well-known and respected in the regional archive network, with strong links, for example, to the Singapore-based Asian Film Archive and the Thai Film Archive. In his first 6 months at the NFAP, Olgado has already done a great deal: shepherding a fast-growing collection; stabilizing the NFAP collection through rigorously monitored temperature controls and film inspections at the interim facility in Cubao; streamlining operations and workflow; training personnel through workshops and refresher courses; organizing numerous events in coordination with the NFAP; and authorizing various important documents, from the NFAP acquisition policy to its first annual report.

To be successful, strategic planning must recognize that existing strengths — in this case, personnel strengths in the leadership of the FDCP and the NFAP — may be eroded over time.^{xvi} The threat posed by a change in leadership to the FDCP has already been mentioned above. Given that the tenure of the FDCP chair is by nature limited, maintaining continuity on the level of the NFAP leadership despite changes in the FDCP administration is absolutely crucial.

To protect the NFAP's existing leadership strength and ensure continuity despite changes in FDCP leadership, one long-term recommendation is to vigorously work to retain Olgado as NFAP head— past 2016 to at least 2020— through promotions and incentives.

Weakness: NFAP understaffed. Alongside Olgado, the NFAP has also successfully recruited a small group of skilled, experienced archivists with strong ties to the archive movement: the NFAP's senior archivists, Eros Arbilon and Emilio "Mhel" Acurin, trained with Ricky Orellana of Mowelfund and Mike de Leon at LVN, respectively, while junior archivist Jose "Dudoy" Dineros was an archivist at Sampaguita.^{xvii} However, the rapid growth of the NFAP collection—the transitory facility in Cubao is already at 70% capacity—means that new acquisitions are far outpacing the NFAP staff's capacity to accession them in a timely manner. The NFAP's very low processing target (at the summit, Olgado mentioned that they hope to accession between 10% to 15% of the NFAP's total collection by the end of 2013) is due to the shortage of qualified staff. The number of qualified archivists must grow as quickly as the NFAP collection grows in order for the NFAP to eventually provide public access to its collection.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An immediate recommendation is to hire much-needed personnel for the NFAP, especially video archivists and catalogers in order to process new acquisitions in a timely manner and gain better intellectual control over the archive's holdings.

When possible, the NFAP should hire a grant writer to seek external funding for NFAP projects.

Over the long run, the NFAP must gain more plantilla positions in order to retain skilled staff.

Weakness: lack of accurate information about country's existing archival holdings. Since it is now almost 8 years since the completion of the master inventory conducted by SOFIA and the NCCA in 2005, an accurate estimate of extant surviving titles in the Philippines is not available.

One long-term recommendation is for the NFAP to conduct a national inventory of surviving audiovisual works produced in the Philippines since the introduction of cinema.

This inventory should be pursued with the active collaboration of all archival stakeholders in the Philippines and should try to ascertain the location and condition of all remaining titles, including both NFAP and non-NFAP audiovisual collections in the country as well as audiovisual productions beyond Manila.

This is a medium-term recommendation since other short-term recommendations requiring more immediate action, detailed later in this article, should take precedence over this project. At present, the NFAP's transitory facility, its limited staff, and the immediate need to process new acquisitions mean that it will take time before the NFAP is in a position to conduct this inventory.

Weakness: NFAP unable to collect memorabilia and print documentation related to film. The NFAP has candidly stated that it does not have paper conservators to handle textual documents, movie advertisements, and posters. Arguably, however, such extracinematic materials, which also include non-paper-based materials such as costumes, props, and the like, would enrich the archive's holdings.

Adding extracinematic or paratextual materials (memorabilia, props, costumes), and film-related print documents (scholarly books and articles, film reviews, periodicals, correspondence, posters, and promotional materials) to its collection would be an ambitious long-term goal for the NFAP, should its storage and staffing capacities permit. Failing this, a long-term recommendation is for the NFAP to actively collaborate with a library, museum, or archive that could collect and preserve such materials.

C. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The **key success factors** for the NFAP at this juncture could be summarized as follows:

A. Sustainability/permanence

B. Leadership stability

C. Collaboration with stakeholders

D. Sufficient number of qualified staff

The strategic recommendations broached in the above analysis are an attempt to close the gap between these key success factors and the NFAP's actual resources and capabilities. The recommendations discussed above are summarized as follows:

Short-Term recommendations (accomplish by 2016)

1. Build a permanent archival storage facility to house the NFAP collection. Secure appropriate land and funding, from a combination of government, non-governmental, non-profit, and private sources, if necessary, so that construction can begin before 2016.

2. Explore possible partnerships not only with private entities but also with non-profit organizations and cultivate non-profit participation from private individual donors. In the event of a private-public partnership, keep administrative control of the permanent archival facility firmly within the hands of the NFAP, since the profit motives of private business are in deep tension with an archival mandate that sees access to film heritage as an inherent public good that serves the public interest. If a private business donates land and infrastructure for the establishment of a permanent archive and expects only tax breaks and the benefits of corporate social responsibility, then it would be inaccurate and unwise to term this a PPP, since that would imply that the private enterprise is expecting a certain rate of return.

3. Pursue firm legislative support for the NFAP in the form of a Republic Act or Executive Order.

4. Pursue legislative and financial strategies to cushion and stabilize the NFAP in the event of a change in FDCP leadership after 2016.

5. Continue the NFAP’s multi-pronged approach to sustainability (funding, legislation, staffing, and partnerships).

6. To alleviate understaffing, hire video archivists and catalogers as soon as possible in order to process new acquisitions in a timely manner, gain better intellectual control over the archive’s holdings, and move closer to the NFAP’s stated goal of offering permanent public access to its collection. When possible, hire a grant writer to seek external funding for NFAP projects.

7. Formulate a realistic contingency plan in the event that legislative support and construction of a permanent archival facility are not achieved by 2016.

Long-term Recommendations

8. Continue on the collaborative path exemplified by the summit, allowing the NFAP’s broader constituency of stakeholders to be meaningfully involved in its projects going forward.

9. Pursue a long-term strategy of decentralized redundancy alongside state centralization. If requested, give donors, free of charge, digital copies of titles that are turned over to the NFAP. Ideally, a consortium network would link the NFAP to these other satellite collections to allow collaboration.

10. Retain Benedict “Bono” Olgado as NFAP head—past 2016 to at least 2020—to protect the NFAP’s key resource strength and ensure continuity despite changes in FDCP leadership.

11. Explore ways to gain relative autonomy from the state, possibly by pursuing organizational models other than its current administrative chain (Office of the President-FDCP-NFAP).

12. Gain more *plantilla* positions in order to recruit and retain skilled staff.

13. Conduct a national inventory of surviving audiovisual works produced in the Philippines since the introduction of cinema. The inventory should be pursued with the active collaboration of all archival stakeholders in the Philippines and should try to ascertain the location and condition of all remaining titles, including both NFAP and non-NFAP audiovisual collections in the country as well as regional audiovisual productions beyond Manila.

14. If the NFAP’s resources permit, consider adding extracinematic or paratextual materials (memorabilia, props, costumes), and film-related print documents (scholarly books and articles, film reviews, periodicals, correspondence, posters, and promotional materials) to the NFAP collection; OR actively pursue a collaboration with a library, museum, or archive that could collect and preserve such materials.

- i. Ramon C. Nocon, “Finally, a national film archive,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, October 27, 2011. <http://entertainment.inquirer.net/18699/finally-a-national-film-archive>.
- ii. Society of Film Archivists (SOFIA), *Terminal Report: Philippine Audiovisual Archives Collections: An Inventory*. October 2005, 8.
- iii. The FDCP’s archival mandate reads: “to ensure the establishment of a film archive in order to conserve and protect film negatives and/or prints as part of the nation’s historical, cultural, and artistic heritage.” Republic Act No. 9167. An Act Creating the Film Development Council of the Philippines, Defining Its Powers and Functions, Appropriating Funds Therefor, and for Other Purposes. Ed. *First Regular Session, Twelfth Congress, Congress of the Philippines*. http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2002/ra_9167_2002.html 2002 - June 7.
- iv. Ray Edmondson, “Notes on Sustainability of Audiovisual Archives,” included in this publication, 2013 Philippine Cinema Heritage Summit: A Report.
- v. Clodualdo del Mundo Jr., “The dream need not be a nightmare,” *Philippine Inquirer* January 23, 2013. <http://entertainment.inquirer.net/77897/the-dream-need-not-be-a-nightmare>.
- vi. These stakeholders include “government and academic institutions”, chief among them, the Cultural Center of the Philippines (CCP), the Philippine Information Agency (PIA), the University of the Philippines Film Institute (UPFI), and the National Commission on Culture and the Arts (NCCA), which funded several collaborative restoration projects. Among the “private and industry-based institutions”, the significant players are the Mowelfund Film Institute, the film studios, LVN Pictures and Sampaguita Pictures, and the broadcasting corporation, ABS-CBN. The third group of stakeholders include nongovernmental organizations and private individuals; in this category, the most important organization is SOFIA (the Society of Filipino Archivists for Film) which has coordinated and spearheaded several film restoration projects. See Report on Asean Seminar on Film and Video Archive Management. ASEAN Seminar on Film and Video Archive Management. May 8 to June 3, 1995, 5-6, Print; and Benedict S. Olgado, “Undergraduate Thesis Proposal: Towards a National Film Archive, an Analysis of and a White Paper on Policies and Practices in Film Preservation in the Philippines.” 2008, 3-4.
- vii. Clodualdo del Mundo Jr., “Ukay-Ukay: Where’s the Archive? Continuing the Search for a National Film Archive,” *Dreaming of a National Audio-Visual Archive*. Society of Film Archivists (SOFIA) monograph for *Ukay-Ukay: Where’s the Archive, a Festival of Restored Filipino Film Classics in Celebration of SOFIA’s 11th Anniversary*, July 2004, 28.
- viii. “NFAP believes that ultimately, the goal of preservation is permanent access.” *National Film Archive of the Philippines*, Annual Report, 2011-2012, 14.
- ix. Briccio Santos, personal interview with Bliss Cua Lim, November 5, 2012, Film Development Council of the Philippines Office, Makati.
- x. Bayani San Diego, Jr., “Restored classic film comes home,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer* September 6, 2012. <http://entertainment.inquirer.net/60228/restored-classic-film-comes-home>.
- xi. President of the Philippines, Administrative Order No. 26. “Prescribing the Rules on the Deposit of Copies of Films and Other Audio-Visuals to the National Film Archive of the Philippines.” Malacañang Palace, Manila, April 17, 2012.
- xii. National Film Archive of the Philippines, “Acquisition Policy & Protocol” Version 1.2, October 10, 2012.
- xiii. Edmondson, “Notes on Sustainability.”
- xiv. “DPWH, BIR Aquino’s favorite success stories,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer* February 7, 2013. <http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/353923/dpwh-bir-aquinos-favorite-success-stories>.
- xv. Edmondson, “Notes on Sustainability.”
- xvi. Heinz Wehrich, “The TOWS Matrix — A Tool for Situational Analysis”, *Long Range Planning* 15.2 (1982): 61.
- xvii. Benedict “Bono” Olgado, personal interview with Bliss Cua Lim, September 19, 2012, at NFAP Archive Operations office, Cubao, Quezon City.