



## Third International MFFC Audio-Visual Salon - 2011

### *PSSA Patronage "A"*

Salon Director: Jeff Morris LRPS APSSA  
Telephone: 012 803 2105 / 082 840 5459

PO Box 912 805  
0127 Silverton  
2011-05-05

## Salon Report

A final report is a requirement for continuing patronage by PSSA. An electronic copy of this report is available at:

<https://sites.google.com/site/mffcavsalons/Home/mffcavsalon2011/salon-report>.

The results of this salon are given in a separate document and are available on the salon website:

<https://sites.google.com/site/mffcavsalons/Home/mffcavsalon2011/results>. We give our sincerest congratulations to all the successful entrants and our thanks to all participants for making the salon a success by entering. If you were an unsuccessful first-time entrant, please do not give up with this fabulous hobby. To succeed you need to practice and practice and practice.

There were a few disqualifications. The author of every such AV was given the opportunity to re-submit, and most did so. The main culprit was the 'No menus' rule, which is taken from the PSSA Honours and Awards Division documentation and is not our invention. The rule is there for a purpose, is applied internationally and it will be a shame if it is scrapped without due consideration. Only two AVs were disqualified for exceeding the seven-minute overall time limit.

Technology in the form of incompatibilities between computer operating systems and some AVs reared its head again. Wings was again one of the culprits with mismatched DirectX release levels. With on-going development of software and hardware, these difficulties will not go away. Another problem already faced with mixed levels of success in England and Australia is the inclusion of shows produced on Mac systems. There is likely to be a requirement to cater for .mov and .mp4 AVs in future although it did not affect us.

Delays in the postal system caused concerns and lead us to offer some overseas entrants the opportunity to submit electronically instead of waiting for their CDs to arrive. Typical delivery times from England, France and Australia were in to order of 25 days for airmail express postage – not good. Future salon directors will need to take this delay into consideration in their planning.

Some of our judges kindly provided comments and suggestions. We can all learn from these respected AV makers. Comments included:

“Quite a number of AVs was prepared with 1024x768 photos, yet the author did not prepare the AV to stay within those boundaries. On the modern LCD screen (I have a full HD NEC Graphics workstation) these AVs expand automatically to full-screen size and then the quality of the visuals suffer.”

Another wrote:

- “Some sequences had wonderful images but were spoilt by overuse of transition effects
- Some sequences had either an interesting or fun story, let down by poor images
- Many are little more than a slideshow with background music
- Some sequences end up being more like an advertisement for ProShow’s effects
- In most cases the audio was competently handled.

I hope that the above does not sound negative, but I am looking for the skill and ideas of the author, not of the software programmer. I think you will find in my scoring that those which scored highest have a strong storyline. This is controversial in some circles, with some saying that we are only photographers, but for me AV must be the whole package.”

A third judge wrote as follows: “Please find attached my scoring sheets for the 2011 AV Salon. One or two points that may be of interest to you are as follows:

- Too many effects being used especially in ProShow which spoilt some good photography
- Natural History sequences do not need animals placed in insets and dancing all around the frame. They should stand alone
- Another point to note is that some sequences had images of various sizes and formats which is not good practice even if it is intentional.

Having said this I have enjoyed judging the sequences and I have learned from the experience.”

We received 82 entries from 56 authors/teams. This is an improvement over last year when we had 70 AVs from 44 authors. A list of entries is given on the salon website: <https://sites.google.com/site/mffcavsalons/entry-list>

Future salon directors should be aware that breaking-even financially with an AV salon is not easy. The costs of going the remote-judging route are not high but the income from 50 authors is low. Sponsorship would be a way to ease the pressure on budgets.

We have made some statistical summaries which we present here.  
Province/Country representation (by all submitted AVs) was as follows:

Local/International	Country/Province	Total
<b>International</b>	United Kingdom	9
	France	8
	Australia	5
	Poland	4
International Total		26
<b>Local</b>	Gauteng, SA	23
	W Cape, SA	11
	Garden Route, SA	8
	MPU, SA	5
	Freestate, SA	4
	KZN, SA	3
	E Cape, SA	2
Local Total		56
Grand Total		82

It is clear that Gauteng has taken centre-stage as the home of AV in South Africa. A large proportion of the acceptances in this salon were also from Gauteng. This is possibly the result of the activities of the Pretoria AV Club although it is also the province with the largest population.

The overall acceptance level was set at 44% after consultation with the PSSA Salon Coordinator. The following table gives the number of entries per section and acceptances with a breakdown by local/international. If this had been a National salon with the same South African entries the acceptance level would have been 34%, well within the norm for an international AV salon. The high standard of overseas entries is clear from their number of acceptances.

	Section A			Section B		
	Entries	Accept	Percentage	Entries	Accept	Percentage
<b>Total entries</b>	26	11	42.3	26	13	50.0
<b>Local</b>	20	6	30.0	19	6	31.6
<b>International</b>	6	5	83.3	7	7	100.0
	Section C			Section D		
	Entries	Accept	Percentage	Entries	Accept	Percentage
<b>Total entries</b>	24	10	41.7	6	2	33.3
<b>Local</b>	15	6	40.0	2	1	50.0
<b>International</b>	9	4	44.4	4	1	25.0
	Overall					
	Entries	Accept	Percentage			
<b>Total entries</b>	82	36	43.9			
<b>Local</b>	56	19	33.9			
<b>International</b>	26	17	65.4			

We wanted to see whether there were any particular weaknesses in South African AVs so tabulated all acceptances by Province/Country average scores across all seven judges for audio, visuals and presentation. Apart from South African scores being in the bottom halves of the tables, the exercise did not help. We are weak in all areas.

Average of Audio Country/Province	Average of Visual Country/Province	Average of Presentation Country/Province	
United Kingdom	48.2Poland	49.0United Kingdom	51.1
Poland	43.5United Kingdom	47.4Poland	48.0
Australia	43.0Australia	45.3E Cape, SA	45.0
France/Germany	39.5France/Germany	43.7Australia	44.2
E Cape, SA	38.0E Cape, SA	43.0France/Germany	42.3
MPU, SA	38.0W Cape, SA	42.0Freestate, SA	41.0
Freestate, SA	37.0Gauteng, SA	41.3MPU, SA	41.0
Garden Route, SA	36.0Garden Route, SA	40.0Gauteng, SA	40.0
Gauteng, SA	35.4Freestate, SA	39.5W Cape, SA	37.8
W Cape, SA	34.3MPU, SA	39.0Garden Route, SA	36.5

We also looked at averages for audio, visual and presentation across all submissions. Once again, South Africa lags behind the rest of the world.

Average of Audio	Average of Visual	Average of Presentation	
International	40.4International	42.2International	43.3
Local	30.9Local	35.4Local	32.7

Successful clubs according to number of points scored by accepted AVs are given below.

Club	Total
Wilmslow Guild A-V Group	2785
Cape Town Photographic Society	1651
Fotoklub RP , Fotoklub Zamek	1054
MFFC	929
Bloemfontein	882
Krugersdorp	821
Leighton Buzzard Photographic Club	586
Leeds AV Group	517
Queensland Camera Group (QCG)	514
AV Club of South Australia	506
East Midlands Audio Visual Group	489
Photo Challenge Camera Club	489
Port Elizabeth	477
Tafelberg Fotografielklub	462
Helderberg	459
Lowveld Photographic Club	441
AFO	433
Pretoria Photographic Society	431
George Camera Club	418
National Photographic Club	412

Congratulations to Cape Town Photographic Society which wins the Most Successful South African Club Floating Trophy with MFFC in second place.

We would like to acknowledge the help of our judges in the smooth running of the salon. They had a huge task that they completed professionally and without complaint. After all the entries were in, we decided not to do a pre-selection but send all the entries to all the judges. We thank Frank Reuvers Hon FPSSA FPSSA (Dux) EPSSA EFIAP for his oversight on behalf of our patron.

We thank Cape Photographers for the PayPal facility they made available to us which resulted in a number of overseas entries that we would not have received otherwise.

We also thank Outdoorphoto for their generous sponsorship of tripod prizes.

Salons in future may wish to use some of the processes and documents we have developed over the three salons. They might be useful as templates or examples on which to build. For this reason, we post all the applicable documents and spreadsheets on the salon website at:

<https://sites.google.com/site/mffcavsalons/Home/mffcavsalon2011/salon-process>.

*Jeff Morris LRPS APSSA – Salon Director, Magalies Foto Fun Club*

*Francois Venter APSSA – Chairman, Magalies Foto Fun Club*

*Ria Katzke LRPS APSSA – Magalies Foto Fun Club*

*Cedric Creghton – Magalies Foto Fun Club*

(final 2011-05-05 v2.0)

**Prizes sponsored by outdoorphoto,**

**sole distributor of **BENRO** tripods**

