

## ATTENTION, PLEASE!

Letters received from delegates and collectors as well as the judging and the meetings with the exhibitors in front of the frames suggested these notes for general clarification.

### 1. The Post goes private

Several Postal administrations have already completed, or are in the process of completing, their privatisation. In a growing number of countries mail services are no longer a monopoly; as a consequence, private companies that provide them in competition with the ex-governmental Post are issuing their own stamps. For instance, I received the documentation of a 4 stamps set celebrating the 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Marconi's birth, issued by Rowing Simple, with the caption "Republica Argentina".

Changes impact the ex-governmental Post as well; they are aimed at providing a better service and, sometimes, in making more revenue out of the philatelic business. The bulletins and the catalogues of their philatelic services offer a variety of items to collectors. The number of collectibles made available by marketing or philatelic departments of the Post has increased dramatically, And sometimes along original ways. For instance in the Republic of Korea some post offices prepare booklets on occasion of local events, with nice and (thematically) intriguing interleaves. They are no "new issues" but a different way of packaging a regular issue. This type of packaging is, to my understanding, neither

announced nor formally approved by the central postal authority; it is rather a private initiative of the local office, probably within the empowerment of local management.

The question is "**May these items be shown in competitive exhibits**"?

Art. 3 of the GREV gives a very clear answer. As long as items are issued by a duly empowered organisation they are appropriate, *under the condition that they are related to the transmission of mail or to other postal communications*. Items produced for information or marketing purposes are not appropriate, unless they present some appropriate elements, like theme-related cancellations.

### IN THIS ISSUE:

<b>Attention, please</b>	<b>Page 1</b>
<b>Fakes, Forgeries, Experts</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>The FIP Thematic Commission</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Report to the F.I.P. Congress</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Conferences of the Commission</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>News</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>What is wrong with thematic exhibits? (2)</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Do stamp exhibitions have a future?</b>	<b>10</b>

But, even when they were appropriate, what is their philatelic significance? Not much. Exhibitors intending to show at international



exhibitions aim at getting the best awards, hence the selection of material must take into account the contribution of each item to development, philatelic knowledge and rarity. Some of these items could fill thematic holes when no other item is available and strengthen the development. Anyway, whenever they depict a thematic point that can be covered with more important material, they should be ignored in the selection. That does not mean that exhibitors should not acquire them: I want only to make clear that there is a difference between building a top class competitive exhibit and collecting items for personal pleasure and interest. I believe that almost every philatelist has bought several items just because they looked nice and interesting.

The contribution of such items to philatelic knowledge and rarity is, at large, irrelevant if not negative, insofar they “steal” the place to items that allow showing better knowledge and/or presenting a greater rarity.

## **2. Photo essays and artist's sketches**

Items related to the process of preparation of the stamp, and in particular photo essays (or the like) and artist's sketches are getting an increasing attention in the exhibits.

At large, photo essays can be classified in three main groups

- items produced as a necessary step during the process of stamp preparation
- items produced for internal communication (e.g. approval process) or for archives within the issuing authority
- items produced for information at the end of the same process (for press releases etc.).

The first type is appropriate as printed proof material, whereas the third is, of course, inappropriate.

The appropriateness of the second category has to be decided from case to case, but definitely those that are appropriate present anyway a

limited philatelic significance. I have asked Damian Läge and Joachim Maas to present a report on the German photographs of proposed stamp designs to be published in the next issue of TCNews.

Furthermore, the nature of this type of items is sometimes dubious, as long as they do not show any official stamp or mark. In addition, photographic artworks can be reproduced easier than stamps or printed proof material.

Several artist's sketches may be of private nature, from personal studies that the artist did in order to reach the solution proposed to the Post. Sometimes they are made available to the market by the family, when it decides to sell the artist's archives, not by the Post.

In several cases these items are used to accompany or even replace the stamp they refer to, for any point of the development, not necessarily for the most important. They are not a part of a philatelic study, and, at a first glance, it seems that they are presented aiming at getting more points for philatelic knowledge and rarity. Unfortunately philatelic knowledge is not demonstrated, as far as the philatelic text does not provide a clear information about the process they refer to. Rarity cannot be affected by most of these items (with the exception of essays of the first group), as they are easily acquirable through current sales and auctions.

It is also to be pointed out that the majority of traditional collectors *de facto* ignore these items.

## **3. Private postal stationery**

The utilisation of so called “private postal stationery” is going out of control: exhibitors tend to go very easy with this material and they even make confusion in describing items produced to private order and items with privately added information (*répiquage*). For example, it is evident that several invitations, product descriptions, bill forms, company headings, etc. were added privately by the organisation concerned, for efficiency purposes.



Up to now we have been quite tolerant, but it is time to ask for a clear demonstration of philatelic knowledge, by documenting the nature of each item. The justification of each item is needed as postal rules on the subject are different from country to country and vary over time. The more the justification is harder to obtain, the higher is the appreciation of philatelic knowledge. Exceptions can be tolerated as such, using the same criteria defined for borderline material; hence, they must be in a very small number, as well as thematically and philatelically justified.

#### 4. Misrepresentation of philatelic items

The previous point brings to a more general subject, which is often raised in the international juries: misrepresentation of philatelic items. I urge exhibitors to validate the items shown and to take the necessary steps, as faults in this area could sometimes involve the expert team and anyway it could be difficult to convince jurors of other classes when checking the proposed awards. Some examples:

- Reprints or repaired items not described as such
- Die proofs, specimen, etc. described incorrectly. Is the item unknown to the students (hence, a possible forgery) or just the philatelic text is superficial or incorrect?

Manuals, catalogues, study units have published a lot of documentation on the various matters and it is expected that an exhibitor showing at world level does the necessary checks in order to present a correct exhibit. For instance I have

seen philatelic reproductions of BLP letters presented as original ones, ignoring the time period and the postal aspects concerning the stamps used on these items. This information can be found even in world catalogues, like the Michel and the Yvert!

#### Conclusion

In a nutshell: remember always Marc Dhotel principle "Thematic philately first of all is, and must remain, true philately". That means to adhere fully to the fundamentals of philately, that refer to stamps, stationery, postmarks and cancellations, and to give attention to any niche item because it has a postal significance, not because it is of a different nature. That means also to be a student of philately, not a hunter of less significant things that are considered important just because they are different, if not extravagant.

GIANCARLO MOROLLI

#### TCNews is published by the FIP Thematic Commission

President: Dr. Ing. Giancarlo Morolli,  
Seconda Strada 12  
I 20090 Segrate (MI) Italy  
[gmoroll@tin.it](mailto:gmoroll@tin.it)

Vice President: Gunnar Dahlvig  
[dahlvig@mail12.calypso.net](mailto:dahlvig@mail12.calypso.net)  
Secretary: Bernard Jimenez  
[rocamadour@wanadoo.fr](mailto:rocamadour@wanadoo.fr)

## FAKES, FORGERIES, EXPERTS

As a part of their responsibility, all delegates are committed to support the fight against faking and forgeries. FIP and AIEP (*Association Internationale des Experts de Philatélie*) publish, as a joint venture, a journal, FAKES, FORGERIES, EXPERTS. The information it provides is a very important contribution to the education of jurors and collectors. The FFE journal is published once a year and each issue costs US\$ 40 (overseas) or CHF 50, DM 60, or FFr 200 in Europe. The easiest way to get the FFE Journal is to send banknotes in an envelope addressed to

**FFE Journal – P.O.Box 108, CH-6976 Castagnola, Switzerland.**



# THE FIP THEMATIC COMMISSION

## THEMATIC COMMISSION CONFERENCE

MADRID, 13 October 2000

Delegates are invited to attend the Conference of the Commission that will take place in Paris on Friday, October 13<sup>th</sup>, from 11.00 to 13.00, on the Exhibition premises of ESPAÑA 2000.

### Agenda:

1. Roll call of Delegates
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings in Milano<sup>1</sup> and Paris
3. Report of the President
4. SREV and Guidelines
5. Composition of the Bureau
6. Elections of the President and Bureau
7. Miscellaneous

<sup>1</sup> Note: In the agenda mailed to the delegates it was incorrectly written "Istanbul"

We welcome the following **new delegates**:

Welcome in the Thematic Commission to the new delegates

- Chile

Ricardo Boizard G.  
c/o Sociedad Filatelica de Chile  
Casilla 13245  
Santiago de Chile

- Paraguay

Teresa Pintos  
P.O. Box 652  
Asunción

Good luck and thanks to Carlo Krone who is leaving the Commission!

### Change in Address:

- Switzerland

René Berberat  
Mattstettenstrasse 7  
CH-3303 Jegenstorf

We remember two friends who passed away:

### Dr. Walter Lippens,

past delegate of Germany and Vice President of the Thematic Commission, Jury Team Leader and DMG President

### Karl Dostal,

Thematic Juror from Austria and Editor of the Austrian Thematic magazine

## **Report to the F.I.P. Congress**

---

In presenting this report on the activities of the F.I.P. Thematic Commission I wish to thank the members of the Bureau and the delegates for their Cupertino as well as Dr. Eliseo Ruben Otero, the FIP Board member in charge of the contacts with the Commission, for his constant attention to our work. I am also grateful to the FIP President, the other members of the Board and the Presidents of the Philatelic Commissions for the continuous co-operation during this period.

1. The Commission consists of 62 delegates as of June 30<sup>th</sup>. Since the last Congress three Federations appointed a new delegate to the Thematic Commission, whereas one has not filled yet the seat left by a delegate passed away. Recently all Federations were invited to review their current representation and, if the case, to appoint a new delegate. As I stated in the report to the previous Congress "it is regrettable that some federations of ancient philatelic tradition are perpetuating a sleepy relationship, through delegates who have not given signs of life since years. The Commission, by definition, is the sum of its delegates, and its strength and effectiveness depend on their support. "Mail box" delegates should be replaced by more active ones, even if less knowledgeable, to ensure an appropriate link between the Commission and thematic philatelists of a country."
2. The Commission met in Paris during Philexfrance 99 and a very large majority of delegates approved the proposal of the new SREV. This text is by far closer to the current structure of the GREV and we hope that it will contribute to reach a simpler and more effective evaluation of the exhibits.

In the same meeting it was approved a motion asking that the Commission President be involved, on behalf of the Bureau, in the definition of the Juries at international exhibitions, to ensure the most appropriate coverage of the specific needs, and to combine rotation and continuity. On that occasion it was also expressed concern on the way second qualification is currently handled.

3. Several delegates contacted the President asking for additional documentation and for advice on specific topics. The privatisation of postal services all over the world and the marketing emphasis of several philatelic services are presenting collectors a variety of new collectibles that not always comply with the definition of appropriate material stated in the GREV. Hence, collectors are confused by the "postal" origin of such items, vis-à-vis the lack of relationship with transportation of mail or to other communications services.
4. The Bureau had a very important and constructive meeting in Lausanne, organised thanks to the hospitality of the F.I.P.O. and the C.I.O. In preparation of the meeting all Bureau members submitted their proposals for changes to the Guidelines on the basis of the SREV approved in Paris, so that a thorough analysis could be performed. As a result a new text of the Guidelines was prepared, aimed at presenting collectors and exhibitors a clearer and friendlier piece of advice.

I take this opportunity for recommending all jurors involved, especially at national level, to circulate, explain and use the Guidelines



for what they represent, i.e. a more detailed information to guide collectors and exhibitors, and not as an additional set of rules. Also they are requested to make clear that neither the SREV nor the Guidelines establish quantitative rules, e.g. only "two" items of a certain type of material are admitted.

5. A significant improvement in the contacts with the exhibitors is shown by the dedicated sessions that took place on several occasions. Personally I was involved with the initiatives at Philexfrance 99, The Stamp Show 2000 and at the Czech national exhibition Brno 2000. I strongly recommend to have these sessions at each exhibition and to publish the information well in advance.

These events are a two-ways education sessions, as the exhibitor can learn from the jurors but also the jurors can understand where the issues and the misunderstandings are and suggest appropriate action to take care of the same at the appropriate level. The success of such initiatives greatly depends on the recording of key comments during the exhibits valuation process and on the consistency of advice from the jurors. Furthermore, it is task of the team leaders to ensure that the exhibitor receives the assessment of the whole jury team, non the personal opinion of an individual juror.

6. The previous is just one of the many facets of the education role to be played in future by FIP Philatelic Commissions. The overall education effort will be guided by the Bureau and implemented locally in full Cupertino with Continental Federations and their representative in the Bureau. Availability of suitable material is necessary but not sufficient to achieve this objective, as it is necessary to teach the teachers and to prepare them adequately.

A major task in this education plan shall be the improvement of philatelic knowledge among exhibitors. We should overcome the stage of just checking if an item is appropriate, and educate to the criteria for the selection of the material (also in terms of quality), to the attention for the philatelic specialisation of items, to a greater awareness of the issue of fakes and forgeries.

A second task should be to present the new perspectives in thematic development. Many exhibits are limited by aged plans that limit the possibilities of a creative and original development and this is the major constraint for reaching higher awards. This point was addressed by a Seminar held in Beijing during China 99, on invitation of the All China Philatelic Federations.

In 1999 a special issue of TCNews presented the content of the Seminars held at Pacific 97 and at Israel 98; this paper was translated in the magazines of some national Thematic Associations greatly helping to disseminate this information. A new one, under preparation, shall make available the main points covered at the Seminar in Beijing.

But the major task is to make sure that jurors achieve a more consistent methodology for evaluating the exhibits and that their capitalise on each other's experience. In this respect the role of team leaders is vital and I welcome in the next future education sessions for team leaders, as the Commission already organised in Thun (Switzerland) some years ago.

Segrate, July 2000

Dr. Ing. Giancarlo Morolli,  
President, F.I.P. Thematic Commission

**Due to a misalignment in the Commission address file some delegates might have not received TCNews # 7 and/or 9. Copies of these issues can be obtained from the Secretary.**



# Conferences of the F.I.P. Thematic Commission

Paris, 9 July 1999

## 1. Roll call of Delegates

24 federations were represented by their delegate or by proxy.

Giancarlo Morolli welcome all the presents and thanked Ruben Eliseo Otero, FIP Director, for playing his role of "ambassador" to the thematic Commission the Board with attention and commitment.

## 2. Approval of the minutes of the Conference in Milan

Minutes of the meeting in Milan could not be approved. It was evident that some Delegates did not receive the issue of TCNews. It is decided to send the bulletin again and to have a vote by mail.

## 3. Report of the president

First of all the President remembered Antonio Castellano Rueda, a well known exhibitor from Spain, Jacques Stibbe, former president of FIP, and Beatriz Pantoja de Gil, delegate from Colombia, who passed away recently. He also welcomed Damian Läge, delegate of Germany as successor of Hans-Walter Bosserhoff.

He pointed out that the communications with the delegates via e-mail had already taken off and was some discipline, in particular he asked a timely information about change of address and to keep the distribution list only to the persons really involved.

Having received growing concerns about the Jury composition, he pointed out his agreement that juries have to be consistent from an exhibition to another and made clear that a Commission President is not consulted during the definition of a jury.

In the discussion Manfred Bergman proposed to send a motion to the FIP board to have the Commission Presidents assessing the proposed juries, to ensure at the same time continuity and rotation and to avoid languages problems. Ruben Eliseo Otero explained the process of jury nomination and said that one part of the problem comes from the lists sent by the national federations. Franceska Rapkín said that another problem is that some cross-accredited jurors have a thematic collection but have never judged in thematics. Ingolf

Kapelrud said that to change the nomination system is also the problem of the continental exhibitions.

Finally, the following motion, presented by Switzerland and seconded by Spain, was approved:

*"The thematic commission ask the FIP board to have constantly consultation with the president and the board of the thematic commission to insure to have a better rotation".*

## 4. S.R.E.V

The President explained each sentence of the proposed SREV, with a large participation of the delegates to the discussion and the refinement of the text presented in TCNews. At the end 20 delegates approved, and 4 voted against it.

In the discussion it was proposed to subtract 3 points in case an exhibit does not present the plan page.

Giancarlo Morolli thanked all the delegates for their co-operation and the active participation top the meeting.

*Hereafter we re-publish the Report of the Meeting in Milan, to be approved at the next Conference in Madrid*

Milano, 30 October 1998

## 1. Roll call of Delegates

Giancarlo Morolli welcomes all attendees (32 federations have been represented) and especially John Sinfield, new delegate for Australia, Damian Läge representing Hans-Walter Bosserhoff, who has announcement his retirement from the Commission, as well as the new delegates present. The President expresses his best thanks and friendship to Betty Van Tenac and Hans-Walter Bosserhoff for their long service in the Commission and in the Bureau. He also informs about the delegates excused, including Ruben Kley, absent for medical reasons, and thanks Ruben Eliseo Otero for being a very active ambassador of the FIP Board to the Commission.

## 2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings in Istanbul and London

The President comments these minutes and apologises for the omission of Manfred Bergman among the attendees of the meeting in London. Both documents are approved by the delegates.



### 3. Report of the President

The President informs about the most recent communications from the FIP, with special emphasis on those discussed in the meeting of the Commission Presidents and the Board, which took place the day before.

Jurors. The Board decided to work more in the jury preparation. Currently 112 thematic jurors are in the FIP list (32% of the total): 65 are from Europe, 14 from Asia, 10 from North America and 23 from South America. Only 10 are younger than 49. Giancarlo Morolli already asked for a by far stronger control of cross accreditation (34% of the total) because some of these jurors have no direct experience of thematic exhibiting or never obtained a vermeil medal in our class.

Giancarlo Morolli points out that as of today Commission Presidents are not involved regularly in the selection of jurors for specific international exhibitions.

**FIP Philatelic Commissions.** The discussion on the future of the FIP Philatelic Commissions has been postponed to the 2000 Congress in Madrid. In the meeting with the Board the President reiterated his negative comment on the proposal of having only 4 commissions:

- Commission for Exhibitions (Traditional, Postal History, etc.),
- Commission for Thematic Philately, Maximaphily and Social Philately
- Commission for Youth Philately,
- Commission for Falsifications and Undesirable Issues.

Giancarlo Morolli also informed that he was supposed to work in the special commission set up by the FIP Board to discuss this matter, but he was never involved in the small meetings that were the main activity on the subject, up to now.

FIP WEB site. On 2.1.99 the FIP Secretariat will have its own WEB site on the Internet. The Thematic Commission intends to be present with information and news, educational material and regulations. About 35% of the delegates present at this meeting have an E-mail address and that will allow starting quicker communications.

SREV. The new SREV, as approved by the Bureau in London in a text closely consistent with the GREV, will be proposed to the Congress in Madrid. Delegates will receive the text and the proposal for the Guidelines three months before the special conference of the Thematic Commission to be held in Paris, during Philexfrance 99.

In the discussion, it is asked again to clarify the situation on Fiscal Stamps. The President points out that the approval of the Swedish motion at the Congress in Istanbul gives the Commission the authority to define in the SREV the position about the subject. The Bureau repeats that only fiscal used postally are acceptable.

Finally Giancarlo Morolli thanks the delegates for their co-operation and informs that, after 21 years as President of the Thematic Commission, he has decided that this will be his last term in the commission.

**NEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWSNEWS**

## Gunnar Dahlvig signs the Roll of Distinguished Philatelists

Vice President Gunnar Dahlvig has been selected for signing the Roll of Distinguished Philatelists at the coming Philatelic Congress scheduled in London next September.

The motivation underlines, among his many achievements, the significant contribution to thematic philately as collector, juror, seminar, writer and manager at national and international level.

To Gunnar the warmest congratulations of all the Delegates!

## Thematic Seminar in Brno

During the National Czech Exhibition Brno 2000 Giancarlo Morolli gave a presentation that was attended by an international audience.



## What's wrong with thematic exhibits? - 2

In TC News # 7 Gunnar Dahlvig was asking "What's wrong with thematic exhibits?" The article was raising the point of equal assessment of thematic exhibits at FIP exhibitions, and compared the awards breakdown with the other classes. Gunnar has prepared a table comparing 1999 results that it is published hereafter.

I added a few words, asking for further elements to analyse this subject. Gunnar's article has been published in several national magazines, but I have just received one answer, very short, to my question. I renew my invitation to send me your comments, as asked on page 6 of the said TCNews. I ask to analyse facts, as Gunnar has done, not feelings or hypothesis. I hold my considerations on the subject, as I do not want to influence any answer. (g.m.)

### Thematic results in 1999

In an article in no 7 of TC News I draw the attention to the medal levels in the thematic class at ITALIA 98, compared with the other classes at this exhibition. I have learned that this article has been reproduced in several thematic magazines all over the world and I have also got a positive response from many collectors.

In 1999 we have had three full FIP exhibitions and I have looked at the results at these. Below you can see the figures for the three highest medals in percentage for all the classes. ITALIA 98 is shown as a reference.

Trad	Ibra	Philex france	China	Mean
Number of exhibits	146	140	123	
LG	11,6	11,4	9,8	
G	25,3	29,3	22,8	
LV	26,0	25,9	15,4	
S LG + G + LV	63,0	66,4	48,0	59,1

Post Hist.	Italia	Ibra	Philex france	China	Mean
Number of exhibits	175	161	165	120	
LG	11,4	7,4	15,2	4,8	
G	28,5	22,4	19,4	13,4	
LV	32,6	34,8	24,2	36,8	
S LG + G + LV	72,5	64,6	58,8	54,2	62,5

Aero	Italia	Ibra	Philex france	China	Mean
Number of exhibits	68	45	31	31	
LG	4,4	4,4	3,2	3,2	
G	17,6	13,3	25,8	16,1	
LV	38,2	22,2	32,3	45,2	
S LG + G + LV	60,0	40,0	61,3	64,5	56,5

Post Stat.	Italia	Ibra	Philex france	China	Mean
Number of exhibits		23	29	35	
LG		0	3,5	2,9	
G		13,0	20,7	11,4	
LV		52,2	24,1	40,0	
S LG + G + LV		65,2	48,3	54,3	55,9

Thematic	Italia	Ibra	Philex france	China	Mean
Number of exhibits	169	80	89	87	
LG	1,8	5,0	3,4	3,4	
G	11,2	16,3	15,7	3,4	
LV	22,5	28,7	24,7	19,6	
S LG + G + LV	35,5	50,0	43,8	26,4	38,9

I don't think that the figures need any comments. They speak for themselves.

Gunnar Dahlvig



## **Do Stamp Exhibitions have a Future?**

Australia post arranged seminars during three days in connection with AUSTRALIA 99, the first two days for postal administrations only but on the third day also philatelists were welcome. The themes of the third day were "Do Stamp have a Future? and Do Stamp Exhibitions have a Future?" I attended this third day and the unanimous answer of the first question was "yes", what else could it be with participants from the post, the stamp dealers and the philatelists?

The answer of the second question was also "yes", but with several "but", and I will try to give a brief summary of the viewpoints. Some of these may be unrealistic but interesting anyhow.

In the panel were Knud Mohr and D.N.Jatia from FIP, , Rick Arvonio from US Post, Petra Zikkenheimer from the Dutch PTT, Steven Kander and Arthur Morowitz from IFSDA.

Debate chairman was Peter Couchman.

Opening addresses from the panel.

### **FIP**

Stamp exhibitions are for philately what Olympic Games are for the sport. Stamp exhibitions are important to stamp collecting and play an important role in the life of the philatelists. To arrange a successful stamp exhibition you need three legs: philatelists, postal administrations and stamp dealers. FIP contributes the exhibitions experts on world level such as coordinators, commissioners, jurors. And that at a low price. Part of the competition is for the big exhibitors but you also find Social Class and Open Class for the common collector. Don't overdo the importance of the competitions at the exhibitions. there is a lot of other things which can attract the visitors.

### **Post**

US Post arranges - in cooperation with APS and the Dealers Association - four big national

exhibitions a year, one international exhibition every fifth year (starting in Anaheim in 2000) and participates in three international exhibitions annually. Our aims is:

- to meet our customer
- to introduce the hobby to new potential collectors, not least youngsters
- to increase the consciousness of our stamp program
- to increase the revenue of our sale

PTT Holland is discussing a big international exhibition in 2002.

Most stamp shops have not survived the new time and the best opportunity for the collectors to find new material are the dealers and post offices at the exhibitions. If we want the hobby to survive, we have to support the exhibitions. A stamp exhibition will never be profitable. It must be seen as an investment for the future. A marketing tool for cultivating the long time relations to the customers. Let us suppose an exhibition with arranging costs of 5 million \$ and 100 000 visitors. It makes 50 \$ for each visitor.

- the visitors must be engaged by attractive, informative and interactive exhibitions
- the arrangements must give the visitors experiences they never forget
- there is no place for activities with small target groups. Every event must attract the greater part of the target groups
- an exhibition with FIP status don't guarantee a high number of visitors
- 90% of the visitors at an international exhibition are national

### **Dealers**

90% of the visitors spend less than 10% of the time in front of the frames. The dealers must realize that they should not only do business but also take part in the education of the collectors and support the future of the hobby. The stamp exhibitions look like they did 50 years ago. The majority of the visitors are probably not-engaged collectors. The primary target must be