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Editorial

Videodance Studies: Screendance festivals

Blas PAYRI & Rafel ARNAL
Editors, videodancestudies@upv.es

With the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Festival International de Vidéodanse de Bourgogne, that was our guest at the Encontre International de Videodansa de València, the theme of this year’s proceedings was the curation of screendance festivals, and more generally, their meaning, goals and processes. A decade after the American Dance Festival conference on the state of the art of screendance and its curation, it seems necessary to propose new reflections regarding festival activity.

The in-depth quantitative study *Life and death of Screendance Festivals: a panorama* (Blas Payri) finds 267 active screendance festivals in 2017-18, with a recent increase of more than 80 new festivals created (and 25 discontinued) between 2016 and 2018, analyzing their goals and processes.

Marisa C. Hayes proposes a first-hand analysis of the activities and the meaning of festival curation with *Ten years of Artist-Led Curation at the Festival International de Vidéo Danse de Bourgogne*. Clare Schweitzer uses film festival theory and her own experience at the San Francisco Dance Film Festival with *Screendance Festivals and the Cultural Production of Screendance in the Technological Age*, and Cara Hagan brings her curatorial innovations at ADF’s Movies by Movers with *Screendance as Social and Intellectual Enterprise*. The theory section closes with an article by Blas Payri and Rafel Arnal on preexisting music in screendance, using examples from different festivals.

The 2d and 3d sections include a series of articles by the artists that presented their work at the 4th EIVV, that was held in September 2017 at La Nau, Valencia. We asked them to develop their thoughts on how they create movement in screendance, allowing them total freedom to expose their creative intentions.

Finally, we include a catalogue of works selected for the 4th EIVV.
El tema que abordamos en esta edición correspondiente al IV Encontre Internacional de Videodansa i Videoperformance ha sido la programación o comisariado en los festivales de videodanza, a propósito de la celebración del 10º aniversario del Festival International de Vidéodanse de Bourgogne (Francia), cuyos directores vinieron a València como invitados de nuestro Encuentro. Entre los días 20 al 22 de septiembre nos preguntamos acerca del sentido que tiene programar o comisariar obras de videodanza, los procesos que conlleva y las metas, un propósito que se antoja necesario aún cuando este año se cumplía una década de aquella American Dance Festival conference en la que se abordaba el estado de la videodanza y su comisariado.

El estudio cuantitativo en profundidad Life and death of Screendance Festivals: a panorama (Blas Payri) encuentra 170 festivales de videodanza activos en 2017, con un incremento reciente de más de 80 festivales creados y 25 desaparecidos entre 2016 y 2018, analizando procesos y objetivos.

Marisa C. Hayes propone un análisis de primera mano de las actividades y el sentido del comisariado de videodanza en Ten years of Artist-Led Curation at the Festival International de Vidéo Danse de Bourgogne. Clare Schweitzer usa la teoría sobre festivales de cine y su propia experiencia en el San Francisco Dance Film Festival en su artículo Screendance Festivals and the Cultural Production of Screendance in the Technological Age, y Cara Hagan aporta sus innovaciones en el campo del comisariado con ADF’s Movies by Movers en su artículo Screendance as Social and Intellectual Enterprise. La sección de teoría cierra con el artículo de Blas Payri y Rafel Arnal sobre música preexistente en videodanza, utilizando ejemplos de diferentes festivales.

Las partes segunda y tercera incluyen una serie de artículos escritos por los artistas que presentaron sus piezas en el 4º EIVV, que tuvo lugar en el Centre Cultural La Nau de la Universitat de València a finales de septiembre. Les preguntamos acerca de sus pensamientos sobre la creación de movimiento en la videodanza, dándoles total libertad para exponer sus intenciones creativas. Finalmente, incluimos un catálogo de los trabajos seleccionados en el programa del 4º EIVV.
Procesos y objetivos en festivales de videodanza

Processes and goals at screendance festivals
Life and death of Screendance Festivals: a panorama

Blas PAYRI
Universitat Politècnica de València, blapay@upv.es

Abstract

This study analyzes 267 screendance festivals and events, of which 170 are active in 2017-18. There is a recent increase with 68 new festivals created (and 25 discontinued) between 2016 and 2018. In 2017, 27 festivals had reached 10 years or more, and longevity is not associated with submission fees, but with the support of institutions and the selfless perseverance of organizers. Average lifespan of festivals is 4.6 years. Festivals can be grouped into institution-driven or artist-driven, which influences selection, audience targeting and resources. Submission fees are present in 82% of Anglo-Saxon festivals (USA, Canada, UK, Australia) and in 12% of the rest of countries, showing a clear cultural divide. When counting the cumulative years of festival activity, Europe has 48% of the activity, USA-Canada 30%, Latin America 16%, and the rest of regions 6%. The country with most activity is the USA (29%), followed by Spain (8.5%), UK (7%), Italy (5%), Germany (4.3%), France (3.8%) and Brazil (3.2%). There seems to be a correlation between festival activity and screendance quantitative production per country. Festivals are the main and often sole means to connect creators and audience, to give recognition and visibility to works, and also to foster creativity and academic studies. Selection criteria are grouped into screendance as an extension of dance, screendance as an art form, and narrative screendance (dominant in the USA in festivals with high fees). Processes include programming from an open call (predominant, allows the discovery of new pieces), meta-programming (selecting from existing programmes), curating with pro active search (useful for retrospectives and academic studies), commissioning (often open call to provide funds) and creative commissioning to create specific projects and unusual works. Academic publications complement the activity of festivals. In the quasi-absence of recent TV broadcasting, most audiences ignore screendance that becomes a marginal art, and internet is the main medium to reach a diverse community and dispersed audience.

Biography

Blas Payri is a professor of Audiovisual Communication at Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain, where he teaches sound design, film music, and music perception. He is active in screendance and music creation, and co-organizes the International Meeting on Videodance and Videoperformance.
Introduction

During its IVth edition, the International Meeting on Videodance in Valencia (heceforth EIVV or Encontre Internacional de Videodansa i Videoperformance de València) changed its format from that of a purely academic conference with a focus on theoretical papers to a mixed format where artists present their own works, becoming similar to a festival with a call for submissions. This partial shift to a festival format calls for our reflection as organizers/programmers on the usefulness of festivals, their function and what is often their limited life span. For that matter, this text presents data on current and past festivals and videodance-related events in an attempt to expand our ‘archaeological’ understanding of why so many festivals disappear after one or several years. For instance, in 2016, 35 new festivals were created and in 2017-18, 31 new festivals have appeared: these new festivals share in their call for entries similar general goals and statements, and often seem to ignore the presence of other festivals and do not appear to have a clear place or goal in the screendance ecosystem. Festivals seem to be created with a lot of enthusiasm and goodwill, but with a limited knowledge and reflection on pre-existing festivals and the true purpose of this festival system. By creating a panoramic study on screendance festivals, this article aims at creating categories that describe goals, selection criteria and regional specificities that are often implicit in the festivals studied.

The methodology included the search for festivals and events on the internet in general, on film festival platforms, on listings of screendance festivals that often are created to help the community only to become obsolete, and other sources from academic publications. The call for submissions for each festival studied has allowed me to find their selection criteria, submission fees, location and years of existence. I have completed this information by interviewing festival programmers and through online conversations, which were very important to understand how these festivals function(ed) and at times, the reasons behind why some festivals appear to be discontinued with no present activity and no information available on the internet.

The academic articles and publications that have developed theories on general film festivals (Peranson 2008; Iordanova 2009; Gass 2009; Mathieu & Bertelsen 2011; Vilhjálmsdóttir 2011; Ruff 2012; de Valck 2014; Wolf 2017) have set a frame and For instance, the following links include festivals no longer active and that sometimes, left little trace:

- [https://dijkmeij.home.xs4all.nl/media-dance/who.htm](https://dijkmeij.home.xs4all.nl/media-dance/who.htm)
- [http://www.dancefilmsassn.org/Linksmain](http://www.dancefilmsassn.org/Linksmain)
- [https://danseinfo.no/dfk/2006/mediadance.html](https://danseinfo.no/dfk/2006/mediadance.html)
- [http://dance-media.com/jp/pg49.html](http://dance-media.com/jp/pg49.html)
categories that can be applied, to a large extent, to screendance festivals. This is important in order to go beyond subjective opinions and value judgements to analyze the different types of screendance festivals as they are. It is important to note that many historical studies on screendance include a section dedicated to festivals (Walon 2016, Arias Gijón 2017), as it seems impossible to separate the history of screendance and the existence of corresponding festivals. Nevertheless, an in-depth study of festivals and events related to screendance has not been made to my knowledge. Many publications refer to the 2008 conference at the American Dance Festival in Durham, NC, USA, the topic of which was “Curating the Practice/The Practice of Curating” and in particular to “Douglas Rosenberg, a filmmaker, scholar, and organizer of the conference [who] started off the proceedings with a lecture about the history of curating as it arose out of the visual arts field and how this practice has gradually slipped by the wayside with the rise of the festival model in screendance” (Sabo, 2008). Rosenberg (2010) stated several “commandments” about curation and criticism in regard to programming at festivals, and has therefore shaped the academic discourse on curation, but these opinions do not constitute a complete theory of screendance film festivals, and they are not based on an analysis of diverse festival practices, in particular the festivals outside the USA. Moreover, since this conference took place almost 10 years ago, 44 festivals have disappeared and 164 festivals have appeared around the world, with a diversity of goals, institutional attachments, audiences and programmers; meanwhile, conferences and academic discussions have widened the scope of screendance studies.

There is therefore a need to observe festival activity in its actual state to try and answer questions about the utility of these events. I would like to emphasize that the categories I propose here came after observing the data I have gathered, and were not preconceived in advance. Some of the questions tackled in the following analysis are:

- longevity: measuring the life-span of festivals and attempting to understand why some prevail and others disappear, with a summary analysis of economic conditions and institutional support.

- selection criteria and screendance definition: here I am not going to study the recurring question of what screendance is, but it is important to analyze what each festival expects from the submissions, as well as the explicit and implicit criteria for selection. This is paramount to understand the field, and to know if the different practitioners and programmers of “screendance” are talking about the same thing, or if in fact there are insurmountable differences in points of view.

- selection processes, as well as screening strategies and the oral and written presentation or discussion of the works, and theoretical contributions.
Studying these questions will help understand the utility of festivals, or rather, the different utilities of various approaches in the screendance ecosystem, with an awareness that different practices respond to different needs or goals, and that this diversity may result in complementarity, as opposed to any attempt at establishing “good” and “bad” approaches.

**A corpus of videodance festivals**

I have gathered as many festivals and similar events as possible, with the condition that they explicitly include(d) videodance, screendance, dance film, choreocinema or any other equivalent denomination in their call for works. This has required some “archeological”, or rather, "paleontological" work on my part, attempting to unearth festivals that have since disappeared, looking at current listings and using platforms for festivals like FilmFreeway, Movibeta, etc. Our total number is of 266 festivals, that I have listed in the appendix², and 169 are still active as of early 2018 (figure 1).

**Life span and temporal distribution**

The first statistic that I have researched in this data is the temporal evolution of the number of active screendance festivals, which is summarized in figure 1. We can see that there is a steady increase in the number of active festivals, with a plateau of around 50 active festivals between 2007 and 2012, and a clear jump in 2016. We must insist in the fact that there might be a considerable number of past festivals whose data we have not found, and the closer we are to the present, the easier it is to find the data online.

---

² see [http://videodance.blogs.upv.es/list-of-screendance-festivals/](http://videodance.blogs.upv.es/list-of-screendance-festivals/)
Their longevity, which includes active and discontinued festivals, is measured in figure 2a, where we can see that many festivals last 1 or 2 years, but that few reach the third year, after which there is a plateau.

As 2016 and 2017 have known many new festivals, it is impossible to know if they will survive beyond the present time and therefore the number of festivals with 1 or 2 years is over-represented: I have computed also the longevity of discontinued festivals as can be seen in figure 2b. There are 33 events that only lasted one year, half of them curated events with no open call submissions that probably were conceived as a one-time event, and the number of festivals that disappeared with more than one year of activity is more or less evenly distributed between 2 and 8 years of life.
Life and death of Screendance Festivals: a panorama

In order to compare this data with general film festivals, I have gathered the data from the website filmfreeway.com, which lists more than 6000 festivals. As we can see in figure 2c, the number of general film festivals has also been increasing with a tendency towards acceleration in recent years (the data is comparable to figure 2a). There is a plateau in the number of festivals that have been active for 9 years or longer.

![Fig. 2c: Number of filmfreeway total festivals per number of years active (January 2018)](image)

As we can see in figure 3, the increase in active festivals at any given year is not a purely additive process, as many festivals disappear each year.

![Fig. 3: Number of videodance festivals creation and disappearance per year](image)
Fig. 4: Graph of videodance festivals lifespans (green cell indicates activity)
There is a recent acceleration of festival creation: for instance, in 2016 I counted 41 new festivals (births) and 18 festivals that were discontinued and did not have a new call for 2017 (deaths). In 2017-18, 49 new festivals were created, and it is too soon to compute discontinuations. In comparison, the plateau from 2007 to 2012 seen in figure 1a corresponds in fact to a moment of instability with many festivals appearing and disappearing: for instance, 14 festivals did not continue in 2009 from 2008. This data is summarized graphically in figure 4.

**Entry fees**

The question of entry fees is paramount when we study festivals, and it was a central question to the IVth edition of the *Meeting on Videodance and Videoperformance*, when we opened the call to works using among others, a platform specifically targeting film festivals like FilmFreeway. Formerly, the Meeting was essentially academic in nature, with presentations of conference papers rather than screendance works, but even then we had no fee to present papers or to attend the meeting as we wanted it to be a real meeting, including practitioners from different areas linked to videodance. Setting a fee would create a barrier for those who do not have the economic support of a university department or its equivalent. Academic conferences tend to have a registration fee, and those presenting a paper have a higher fee than those attending as passive audience members, which is somewhat paradoxical; but at least, only those that have been selected and are attending need to pay the registration fee, contrary to the film festivals where artists pay in advance regardless of the selection results.

**Fig. 5:** Number of free/paid submissions at festivals. General *filmfreeway* nº film festivals (left) vs *videodance* festivals (right)
We maintained our policy of no submission/attendance fees to foster this opportunity to meet and discover other people regardless of their economic support by academic institutions, taking into account that film festivals tend to have lower fees: a registration fee for an academic event fluctuates between 90 and 400 euros, as opposed to film festival submission fees that tend to be below 60 euros (although they are paid regardless of selection/attendance).

I summarize in figure 5 the number of festivals that are free or request a submission fee, comparing screendance festivals for which we know the submission fee status alongside general film festivals that use FilmFreeway. A general finding is that screendance festivals are much more often free than general film festivals (again with the caveat that FilmFreeway might not be representative of the same scope as the screendance festivals that I have identified around the globe).

Less than 5% of the general film festivals examined are free (4.7%) as opposed to 59% of the screendance festivals studied. The difference is even more blatant when comparing festivals from the USA and Canada to festivals from the rest of the world: this dichotomy is a default option in FilmFreeway, so I have applied it to our samples and it has proved more useful than anticipated. Only 3.3% of the general festivals in the USA/Canada are free, as opposed to 6.7% outside these two countries. For screendance festivals, only 15% of the festivals in the USA/Canada are free, which contrasts with the 80% free festivals found in the rest of the world. I have also noticed that festivals in the United Kingdom and Australia tend to request a submission fee, so I have grouped festivals from the USA, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia together, where 19% of festivals are free (81% request a submission fee) as opposed to the 83% of other festivals elsewhere that are free. Although Gitta Wigro, who curated the now discontinued Dance on Screen (London 1995-2006) commented that “it had a call for submissions, but didn’t charge fees for submitting; most screendance or fringe festivals at the time didn’t. In the screendance world that became mainstream later. Cinedans was one of the first in Europe to start charging, if memory serves me right.”

There seems to be a clear cultural divide between Anglo-Saxon countries and the rest, which mainly include the rest of Europe and the rest of the Americas (i.e. Latin-America) and explaining the reasons behind this policy difference is beyond the scope of this article.³

³ In their review about platforms for online submissions, festagent reflects upon the success of FilmFreeway: “The main secret of its popularity is a successful business model which let festivals save money. The extra fee is collected only from the fee-paying festivals and it’s not more than 8.5% (at Withoutabox it is about 35%). From the filmmakers the service does not take any money at all. It should be noted that this type of business is good only for the American market, where practically all festivals are fee-paying.” https://festagent.com/en/articles/online-services-en
Furthermore, we can see in table 1 that the most expensive fees are associated with festivals in the USA and (English-speaking) Canada. These festivals include the most longevous like Dance on Camera Festival but also newcomers like LA Dance Film Festival or CAPITOL Dance & Cinema Festival. These are some arguments found in the calls for works to entice participation and fee justification. SFDFF lists as "Filmmaker Benefits:

- Eligibility for filmmaker cash awards up to $1,000

- Industry networking and discovery opportunities. Several of the films screened at SFDFF have gone on to receive distribution offers."

Capitol offers filmmakers the opportunity to "cultivate their own skills by connecting with industry leaders and those who are passionate about what they do." I have listed these arguments in most of the festivals in table 1, which can be grouped into two types:

1. the raffle/tombola argument (you buy a ticket to win a bigger prize).
2. the argument about meeting the industry professionals who will buy your work or finance your new projects.

It may be the case that in the USA/Canada there is an audiovisual industry that may buy or finance screendance for a commercial exploitation, but it is not an argument that we find in most festivals outside this area, likely because the time when TV channels would frequently broadcast screendance shows is behind us.

All in all, festival policies regarding submission fees reveal a cultural divide, where Anglo-Saxon festivals are predominantly fee-based, while the majority of other festivals are not. This cultural difference reflects perhaps differences across countries in general public policies and cultural management and funding, but it seems there is a deeper feeling regarding the role of the artist/creator. In informal conversations with screendance artists from Latin America and Southern Europe, I have found a shared feeling of inappropriateness regarding submission fees, as it is not up to the artist to pay to show his/her work. This feeling runs even deeper when the creators have basically no budget nor grants to fund their work; but even in the case of obtaining a grant which might serve to cover the cost of submission fees, I have found artists who refuse (or do so reluctantly) to send their work to festivals with submission fees based on principle. Additionally, often the organizers of screendance festivals are artists themselves who want to promote the art of screendance widely, and as a result, they tend to rely on public grants and volunteer work to get their event off the ground. At the Meeting on Videodance in Valencia, we prefer to quickly cull unfit submissions and maintain a completely free submission process, allowing works from all over the world to be submitted.

**Business vs audience and institution-driven vs artist-driven festivals**

If there is not a real market for screendance with a viable economic and commercial funding, it can’t be the purpose of a festival to "meet the industry". Discussing the economy of screendance is certainly outside the reach of this article, but it is essential to refer to it so as to describe the purpose of the festivals discussed, and their corresponding fees.

Peranson (2008) groups general film festivals into two main categories:

- Business festivals, would be major festivals with markets or de facto markets (he lists Cannes, Berlin, Venice, Toronto, Pusan as examples). They have a high budget, with an operating revenue not restricted to audience/ticket sales, and are a place to

---

4 In a conversation with dance-film director Mitchell Rose, he explains that often times the distribution argument is mostly a marketing ploy as there is little or no business model for short dance-film distribution in the U.S.. According to Rose, at American festivals one meets mostly other screendance directors instead of distributors who are ready to provide financial support.
promote and sell films to distributors as they have a market/business presence. Apparently, some festivals listed in table 1 attempt to follow these rules to become business festivals.

- Audience festivals, with a low budget, a good deal of operating revenue comes from attendance, and often featuring niche programming, more “artsy” and films oriented towards specific audiences. This category seems to be a better fit for most of the screendance festivals. In reference to general film festivals, Peranson (2008, p.30), argues that in recent years festivals have become increasingly dependent on big sales agents: “They decide which festivals a film will play at, and often demand fees from [audience] festivals to cover ‘their costs,’ costs that include participation at business festivals.” (de Valck, 2014).

Cara Hagan reflects on screendance festivals, that would correspond to audience festivals, in contrast to “many cinema festivals that are actual marketplaces. While many of the small cinema festivals have the same issues as we do trying to stay afloat, even our largest cannot, and do not, do what cinema festivals do in terms of distribution⁵ (among other things). For many, screendance festivals come with a lot of prestige, but are ultimately dead ends. These are especially dead ends for those for whom making the work is a great financial burden. There are many presenters/curators working to mitigate this (through outreach, creative programming, etc.), but there isn't any infrastructure; there isn't an actual industry. And while we as a community may not want to be part of an industry - it seems to go against the values of many practitioners - a commodity requires an industry if it is going to survive in a way that brings people to the form in droves, with money to spend.”

Anna Brady Nuse (2008) proposed a categorization that seems a better model for screendance festivals than the business vs audience division:

---

⁵ On the role of non business festivals, it is interesting the commentary of Gass (2009), although it refers to feature films, stating that "there are indications that film festivals, alongside the Internet, are emerging as the most important public platform for movies, thus assuming the role traditionally assigned to cinemas and TV. While festivals presented a marketplace for movies in the past, establishing the conditions of a commercial application of movies and reaching only a relatively small number of people, they now generate publicity and become a part of the commercialisation chain, often the only part. There can be no doubt about it: even in the few relevant film markets in the world, only a few films actually find a ready market. One example illustrates the gravity of the situation: Marco Müller, director of the Venice Film Festival, has recently proposed the founding of a trust to strengthen the distribution for the film festivals of Cannes, Berlin and Venice, as even most of the films from these festivals will not find their way into cinemas. This means that even the concept of the marketplace itself is in crisis. Business is done in other places, with DVD, and also increasingly on digital channels.” This business model does not seem to have come true, and least of all for screendance.
- institution-driven festivals, "he most common method for [American] screendance programs, where experts decide program themes and choose which films to show."

- artist-driven festivals "which generally consists of small, more informal gatherings of artists who share and talk about their work." This would define events such as the Festival de Bourgogne and the Meeting in Valencia, which were created by screendance artists, and dedicate an important effort and time to the debate and presentation from and between artists.

According to Nuse (2008), "institution-driven curating can be a very inspiring and successful way to promote a genre. Institutions have the resources and means to bring in work of high caliber and to expose artists and audiences to new ideas and styles that they would not have access to otherwise." These festivals "can also present some problems for fledgling genres like screendance. For one, institution-driven curating can tend to create homogeneity in emerging fields, and discourage innovation and experimentation. Large organizations have a great deal of economic and marketing pressure to fill seats and prove to funders that they are serving a wide audience. This pressure filters into the curating process and influences programmers to show work that they know will attract their core audience base." Nuse cites Dance On Camera Festival, coproduced by the Film Society of Lincoln Center with the Dance Films Association, as an example of institution-driven festival. "The core audience for the Dance On Camera Festival is affluent, retired, ballet patrons. No matter how varied or exciting the entries are in any given year, the curators of the festival must take into consideration the needs of this core audience base, and program a few ballet films to ensure sold-out houses. This will inevitably lead to dropping some exceptional dance films that may be pushing the boundaries of the form and could inspire a local art movement. In these types of institutional settings there is often little room for risk-taking, and as a result, institution-driven curating can dampen artistic innovation in an emerging field rather than cultivate it." It is important to note that Nuse refers to American institutions, and it is possible that institutions in Europe that have an important funding from the state have more liberty to generate more ambitious and daring programmings. Rosenberg, seems to take in account mostly this type of American institution-driven festivals, which he generalizes in his criticism against all festivals.

An important point that answers one of the questions that prompted this study is the relationship between entry fees and the lifespan of festivals. One might assume that festivals with an entry fee would remain active longer as these fees help pay for the event. In reality, I have found no significant trend or correlation between the presence of fees and the longevity of both general film festivals (figure 2) or screendance festivals (figure 1 and table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festival</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>nº years</th>
<th>fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance on Camera Festival</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fest Intl di Videodanza II coreografo elettronico</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF's Movies By Movers</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VideoDanzaBA</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0/0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostra de VideoDansa</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand prix international Videodanse</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dança em foco</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sans Souci Festival of Dance Cinema</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping Frames International Dance Video Festival</td>
<td>Hongkong</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miden</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deSales uni Screendance Festival</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International University of Utah Screendance Fest</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance on Screen</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Outlet Dance Project</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrations Dance Film</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Danza</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIVA</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEOMOVIMIENTO</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIVSC - São Carlos Videodance Festival</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciclo de Cine y Flamenco</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Pictures Dance on Film &amp; Video</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAME – International Dance-Video Festival</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCESCREEN</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OkDFF</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMJ</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANS FOR KAMERA</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinedans</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agite y sirva</td>
<td>México</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOREOGRAPHIC CAPTURES</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of the screendance festivals with a life-span superior to 10 years as of 2017
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