

FOREWORD

The commission had a very intense conference in Madrid and the new Bureau started immediately to work on the program agreed in a short meeting on the same day.

In the first months after Madrid, the whole philatelic community was hit by a sequence of sad news: the death of D.N. Jatia, Ed Druce and José Antonio Hernan.

D.N. spent a lot of time looking after our commission, at first helping to review its Regulations and Guidelines, and in parallel in promoting the growth of thematic philately in his home country and overall in Asia. He was always attentive to the commission matters and available to give us his friendly advice. Ed was pushing social philately and had a great involvement in the last Olympilex; he had also been launching the FIP Education program and I was co-operating with him for preparing the computer software in support of the project. José Antonio was with the commission and its bureau since many years and always was available to bring his expertise and his support to international exhibitions as juror or commissioner. Through his passionate comments he always aimed at improving our definitions for the benefit of the collectors. In a seminar at España 2000 he addressed a subject that he believed deserving more attention at international level: how to exploit at best postal history documents in a thematic exhibit.

For replacing him in the bureau, according to the FIP regulations, I consulted the members of the bureau and the FIP President and I appointed the new Spanish delegate, José Ramon Moreno until the next FIP Congress. I welcome him in the bureau for several reasons: his philatelic background, his experience as juror, and also because he ensures continuity of representation of the Spanish speaking community.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Foreword	1
Commission Meeting in Copenhagen	2
Bureau Meeting in Copenhagen	2
Report of the Meetings in Madrid	3
Considerations about the Commission	4
Thematic SREV	6
The FIP Thematic Commission	8

The first task of the bureau was a collection of ideas for the full term program of the commission. This program was reviewed in a meeting with Damian Laege and has been recently circulated to the Bureau so that we will present it at our next meeting in Copenhagen.

Meanwhile some parts of the program have been already started, like the One-Frame Exhibit assessment. Menachem Lador and other delegates, in different forms, needed a definition of this type of competition and the Bureau members, as well as other delegates, brought information both on current experiences and on new initiatives in their countries. The results will be made available to the FIP community in the next weeks. Furthermore a review of the Guidelines was necessary in order to ensure the best alignment with the decision of the FIP Congress about acceptance of fiscal stamps. Finally I was able to propose a text that combines the result of the vote on Art 3 of the SREV with the definition of "postal" material in the same paper. The careful acceptance of fiscal does not mean that from today exhibitors must show fiscals; it just states the conditions under which these items can be displayed.

We are working with full attention to the new developments of FIP: the Bureau has just started a work on the definition of the role of thematic

philately within the World Stamp Championship. Currently I am involved, as project manager for my Federation, in the next Nation's Cup exhibition in Finland.

Each Bureau member has been asked to identify the thematic associations and groups active in certain geography. Based on this data collection, the Bureau shall decide what to do in this area and how to reorganize it. The same applies to the utilisation of Internet for this purpose as well as for several others.

We are now addressing the problem of judging and of preparation of jurors in order to achieve a better consistency of evaluation. Thanks to the German Federation we are scheduling a team leader seminar in Bonn, on April 2001. Details will be circulated in due time. Furthermore, documents on specific types of philatelic items will be circulated to increase the level of information of exhibitors.

All these initiatives will have little effect without the cooperation of delegates. This bulletin has problems because it does not receive any significant input in spite of the several invitations to the delegates. Some e-mail addresses have been just added to the list thanks to common friends. For this reason I propose, once again, my views on a correct role of a delegate in the next pages, also for the benefit of the new delegates joining the commission. I am looking forward to receiving comments on the subjects covered in this introduction; so that I can bring them to the attention of the Bureau that will have its first business meeting at Hafnia.

I congratulate Lumir Brendl, member of the Commission since several years but now FIP Director in charge of our commission, and I wish him the best success in his new task.

Giancarlo Morolli

Invitation to the Meeting of the Commission - Copenhagen, Saturday 20 October 2000

Delegates are invited to attend the Meeting of the Thematic Commission, which will be held in Copenhagen, on Saturday 20 October, from 15.30 to 17.00, on the exhibition premises.

The agenda is as follows:

1. Roll call of Delegates
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting in Madrid (*published on next page*)
3. Report of the President
4. SREV Deployment and Education Program supporting it
5. Miscellaneous.

According to the FIP Statutes each Federation can designate only ONE delegate; if he/she cannot attend, a representative (from the same or another Federation) can be appointed. In this case a written proxy, signed by an empowered officer of the same Federation, must be made in writing at latest by September 20th (art. 13.4 of the Regulations for the FIP Philatelic Commissions). Federations without a permanent delegate do not have voting rights at the Conference (Art. 13.3). Delegates wishing to invite observers are asked to contact the President in advance).

Meeting of the Bureau - Copenhagen:

1st session: Friday 19 October 2000; 2nd session: Sunday 21 October, 10 - 13

Topics on the agenda: Deployment of SREV and Guidelines, Seminars 2002, Juror education & Team Leader Seminar in Bonn, Special Exhibits, FIP WSC, Education Program, TCNews, Internet, Informal meetings at 2002 exhibitions, Other initiatives, Miscellaneous

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE F.I.P. THEMATIC COMMISSION - Madrid, 15th October 2000

Roll call of delegates

52 federations were represented by the relevant delegates or by proxy. Giancarlo Morolli welcomed the participants and the guests, first of all Ing. Ladislav Dvoracek who was representing the FIP Board. He thanked Ruben Eliseo Otero for his continuous support of the thematic commission in the FIP Board and congratulated Gunnar Dahlvig, who signed recently the Roll of Distinguished Philatelists and announced his retirement from the Bureau, and thanked him for his longstanding activities.

Approval of the minutes of the meetings in Milano and Paris

All delegates approved the minutes.

Report of the president – first part

Giancarlo Morolli asked a minute of silence in memory of Dr. Walter Lippens, past vice President of the Commission, Alma Lee, Karl Dostal and Dr. Enzo Diena, who passed away in the recent period. Then he informed the delegates about the main topics of the meeting between the Commission Presidents and the FIP Board. He gave details on the proposal for changing the structure of the FIP philatelic commissions in the frame of the new FIP Statutes and announced the projects of new competitive exhibitions, namely the World Championship and the Nations' Cup. These competitions will have a new ranking approach, like in the last Olympilex where one gold, one silver and one bronze medal were awarded to the best exhibits in show.

Then the conference made the following decisions:

- to change the agenda as proposed in the papers circulated in preparation of the meeting, by voting immediately for the election of the President and of the Bureau, and then passing to the second part of the President's report. That in order to enable some delegates, who had problems with the new schedule of the

commission meeting, to attend other meetings as planned.

- to keep the structure of the Commission as in the current FIP Regulations for the Philatelic Commissions, i.e. seven members including the President.

Election of the President and Bureau

The election of the President had the following results: Giancarlo Morolli (Italy), 25 votes; Ingolf Kapelrud (Norway), 18 votes and Jose Antonio Hernan Seijas (Spain), 9 votes.

For the Bureau were elected Bernard Jimenez (France), 45 votes, Damian Laege (Germany), 43 votes, Ann Triggler (U.S.A.), 37 votes, John Sinfield (Australia), 35 votes, Ingolf Kapelrud (Norway), 28 votes, and Jose-Antonio Hernan Seijas (Spain), 24 votes. Others candidates: Francesca Rapkin (Great Britain), 19 votes, Nestor Ferré (Argentina), 17 votes and Dan Dobrescu (Romania), 4 votes.

Report of the president – second part

The President thanked Francesca Rapkin and presented the best wishes for her health, and Nestor Ferrè, and congratulated Manfred Bergman on the success of Olympilex.

The Commission grew in the recent period in parallel with the globalisation of FIP. New countries represent additional potential and additional needs and both are to be addressed with a strong education program. He remembered the seminars he gave in Beijing, Praga, Brno, and Budapest, as well as the very successful meetings with the exhibitors at Philexfrance and StampShow 2000. In this sense a new effort has to be developed in the next four

Saturday, 20 October 2001-08-03,

**THEMATIC SEMINAR
AT HAFNIA**

Check the exhibition's program for details

years for supporting the implementation of the new SREV and Internet shall be exploited for the future education activities of the Commission.

As far as exhibitions are concerned, Dr. Morolli pointed out that the requests of the Commission in Paris have not been yet followed by specific facts: rotation, team-leaders selection, competence of second-qualification jurors, and convergence of evaluation among the jurors are the four areas to be properly addressed.

Giancarlo Morolli pointed out also that TC News was prepared irregularly and with very little input from the delegates. Anyway five issues of the bulletin were published in the 2 last years, also thanks to the French Federation that gave the support in editing and sending out the bulletin.

He also informed that the FIP President had asked for a review of the article of the SREV concerning the use of fiscals in thematic exhibits, as it would have been not appropriate to exclude items admitted by FIP as a class. He anticipated a motion to be submitted to the vote of the FIP Congress and he proposed to redraw article 3.2 of the SREV; the delegates decided to keep the text of the SREV as voted in Paris and to wait for the final decision of the Congress.

Next meeting of the Commission

It was decided to hold the next meeting of the commission in Copenhagen, on Friday 19 October 2001.

Bernard Jimenez,
Secretary

Giancarlo Morolli,
President

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BUREAU

Madrid, 15th October 2000

Presents

All elected members of the Bureau were present, along with Dr. Manfred Bergman. Dr. Eliseo Ruben Otero represented the FIP Board.

Election of the Vice-President and the Secretary

The president proposed Damian Laege as Vice-President and Bernard Jimenez as Secretary. They were both elected with 5 votes.

Program of the Commission 2000 - 2004

The President Morolli presented an outline of his program for the next 4 years. He proposed to circulate the same and to have the feedback from the members of the Bureau.

Bernard Jimenez,
Secretary

Giancarlo Morolli,
President

CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE COMMISSION

Current Situation

Delegates

Currently the situation consists of 64 members.

Very few delegates, beside the members of the Bureau, make proposals, react and co-operate in due time. Several delegates are just mailboxes, and there is no way to change it, as that represents the level of attention of that Federation in our field. Others ask only to receive advice, but do not send or propose anything. Many others have several

philatelic duties, so that their contribution is at random, depending on what they can do.

Commission's meetings

According to FIP schedule over the years, a Commission meeting has a 2 (max 3) hour time allocated in the program of an exhibition. Some delegates (and Federations) complain that such duration does not allow any exchange of ideas and that is also unfair considering the time and the money spent for attending. Other delegates (and Federations) point out that only in this way they can

attend the meetings of other Commissions, either because there are delegates also in the same, or have a proxy, as many Federations cannot afford to pay for all their delegates.

It is becoming more difficult to have a yearly meeting, as neither the organisers nor FIP have enough budgets to take care of the President's travelling expenses. In this respect I wish to express my thanks to the Hafnia organisers.

In case there is no meeting of the Commission at a given exhibition, it should be resumed the initiative that we had some years ago, by having an informal meeting chaired by a Bureau member, prepared in coordination with the President (e.g. a working breakfast or lunch).

Bureau meetings

For the same reasons it will be more and more difficult to have the two-days meeting outside an exhibition that we were able to organise for several years. It is quite impossible to plan such an event during an exhibition, for the short time left after judging and the concurrent meetings in the last days.

Way of Operations

Both at Bureau and Commission level we have to accomplish most of our work via mail, at best e-mail, trying to work respecting the dates or proposing to reschedule a deadline is something is not feasible as originally planned. Any missing answer creates problems and can introduce longer delays, because everybody's input is needed for consolidating what has been received.

Furthermore we must be realistic, but not pessimistic, when we set our expectations about the reply of the delegates.

Roles and responsibilities of the delegates

The roles and responsibilities of a delegate are:

- to report regularly on Commission meetings to their Federation and their thematic exhibitors and collectors and to keep them up-to-date on the guidance of the Commission. They must also transmit the spirit in which we work, namely pointing out that the Bureau is composed of several experts and outstanding exhibitors, and that most of their decisions are taken following the new concepts already successfully

proposed and implemented in the leading exhibits.

- to feedback proposals, issues, as well as unformatted thoughts and ideas and to contribute to the preparation of the agenda of the Commission meeting.
- to circulate TCNews at national level, to stimulate the translation of articles of interest in the national press, and to contribute to this bulletin with input of international relevance.

A delegate is, by definition, the representative of its Federation. In Madrid I was disappointed not by the result of the vote on fiscals, but by the evident misalignment between the position of several Federations and of the relevant delegates. Unfortunately several delegates had neither agreed their position on fiscals with their Federation nor updated the same about the position taken in our meetings.

The meetings of our Commission have been selectively open to invited observers. I intend to keep this approach by admitting a small number of observers, normally proposed by the respective delegate or invited by myself or by another member of the Bureau. There is the need to keep this as an exception as our meetings are always quite crowded, as seen in Paris and Madrid. Also an observer could get a wrong impression, as our conferences are short business meeting and not a debate on technical matters of thematic philately and it would be difficult for an outsider to understand the different situations not knowing the background. At large I prefer the delegate to a good homework by keeping these persons in the loop (by presenting the items in discussion and asking their opinion, and later bringing them the feedback) rather than by having a random attendance.

Confidentiality should be kept on matters not decided yet. What is still an internal draft of the Bureau should not be published or circulated; if someone want to share the content with other experts as suggested in the previous paragraph, the counterpart should be warned about confidentiality. Otherwise we create false information and, at the end, we disappoint collectors because they believe we are crazy persons. I know that our papers are not dealing with top industrial or military secrets; but the process of reaching the best consensus on worldwide basis takes time and intellectual resources and cannot be spoiled by disseminating partial or incomplete news.

Giancarlo Morolli

SPECIAL REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THEMATIC EXHIBITS AT FIP EXHIBITIONS

Article 1: Competitive Exhibitions

In accordance with Article 1.4 of the General Regulations of the FIP for the Evaluation of Competitive Exhibits at FIP Exhibitions (GREV), these Special Regulations have been developed to supplement those principles with regard to thematic exhibits.

They are explained in the Guidelines to these Special Regulations.

Article 2: Competitive Exhibits

A thematic exhibit develops a theme according to a plan, as defined under 3.2.1, demonstrating thematic and philatelic knowledge through the items chosen.

Such knowledge should result in the best possible selection and arrangement of the material and the accuracy of the relevant thematic and philatelic text.

Article 3: Principles of Exhibit Composition

3.1 Appropriate Philatelic Material

3.1.1. A thematic exhibit uses the widest range of appropriate postal-philatelic material (ref. GREV Art 3.2).

3.1.2. Each item must be connected to the chosen theme and present its thematic information in the clearest and most effective way.

3.2. Thematic Treatment

The treatment of a thematic exhibit comprises the structure of the work (title and plan) and the elaboration of each point of that structure (development).

3.2.1 Title and Plan

The title with any subtitle defines the scope of the exhibit.

The plan defines the structure of the exhibit and its subdivisions and covers all major aspects relevant to the title. It should be entirely structured according to thematic criteria. The order of the main chapters and their subdivisions should demonstrate the development of the plan rather than list its main aspects.

The title and the plan must be presented on a page at the beginning of the exhibit, written in one of the official FIP languages.

3.2.2 Development

The development means the elaboration of the theme in depth, aiming to achieve an arrangement of the material fully compliant with the plan.

The elaboration utilises only the thematic information, postally authorised, available from:

- *the purpose of issue or use of the item*
- *the primary and secondary elements of the design of the item*
- *other postal characteristics.*

Such elaboration requires:

- *a thorough knowledge of the chosen theme*
- *a high degree of philatelic knowledge*
- *a thematic text, to ensure the necessary thematic links and to provide thematic details, whenever needed.*

3.2.3 Innovation

Innovation is shown by the

- *introduction of new themes, or*
- *new aspects of an established or known theme, or*
- *new approaches for known themes, or*
- *new application of material.*

Innovation may refer to all components of Treatment.

3.3 Qualification of Philatelic Material

The connection between the philatelic material and the theme must be clearly demonstrated, when it is not obvious.

Article 4: Criteria for Evaluation

The general criteria, as specified in GREV Art. 4, are adapted to the peculiarities of the thematic class.

4.1. Thematic Treatment

Treatment will be evaluated according to the title and the plan, the development, and the innovation shown in the exhibit.

4.1.1. The title and the plan will be evaluated considering the:

- consistency between the plan and the title
- presence of the plan page
- adequacy of the plan page
- correct, logical and balanced structure (divisions and subdivisions)
- coverage of all major aspects necessary to develop the theme.

4.1.2. The development will be evaluated considering the:

- correct assembly and positioning of the items in conformity with the plan
- connection between the items and the thematic text
- depth, shown through connections, cross references, ramifications, causes and effects
- balance, by giving to each thematic point the importance corresponding to its significance within the theme
- elaboration of all aspects of the plan.

4.1.3. Innovation will be evaluated according to Art. 3.2.3.

4.2 Knowledge, Personal Study and Research

The criterion for Knowledge, Personal Study and Research requires the evaluation of the thematic and philatelic aspects of the exhibit.

4.2.1 Thematic Knowledge, and its related Personal Study and Research will be evaluated considering the

- appropriateness, conciseness and correctness of thematic text
- correct thematic use of the material
- presence of new thematic findings for the theme.

4.2.2 Philatelic Knowledge, Personal Study and Research will be evaluated considering the

- full compliance with the rules of postal philately
- presence of the widest possible range of postal-philatelic material and its balanced use
- appropriateness of postal documents

- appropriateness and correctness of philatelic text, when required
- presence of philatelic studies and related skilful use of important philatelic material.

4.3 Condition and Rarity

The criteria of "Condition and Rarity" require an evaluation of the quality of the displayed material considering the standard of the material that exists for the chosen subject, the rarity and the relative difficulty of acquisition of the selected material.

4.4 Presentation

The criterion of "Presentation" requires an evaluation of the clarity of display, the text as well as the overall aesthetic balance of the exhibit.

Article 5: Judging of Exhibits

5.1. Thematic exhibits will be judged by the approved specialists in their respective field and in accordance with the section V, Art. 31 to 46, of the GREX (ref.: GREV, Art. 5.1).

5.2. For thematic exhibits, the following relative terms are presented to lead the Jury to a balanced evaluation (ref.: GREV, Art. 5.2).

Treatment	35
Title and Plan	15
Development	15
Innovation	5
Knowledge, Personal Study and Research	30
Thematic	15
Philatelic	15
Condition and Rarity	30
Condition	10
Rarity	20
Presentation	5
Total	100

Article 6: Concluding Provisions

6.1. In the event of any discrepancies in the text arising from translations the English text shall prevail.

5.2. The Special Regulations of the FIP for the Evaluation of Thematic Exhibits at FIP Exhibitions (SREV) were approved at the 66th Congress on October 14, 2000 in Madrid. They take effect immediately after closure of Congress.

Delegates can contact the President if they need the SREV or the Guidelines in electronic format (MS Word file).

THE FIP THEMATIC COMMISSION

Albania

Mr Juli Daragjati
Viale Barce 19/6
47812 Torre Pedrera (RN)
Italy

Argentina

Ing. Nestor Ferre'
Casilla Correo 115
1000 Buenos Aires
suque@netizen.com.ar

Armenia

Mr Souren Arakelov
Armenia UPA
P.O. Box 50
375010 Yerevan

Australia

Mr John Sinfield (Bureau)
P.O. Box 548
Heathmont Vic 3135
johnsinfield@smartchat.net.au

Austria

Mr Peter L. Riedl
Natorpgasse 61
A 1220 Wien
peter.riedl@chello.at

Belgium

Mr Marc Collage
Stratendries 101
B-9572 Lierde

Bolivia

Mr Eugenio von Boeck
Fed. Filatelica Boliviana,
Ap.do Postal 3280
La Paz

Brazil

Dr Ruben Reis Kley
Caixa Postal 3370
BR 01060 - 970 Sao Paulo

Bulgaria

Mr Christo Nikoltchev
Union des Philatelistes Bulgares,
Bld. G. Traikov 15
BG 1421 Sofia

Canada

Mr Frank Alusio
331 Rathburn Rd
Etobicoke, Ont. M9B 2L9

Chile

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

China

Mr Liang Hong-Gui
All China Philatelic Federation,
27 Dong Chang an Street
Beijing

Chinese Taipei

Mr Shou-I Chu
7F, No. 298 Minchuan E.Rd., Sec. 6
Taipei 114

Costa Rica

Prof. Luis Fernando Diaz
P.O.Box 45
2150 Moravia
lfdiaz@cariari.ucr.ac.cr

Cuba

Mr Fernando L. Fabregas Rodriguez
Federacion Filatelica Cubana,
Apartado 2222
Habana 2, CP 10200

Cyprus

Mr Andreas Eliades
Asantos Str. 16,
CY 1082 Nicosia

Czech Rep.

Dipl. Ing. Lumir Brendl (also FIP Board)
U Jam 19
CZ - 323 24 Plzeň
svetla.brendlova@atlas.cz

Denmark

Mr Frode Vetsreby-Knudsen
Finlandsvej 15
DK 9500 Hobro
vesterby@post4.tele.dk

Egypt

Mr Amhed Hamed
Philatelic Society of Egypt, P.O.Box 142
Cairo

Estonia

Prof. Dr. Rein-Karl Loide
E. Vilde tee 52-9
13421 Tallinn
KARL@edu.ttu.ee

Finland

Mr Eero Hellsten
PL 9
SF 11101 Riihimachi
eero.hellsten@pp.inet.fi

France

Mr Bernard Jimenez (Bureau)
La Ginestie
F 46500 Gramat
rocamadour@wanadoo.fr

Germany

Dr Damian Laege (Bureau)
Buchzelgstr. 21
CH 8053 Zurich
dlaege@allgpsy.unizh.ch

Great Britain

Mrs Franceska Rapkin
Eaglewood, Sheethanger Lane,
Felden, Hertordshire HP3 0BG
fr@frankincense.fsnet.co.uk

Greece

Mr Pandelis Leoussis
V. Agiou Dimitriou 12-14
GR 14452 Metamorfosi -
Athens
pleous@x-treme.gr

Hong Kong

Mr S. Chan
G.P.O. Box 446
Hong Kong

Hungary

Dr Laszlo Molnar
P.O. Box 252
H 1502 Budapest

Iceland

Mr Ernst Sigurdson
Asturweg 21B
Selfossi

India

Mr Rameshwardas Binani
9, Ramsevak Mullick lane, 43, Strand Road
Calcutta 700 007
binani@iname.com

Indonesia

Mr F.X. Kurnadi
Jl. Kedoya Akasia Raya Blok B 10 No. 23
Jakarta 11520

Iran

Mr Joussef Babhoud
6-28 Andisheh - 1 Str., Behesti Ave
Teheran 15697

Ireland

Mr Geoffrey McAuley
24 Nutley Ave., Donnybrook
Dublin 4
mcauleyg@indigo.ie

Israel

Mr Menachem Lador
P.O.Box 340
IL 90836 Har-Adar
Menachem.Lador@Compaq.com

Italy

Dr Ing. Giancarlo Morolli (Bureau)
Seconda Strada, 12
I 20090 Segrate (Mi)
gmoroll@tin.it

Japan

Mr Tsugumi Shirai
Shin-Isjikawa, Aoba-ku,
Yokohama 225

Luxemburg

Mr Willy Serres
27 rue de Hunsdorf
L 7359 Lorentzweiler

Lybia

Mr Mohamed Ali Siala
P.O.B. 2411
Tripoli

Malaysia

Mr C. Nagarajah
P.O.Box 11748 G.P.O.
50756 Kuala Lumpur

Malta

Mr Godwin Said
43/2 Zachary Street
Valletta

Nepal

Mr Shyam Prasad Nucha Pradhan
G.P.O. Box 2265
Katmandu
bhanupr@wlink.com.np

Netherlands

Mr Anton van Deutekom
Bernhardlaan 4
NL-6226 BH Maastricht
Anton.vanDeutekom@PO.UNIMAAS.NL

New Zealand

Mr Doug South
P.O. Box 20
Wakefield, Nelson

Norway

Mr Ingolf Kapelrud (Bureau)

Sjöraakveien 1
N 4070 Randaberg
ikapelru@online.no

Paraguay

Ms Teresa Pintos
P.O. Box 852
Asuncion

Peru

Mr Fernando Diaz
Luis Felipe Villaran 712
Lima 27

Philippines

Mr Larry N. Carino
27 R. Alvero St., Xavierville Subd.
1108 Quezon City

Poland

Mgr. inz. Antoni Kurczinsky
Polsky Związek Filatelistow, Al. 3 Maja 12
PL 00391 Warszawa

Portugal

Dr Antonio Dionisio Silva Gama
Av. Marconi, 16 - r/c E
1000 Lisboa

Rep. of Korea

Mr Sang-Woon Park
K.P.O. Box 1636
Seoul 110

Romania

Mr Dan Dobrescu
Sos. Stefan cel Mare Nr 4 Bl 14 sc B al 3 ap 47
R 71133 Bucuresti
dand@mtilgroup.ro

Russia

Oleg V. Poljakov
Union of Philatelists of Russia,
12 Twerskaya Street
103 831 Moscow GSP-3

San Marino

Dr Ing. Denis Gemmani
V. Consiglio dei Sessanta 166
47031 Dogana

Singapore

Mr Huei Loch Chan
93, Dundar Walk
Singapore 459404

Slovakia

Dr. Peter Osusky
Heydukova 1
SQ-811 08 Bratislavia

Slovenia

Dr Peter Suhadolc
postno lezece
SI 6210 Sezana
suhadolc@dst.univ.trieste.it

Southern Africa

Mr Martin East
67 Princess Alice Avenue
Glenwood

Spain

Mr José Ramon Moreno (Bureau)
Tabladilla, 2 (Edificio "Bekinsa")
E 41013 Sevilla
josr_moreno@yahoo.com

Sweden

Mr Gunnar Dahlvig
Danska Vagen 2
S 31232 Laholm
gdahlvig@everyday.com

Switzerland

Ms Ursula Küenzi
Route Bel-Air 13
CH-1723 Marly
kuenziupmarly@bluewin.ch

Thailand

Mr Kawee Kehasukcharoen
76/25 Soi Langsuan, Ploenchit Road
Bangkok 10330

Turkey

Mr Erol Tugcu
Egemen Sokak 20/9
Feneryolu - Istanbul

U.S.A.

Mrs Ann M. Trigg (Bureau)
4865 Spaulding Drive
Clarence, New York 11217
atriggle@buffalo.edu

Uruguay

Lic. Herman C. Kruse
Enrique Turrini 970
Montevideo 11.700

Venezuela

Mr Ignacio Martinello S.
Apartado Chacao N. 61082
Caracas 1060-A
firejack@cantv.net

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

President: Dr. Ing. Giancarlo Morolli, Seconda Strada 12,
I 20090 Segrate (MI) Italy;
Vice President: Dr. Damian Laege;
Secretary: Bernard Jimenez