

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE

DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

LAUSANNE, October 16, 17 and 18, 1981

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HELD IN LAUSANNE

October 16, 17, 18, 1981

Present:

Members:

W. Klaue, President
R. Borde, Vice President
E. Bowser, Vice President
D. Francis, Vice President
R. Daudelin, Secretary General
J. de Vaal, Treasurer

T. Andreykov
G. Cincotti
M. Gonzalez-Casanova
E. Orbanz
A.L. Wibom

Reserve members:

M. Strotchkov (with interpreter)
S. Kula

Honorary member:

E. Lauritzen

Executive Secretary:

B. van der Elst

Interpreter:

J. Johnson

FIRST SESSION

Mr Klaue opened the meeting with a welcome to everyone. Apologies for absences had been received from Mr Volkmann and Mr Alves-Netto, both for financial reasons, and from Mr Toeplitz (delay in getting visa).

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

As Mr Francis had to leave early on Sunday morning, it was agreed to bring forward items 10 and 8a so he could participate in the discussion. The following agenda was then unanimously adopted:

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the preceding meetings in Rapallo
3. Membership questions:
 - Reconfirmation of members: Istanbul
 - Reconfirmation of Observers: Caracas
 - New candidatures for observership: Cinemateca Colombiana -- Bogotá
 - Miscellaneous draft letter to the membership about 'exclusivity rule' and art. 104
4. Financial report on the period January - September 1981
5. Report of the specialized Commissions:
 - Discussion on the general working principles
 - Report of the Preservation Commission (UNESCO contract - Future work)
 - Report of the Cataloguing Commission
 - Report of the Documentation Commission (Madrid meeting - PIP -- etc...)
6. Projects underway (see enclosed list)
7. Relations with other international organisations:
 - UNESCO: nomination of film archive experts
regional conferences
other UNESCO projects
 - CILECT: questionnaire on film schools
 - Report on joint meeting and future cooperation with FIAT, ICA, IFLA and IASA
8. Future Congresses: Mexico 1982
Stockholm 1983
9. Report on the World Film History Project
10. General debate on FIAF's future development (perspective of new film archives in the 80's and FIAF, membership of international organisations: national or individual membership; black market and film archives; FIAPP; FIAF and television; a policy for archive screenings; increasing publicity on the role of film archives; technical progress and film archives; colour film campaign; inflation and impact on film archives; directory of film archives; division of tasks among members of the Executive Committee, etc...)
11. Varia
 - Next meeting of the Executive Committee

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS IN RAPALLO

Mr Lauritzen mentioned that his name had been included in error on the Attendance List for the second meeting on 7 May.

Mrs Bowser raised 3 points for record:

p4 Uruguay: she felt Mrs Ferrari's replies to the questions put to her should be recorded.

Mr Daudelin agreed to send his notes to the Secretariat for inclusion.

p16 Mrs Bowser had been the longest serving President of the Documentation Commission, not of any FIAF Commission.

pp2/3 of 7 May meeting: correction to spelling of STAYKOVA

Mrs van der Elst expressed thanks to Jill Johnson for the Minutes and Mr Klaue expressed approval of the amended format which highlighted decisions taken.

On a point of protocol, it was clarified that the newly elected Members could only approve the Minutes of the Second Meeting. The Minutes of the First Meeting had already been sent to all those who had been present.

Decision: The Minutes for both Meetings were approved..

3. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

A. RECONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS

Istanbul/ Sinema - TV Enstitüsü

Mr Daudelin reported he had received no reply to his letter of June 8 explaining the reconfirmation procedure.

Decision: Secretariat to write explaining that the Executive Committee could not reconfirm without the information requested.

B. RECONFIRMATION OF OBSERVERS

1. Caracas/ Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela

Mr Daudelin reported that they had paid their subscription for 1979 and 80 and submitted their Report for 1979 but not for 1980. It was felt that they were interested and active and the delay was probably due to the postal service said to be the worst in the world.

Decision: Unanimously reconfirmed.

Secretariat to advise 1980 Report still awaited.

2. Lyon / Musée du Cinéma et Cinémathèque

Mr Daudelin reported that Dr Genard had sent a one-page Report on the changes taking place and the formation and proposed activities of the new Institut Lumière.

Mr Borde, who had attended a meeting with Dr Genard, reported that the original Comité de Fondation was still officially the FIAF observer.

Decision: Unanimously reconfirmed.

C. NEW OBSERVER CANDIDATES

1. Bogotá: Fundacion Cinemateca Colombiana

Mr Daudelin reviewed their dossier which was complete and met FIAF requirements. Their candidature was supported by Mr Casanova who knew the individuals personally and said they were serious; this view was supported by others including Mr Francis and Mrs Bowser who appreciated their active interest in preservation.

Mr Daudelin asked how FIAF might help them in their difficult financial situation to get proper state funding; Mr Francis felt the most useful step was in fact to admit them to FIAF.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

2. Luanda: Cinemateca Nacional de Angola.

Mr Daudelin reported that they met the FIAF requirements: several FIAF members had met the people personally or had written contact with them and were aware that, though small and poor, they were very enthusiastic.

Their candidature was supported actively by Mr Andreykov and Mr Alves-Netto (via a letter of commendation sent to Mr Casanova).

Ms Orbanz noted that their collection was 16 mm and of television holdings only and Mr Andreykov said they had only 40 titles in total. Bulgaria was encouraging them with a gift of 60 Bulgarian films and he hoped other archives would also send films.

Mr Klaue pointed out that they were working under very difficult conditions and for instance did not even have cans for the films on the history of Angola left behind by the Portuguese. He suggested we should ask them to give details of their specific problems so that FIAF could see how best to help them.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

Letter to be sent encouraging them in their preservation work and offering help and asking for specific details of their needs.

D. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Yugoslavia

Mr Daudelin reported that Mr Pogacic had advised FIAF that he had resigned his post as Director of the Cinematheque of Belgrade; he would be remaining the Yugoslav representative on the World Film History Project.

He sent detail of his successor Mr Bogdanovic.

2. France

Mr Borde reported that the situation of the cinémathèques in France was beginning to be clarified officially and the first steps had been taken towards his ideal of a national cinémathèque.

The Cinémathèque de Toulouse had signed an agreement with the Centre National de la Cinématographie which would protect them from the proliferation of "false cinémathèques" and nominated them as the official Research Centre for the History of the Cinema and, in particular, French Cinema. A civil servant from the CNC, Pierre Cadars, had been nominated Director and was at Lausanne to meet the FIAF members; he had previously been Mr Borde's assistant, working on an unpaid, voluntary basis.

Mr Borde anticipated that the agreement they had signed would be the model for a similar agreement between CNC and the Cinémathèque Française, providing for 3-way co-operation. The CF had a new Director in succession to Mr Astié called Mr Delocque-Fourcaud who was a civil servant, he had known in the Finance Ministry, and seemed to be the right personality to ensure progress and co-operation.

3. Tokyo

The Film Centre had asked for information / advice on vault construction and were sent a list of archive members who had built vaults recently.

4. United Nations

Mrs Bowser had had several telephone conversations and Mr Daudelin had been in correspondence with Mr Sydenham and explained some of the problems regarding their possible admission to FIAF.

This matter was postponed until discussion under point 10 of the Agenda.

5. India

The Film Division of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in India asked for information about FIAF. They have a fairly substantial collection of newsreels and government productions.

6. Wisconsin Centre for Film and Theatre Research

Following Maxine Fleckner's attendance at Rapallo, they had seated their intention to apply to be FIAF observers.

7. Australia / National Film Archive

Mr Klaue reported that he had, at their request, sent a letter stressing the importance of archive work and referring to the UNESCO recommendation to try and help with their economic problems which had caused the archive building project to be suspended.

8. Iceland

At the request of the archive, Mr Klaue had written to municipal and government authorities to try and save the oldest cinema in Iceland, suggesting it should be restored and used as a cinematheque by the archive.

9. Bangladesh and Bolivia

At the request of these countries, two circular letters had been sent to FIAF members asking for help in recovering films and documentation concerning these countries.

10. Uruguay and Czechoslovakia.

Mr Klaue had been involved in helping to sort out a problem regarding some films sent to Czechoslovakia 15 years ago for identification and possible restoration, but subsequently mislaid.

11. Philippines.

There seemed to be 2 competing organisations, both working with UNESCO support:

(1) The University Film Centre, Manila (Mrs Moreno)

They were planning to set up an archive and Mrs Moreno had been to Brussels some time ago to get information and to state their intention to apply to be observers.

They had put a proposal to UNESCO for a feasibility study for creation in the Philippines of an Archival Training Centre for SE Asia.

(Mrs Bowser said that in New York Mrs Moreno seemed to be talking of training for film makers, which would have been outside the interest of Unesco).

Apparently, Dr Roads had been sent by Unesco to advise but, according to Mrs Moreno, had been anti-FIAF; he was hosted by the Multi-Media Organisation.

(2) Multi-Media Organisation (MMO) Mr de Pedro.

UNESCO had asked FIAF to help MMO by sending a circular letter to members asking for photographs of British, German, French and American films (unspecified) and for early technical apparatus, for a new Filmmuseum.

The only direct contact from MMO had been an invitation to Mr Volkmann, as Head of the Preservation Commission, to visit and advise them;

this had fallen through because Mr Volkmann had not been available for the dates specified.

Mr Klaue asked for views on the UNESCO request to help MIO.

Mr Francis said we had a responsibility to UNESCO in our advisory role with B status, to let them know our misgivings about MIO which seemed primarily a commercial organisation. He mentioned that Clive Coultass could confirm this from the report of Dr Roads' visit.

Mrs Bowser did not know the situation of the organisations in the Philippines but had been impressed with Mr de Pedro of MIO at the Unesco recommendation meeting in Belgrade. He seemed to be fully aware that any archive activity would need to be managed independently of the commercial side of MIO. On the other hand, she felt Mrs Moreno was far from understanding archive needs and functions.

Mr Kula would be in the Philippines November 2 - 4 to attend a meeting of the SE Asia Bureau of the International Council of Archives on audio-visual resources in the region, and volunteered to investigate both at the meeting and by meeting the two organisations.

Decision: Reply to UNESCO that FIAF Executive Member would be in the Philippines in November and FIAF would respond to their request re MIO following his report, as the situation was currently unclear.

12. Koblenz

Mr Daudelin reported they had received a late application from the Bundesarchiv to be full members but there were some documents missing and no mention of the question of autonomy which would be their main difficulty.

Mr Klaue said that he had had many conversations with Professor Kahlenberg pointing out the requirements of Article 3. The question of autonomy could be solved if it was the Filmarchiv rather than the Bundesarchiv which applied to be member, following the situation with the Imperial War Museum in London and the Public Archive in Canada.

Decision: Letter to be sent referring to Article 3 so that they can submit application for next meeting.

13. Mr Pogacic

Mr Klaue and Mr Daudelin suggested that Mr Pogacic should be proposed as an Honorary Member: he had been a member for over 25 years and President of FIAF for about 7 years and had given time, energy and total devotion.

Everyone present agreed wholeheartedly, and approved 3 steps below:

Decision:

1. Mr Klaue to approach Mr Pogacic to see if he is willing.
2. Mr Borde to draft a friendly letter of appreciation in French to be signed by the entire Committee and sent from Lausanne.
3. Mr Klaue to write an article of appreciation for the Bulletin.

14. Clarification of Article 104

Mr Daudelin introduced two documents as a basis for the discussion:

- 1 A draft circular letter to be sent to all members which he had agreed to prepare following the last Rapallo meeting.
- 2 A discussion paper submitted by Mrs Bowser, which proposed two alternatives for an addition to Article 104 to provide a solution to the problems that had arisen where Members were dealing with non-FIAF institutions in a territory where there were two or more Members.

Mrs Bowser explained later in discussion that:

Option a (ie that each member in a territory must give agreement to the activity) expressed what she understood to be the view of the Italian members.

Option b (ie that it was sufficient to inform one member in the territory and that national members should make their own arrangements to inform each other) expressed the views of the 4 American members.

Mr Francis supported Option b and suggested a further addition to simplify the operation of the Article:

The national members in each country should be responsible for nominating one Archive to provide the co-ordinating function for enquiries from Members outside the country. If they fail to agree, then each Member archive within the country should take on the coordinating function on an alternating basis for one year at the time.

Mrs Bowser confirmed that this was the system they had agreed within the United States; all enquiries were addressed to the American Film Institute regarding proposed activities in the USA by non-USA FIAF members the AFI was then responsible for informing the other USA Members.

Mr Daudelin explained that there had been a problem in Italy last year because one Italian archive (Turin) had been informed of a foreign archive's activity in Italy and had no objection but the other two Italian archives felt that Turin did not have the authority to approve without consulting them. The proposed Option b would obviate such a situation.

The recently elected Members of the Committee raised a number of other issues asking clarification of the intention of Article 104 and, in particular, who was responsible for informing whom.

Mrs Bowser (in reply to some examples from Mrs Wibom) stressed that it was the responsibility of the Member supplying films to ensure that the Member in the territory where they were to be used was informed. She later added that she personally expected would-be borrower to do the work of getting approval from the Member in the territory where films were to be used. For example, if US State Department wants to borrow a film for showing abroad, she will only lend the film if they arrange for

her to get a letter of approval from the FIAF Member in the country concerned.

Mrs Wibom and Mr Kula both mentioned that they very often didn't know where and when films lent to the Foreign or External Affairs Department were used.

Mr Casanova made a number of interventions in the discussion, expressing his concern about difficulties of getting agreement between members in one country. He felt:

- one Member might inhibit the activities of another Member by withholding permissions without any good reason.
- a Member could delay the programmes of another by taking a long time to reply or not replying at all.

He felt the Rule should stress that a Member only has to inform another of his activities, not seek his approval. Perhaps an agreed time period could be introduced, if no reply was received then approval was assumed. If there were cases of disagreement, then FIAF or the Executive Committee would have problems of being called in to arbitrate.

He agreed with the present interpretation of Article 104 that a Member must inform another of any interventions in the latter's territory. He felt there were problems that could arise between members regarding activities in their own countries.

Mr Kula had also expressed concern that the two issues were becoming blurred. Whether a Member was planning activities in his own territory or outside his own territory he was obliged to inform other Members concerned: within his own territory, it was irritating for the other national members to hear about activities only through newspapers reports or other means; to infringe the "obligation to inform rule" outside his own territory was much more serious as it threatened the authority of other members in their own territory.

The meeting agreed to concentrate on solving this more serious problem and search for a way to clarify who should be responsible for ensuring all national members in a territory were informed. The trend of the discussion and in particular contributions from Mr Kula, Mr Daudelin, Mrs Bowser, Mr Francis, Mr Klaue, was in favour of Option b of Mrs Bowser's discussions paper.

In deciding on what should be done next, the following contributions were made:

- Mr de Vaal asked that Option b should be formally identified as the recommendation of the 4 US archives.
- Mr Francis asked that the Rule (and perhaps all FIAF Rules) should be amended to allow for the development of video. Perhaps it would be necessary to have a global amendment saying "For 'film' read 'film and video'".

Many speakers felt there should be guidance on specific operational problems:

- 1 Mr Francis mentioned that they received many requests from private individuals or organisations. Till now, they had routinely refused because of the UK copyright law but now that that was being changed, he would be in a position to meet these requests. He wasn't sure that the Americans would be happy to be involved in handling up to 100 such requests a year from non-commercial organisations like the Sherlock Holmes Society.
- 2 There was the further case of films over which archives had lost control, for instance Napoleon which still carried the NFA name in the titles, or films which a donor had subsequently withdrawn from the Archive.

Mrs Orbanz wanted clarification on whether one was asking permission or simply informing. Mr Daudelin confirmed that the spirit of the Article was that, by informing, you recognised the right of the "home" member to object: but objections should of course be supported by good reasons.

In response to Mr Casanova's point about archives within a country not agreeing, Mrs Bowser felt that was another issue but one for the archives themselves rather than FIAF to sort out.

Decisions:

- Mrs Bowser to redraft her proposal in the light of the discussion, including Mr Francis' operational amendment.
- This draft to be sent to all the members in the seven countries where there was more than one member, asking for their views.
- Mr Daudelin to send circular letter to all members referring to
 - EC discussions continued on Article 104
 - EC hopes to submit new version soon with practical solutions to resolve problems of present wording
 - All invited meanwhile to note the requirements of Article 104 and observe the spirit of it.
- At the request of Mr Francis, particular attention will be paid to clarify the intention of the word "public": does it mean open to everyone or only to selected audience, paying or members or a particular organisation?
- At the suggestion of Mr Kula, mention should also be made of responsibilities as between Members and Observers, within and outside a territory.

4. FINANCIAL REPORT ON THE PERIOD JANUARY - SEPTEMBER 1981

Mr de Vaal commented on this written report, saying that all was according to plan.

The following points were mentioned:

1. Special Publications and Preservation Manual As there was money in the Preservation Commission budget, it was proposed to allocate this to the cost of translating parts of the Preservation Manual from German into English (the work is being done in London).
2. PIP Subsidy or Loan. The words "or loan" were deleted as it was agreed by all that the amount would be a subsidy as in previous years, for this last time.
3. Subscriptions. Thanks were due to the members for sending in subscriptions in good time.
4. Publications. A welcome increase in sales but there was a request to the francophone members to publicise the French version of the Manual.
5. PIP. Mrs Dowser spoke on behalf of the new Head of the Commission and reported that there were no problems. She and Mr Francis reported on the state of negotiations with the new lease, which after a long and difficult beginning, were now satisfactory, and would be pursued by Mr Moulds and Mr Francis together.
6. Cash Flow. In response to an inquiry from Mr Daudelin, it was confirmed that there were at present no cash flow problems, specifically because subscriptions were raised and paid promptly.

As there were no further questions, Mr Klaue passed to the next item.

5. REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONS

A. GENERAL WORKING PRINCIPLES

Mr Klaue called first for a discussion of the general working principles guiding the operation of the Commissions and the means of communications with the Executive Committee and the General Assembly, making the following points:

1. Communication

Should Commission Heads attend all meetings of the Executive Committee?

Should they attend the General Assembly?

Should they receive the Minutes of the Executive Committee?

How do we ensure their budget needs are submitted to the treasurer in good time.

Until recently most of the Commission Heads have been also Members of the Executive Committee so these questions have not arisen. Now in cases where a Commission Head is not even the Head of his archive, there were difficulties as regards:

- confidentiality of information
- costs of financing attendance at meetings
- alternative methods of communication if they do not or are unable to attend.

2 Composition

Currently appointments to Commissions are open ended and thus terminated only by death or voluntary withdrawal. This was perhaps not the best system to ensure lively activity in the Commissions.

Mrs Bowser responded first by stressing how important she felt it to be for Commission Heads to have a full understanding of FIAF work in general; if the line of communication via the Committee meetings was broken, then there were errors, conflicts and misunderstandings. She was strongly in favour of a policy that Commission Heads should attend all meetings but appreciated there could be financial problems, which should perhaps be reviewed from year to year.

From her own experience, she mentioned how difficult it had been to get the PIP workers to understand the relevance and importance of their work for FIAF and how invaluable it had been to have Mr Houlds, the PIP Editor, attend the Rapallo Congress.

Regarding Point 2, within the Documentation Commission, they had been urging voluntary resignation on long-standing members and stressing that Commission members should only stay as long as they are active on a project and making a real contribution. There were many people round the world, qualified and keen to join the Commission, to replace those currently not contributing. Till now, they had no mechanism for asking the 'non-contributors' to withdraw.

Mr Kula reported that this issue was also being addressed by the Federation of Television Archives. He agreed that to ensure communication and continuity, Commission Heads should attend at least one Executive Committee per year, preferably the one associated with the General Assembly. He felt it was important for the body of the FIAF members to have access to the Commission Heads during the Assembly and Congress period to put forward and discuss informally comments, criticisms, contributions, etc.

On Point 2, he suggested there should be a formal term of membership in the Commission which could be extended to meet the needs of particular projects but at the discretion of the Commission Head who would have a relatively painless way of ensuring that the Commission retained only the productive members.

Mr Casanova urged that FIAF should pay for the travel of the Commission Heads at least to the General Assembly, if they could not manage to meet the

costs from their own archive. Their work as professionals was very important to FIAF. He also felt there should be formal regulations on the responsibilities and rights of commission members and the methods of election or selection, the length of term, etc...

Mr Francis raised what he felt might be a difficult issue if FIAF were to pay for the Commission Heads to attend a FIAF meeting. This might mean that the Head of an Archive with limited resources would not be able to attend but one of his own staff would be paid for in his capacity as Commission Head. Mr Casanova did not agree that this was a problem for FIAF: the Head of the Archive made his decision in the context of his own Archive budget: the Commission Head was paid for as an individual professional, not as a member of that archive.

Mr Daudelin felt it would be dangerous to set a precedent of paying for travel. Mrs Wibom felt the Archive should recognise that there would be travel costs to meet before accepting that a staff member should take up such an appointment.

Mr Klaue pointed out the practical consequences of two current situations:

- Cataloguing Commission: the Library of Congress had agreed to the appointment of a staff member as Head and the consequent costs; then their own financial situation had changed so they had no longer been able to meet the costs.
- Documentation Commission: the Bulgarians had no provision in their budget for travel to Mexico by both the Head of the Archive/member of the EC and the newly appointed Head of the Commission.

In those two cases, therefore, FIAF would be without direct contact with the Heads of two of its Commissions.

Mrs Bowser pointed out that there was not a problem as the money was not to come out of the general FIAF budget but from the individual Commission Budgets. It was up to the Commissions themselves to decide how to allocate that money. She agreed however with Mr de Vaal that the Budget would not always be adequate.

Decision:

Mr Klaue will write to the three Commission Heads reporting on the discussion and seeking their opinions so that the following Working Principles may be discussed and agreed at Mexico:

- 1 It is considered essential that Commission Heads attend the General Assembly and the Executive Committee meeting preceding it. They should allow for this in their own Archive budget and only in very exceptional cases, use the Commission Budget for this purpose.
- 2 They are automatically invited to all other Executive Committee meetings but not obliged to attend.
- 3 They will automatically receive copy of the Minutes of all Executive Committee meetings, for their own information only, ie not for distribution

- among the Commission members although they may report on relevant items at their discretion.
- 4 If they are unable to attend EC meetings, they may, at their discretion, nominate one of the Commission members to attend on their behalf if he can attend at his own (archive's) expense.
 - 5 The Commission Head should submit a written report to all meetings of the EC.
 - 6 The Commission Head should submit full budget requests to the Treasurer by the end of March of the following year.
 - 7 They are invited to submit their views on possible working principles for election / selection / renewal of members, terms of membership (5? 10?), etc.

B. PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Mr Klaue reported that he had not received a written report from the Head of the Commission.

He made the following points:

1 Unesco contract:

A request had been submitted to them to extend the deadline from October to March 82. A small editing meeting would be called by Mr Volkmann before the end of 1981.

2 New Head of Commission

Mr Volkmann had said he would resign once the Unesco manuscript was submitted, but had no suggestions for a successor. It would be necessary to nominate a successor in Mexico so the matter needed to be discussed now.

3 Preservation of Tapes, scientific version for BKSTS

Mr Volkmann had not been able to meet the agreed deadline for "Film 31". Mr Francis reported that he had discussed an earlier version of the FIAP manual with BKSTS who had commented that they would not have wanted it as it stood anyway. In particular:

- the historical part was adequately covered in other publications
- the tape developments were not sufficiently up-to-date. The technology was changing so fast that one needed to include developments in the year of publication.

However the preservation detail was of great interest, especially the analysis of the problems.

BKSTS would be interested to have a document purely on the preservation of all kinds of tapes (sound, film, A/V) in time for their next Conference in June 83.

Decision: It was agreed to submit final Unesco document to BKSTS to discuss what could be used and what needed further work. (This would also be relevant to the proposed Stockholm Symposium.)

There was then a lengthy off-the-record discussion of possible candidates for the new Head of the Commission. The following qualifications were considered desirable:

- appropriate technical background with appreciation of both conventional and new technologies.
- a good organiser, able to ensure work gets done
- a good communicator
- enthusiastic, energetic and interested
- if remote geographically, must have freedom and financial resources to travel as needed for the Commission's work

Decision

At the suggestion of Mr Francis, it was agreed that Mr Klaue should invite the 3 proposed candidates to submit in writing:

- confirmation of their willingness and ability to stand
- outline of their ideas for the future work of the Commission and how it should function.

In addition, Mr Klaue would ask the existing Members of the Commission for their views and see how they compare with those of the prospective candidates.

The existing Head of the Commission would be asked for his views but the decision on the new Head rested with the EC. The composition of the Commission was the decision of the new Head.

C. CATALOGUING COMMISSION

Mr Klaue reported that he had not received a written report from the Head of the Commission.

As a member of the Commission he made the following points:

1 Draft for the cataloguing audio-visual material:

The Head of the Commission, Mrs Harrison, had prepared a project description for preparation of draft rules, for discussion with UNESCO, who it was hoped would help with funding of the meetings as the Cataloguing Commission itself only met once a year.

The proposals would also be submitted to other interested international organisations and it would hopefully be discussed at the Round Table in November.

In response to a question from Mr Kula, Mr Klaue reported that contact had already been made with IFLA who accepted the need for change as their own rules, designed for books and written material, were inadequate.

Mr Kula felt it would be useful to promote the FIAP Commission's efforts in this area as he felt (and suggested that both UNESCO and IFLA would agree) that the seven-years labours of Christopher Roads at IFTC had not produced anything very useful and he would like to see the IFTC project killed off in the light of the more practical possibilities offered by FIAP/IFLA cooperation. He mentioned that Canada would be withdrawing as hosts of the next IFTC meeting.

2 Other projects

Work continues.

In response to an enquiry from Mrs van der Elst, Mr Klaue said he was not aware of the status of the 3 language glossary that members had asked at Rapallo should be printed as soon as possible without waiting for the other languages.

D. DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION

General Report

Mrs Bowser reviewed the Commission's projects in turn:

1. International Directory of Cinematographer Set and Costume Designers
Volume 1 is ready (a copy available at the EC meeting). It will be distributed through the Secretariat.
FIAF will make no money from this publication but it adds to our list.

2. International Directory to Film and TV Documentation Sources
MOMA volunteered to publish the second enlarged edition at a time when FIAF was short of funds. It has been slower than expected because of the need to retype and redesign and delays in redesigning the cover (a copy of text available at the EC meeting).
MOMA would print 500 copies (not more as it will get out of date) at a cost of \$2000 (some typing costs being absorbed by MOMA in addition). Suggested selling price \$ 6.50, giving breakeven after 300 copies.

Free copies to Members and Observers, members of the Documentation Commission and the ex-FIAF Editor, Brenda Davies.
MOMA will try to sell 300 copies and hopes FIAF members will try to sell the remaining copies from Brussels. A sales leaflet will be available. There may be an update in 1983 under the editorship of Frances Thorpe.

3. International Bibliography of Dissertations on the Cinema.
This project is continuing in collaboration with a US publisher who has been publishing US and Canadian lists. The Editor, Raymond Fielding, is setting up a computer databank.

So far 12 countries have contributed material.
Mrs Bowser will be happy to continue with this project even after leaving the Commission which she expects to do shortly.

4. Workshop in Madrid on Classification of Film Literature.
Mrs Bowser attended opening meeting, has list of 17 participants, 3 teachers and a copy of the programme.
The Poona delegate for whom FIAF was paying the staying costs had not arrived: there had been delay in authorising his travel costs and it was not known if he would be attending or not.
She supported that the arrangements for the Workshop were excellent thanks to the meticulousness of Karen Jones and the services of their hosts at the Spanish Archive.

NB The Spanish Archive expressed their strong wish to host an Executive Committee meeting next year and Mrs Bowser strongly recommended acceptance. (see item 11,1).

5. PIP Meeting of Indexers
Mrs Bowser asked again if any member, particularly from Eastern Europe,

was able to host and pay the staying costs for a meeting of indexers to clarify problems and answer questions that the Editor didn't have time to attend to on an individual basis.

It was thought that a meeting of all 35 indexers would present problems so the present suggestion was that there might be 3 meetings for 15 people each, one in North America and two in Eastern Europe. The Eastern Europeans were asked particularly if they could make such a contribution to the project as for currency reasons they were unable to pay directly for the cards they received.

6. Publications promotion

It was suggested that as Frances Thorpe is working on improving promotion of PIP she could at the same time help to promote FIAF publications as the mailing lists would overlap. Mrs Bowser asked if it was possible to allocate say £300 from the FIAF 1982 Publications budget to this purpose, perhaps for a year's trial.

7. Training of archivists from developing countries.

The PIP Editor suggested it might be useful to offer to take on a trainee who could learn about indexing and improve his English by working on the project for a period of say 3 months minimum.

A basic knowledge of English or French would be essential; he should be able to stay at least 3 months to be useful to the project.

There was no provision in the PIP budget for this but perhaps it could be funded through a cultural exchange programme.

Mr Klaue opened the discussion by volunteering to communicate with the 7 socialist countries re the possible meeting of indexers (item 5). Both he and Mr Andreykov felt that it was already too late for 1982 but 1983 should be a possibility.

Regarding FIAF publications promotion by Frances Thorpe (item 6), Mr Daudelin, Mr Andreykov and other members expressed their approval. It was suggested that Mrs Bowser and Mrs Thorpe together should prepare a document outlining the proposed activities and terms of reference and the Senior Executive Officers of the EC should approve it so that work can start as soon as possible.

Mr Francis felt FIAF members could all do more with activities like "piggyback mailing", swapping advertisements with useful publications, etc. Mrs Bowser agreed and saw Mrs Thorpe's role as co-ordinator in this, in addition to the work she would do in compiling mailing lists and following up enquiries.

It was the feeling of the meeting that the Documentation Commission was engaged on a large number of useful activities. In particular FIAF thanks would go to Dr Krautz for his work on project n°1 above.

PIP new operational principles

Mrs Bowser asked for comments on the draft principles put before the EC for the operation of PIP under the new regime.

Mr Klaué asked for clarification of the role and rights of the sponsors: were they advisory only or could they take decisions on the project?

Mrs Bowser, supported by Mr Kula, Mrs Orbanz, Mr Cincotti and Mrs Wibom felt that the sponsors had no special rights regarding the direction of the project; this was still in the hands of the Documentation Commission. If the Editor and the Documentation Commission wanted to introduce changes (perhaps extending the project to include extra periodicals, languages, etc.) which would affect the financial situation, then obviously the sponsors would need to be consulted if the changes affected the limits of their commitments.

Mr Francis asked, on behalf of the Editor what procedure would be followed if the Editor wanted to do something extra. It was agreed, that he would have to refer this to the Documentation Commission just as under the previous regime.

Mr Francis asked if the document could include a definition of the role of the FIAP member in the host country (in this case himself) as he was uncertain how far he should get involved or give his opinion on project details.

Mr Cincotti suggested, and it was agreed, that it was sufficient to have 2 reports per year not 3 as suggested in point 4.

Mr Francis raised a question of principle regarding the change-over date and the allocation of bills of 1981 and 1982 respectively was it the intention to allocate charges according to strict percentage (eg rent, etc.) or to use what might be called "sympathetic accounting" which meant paying as many bills as possible before the change-over, even though some, or some portion of them, were strictly payable after the change-over? It emerged during discussion that the subsidy of £ 1910 followed this "sympathetic accounting" principle in that, if revenues by the end of 1981 exceeded expectations, FIAP did not expect any of the subsidy to be returned.

Revised budget for 1982

Mrs Bowser reviewed this budget and said that, although it would probably not be necessary to call on the full \$300 per sponsor, they would nevertheless like to ask for this amount to be paid in 1982 and 1983 to allow some funds to be built up in the project to pay for the Annual Volume, whose costs were currently being met by only one of the sponsors, MOYA, in advance of the revenue. An account would be opened in London for the sponsors' money so that it could in addition earn interest.

Mr Stenklev had written to suggest that many archives had a budget year starting in January and could be invoiced at the beginning of the year for the whole amount of \$800 instead of in two six-monthly parts. This suggestion would be sent to the sponsors and if they agreed, then the Secretariat would issue the appropriate invoices.

Decision Agreed to open interest account in London under control of the Treasurer.

Agreed to write to sponsors as above.

Budget for 1983

Mrs Bowser stressed that income was based on known sales, not estimates, even though it was hoped to increase sales.

For convenience, it was agreed to keep the accounts in pounds sterling.

BFI offer to finance Annual TV Volume.

The BFI Documentation Department offered to finance this volume in the same way that MOMA currently finance the Annual Volume.

The first volume would appear in 1983, representing a 3-year accumulation. It would be produced from the Infodoc computer base and would provide the opportunity, at no cost, to assess if it would be possible in future to use the same system for producing the cards.

Nothing had been included in the budget for possible sales of this volume.

An offer would be sent in writing to FIAF by BFI.

Relations with PIP and BFI

Mr Francis asked if FIAF would send a formal letter to BFI thanking them for their offer to take over the PIP project and giving some indication of why it was not taken up. The Director of the Institute is currently responsible for the Documentation section and both Gillian Hertzell and Mr Francis would find it helpful if such a letter would be sent from FIAF to him.

Decision:

Mrs Bowser agreed to ask the Chairman of the Commission to draft the letter for Mr Klaue to sign.

10. GENERAL DISCUSSION ON FIAF'S FUTURE

Mr Klaue opened by explaining why he had put this item on the Agenda:

- a There were 5 new members on the EC and he felt it would be helpful to give them the opportunity to express their ideas on what they felt the Federation should be doing.
- b He felt it was useful anyway to have a periodic review of the aims and activities of the Federation.
There had been a similar discussion at the beginning of the 1970's which had resulted in a number of useful new initiatives
 - launching the Bulletin
 - Summer Schools
 - policy towards developing countries
 - changes to the Statutes and Rules.

He felt it would be useful to review the problems of the past ten years and anticipate the future. The items on the Agenda had been compiled from comments in the various Annual Reports of Members and Observers and from numerous individual discussions. He viewed today's discussion as the first step, not as needing to produce results.

Mrs Wibom spoke first, welcoming this opportunity to review their problems in a climate of such rapid change. (For example, where US film industry receipts in 1980 were higher for video cassettes than from the cinema; where in Sweden cinema attendance had dropped 6% in the last quarter). She asked if we were on the right path:

- should we continue to preserve film on 35mm, simply to provide quality masters for TV/video prints?
should we continue to build expensive vaults for this? who will want contents?
- what advice should we give Third World archives? to continue as we do now?
- how long will there be cinemas? will all films be shown on video?

Mr de Vaal agreed that these problems were very important and needed urgent attention. In Holland, they had decided not to seek more Government money for building vaults (but they had the use of the late 1930's Art Treasure Vaults) or for obtaining current generation film preservation systems. Instead they were studying the many new emerging possibilities provided by the new technology. He felt it was important for all FIAF Members, and in particular the Preservation Commission, to enlist the help of experts to study the various options as a matter of urgency.

Mr Daudelin referred to the constant dichotomy between the responsibilities for preservation and for diffusion: he felt the new technology would certainly have an impact on the latter in providing access, but perhaps not for preservation.

He felt the issues were well presented in a Village Voice supplement on the

cinema in June 81, in an article about Film after Video, which suggested that video and cinema would continue in parallel just as the explosion of the record industry in the 40's had, after initial anxieties that it would empty the concert hall, resulted in concert halls being fuller than ever. It was envisaged that the next 5 years would see the thousands of mini-cinemas switching to showing video while at the same time there would be a return to the full size cinema for showing film in the proper conditions. Regrettably cinema would no longer be the popular, mass media and might indeed take on a certain snob appeal compared with seeing the same films on TV.

Personally, he was suspicious of the trend towards the modern ideology of "information", which tended to reduce all creative works into "information" terms. He did not see that ease of reproduction (whether xerox or video) affected the importance of the item or its value.

At a recent Workshop run by a French inventor* working with the new technologies, it was pointed out that with the advent of High Fidelity television (which the Japanese would be marketing in 2 years), there would be a need for more and more films made for the cinema to show on these screens.

He didn't feel the problem was so urgent for archivists as their role was unchanged: there were and would be more and more films to preserve and it was not their role to judge the value of them or discriminate according to how they were shown, but simply to provide facilities for preservation of the cultural heritage.

Mr Borde welcomed the discussion. He agreed with Mr Daudelin and the known views of Mr Kubelka, that while video would be useful in the archives for consultation etc., it was essential to continue to preserve films in their original form. They were as precious as the original manuscript of La Chanson de Roland for the cultural heritage. It may certainly be cheaper now to transfer everything to videodisc but that is not a reason for destroying the originals in years to come even better systems may become available for transferring the essence of the originals.

Mr Francis referred to a presentation by David Putman in London recently where he forecast that in 10 years there would be no cinema in rural Britain and in London they would simply be preview theatres for cable TV operators. The role of the archive therefore seemed to be to ride out the next 20 years until people started to demand again the experience of the cinema (seeing a film as a group, outside their own home), which he was convinced would happen. Meanwhile, governments would want to reduce grants and they would need to seek funds elsewhere.

He made the following recommendations

1. avoid duplication of effort in preservation
He felt it was essential to have a Commission (Cataloguing, Documentation or another new one?) to be concerned with setting up a central world registry of holdings, confidential including some method of attempting to define the quality of the films.

* Mr Beauviala

With limited funds, every time a film was copied unnecessarily, another film lost the chance to be saved.

In the past, archives had been reluctant to reveal their holdings in case producers or others wanted to seize them; this was no longer the case; they were not worried about illegal copies but grateful that they exist at all.

2. promote the importance of archives through public relations exercises
In London they were applying for licence to disseminate archive material via the new cable stations.
3. cooperate with the video cassette industry as potential source of funds
these manufacturers need our high quality originals and are therefore likely to be our most important source of funds in the coming years.

Mrs Bowser agreed that we should continue to preserve film as film and this was and would be the policy of their archive. She felt we should address Mrs Wibom's questions about the future: would films continue to be produced and require us to build more vaults than those envisaged for films already produced to date? Contrary to Mrs Wibom's statistics, she said the US film industry was healthy and audiences were increasing. She felt film and video would continue to exist together, in the same way as concerts and records.

She also agreed with Mr Francis that producers are glad we have films so we should be less secretive and start working on catalogues of all our holdings and make them public.

Mr Lauritzen stated he was a great believer in the cinema, the mini-cinema, with up to 5, under one roof, and the large ones. After hearing of the showing of Napoleon at Radio City, he had a dream that MOMA would be showing in the Radio City Music Hall and in Sweden the cinematheque would be using the largest cinema as well.

Mrs Wibom replied to some of the foregoing with

- Pursuing the concert/cinema analogy, she pointed out that all the major symphony orchestras were dependent on municipal or government funding. Till now, there had been no funding of cinemas which had been commercially selfsupporting. Did FIAP envisage therefore encouraging municipal support for big cinemas so that people would have the chance to see film in its "proper" environment?
- As foreseen for the UK, in Sweden the distribution were already closing down cinemas in areas with less than 150,000 population. If people did not have the experience of cinema and no longer knew of the experience, then they would not later create a demand for it.
- The trend towards video was also apparent to their archive in that bookings for 16 mm prints were being cancelled because the users were preferring to spend their money on buying cassettes outright.

- she agreed that it was important to preserve the 35 mm prints.
- the main question was how should FIAF fulfill its role of "proposing the development of cinema art and culture" (Article 1d) under these changing conditions? what should FIAF be trying to achieve? were public funded large cinemas the answer? what is the FIAF policy?

Mr Casanova said what we decided to preserve depended on our concept of the role of the film archive: providing access to the experience of the film as "information" could be achieved via video etc and was better than nothing. Preserving the film in the same sense as a precious manuscript was a different activity but he agreed with Mr Borde that it was an essential one.

He felt the discussion had been confined to capitalist countries whereas in socialist countries the cinema was already a state activity. He had written an article in the early 70's predicting that the cinema would be taken over by the state as it was becoming increasingly expensive but was an important, collective experience of our time which video would not eliminate or substitute for.

The writer, Eugene Val, had written in the early 50's that the wife would prefer to go out to a distant cinema rather than see the same film at home on TV, because she wanted to go out, and be with other people. He agreed with this view as the cinema provided an opportunity for shared emotions and a magic absent from TV viewing.

Mrs Orbanz was not so pessimistic as Mrs Wibom about the attendance: the figures in the subsidised film clubs were increasing. She pointed out that in Germany which was non socialist there was substantial subsidy of film production and distribution as well as the chain of film clubs. Certainly FIAF would play a larger role in encouraging greater subsidies.

Mr Cincotti agreed with previous speakers that it was important to preserve film as film and to use the new technologies for access. He mentioned that in Italy and France too, there were already substantial subsidies for film industry and culture.

He wanted to address the more specific problem of what kind of film should be retained. In Italy they were hoping for a substantial subsidy next year, through a special Act of Parliament, to copy nitrate films to safety stock. In case of the more recent films, from the 30's onwards, where the copy would be very close to the original, he was willing to have the original destroyed. He felt the case was much more difficult to decide with older films, which used special techniques including hand colouring. Although they had been copied to safety stock, he felt they should still be retained in the same way that we retain precious early manuscript and incunabula, even though they would never be shown. He asked what was the attitude of the other archives towards keeping original copies and negatives after they had been transferred to safety stock?

Regarding video, he stressed that we could not plan for the next 100 years

and there would certainly be substantial changes in the future; in the immediate future we should welcome video for practical purposes in access, etc. but not assume that it was the solution for preservation.

Mr Kula was fascinated by the discussion of such fundamental questions about what archivists should be doing now and in the near and distant future.

His Government required him now to make 3-5 year and even 10 year budget forecasts which was difficult when he had no idea what he would be called to preserve. Archivists could easily confirm that they would not destroy their present holdings but in the climate of changing technology and society, they could not easily forecast their rate (n° of cans/title, different altogether??).

He realised, in preparing training lectures for archivists in developing countries, that the problem of giving advice to them was even greater where conditions were so different. (For example, Angola whose entire film production is films made for television: countries where physical humidity and temperature and lack of facilities made it preferable to resort to electronic media, as an inferior copy was better than nothing at all). Was it relevant to train them in the classical film preservation techniques when their access to film and to resources to preserve it would be so limited?

Mr Francis envisaged an 'ice age' where there would be very little interest or funding for public exhibition of films. During this period they would concentrate on continuing the work of preservation, as an 'underground operation'.

In the UK, the 'capitalist' government was against support for the arts. The BFI was reducing its chain of regional cinemas from 40 in 1970 to 19 in 1981 and 9 in 82 for 2 reasons: the demand was for current productions primarily (art houses) and all money spent on distribution was money lost to preservation, as they came from the same budget. The Film Societies too were seeing their supplies of 16 mm films diminished because as they were wearing out the distributors were refusing to make new copies as the investment was not justified. The move was to video tape distribution.

Mr Daudelin replied to Mrs Wibom's point about the analogy with music: certainly symphony orchestras were publicly funded but other areas of music like jazz, were not and yet, they were more important to our contemporary history even though they had little official recognition.

FIAPF could help young film-makers (who seemed to be very ignorant of the potential of film as film as opposed to television) by encouraging access to films of the past.

It was important for FIAPF to be much more positive about the importance of the archives, not simply keep a low profile as suggested by Mr Francis. He would like to see a major publicity effort, including for example:

- 1 an Annual FIAPF prize, even if only \$500, for a work on some aspect of film history.

- 2 regular participation in the major film Festivals, perhaps one evening at each over a 10 year period, with a FIAF presentation of "great films from the past" that would stress the importance of archives' work. The Festivals were very well covered by the media and this could thus be a good source of publicity and good will.

Mr de Vaal was disappointed that the discussion was primarily ideas and opinions rather than a statement of what each Archive was actually doing in the face of these problems.

Following up particular points, he said:

- he too was of course in favour of preserving 35mm film material as film but we had to face the fact that it would not last for ever. What was to be done, when?
- "moving images" were being made without celluloid so what was being done with them?
- Mr Francis' suggestion of a general registration system he felt was very valuable.
- FIAF should be taking positive action in this and other areas.

Mr Borde replied to Mr Cincotti's question about preserving nitrate. This question was often discussed in the FIAF Minutes in the period 1957-60 and there were two irreconcilable and often violently held positions between those concerned with safety (it's dynamite!) and those like Langlois who wanted to keep them for sentimental reasons. He himself felt it was important to keep them until one was certain one had extracted the maximum possible, for example:

- early talkies in B/W: was there money to recreate the sound track
- early silent: 30% were tinted yet most copies are B/W only: would there be resources in the future, and techniques, to copy more accurately?

Mr Andreykov spoke first of the policy in Bulgaria on nitrate: a law had been passed determining that the negative was to be preserved as the original, for all the national production (fortunately not very large) unless it was in very poor condition.

For many years, Bulgaria had had very high cinema attendances (16 pa) but these suddenly dropped two years ago to 10 or 11. To counteract this the Direction Générale de la Cinématographie had decided to set up large numbers of very modern video clubs in order to get revenue from the distribution of cassettes. This had of course diminished attendance at the large cinemas even further. The industry was in serious financial difficulties because in addition, to celebrate the 1300th anniversary of the State, they had made 3 or 4 superproductions at \$8 - 10 million each (ie 20 normal films at 1/2 million each) and even these budgets had been exceeded!

Revenue was being recovered from the video clubs but no investment at all was being put into the cinemas with aging equipment and decor. On the other hand, attendance at the Archive cinema actually increased two years ago and has maintained a good level since.

Mr Strotchkov compared the superiority of experiencing film in the cinema to video with the difference between live opera and TV, attending a live hockey match and TV. He then reviewed the perspective of changes in film technology since the War, drawing attention to the investments which had been made in technologies which did not persist for long (eg they built 3 Panoramic cinemas and 370 wide screen cinemas and have no films for them! Now only about 2 US and 7 USSR wide screen films pa).

Video and hologram techniques were the latest in this line and we couldn't tell yet what would happen.

Meanwhile, he agreed with Mr Borde and others, that we should preserve everything.

In Russia they have a very good laboratory able to process 12 million meters stock and with government support in money and film stock were copying nitrate.

Mr Strotchkov ended by saying that all were agreed on the role of FIAF: what was needed were some FIAF recommendations for its members which would include the recommendation to tell their governments and express concern about what is happening. Mr Daudelin's idea about participation in Film Festivals would provide another useful opportunity to convey our concern.

Mr Klaue described the situation in East Germany where they did not expect to have major problems arising from the new video technology for about 10 years: there was no domestic production of video recorders or tapes and they had no hard currency available for that purpose. Cinema attendance, after the universal drop during the period mid 60's to mid 70's, was fairly constant, though low at 4 pp/year compared with USSR at 20+ and Italy at 12+. The archive policy was to retain everything as it was produced they had a responsibility to preserve TV material but for the moment the TV companies were keeping the material themselves. At that stage the archive will of course need professional video facilities but there will be no funds for this before 1986.

He then reviewed the morning session identifying some of the major suggestions so that in the afternoon session they might consider practical solutions:

1 The Future of FIAF and the future of the cinema

He suggested this subject should be debated at the General Assembly as soon as possible. He would like to see it at Mexico instead of the topic previously agreed (Unesco recommendation). He felt it was very important to listen to the views of all the members.

2 Updating on use of video techniques in archives

There was no point in ignoring the new technology and he suggested it was important to provide an opportunity to update their knowledge on developments since the Brighton symposium and consider the possibilities for both access and preservation. He hoped this could be done at the Technical Symposium in Stockholm.

3 Central Registry

He felt it was urgent to follow the proposal of Mr Francis and ask the Cataloguing Commission to draft a project for discussion as soon as possible. There was an enormous waste of previous resources through duplication of work. It would of course be a project on a voluntary basis.

4 Relations with producers.

Many members had asked whether in the light of the Unesco recommendation it was time to establish a new relationship with the producers on an international scale. Some of the remarks this morning were encouraging about the change in their attitudes. Should we take an initiative?

5 Promotion of the survival of the cinema (Article 1d)

What contribution can we make? Would it do any good to issue a joint or separate declarations to governments? or to try for another Unesco recommendation (this would take another 6 years...although they were certainly more active in including cinema and film in their programmes these days).

5 Nitrate problem

He felt this should be discussed at the General Assembly or in Open Forum, and a set of guidelines drafted as general orientation for members.

7 Public awareness of importance of archive work

He agreed that we should be more active in this area but this raised the problem of who in the Executive Committee would take responsibility for this kind of public relations activity. It further related to the role of the Executive Committee, the function and roles of its members which should be discussed as well. Several public relations activities had been identified:

- FIAF Annual Prize: This had been discussed before but rejected because of administrative problems. It could certainly be revived.
- FIAF at Major Festivals: This would require a lot of effort to make the appropriate contacts, especially as Festival programmes were already over-loaded.
- International and national press releases: Much more could be done in this way to publicise our work.
- Unesco Courier Special issue: This offer was still waiting for us to take up.
- Films on Archives: These could be encouraged.

8 Government awareness of importance of archive work

He agreed with the suggestion of Mr Strotchkov that it would be useful to make formal declarations to our governments on the importance of the preservation of moving images, and the consequent need for funds. This could include a more practical approach than the Unesco recommendation.

Mr Klaue concluded by affirming that we would achieve more if we set specific targets and objectives but first we had to determine what we saw as the role and future of FIAF.

Mrs Wibom wanted to clarify the context of her earlier remarks about change. She saw the role of the film archives as a reflection of the role of cinema in our society: if the role of cinema was changing, then the archives would need to change too. In Sweden, 65% of films came from the USA so changes there would immediately affect their work. She felt that even the Socialist countries would feel the impact of these changes from outside their country, even though their own production was not changing so fast.

Mr Francis made further point about point 3: Central Registry: he stressed that even if some archives wanted to keep specific items in their collections secret, they could nevertheless perhaps be willing to provide information on the rest.

He raised a new item: Contributions to Retrospectives

While he was willing to support his own colleagues in assembling programmes and to help others assembling British programmes, he was increasingly being asked to supply films for retrospectives of non-British films. He would like to see a new principle established:

- that organisers of retrospectives should apply first to the country of production and only elsewhere if the Member concerned could not lend.
- Members should be willing to give a confidential report of their assessment of retrospectives being organised in their countries for which outside help was required.

He wanted it to be understood that each time a film was sent out on loan for screening, one more opportunity was lost to preserve a film, as the same skilled person was involved. Members should therefore assess whether the requested screening was more important than preserving another film. He felt this was a particularly important point now that many international Festivals were in fact at a very low level.

In reply to Mrs Wibom's suggestion that a handling fee should be charged he stressed that it was not the money so much as skilled time that was important.

Mr Klaue suggested that perhaps FIAF should offer its patronage for Retrospectives that it did approve, which Mr Francis felt would be a help to Members, although he felt the confidential opinion would suffice.

Mrs Orbanz then intervened:

• she felt it would be possible to organise a FIAF evening at the Berlin Festival and she would investigate. It was felt that it would be most interesting to have a film programme though a Reception might also be attractive.

- she asked if the register was the same project as discussed before to record foreign nitrate holdings. Mr Francis clarified and said it was for all holdings, originals, restorations, copies, etc. it was quite possible for another archive to have a better version than the national archive.

- she asked that the General Assembly discussion on the future of FIAF should be tied to specific questions. Her experience of today's discussion was that it was too vast a topic.

Mr Strotchkov spoke of Retrospectives at Festivals. He felt:

- one member of the EC should attend the Festival to be available to talk about FIAF informally.
- we should not attempt to charge a handling fee as it was part of our role to encourage retrospectives.
- we should also consider exhibitions at the Festivals, eg. posters, stills, to attract interest for FIAF.
- he personally would approach the Directors of the Moscow Festival (and the Tashkent Festival as well at the request of Mr Klaue who felt it was specially important for the Third World) to get agreement in principle at least with the practical details to be agreed later.

Mrs Bowser described the MOMA experience with Festivals. The organisers were hungry for films and were willing to pay fees and give publicity to the archives. She gave preference to FIAF members and met requests of about half the others. The modest fees enabled them to preserve up to 3 extra films a year. She felt everyone in FIAF would be willing to make a concerted effort to put together an outstanding FIAF programme of important films and high quality prints for use as the FIAF contribution to such Festivals.

On the Register project, Mr de Vaal sought a way of speeding it up which he thought Mr Francis had already initiated some years ago. Mr Francis explained that he had prepared and circulated at a congress a list of all the NFA's foreign holdings, hoping to get similar lists back from other archives; he only got one back. This informal approach therefore had not worked so he recommended a more formal FIAF project.

Following Mrs Bowser's enquiry about the Directory of Film Archives on the agenda, Mr Klaue explained that he thought it might be useful to have an update of the black book produced by Mr Buache some 20 years ago, which was of course very out of date, both on addresses and activities. Several people agreed it could be useful for prestige and publicity purposes as well as day to day practical reference.

In response to Mr Kula, Mr Klaue explained that Membership of International Organisations was on the agenda as we had requests for Observership from such organisations, eg. Unesco department, which could not be handled under existing FIAF rules. The EC agreed with Mrs Bowser's suggestion that meanwhile they could at least be invited to attend the next congress as visitors.

Mr Kula raised the more general point as to whether there was any guiding principle regarding attendance at congresses by outsiders. This was not taken up.

In response to Mr Klaue, it was agreed that it would be useful to have a general debate on the Future of cinema, archives and FIAF at Mexico, but it would need careful preparation and structuring.

- Mrs Wibom suggested a questionnaire to all members asking them to identify their views, problems envisaged, relations with other kinds of archives in their country.
Someone would need to collate replies and prepare summary introduction for the debate.
- Mrs Wibom felt that as well as discussing internally it would be useful to consult many outsiders (motion picture producers association, Unesco, governments, other kinds of archives, audio-visual institutes, etc.)
Mrs Bowser felt the discussion should be internal only at Mexico and widened, perhaps at Stockholm, once we had clarified our own ideas.
- Mrs Wibom suggested a further structuring between the philosophical and cultural issues to be discussed. Mr Kula mentioned that there were two important aspects for FIAF; the effect on national legislation for existing archives and the effect on countries which had no archives previously who would presumably be seeking to join FIAF, substantially increasing the membership. Mr Klaue mentioned he had already prepared a questionnaire on the Unesco recommendation which had been distributed.
- Mr Kula suggested perhaps 6 members could be asked to give papers on their own experiences
- Mrs Orbanz suggested a paper summarising today's discussion would be good starting point.
- Mrs Bowser suggested a dossier of relevant press articles from different countries (eg Village Voice article previously mentioned) especially to get views from outside the archives.

Decisions:

- 1 Mr Klaue to draft and send letter to members explaining plans for Mexico discussion and enclosing questionnaire.
- 2 Mrs Wibom and Mr Klaue to work on questionnaire together (perhaps including portions from draft Unesco recommendation questionnaire). Questions to be very specific (eg plans to acquire video in 2, 5 or 10 years?, requiring as far as possible only Yes/No answers).
- 3 Decision to invite specific archives to open discussion to be made by Mrs Wibom, Mr Klaue, Mr Daudelin and Mr Francis after return of questionnaires, depending on replies, aspects chosen for discussion.
- 4 Mrs Wibom to summarise replies and present a report at Mexico.
- 5 The Symposium to be entitled "Which future for the past? Keeping cinema alive."
- 6 Mrs Bowser to consult the PIP Index for preliminary search on relevant articles.
- 7 Major points to be discussed at the Executive Committee before Mexico.
- 8 Directory of Film Archives: no decision on update or who would progress it.

8. FUTURE CONGRESSES : STOCKHOLM 1983

(Discussed on Saturday before departure of Mr Francis)

Mrs Wibom opened the discussion with the following points:

1. Dates

May 27, 28, 29 (Frid - Sund)	Executive Committee
May 30, 31 (Mond, Tues)	General Assembly
June 1, 2, 3 (Wed- Frid)	2 Symposia

2. Symposium 1 : Role of the archive in society

She felt this should be as open as possible, for example to other archives, government institutions, Unesco, producers' representatives, manufacturers.

3. Symposium 2 : Technical aspects of preservation

She felt a special effort should be made on basic preservation principles for the Third World Archives. Her own colour preservation team wanted to make a 16 mm film and perhaps also mount a travelling exhibition. The laboratory would provide film stock and process it so that each archive could have a copy of the film to take back to their own archive.

The problem would be to determine who would write the script? Would they be able to agree on an official FIAF line?

She had in mind to approach all the stock manufacturers with the same basic problem(s) and invite them to show what could be done. The same approach could be used with the video companies.

The wanted to avoid the problem of Rapallo where we had very competent specialists but the audience was very mixed, some experts, others administrators who found it difficult to follow. She needed guidance on the level at which the seminar should be pitched.

The lengthy discussion which followed was concerned with the practical problems of developing the symposium to meet the needs both of the majority of the members and of the newer archives, and of finding time for everyone to make a contribution, as a talk or in discussion if a large number of outsiders are invited.

The following points were raised:

- Subsidy for representatives from developing archives

Sweden had the possibility of inviting say 6 or 8 people from developing archives so it was felt important not to miss this opportunity, even though some felt problems should be identified first before we invite them to hear solutions.

- Link with Summer School

It was felt important to make the most of their trip to Stockholm, either by inviting them to stay longer in Stockholm, with a core of established FIAF members, for a round table on their particular problems; and/or to time the Summer School so that they could go on to that before returning home.

- Use of technical resources in Stockholm

It was considered essential to use the opportunity of the availability of technical resources/ equipment in Stockholm in the Technical Symposium, It should not therefore be abandoned in favour of the more philosophical aspects of Topic 1 only.

- Choice of representatives from archives

Mr Francis referred to the problem that in many cases the top man, ie the bureaucrat, would attend although the seminar would probably be more useful for the next person down, who was likely to be the technical enthusiast better able to benefit from the technical symposium.

- Problems of developing archives

Mrs Bowser and Mr Francis addressed the question how FIAF could find out the problems of the developing archives and thus design a programme that would be of most use to them.

Mrs Wibom thought their problems might be more psychological and political rather than technical and financial. She felt they might need help in how to convince government and authorities of the importance of having an archive at all.

Mr Casanova stressed the problems of technological dependence and in particular the fact that for instance in their country, the prices charged for even simple equipment which they were obliged to purchase through the manufacturers' Mexican agents, were up to five times higher than if they bought direct from the USA.

Mr Klaue felt information could be obtained on typical problems from the Annual Reports (eg Indonesia, Bolivia) and countries which had wanted to send trainees to developed archives (eg Sri Lanka, Nicaragua, Zaïre)

- Travelling exhibition

Mr Francis said that the first problem for a developing archive was storage of whatever materials they had. The simplest easily available solution was a refrigerated food transporter and therefore suggested one of these should be used as a travelling exhibition to demonstrate techniques of handling, packing, wrapping and canning film. It could perhaps be taken round a given area over a period of time and then left behind with one particular archive. They would of course need sponsorship for this.

- Demonstration film

Mr de Vaal mentioned that Holland Filmmuseum had made a 9 minutes film on preservation which he offered to send to Mrs Wibom.

- Sponsorship

It was felt that Unesco would be receptive to requests for sponsorship for the work proposed for developing archives, perhaps both items 5 and 6.

Decisions

- 1 Role of archives in society
Mrs Wibom to bring to Mexico list of say 10 organisations or individuals who would be invited to participate in discussion or give short presentation.
- 2 Demonstration of video techniques and use in archives (for access and preservation), Mrs Wibom to develop plans for, say, half day session
- 3 Demonstration and presentation by film stock manufacturers
Mrs Wibom to develop plans for, say 5 manufacturers, for, say half day session
- 4 Technical needs of archives in developing countries
Mrs Wibom to explore possibilities for
 - film
 - travelling exhibition
 - symposium
- 5 Help from Unesco
Mrs Wibom to explore via Sweden: Mr Klaue to take project description to meeting anticipated in 1983
- 6 Co-workers
Mrs Wibom to be assisted by Messrs Kula/ Francis/ Klaue and others as needed.

DAY 3 (Mr Francis has left)

6. PROJECT AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

- 1 Embryo 3
Mrs Bowser reported that some contributions had been received and she hoped to have all before Mexico. In response to a question from Mr de Vaal, she said she needed updates (additions and corrections) from previous issue. She anticipated they would need 12 months for editing, 6 months for publishers.
Decision Notice in Bulletin to remind members that animation films were to be included.
- 2 International bibliography on cinema
Mrs van der Elst reported that no information had been received from Bucharest.
Decision The Roumanian Archive to be reminded that it was important to report on this project at Mexico.
- 3 Annual bibliography of IIAF members' publications
Mr Kula reported the project would be on time.

- 4 Handbook for film archives: Spanish version
Mr Casanova reported that contract had been signed and he brought 100 copies to EC for members.
Mr Klaue had already received copy and asked that proofreading on future publications, especially of people's names, should be more careful. he expressed the EC thanks for completion of the project.
- 5 Early Cinema 1900-1906
Mrs van der Elst reported that it would be ready for Mexico. It was very comprehensive: 600 pages including 300 pages of filmography.
500 copies would be printed at cost of £10 each.
Decision: Selling price £15 per copy, with free copy to members, authors, etc.
- 6 Preservation of Colour films (Rapallo symposium)
Mrs van der Elst reported a full transcription had been made by the Italian company used for translation at Rapallo: unfortunately, they had not known names, etc. It would be sent to the main speakers to check.
Decision: It would be made available to members and observers but was not suitable to be offered for sale.
- 7 Research viewing facilities in archives
Mrs van der Elst reported that the results of the enquiry had been collated and were ready for publication (four pages each in English and French). There had been mention of a commentary by Bob Rosen.
Decision: Publish the 4 pages only in next issue of Bulletin
- 8 Summer School
Mr Klaue asked for advice of the EC on whether the next summer school should be confined to basic training, to something more specialised (eg as in Madrid Workshop) or combination of the two (difficult organisationally).
Mrs Bowser thought that if it was being combined with invitations to Stockholm then it should be basic training.
Decision: Mr Klaue to prepare proposal for next EC for Basic training for participants from developing country archives, young archives, or individuals from other archives who needed practical experience.
- 9 Silent Feature Film Catalogue
Mr Daudelin reported that he had advised Mr Ledoux that EC had welcomed the project at Rapallo but he had had no response.
Decision: Mr Ledoux to be asked to report progress at Mexico.
- 10 Guidelines for FIAF Congress hosts
Mr Kula reported that the document presented to the EC reflected his uncertainty about the mandate. It addressed two separate issues:
- Checklist for would-be conference hosts preparing their application
- Checklist for detailed conference organisation
Discussion postponed until document read by EC. (see after item 7)
- 11 Principles for shipment of films
Discussion postponed until document prepared by Mrs Bowser read by EC (after item 7)

12 Rules for handling nitrate films

Mrs van der Elst reported she had found no relevant documents in the files

Decision: Mr Daudelin to prepare questionnaire asking members for information on their current practice and, in particular, for details of any archive rules or national legislation, on use, storage or transport.

He would include issues raised earlier by Mr Cincotti on whether they destroyed original nitrate films after copying to safety stock.

13 Examples of film archives' statutes for use as models by new archives

It was agreed that, in the long run, it would be more helpful to be able to supply a list of headings of items to be considered, together with some sample paragraphs drawn from the statutes of individual archives.

It was recognised that

- statutes would vary considerably, especially as between government and non-government organisations
- established archives did not necessarily have statutes that they would consider "ideal" (eg Mr Francis would like to have some of the clauses for his own archives that he recommended should be inserted in the New Zealand archive statutes)

Decision: a) All EC members present were willing to have their own statutes made available on requests

- b) Mrs van der Elst to give copies of "typical" statutes to Mr Daudelin so he can make start on preparation of useful dossier.

14 Training of archivists

Mr Klaue reported on the results of his survey of training requests and offers. He had had 10 requests for training assistance (8 written, 2 verbal) and 8 positive out of 10 responses from the 28 archives approached for help (7 written, 3 verbal).

On the basis of the replies and some discussion in the committee, the following pairings were made:

- Sofia (Bulgaria) will take trainee from Angola
- SFA (E Germany) will take 2 trainees from Brazil (Nov 81)
- Pyong Yang (N Korea) will take trainee from Tanzania (will pay staying costs)
- Oslo (Norway) will be asked to take trainee from Kenya (in 1983 (can probably pay travel and staying costs)
- Ottawa (Canada) will apply to take Sri Lanka (between 10/81 & summer 82 (funding to be applied for)
- Moscow (USSR) will take trainees from Mozambique and Mexico
- Prague (Czech) will be asked to take trainee from Bolivia (offered 30 pay stay to English speaker)
- Amsterdam (Neth) have arranged to take 1 trainee from China in 1983

Decisions still had to be made on:

- Nicaragua: offer from Berlin for 82 and Mexico (after conference in 82)
- Dominican Republic
- Zaïre

To ensure the success of this programme, it was felt:

- the stay should be for a minimum of 4 weeks and include plenty of practical work (hands-on experience)
- Candidates should have an appropriate educational level, including an adequate knowledge of a language shared with the host archive.
- It was important for the developing archive to get real benefit from the training: Mr Andreykov pointed out it was more important to train someone who was enthusiastic and would stay with the archive than someone who was better educated but unlikely to stay to pass on the experience.
- Mr Casanova felt that archives like his own could offer a very useful experience to trainees from less developed countries because they were closer in experience than the more developed European or American archives.
- FIAF would approach Unesco as soon as possible for help with funding for travel expenses in principle, although the individual archives (host and guest) would need to make the specific applications.
- The host archive in each case should submit a report to FIAF after the training stage so that there may be a central pooling of experiences and identification of particular needs and problems.

Decision: a) The Secretariat will advise hosts and guests of proposed pairings and advise them to contact each other to make the detailed arrangements, including applications to Unesco for help.

b) Mr Klaue to make formal FIAF approach to Unesco for help.

15 Colour film conference

Mrs Bowser reported they had been surprised by a negative response from the President of SMPTE to proposal of international conference on colour film preservation. The American archives were therefore pursuing the matter through individual SMPTE members who they knew to be interested.

One possibility is to plan a conference in Los Angeles to raise consciousness of the problems in Hollywood itself and perhaps have a more scientific, international conference, say, two years later.

Decision: Mrs Bowser and the American archives to progress.

16 Survey of programming in archive cinemas

Mr Borde mentioned that FIAF had last tackled this question in 1963 when Mr Monty from Copenhagen had sent out a questionnaire - he had only 12 replies and no summary report had been made.

He felt it was useful to make a new survey especially now that archive films were being shown on television and in specialist cinemas.

He and Mr Daudelin had devised a questionnaire that could be completed in

15 minutes, mostly with simple box answers. He asked for comments and additions in Lausanne so that the questionnaire could be distributed and replies collated in time for Mexico.

Suggestions were made by Mr Casanova (collaborative showings) Mr Kula (in-house screenings free/subscription/charged, unique or duplicated copies?; nitrate copies?)

Decision: Mr Borde to finalise questionnaire and prepare summary of replies for Mexico. Secretariat to action.

17 Publication of Rapallo Symposium proceedings

Mr Cincotti reported that the Symposium proceedings would be published in the original languages in a special edition of Bianco e Nero. He proposed a special edition in book form, with a special cover (and excluding the other magazine material) for issue as a FIAF publication, with about 200-250 copies for members and other interested parties. He sought guidance on preferred wording to define FIAF role.

Decision: FIAF book version ('on occasion of nth FIAF Congress...') to be ready for Mexico.

18 Spanish film bibliography

For the information of the EC, Mr Casanova reported on a project UNAM had been working on for two years, with the collaboration of Spanish and various Latin American archives, to assemble a film bibliography of works written or translated into Spanish. It was nearing completion.

19 Spanish edition of Film Cataloguing

Mrs Bowser reported that they had still had no reply from the American publisher (Burt Franklin) to their request to publish a Spanish edition. The lawyer felt it was OK to go ahead and had prepared an appropriate contract to defining the position.

Decision: Mr Casanova to get contract signed and sent to Secretary-General for signature on behalf of FIAF.

7. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

1. UNESCO

A. Nomination of film archive experts

No suggestions had been received from the members following the request at the last General Assembly and only the Documentation Commission had submitted names.

Mr Klaue felt it was important to respond to Unesco's request for names (made in June 80) to avoid situations where the wrong people were sent (eg Philippines).

Mr Casanova stressed the importance of using individuals who understood the

problems and daily reality of the developing archives and appreciated the level of technical resources available.

Preliminary lists were compiled during the meeting, taking account of geographical coverage and foreign language capabilities (where known). It was appreciated that nominated experts could not necessarily be available for long periods or even at all (depending on their personal schedules and commitments) but they would be able to give advice at least by letter and perhaps nominate alternatives.

Decision: 1 Secretariat to ask all nominated if willing to have names submitted to Unesco
2 List to be reviewed regularly, especially in light of use made by Unesco (if any).

B. Unesco and Regional Conferences

Mr Klaue reported on progress to date:

- Mozambique

They had reported that they had authorization from their own authorities and were planning for a conference early in 1983 (so they could benefit from Mexico's experience). They would be inviting Angola, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Madagascar). They would submit proposals to FIAF for advice before sending to Unesco.

- Poona

They were planning for 84 or early 85 but had not yet made a formal approach to their authorities.

C. Other Unesco projects

Mr Klaue mentioned the items he would be pursuing at his meeting with Mrs van Vliet in November:

- Support for drafting standard cataloguing rules (to fund extra meetings)
- Exhibition and film on basic requirements for developing archives (Swedish project)
- Summer school in 83 (Berlin)
- Assistance for archivist training (travel expenses)
- Progress on International Documentation Center and BFI proposal
- Unesco Courier special issue

On the Courier issue, a sub-committee was proposed: Mr Kula, Mr Karr (proposed by Mrs Bowser as he had prepared similar material for American archives), Mr Daudelin. Existing material can be reprinted, perhaps with updates (eg Paul Spehr's article on Colour preservation). Mr Kula will visit Mrs van Vliet when in Paris.

Mr Kula referred to progress on ICA project for Unesco to produce "Guidelines for appraisal of audio-visual documentation" which was being prepared in the context of the ICA PAMP Programme (Records and Archives Management

Programme). Unesco had asked that ICA should formally ask FIAP for their comments on the content and organisation of the material.

Mr Klaue then reported on Unesco's medium to long term plans:

- encourage creation of laboratories for preservation of "cultural heritage"
- proposal for possible "International Art Film Year" in mid 80's
- improvement / upgrading of international legal situation on copyright especially in light of recent technical advances
- development and use of modern techniques for audio-visual preservation.

2. CILECT questionnaire on film schools

Mr Casanova read out the proposed questions and asked for comments from the EC:

- Mr Klaue suggested question on charges if any, and an indication of the number of films supplied each year for different purposes
- Mrs Bowser felt it would be difficult to handle for the United States where there were many organisations teaching film apart from 200 + film schools.
- Mr Cincotti also raised the question of the 40+ university professors of film who taught film history and techniques, without being proper film schools.

- Decision:
- To include only Film and TV schools who are members of CILECT
 - For the special case of USA, to enlist help of CILECT member and/or University Film Association
 - Mr Casanova to finalise questionnaire including a preamble clarifying purpose and organisations to be covered
 - Secretariat to organise distribution

3. Round Table meeting with "Other related International Organisations" (FIAP/ICA/IFLA/IASA)

Mr Klaue reported as follows:

The second joint meeting will be in Paris in November 81.

FIAP had sent off all documentation promised.

FIAP had as yet received nothing in return (IASA documents arrived Oct 81)

Three possible joint projects are likely to be discussed in November with Unesco for subsequent raising:

- worldwide study on archival situations (different geographical regions, different political/ economic conditions, different kinds of archives, links between archives and cultural institutions)
 - preparation of guidelines for ideal training programme for audio-visual archivists (joint FIAT/FIAP input; Unesco training or use of existing programmes in FIAT/ICA/FIAP)
 - exchange of views on draft cataloguing rules for audio-visual materials.
- Other proposals were also on the table, eg. FIAT had proposed a meeting on the preservation of video materials.

Mr Kula as member of the Executive body of FIAT as well as FIAP, agreed that the 3 projects were the most likely; the organisations were all interested in

training and audio-visual cataloguing rules, and Unesco themselves were very interested in the world archivist situation and the overall organisation of handling cultural heritage materials.

Mr Kula felt the objectives of the FIAT meeting were undefined but the item would be discussed at Estoril meeting the following week.

Mr Klaue reiterated the purposes of these joint meetings was to avoid competition and misunderstandings by archivists working in overlapping fields. It was encouraging that the previous opposition of Libraries to A/V cataloguing was already changing. Although it was just the beginning he felt FIAF should welcome these opportunities.

Mr Kula asked for clarification regarding FIAF's position vis-à-vis CICT, especially in view of their training programmes. Mr Klaue confirmed that we were no longer members and had no obligations but that the channels of communication should be kept open. As President of FIAF, he received their Bulletin. We should be open for discussion and even possible participation in projects.

Mr Klaue mentioned meeting Mr Fulchignoni at the Moscow Film Festival: he was very friendly and asked if FIAF could help with support of compilation films of national film histories. Mr Klaue asked him to send written request to FIAF for discussion at the EC in Lausanne but no letter had been received. He said he was trying to interest Unesco and invitation would come through them, not CICT.

The basic FIAF position therefore is that there is no longer any conflict and CICT are not engaged in archival activity; we should be openminded.

Mrs Wibom reported that, probably like everyone else at the Moskow Festival, she had been asked for help with the compilation of film history films and she had told Mr Fulchignoni some compilations had already been done in Sweden, for example, half-hour films on individual directors. She felt FIAF could usefully find out what exists already. Mr Klaue agreed this should be the first step but we should first wait for Unesco to formally seek our cooperation.

Mr Cincotti agreed that we should wait and be somewhat circumspect as there seemed to be some confusion between Mr Fulchignoni's former role at Unesco, his role at CICT, and his personal requirements as a Professor at the Sorbonne.

Mrs van der Elst reported that ICA will publish the list of all FIAF publications in their next Bulletin which would be useful promotion for us.

4. Other International Organisations.

A. International Federation of Cine Clubs

They had invited Mr Klaue, as President of FIAF, to their General Assembly but it was sent too late so he could not have attended. He sent cable of good wishes.

B. "International Association of Film Collectors"

Mr Borde reported he had received a letter from an organisation calling themselves the French Association of Film Collectors who were planning to hold an international congress in May 82 to launch an International Association.

He has written for more information and discovered it was launched by a very small group of individuals. They had however secured support from Bois d'Arcy for an exhibition and mini-film festival at the congress. Mr Klaue felt FIAF could not interfere to stop Mr Schmitt's involvement but could perhaps write to discourage him. Mrs Bowser strongly disagreed: she felt it was very useful for the official archives to have open communication and cooperation with private collectors. Both MOMA and AFI helped similar organisations (eg Cinecon) in the United States and hoped eventually to have access to their collections which though private were perfectly legal.

Mrs Wibom agreed. Mr Borde and Mr Cincotti agreed that private collections could be legal but were unhappy at the plans to set up national and international associations.

Decision: Any enquiries to FIAF should be referred to the French Member, Mr Daudelin to ask Mr Schmitt to make a report on the proposed congresses and future developments.

6. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATION UNDERWAY (followed)

10. Guidelines for FIAF Congress hosts.

Mr Kula had drafted a set of guidelines for FIAF Congress hosts to be discussed by the E.C.

The following points were raised:

Mrs Bowser suggested it should mention that the Executive Committee is responsible for organising the Technical Symposium on archival matters. Mr Klaue said that hosts should nevertheless be encouraged to put forward ideas for topics to be treated, in the light of their facilities and interests.

The Secretariat will prepare a Checklist of administrative and organisational details to help in the actual preparation of the Congresses.

Mrs Wibom felt the proposed conditions were so difficult to fulfill that very few archives would be willing to volunteer as hosts. It was felt this could be overcome by amending the wording to indicate that these were guidelines, indicating the most ideal conditions, to help archives decide whether they would be able to undertake a Congress.

On the physical conditions, it was felt ideal for the hotel, eating facilities and conference rooms to be under one roof, or at least nearby, simply to save time. Mr Klaue reminded the EC of conferences where much time had been lost travelling between different locations.

On the cost burden, Mrs Wibom mentioned that in the past FIAF had born the bulk of the cost but now it seemed the host archive was expected to make a very large investment. Several speakers made the point that the sharing of expenses would depend on individual circumstances and the amount of money FIAF had available. In general, archives could refer to budgets of previous years to see the average level of expenditure that FIAF could contribute. In response to Mr Lauritzen, it was agreed that it was unlikely that they would ever again have congresses like those in Turin and Lyon which had been largely organised by FIAF itself: FIAF was now too big for that.

Mr Strotchkov, Mr Klaue and others felt the guidelines would be a very useful aid to archives in appreciating their responsibilities.

Decision Mr Kula to reword guidelines, to incorporate suggestions.
 Secretariat to provide administrative checklist
 Secretariat to distribute to all archives, with special note for already-identified hosts explaining it is for information only.

11. Principles for shipment of films.

Mrs Bowser explained the guidelines had been planned with John Kuiper although he had not seen the written version.

She asked for comments and possible additions and wanted to know if the terms used were understandable to people in other countries.

She envisaged that the heads of archives would give the document to the people responsible for shipment: she felt that in many cases archives heads were not aware of how films were being handled by their own people.

Mr Daudelin welcomed the document and suggested:
 - translation into 4 languages: French, Russian, Spanish and German.
 - reminder to sender to include proper Customs documents and specific information on number of reels, length, etc., because queries on such matters can cause costly delays.

Mrs Orbanz asked if mention could be included of the importance of returning the films on their original reels; some users made a compilation on the larger reels and failed to 'dis-assemble'.

She also asked if it were possible to include all the reels of one film in a single container but it was felt this was not always practicable.

Mr Casanova wanted to include a clause that the sender should check if the receiver has produced any special recommendations on where, when and how to send as he had found in many cases that UNAI recommendations had been ignored and in consequence there had been border problems. It was felt that 'special recommendations' were too complicated and all transportation information should be in the internal list of FIAF members.

On nitrate film, Mr Kula asked for clarification on phrase "legally acceptable": did it apply to receiver or sender?

On insurance, Mrs Wibom said they always insured yet point 9 suggested it was not essential. Mr Klaue confirmed that there were no FIAF rules on this point, it was the decision of each archive.

On the question of damage, Mrs Bowser pointed out that this had not been mentioned previously in any FIAF rule and she felt it was therefore important to include it. Mr Strotchkov mentioned that in Russia their projectors could only handle 300 meters so they would always have to cut the standard 600 meter reel: would this be considered as damage? After some discussion, it was felt that this would certainly count as damage and the receiver should check with the sender to make individual agreements where this was thought necessary.

Mr Klaue asked that extra labels added by the receiver should be removed before returning to the sender.

Decisions:

Mrs Bowser to redraft in the light of the discussion.

Secretariat to organise translation, printing and distribution before Mexico.

At the suggestion of Mr Daudelin, the document will be printed (not xeroxed) to indicate permanence/ importance, and 10 copies sent to each archive.

8. FUTURE CONGRESSES

A. Congress in Mexico: June 82.

Mr Casanova reported on the further arrangements for the Congress, and made the following points:

1. Budget:

He would not have formal notification of the money available for the University until 15 December but he had every reason to believe he would get what he needed for the Congress. If for example, he had enough to pay the stay of the Executive Committee, then perhaps some of the FIAF budget could be used to invite extra guests to the symposia.

He was reminded how much was in FIAF's own budget and asked to send detailed schedule of planned expenditure and money available to the Secretariat as soon as possible, for review with Mr de Vaal and possibly Mr Klaue.

2. Speaking engagements for FIAF members.

He asked for any FIAF members who wanted to prolong their stay in Mexico, either before or after the meetings, to give him details of their wishes as soon as possible as he could easily arrange for them to be the guests of various cultural institutions around the country, in exchange for one or two lectures.

3. Exhibitions

He repeated his request for photographs of FIAF people at previous FIAF congresses for an Exhibition in the hotel lobby (for FIAF only). Photographs should be as large as possible.

He would also like to have posters of any international screenings of Mexican films for an exhibition for the public.

4. Publicity for FIAF activities

From November he would be starting a publicity campaign and would like to have articles to submit to the press which defined the importance of FIAF's activities.

5. Reduction of stay in Mexico to reduce costs.

As some members might find each additional day in Mexico a financial burden, the Committee considered possible elimination of the planned excursions.

Mr Casanova pointed out:

- he felt the excursion was an important occasion for members to meet with each other and the EC on an informal basis
- there were no flights out of Mexico City on Sundays so there would be little advantage to close the congress on Friday eve 11 June and cancel the Saturday excursion and Sunday morning visit and lunch.
- The \$100 daily rate for stay in Mexico City had included all meals and in fact lunch was being provided on Sunday and Saturday so it would not be so expensive as thought. He would amend wording to inform delegates.

The EC meeting was re-scheduled to start one day later on the 4 June, with half-day on 5 June and full day on 6 June.

Decision:

Mrs van der Elst and Mr Casanova to draft letter to Members before leaving Lausanne.

Mr Casanova to submit detailed budget as soon as he had funding information.

B. Congress in Stockholm: 1983

It was confirmed that Mrs Wibom would produce detailed budget proposals for meeting in Mexico.

C. Congress in Vienna: 1984

The two Viennese archives would be asked to bring a progress report on their congress preparations to the second meeting of the EC in Mexico.

9. REPORT ON THE WORLD HISTORY PROJECT

NB: Tapes from now on virtually inaudible so important points may have been missed.

Mr Klaue mentioned that a small group would be meeting with Mr Aristarco the next day to clarify the direction of the project.

Mr Andreykov commented his written report and that of Mr Cincotti which the EC had in front of them.

- It had been a very difficult year for the project but he felt that, now that

the national decree of 7 October had clarified the organisation of the project and the role of the Bulgarian government, everything would go forward smoothly.

- Efforts had been made to increase the international coverage and now 123 countries had agreed to participate.
- Mr Andreykov had been appointed director of the specially set-up publishing house and, to help him cope with this extra load, a new Administrative Director had been appointed to the Cinémathèque. He himself would remain responsible for the cultural and artistic activities: documentation, cataloguing, programming and international relations.
- He proposed that Mr Cincotti should be the FIAF representative to replace Mr Pogacic.

Mr Cincotti accepted this nomination but expressed some reservations about the delays on the project, for example, none of the 3 Italian archives had yet been approached for their help. Mr Borde said he had not been approached either however, he had been always very keen on the project and was reassured now that Mr Andreykov was taking on this new role.

Mr Klaue asked what would happen to the project if they did not obtain the very substantial subsidy requested (\$50,000 per year over 10 years). Mr Andreykov said the money was needed for the translations so it would be very serious but he did not think there would be difficulties.

Decision: Mr Andreykov, Mr Borde, Mr Cincotti, Mr Daudelin and Mr Casanova to meet with Mr Aristarco on Monday.

11. VARIA

A. Future EC Meetings.

An invitation from Madrid was anticipated for the next EC meeting after Mexico. Mrs van der Elst asked if the meeting could be postponed from October to January 83 as the autumn was too early.

Mr Daudelin was able to invite the EC to Montreal but appreciated that the distance would be deterrent after Mexico.

An invitation had been received from Australia to hold an EC meeting in 1983 or 1984. The EC would like to accept but distance could still be a problem for 1983 and, if they were successful for their bid for the Congress in 1986, perhaps for 1984.

Mr Andreykov would like to welcome the EC to Sofia in the autumn of 1983 to celebrate the Cinémathèque's 25th anniversary.

B. Alternative format EC Meetings

Mr Kula suggested it might be worth considering what he called an "Information meeting" somewhere between a simple EC meeting and the full-scale Congress.

He suggested that if the EC wanted to accept invitations to have its meetings further afield, they could use the occasion to allow an extra day for discussion and exchange of ideas with 'local' archives and potential archives.

Mr Klaue asked that this matter be discussed in Mexico under the topic "Future of FIAF".

C. International "Treasures" for Montreal.

Mr Daudelin said he had a good response to his request for help with his programme to celebrate the opening of their new cinema.

Mr Karr of AFI had asked if they could take the programme afterwards and use it as a homage to the preservation work being done by archives.

D. Eastman Kodak preservation publication

Mrs Bowser reported that Eastman Kodak had asked to include the list of FIAF archives in their new publication "Preservation and Care of Films". The suggestion was welcomed.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.20 pm on Day 3.