

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING

LONDON 1985

CONFIDENTIAL

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

London, October 2 - 4, 1985

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| Members | Anna-Lena WIBOM | President | |
| | Guido CINCOTTI | Secretary General | |
| | Raymond BORDE | Treasurer | |
| | Wolfgang KLAUE | Vice President | |
| | Hector GARCIA-MESA | Vice President | ABSENT |
| | Sam KULA | Vice President | ABSENT |
| | Eileen BOWSER | | |
| | Robert DAUDELIN | | |
| | David FRANCIS | | |
| | P K NAIR | | |
| Eva ORBANZ | Deputy Treasurer | | |
| Reserve Members | Jan DE VAAL | | |
| | Cosme ALVES-NETTO | Deputy Sec General | ABSENT |
| | Paul SPEHR | | |
| Honorary Members | Einar LAURITZEN | | |
| | Vladimir POGACIC | | ABSENT |
| | Jerzy TOEPLITZ | | ABSENT |
| Commission Members | Harriet HARRISON | Cataloguing | |
| | Henning SCHOU | Preservation | |
| | Milka STAYKOVA | Documentation | ABSENT |
| Executive Secretary Interpreter | | Brigitte VAN DER ELST | |
| | | Jill JOHNSON | |

FINAL AGENDA

| Item | Page |
|--|------|
| 1 Adoption of the Agenda | 1 |
| 2 Approval of the Minutes of the New York EC Meetings | 1 |
| 3 Relations with other International Organisations | |
| 3.1 Unesco | 2 |
| 3.2 Other International Organisations FIAT *, IFTC/CITC, ICA, CIFEJ, IASA, Council of Europe | 5 |
| 4 Future Congresses | 10 |
| 5 Membership Questions | |
| 5.1 New Candidates for Observership Washington, Lima, Vatican City | 17 |
| 5.2 Reconfirmation of Members East Berlin, Budapest, Madrid, Oslo, Sofia, Frankfurt, Torino, Rio de Janeiro | 20 |
| 5.3 Reconfirmation of Observers: Alger | 23 |
| 5.4 Other Membership Questions Reconfirmation, Bogota, Tehran, Cairo, Dublin, Paris Francophone archives, Roma | 23 |
| 6 Amendment of FIAF Statutes and Rules | 27 |
| 7 Report on Preparations for the Canberra Congress | 40 |
| 8 Reports of the Specialised Commissions | |
| 8.1 Documentation | 42 |
| 8.2 Cataloguing | 45 |
| 8.3 Preservation | 47 |
| 9 Projects & Publications Underway | 49 |
| 10 Financial Report | 52 |
| 11 Any Other Business | 53 |
| 11.1 Evaluation of Restoration Symposium | 53 |
| 11.2 Next EC Meetings | 54 |
| 11.3 Next NGO Meeting | 55 |
| 11.4 50th Anniversary Planning | 55 |
| 11.5 Computer for FIAF | 55 |
| 11.6 Future Congresses | 55 |

* Minutes of FIAT/FIAF Meeting recorded separately, pp 1-6

MINUTES

Mr FRANCIS, as host, welcomed everyone to London, outlined some administrative arrangements and indicated that MM GARCIA-MESA and NAIR were still expected.

Mrs WIBOM, as the new President, opened the meeting with a welcome to all present and regretted the absence of MM. KULA and ALVES-NETTO who were unable to attend. In the meantime, the reserve Members, MM DE VAAL and SPEHR, had the right to vote.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted as presented, subject to the following adjustments:

- Mr SCHOU reported that the Preservation Commission had just met in London so he would be absent on Day 2, preparing the Report; he therefore asked that points 7 & 8 could be held over till Day 3.
- Mr KLAUE asked for inclusion of Iran and Cairo under 5.4.
- Mrs WIBOM suggested item 11 should include an evaluation of the previous day's Restoration Symposium, organised by Mr FRANCIS, which she felt had been extremely valuable.

In addition, the timing would need adjustment in view of the expected visit from the FIAT representatives during the first morning for joint discussions; it was agreed that topics to be raised would include the Unesco survey, the Berlin Congress and the proceedings of the Stockholm Congress.

2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NEW YORK EC MEETINGS

p11 Regarding the draft Reconfirmation questionnaire, Mr SCHOU asked what had been meant by the "3 separate components of conservation".

p27 Mr DE VAAL clarified that his archive had agreed to pay a higher subscription to PIP but were not willing to join the group of "Supporters" who he understood were willing to make further contributions if necessary. Mrs BOWSER and others explained that his archive's position was not different from the other "Supporters" who had made no other commitment beyond agreement to pay the higher subscription.

p4 Mr CINCOTTI noted a typing error in the heading 4.2e which should read: Milano: Cineteca Italiana.

On matters arising from the Minutes, Mr FRANCIS referred to p 30 and the discussion on recognition of services rendered to FIAF. When the EC came to discuss the Preservation Commission, he would have to explain that his archive could no longer fund Mr Harold Brown's participation. He wanted the EC to be aware of the situation immediately as the reception that evening, following Mr Brown's Ernest Lindgren Memorial Lecture, would probably be the most appropriate occasion to mark FIAF's recognition of Mr Brown's contribution to the preservation movement.

After some discussion of alternatives (medals, long-term subscription to US technical publications, technical book signed by EC members, etc), it was agreed that the most appropriate tribute would be in the form of air tickets for Mr Brown and his wife to go to the Canberra Congress.

At the Reception that evening, the President paid formal tribute to Mr Brown and his patient wife Joan, who had been one of the earliest members of the BFI, and presented them with the airtickets, together with flowers and a toy kangaroo.

Mrs WIBOM formally thanked the Secretariat and Jill Johnson for the elegant new style Minutes with the large, easy-to-read print. There being no further comments, the Minutes were adopted.

3 RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

3.1 Unesco

3.1.1 Survey on Implementation of the 1980 Recommendation (See also Minutes of discussion with FIAT, item F1)

Mrs WIBOM read from the Contract document which offered US\$13,350 for a number of specific tasks with completion date specified as September 1985 (sic!).

Mr KLAUE reported that he, Mr KULA and Mr LABRADA (of FIAT) had worked in New York on three versions of the questionnaire, ranging from minimum to "ideal", and intended to finalise them in London. Unfortunately, Mr KULA was not coming to London and had not sent any comments so he and Mr LABRADA would have to finalise them together. The same questionnaire would be used for all types of archives but it had been agreed that FIAT would distribute it to the TV archives and FIAF would handle the rest.

Mr KLAUE confirmed that he was ready to continue work on the Survey and draft a proposal on how the additional work itemised by Unesco should be handled. He felt it was not simply a question of asking the Secretariat to

make a compilation of existing documents. They might call on Mr KULA and/or the Documentation Commission in connection with the Bibliography of FIAF members' publications.

In the meantime, he suggested FIAF should make a formal application to Unesco to extend the contract to the end of 1986. Mrs WIBOM reported she had already advised Unesco that she could not sign the contract without first discussing it with the EC; she had also discussed with them the possibilities of revising the requirements if it was felt too ambitious for their resources within the new timescale to be agreed. The money offered, though useful, would certainly not cover the real costs of the work involved. She pointed out that FIAF had assisted Unesco considerably over the years and, although the information from this project would be interesting and useful for both FIAF and FIAT, the Federations' first priorities should be their own rather than those imposed by Unesco.

On the question of information on national legislation on archives, legal deposits, etc., it was recalled in discussion that Mr Alho had already evaluated a small collection of legislation from different countries for his own purposes and Mr CINCOTTI had agreed to do some work in this area. Mr SPEHR felt this portion of the project would be extremely difficult; in his country, for instance, there was no national legislation covering archives and deposit in a general way, just separate laws concerning arrangements and funding for specific institutions.

Mr KLAUE felt the starting point should be compilation from the existing files in the Secretariat but they would then need to refer to each member to ask if the material could be quoted and/or included and to ask for updates and any comments (eg on how successfully it works in practice in their own country).

Day 3: As agreed, Mr KLAUE produced more specific proposals for handling the project; as there was no further time for discussion, these were simply distributed to EC members for subsequent individual comment.

3.1.2 Sofia General Conference: Sub-Programme III 3.6: Action to promote cinema, photography and audio-visual media

Mrs WIBOM reported there would be a budget discussion on this Sub-Programme within Unesco following their consultations with FIAF and other NGO's. However, the future of Unesco activities was of course very uncertain because of the possible withdrawals of various countries (UK, France) in addition to the USA.

At this point, the meeting was adjourned for a coffee break to welcome the 3 representatives from FIAT: Mrs Anne HANFORD, Mr Fernando LABRADA and Mr Philippe PONCIN. See separate Minutes for record of FIAT/FIAF discussion.

The EC discussion below resumed after lunch.

Mrs WIBOM reported that she had been talking to Unesco about once a week and the status of FIAF projects was constantly changing. Last week Unesco had had a preparatory meeting in Paris but she had no news.

She mentioned that she had found it very difficult to understand how they operate and Mr DAUDELIN suggested it might be useful for FIAF to profit from Mr KLAUE's experience with them over the years and have him continue as FIAF's Unesco liaison contact. This would have the added advantage of starting the move to allocate specific responsibilities to the Vice Presidents, thus relieving the President of some of the ever-increasing burdens. He had not previously consulted either Mrs WIBOM or Mr KLAUE but he felt this might be a practical and effective approach.

Mrs WIBOM welcomed the proposal. Mr KLAUE said that he was willing to continue the contact on the projects he was already involved with; he felt however that it was important that the President of FIAF should be seen to be personally involved in Unesco negotiations. He added that he felt the other FIAF projects (listed on pages 35/6 of the New York EC Minutes) were still in the Unesco programme.

Mr KLAUE then reviewed the status of other projects for 1986-87:

- Canberra Unesco had been unable to help after all
- Argentina

Before leaving Berlin, he had a telex from Mrs Jurado asking him to contact Celia Zaher and send names of archives interested in supporting seminar in Buenos Aires in October 1986. They had not been able to discuss it with her in New York as they were not sufficiently far advanced with their own Ministry. Mr KLAUE feared it was now too late.

- Berlin: Technical Symposium

He agreed that Mrs ORBANZ should submit the formal requests to Mrs Zaher before the Sofia meeting which he understood was starting the next week.

- Brazil

A small allocation of \$10,000 for equipment had been agreed (compared with the \$500,000 hoped for).

- Thai \$13,000 had been allocated.
- Bangladesh

\$18,000 was allocated as contribution towards a FICA Box.

In addition to the above, he felt Unesco would also be open to assisting with expert missions or Fellowships. The past missions of Mrs WIBOM and

Mr FRANCIS, "prophets from abroad", had been successful in helping new archives; he had suggested that Cairo should apply for a visiting expert and asked Mrs WIBOM to support their application when in Sofia.

Finally he mentioned that they might be able to run a new FIAF Summer School after the 1987 Congress in Berlin and, if so, would seek help from Unesco to bring in participants from developing countries.

Mission Reports

Mrs WIBOM said that in acknowledgment of her mission reports on Thailand, Vietnam and Bangladesh, she had received from Mr Arnaldo a long and detailed request for recommendations for further action in each country. She felt this was unrealistic of Unesco as to respond seriously in the detail suggested would require considerable additional investment of time and effort: one could spend all one's time working unpaid for Unesco! Mr FRANCIS was pleased to report he had no such follow-up request.

Thailand

Mrs WIBOM reported they had been making significant progress both on reconstruction of premises and obtaining finance. The Swedish Film Institute had received the \$13,000 contract to supply equipment to Thailand: she had been working on making the money go further by refurbishing discarded equipment, obtaining free transport from Thai Air, and sending out 2 people to visit the archive, including the technician to install it and train the local staff.

3.2 Other International Organisations

3.2.1 FIAT See separate report on joint meeting

3.2.2 IFTC/CITC

There was an extensive discussion of the IFTC invitation to selected archives to attend a meeting in Milan, in October, to consider a project to prepare standardised national film anthologies of the history of the cinema. The trip would be paid for by MIFED.

Mr KLAUE indicated that it was Mr Fulchignoni's personal project as he needed anthologies from different countries for his work as Professor of Film History in Paris. When he was first approached about it in Moscow some two years ago, Mr KLAUE had recommended a formal approach to FIAF, rather than to individual archives, but nothing had been received.

Mr CINCOTTI said he had been approached in Venice this year to prepare a paid report for the meeting as his archive had already produced some national anthologies some 20 years ago.

It was widely felt round the table that the invitations should be refused for the following combination of reasons:

i Poor organisation

The project was inadequately defined, the meeting convened at too short a notice; no information was sent with the invitation on who was being invited or the criteria for being invited; it seemed to be simply his personal contacts, invited to a "free" trip.

ii Suspected political manoeuvring vis-a-vis Unesco

- It was suggested that IFTC were inviting FIAF archives (and particularly hoping for the participation of FIAF's President and Secretary-General) so that they could then cite FIAF's involvement when seeking funds for the project from Unesco

- IFTC had failed to approach FIAF direct, which would have been the logical and courteous way to proceed; in addition they had ignored the advice of Mr KLAUE and Mr CINCOTTI that this was the most appropriate way to enlist help from FIAF archives

- It was suggested that IFTC wanted to imply that FIAF was only interested in preservation and IFTC was the organisation that was actively involved in promoting awareness of international cultural heritage.

iii FIAF's priorities

The proposed project was certainly an appropriate FIAF project but FIAF had many other projects that were more urgent. Archives were of course free to participate on a bilateral basis.

FIAF had not been formally invited so would not intervene at this stage. It was suggested however that, if FIAF were approached, they should first ask for a detailed 5-6 page description of the project to assess how "real" it was.

Both Mr CINCOTTI and Mrs WIBOM had been willing to go but had told the organisers they would take advice from their FIAF colleagues. Mr CINCOTTI was willing in principle to contribute a report on his experience but was unhappy about the organisation; for him, it would be best if everyone refused so that there would be no participants and he could then gracefully withdraw.

Mrs WIBOM had been prepared to accept the free trip on her way to Sofia but intended to voice her misgivings about the project and its organisation in open session at the meeting. Others were unhappy about the whole project for the reasons above but in any case would not have been able to attend because of the short notice.

Invitations to archives by Council of Europe and others

Mr DE VAAL regretted that events organised under the auspices of the Council of Europe (by for example the Greek Ministry of Culture and the City of Lille) suffered from the same defects:

- grandiose projects but very little information provided
- meetings organised at very short notice
- invitations to selected archives rather than via FIAF

In such cases, he thanked the organisers and asked them to refer first to the FIAF Secretariat. FIAF archives were encountering more and more of such "out of the blue" projects and he thought members should be encouraged in every case to refer the organisers to the Secretariat so that FIAF and the EC could take a view of which events to support and how, in order to promote FIAF's best interests.

Mr FRANCIS felt the Council of Europe cases were rather different from IFTC as the invitations had very properly been addressed via the member countries; he acknowledged that the notice was short.

Mr BORDE pointed out that he had been invited to both events even though his archive had no national or government status. In addition, he had recently been invited to speak at Annecy about film archives. He felt it was simply a sign that film archives had become fashionable. He agreed with Mr DE VAAL that the Secretariat should be kept informed, both direct by members receiving such invitations and by asking the organisers to approach FIAF itself.

Mr CINCOTTI supplied more information about the changes of personnel behind the Council of Europe event in Greece which had now been postponed until mid-November. He felt it was quite different from the IFTC case as it was a single event rather than a proposal for a major, long-term project.

Mrs ORBANZ did not see that it was necessary to refuse invitations because they were addressed to individual archives rather than via FIAF. She suggested they should be more positive and flexible and profit from the occasions to present the work of archives.

Mr FRANCIS agreed and explained that the Greek archive had only been involved after the original invitations had been issued. He had spent a day with Mrs Mitropoulos in London helping her plan the week's programme (2-3 days Symposium, 2-3 days screening) so that it was an interesting event in promoting the presence of archives. He hoped that everyone would try to support the occasion so that the archive may be seen to succeed where others had failed.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that FIAF was not a central power for the individual archives and should never attempt to establish itself as such. The invitations were addressed to individual archives and they alone should decide how to respond, in the light of their national circumstances. FIAF had no right to expect archives to supply information to the Secretariat or

wait for FIAF approval for activities. Obviously the situation was different if they were invited to represent FIAF.

Mr CINCOTTI added that he had been specifically asked, as Secretary-General of FIAF, by Madame Mercuri and the organisers if he would encourage FIAF members to attend as Greece was normally rather remote from cultural events and, in particular, to help the Greek archive gain greater prestige in Greece. Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed that the Secretariat had been formally informed back in June, although at that stage the information was somewhat confused. Mrs WIBOM acknowledged that she had also received information, dated September 7, but had ignored it on principle as it was simply addressed "Dear Sir"; just before leaving, Mrs MITROPOULOS had phoned and cabled her to encourage her participation.

In response to Mr DE VAAL, who understood the Greek and Lille events were virtually the same, Mr FRANCIS pointed out that the discussions in Greece would cover certain problems of interest to EEC members, indirectly related to film archiving. It was hoped that in consequence the Council of Europe might release some of its substantial cultural monies to archive activities which might lead to cooperative archive projects within the EEC group.

Mrs WIBOM closed by saying she was pleased that archives were now becoming "fashionable" and, like Mrs ORBANZ, she hoped all archives would welcome these opportunities to make their work better known and appreciated. Mr BORDE agreed with this view but stressed that he was nevertheless distressed that FIAF as an organisation was being ignored; for instance, he had agreed to send a programme to Lille but still felt very strongly that they should have formally contacted FIAF itself.

3.2.3 ICA

Mrs WIBOM referred to the draft cooperation agreement between ICA and FIAF, first submitted to Mr KLAUE in March. As agreed, she had discussed this with Mr KULA who had recommended it should be signed, preferably in time for the next ICA meeting in Ottawa in October.

Decision : Mrs VAN DER ELST to retype for the President's signature.

3.2.4 CIFEJ

After the New York Congress, Mr KLAUE had received a letter in German from the President of CIFEJ suggesting possibilities for joint cooperation with FIAF members through their 27 national centres. He suggested he should get it translated and published in the Bulletin so that individual members were informed and could take initiatives if they wished.

Action : Mr KLAUE.

3.2.5 IASA

Mr KLAUE confirmed that he had represented FIAF at their Congress in Berlin in September and had addressed a few words to their General Assembly. They are interested in closer contact with FIAF, primarily for the 1987 Joint Technical Symposium which he and Mrs ORBANZ had discussed with their Technical Commission.

He felt it was useful for FIAF to see how another international organisation managed itself. They have 430 members (institutions and private individuals) but a very small budget (75,000 Swedish kroner) so they cannot afford a secretariat. Although the subscription is very low, some 20% had failed to pay up. There was a separate participation fee for the Congress, about \$50.

The Congress was a week of numerous workshops, discussion groups etc, in parallel, concerned with their professional activities. The Commissions tended to prepare a selection of specific topics which were then discussed in separate workshops, lasting say 2 - 4 hours each. The General Assembly meetings were restricted to two half-days at the beginning and end of the Congress and were in parallel with other sessions. He estimated that only some 30 of the 300 delegates attended which meant that organisational matters, like changes to Rules and Statutes, could be handled in an unbureaucratic, if somewhat undemocratic, way.

He thought their approach was interesting although not necessarily a model for FIAF.

3.2.6 Council of Europe

Mr FRANCIS reported that their meeting in Strasbourg had produced a very interesting paper on film archiving with a very positive statement, prepared by Olli ALHO and a member of the NFA staff.

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that during the Venice Festival the Council of Europe's Cultural Committee had held its own separate meetings and he had been invited by Olli ALHO to take part in their Press Conference at the Festival itself. They had distributed a Recommendation on the safeguarding of films, similar to but shorter than the Unesco 1980 Recommendation. He had suggested it would be better to work to support the Unesco Recommendation rather than try to start a separate initiative for Europe. He volunteered to supply the text to the Secretariat but was advised it was in fact the Strasbourg document.

Action: Mr FRANCIS to provide Secretariat with copy of the text.

4 FUTURE CONGRESSES

4.1 1986 Canberra see item 7

4.2 1987 Berlin

Apart from progress on the Joint Technical Symposium (see separate report on FIAT/FIAF meeting), Mrs ORBANZ had nothing to add to her New York Report.

4.3 1988 Paris

Mr DAUDELIN referred to the summary of the French archives' June meeting and reported on the decisions taken at the September 30 London meeting of the 50th Anniversary Sub-Committee:

- **Location** Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires (MATP)
(North of Bois de Boulogne)
- **Dates**

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| General Assembly 1 day only: | Wed 1 June |
| Historical symposium, 3 days | 2-3-4 June |
| Unesco Round Table, 2 days, ideally | 30-31 May |

- Unesco Round Table

It was hoped Unesco would agree to schedule their event for the two days before the opening of the FIAF Congress and close with a prestigious celebration in honour of FIAF's 50th Anniversary.

- **Organisers** FIAF archive members in France
- **Coordinators** Bois d'Arcy (part of CNC who provide major financing)

- **Historical Symposium:** "Le cinéma français inconnu des années 20".

Mr BORDE explained that they wanted to follow the pattern of discovery on similar lines to the New York slapstick symposium, so that they might "re-write" the history of the period. He would shortly be discussing possible directions of research with Raymond Chirrat, the major historian of the period, who had just published a catalogue of films for the period 1919-29. They would seek others who were interested in discovering the unknown. It would be a major task which they wanted to pursue as scientifically as possible.

- **Exhibitions**

- i Pre-Cinema Apparatus & Objects at MATP
- ii 20 years of cinema posters, 1920-1940
possible locations: Musée des Arts Décoratifs, rue de Rivoli,
or La Villette, a new exhibition centre.

Both would be international exhibitions; the first, relying particularly on colleagues in Turin, Brussels and London, should be a popular exhibition for

the general public. They had thought of giant blow-ups of some of the early slides and hopefully some permanent shows, perhaps presented by people in original costume.

For the posters, they had thought of having a group of experts who would select them from an aesthetic point of view and produce a high quality catalogue with reproductions and serious texts. (Mr BORDE added later that 1920 was chosen as it was then that the cinema poster started to become a distinct new art form; the emphasis should be truly international, "exotic", to attract the Paris public)

- Screenings

The following suggestions had been made:

- i MATP: French films of the 20's at the Symposium
- ii Paris Arts et Essais cinemas, eg Studio 43:
classics or less well known restorations
- iii Somewhere in Paris: Silent film with orchestra
- iv Cinémathèque Française: programme for that period to celebrate FIAF by drawing on films from member archives.
- v Champs Elysées: world première of a film with appropriate speeches in honour of FIAF 50th anniversary, designed to attach the world's press; thanks to Mrs WIBOM's connections with FIAPF
- vi Travelling programme of classics or restored films drawn from member archives; Gosfilmofond had already offered to provide prints.
- vii Member archives: to be encouraged to develop their own programmes to mark the occasion

- Publications

- i Directory of member archives, with standard information on each supplemented by photos of work areas, vaults, viewing theatres, etc.; pleasing & cheap: offset, spiral binding ?
- ii Press Kit, with history of FIAF, statistics on films preserved, photos, for use of international press

- Budget

FIAF was contributing 1 million Belgian francs and CNC was willing to pay for whatever else was needed. Mr BORDE reported that the Ministry of Culture had already obtained the use of the meeting rooms, projection and exhibition facilities at MATP, all free of charge.

Mr DAUDELIN closed his report by listing the immediate priorities:

- official letters to:

- Director of CNC (confirming that Bois d'Arcy would coordinate and be responsible for contracts, etc.)
- Franz Schmitt (confirming EC decisions in London)

- Unesco (confirming dates and asking if Round Table can be scheduled as suggested)
- Poster exhibition:
 - set up "Expert Commission"
- Pre-cinema exhibition:
 - nominate coordinator and "Expert Commission"; initial tasks to get in touch with archives most likely to contribute material.
- FIAF directory ("bottin"):
 - Secretariat can contribute but additional work will be needed on compilation and editing
- Travelling retrospective:
 - Technical resources from Moscow; in addition, individual(s) needed to plan, define contents, coordinate.
- Financial Planning:
 - Detailed forecasting needed for each project so that Mr SCHMITT can liaise with CNC for the additional resources needed.

For ease of reference, the points made in the subsequent discussion have been re-grouped per topic rather than left in discussion sequence.

Exhibitions

Mrs WIBOM stressed that FIAF staff should not attempt to mount the exhibitions; they should be prepared to pay professionals, at least one person per year per exhibition. She suggested Mr SCHMITT should be asked to approach CNC or the museums concerned to negotiate for the work to be master-minded through their exhibition department, either assigning an existing staff member full-time or bringing someone in to work with them. She pointed out that even for the small exhibition in Stockholm they had needed two people full-time for 6 months (one from the museum, one from her own staff who specialised in their exhibitions).

Mr BORDE thought that Bois d'Arcy were themselves specialists in pre-cinema apparatus so Mr SCHMITT would be able to find a coordinator from his own staff. For the posters, he felt Stockholm could manage it, on the basis of their previous experience, using the staff in Paris for the physical preparation. Mrs WIBOM pointed out however that the area of film posters was largely unresearched and undocumented so there would be substantial initial research to be done for which they did not have the resources nor expertise. She felt it was primarily a task for an art historian. They would be willing to cooperate but she thought it was necessary to rely on the museum itself which would have specialist experience. She suggested it was a project that should appeal to the museum.

Mr SPEHR pointed out that the organisers would need to be a recognised institution so that lenders would feel happy about supplying material.

For the pre-cinema, Mr FRANCIS hoped it would be a longer exhibition, for say 3 to 6 months, so it was a more continuing monument to the Anniversary. Although he recognised it was necessary to involve an institution, he felt it was essential for the individual in charge to be directly responsible to and paid for by FIAF.

For the posters, he felt it was much more of a collaborative venture of FIAF archives and could be managed by a group drawn from FIAF, working in association with the exhibiting museum.

Mr SPEHR asked about the mechanics of selection: would there be a travelling budget for the curator? he shouldn't rely on the uncoordinated judgment of individual archives and he certainly wouldn't be able to select on the basis of written descriptions.

There was some discussion as to whether an art historian, as suggested by Mrs WIBOM, was essential for the posters exhibition. Mrs ORBANZ cited their experience of mounting a special effects exhibition and thought a designer was more important, ie someone who can plan how to present what had been chosen by the subject specialist. Mr FRANCIS agreed with Mrs WIBOM that the posters should be put in a social, cultural and political perspective: he felt it was more important to choose someone on the basis of what was to be achieved than on formal qualifications. He suggested the first priority was for the coordinator (in this case, perhaps Mrs Snapes together with Mrs WIBOM) to visit the museum to see where the exhibition would be and meet the museum officials they would need to work with. Mrs WIBOM mentioned she had personal contacts with several museums but felt it was essential to work through Mr Schmitt as he was the chosen coordinator.

Decisions :

Exhibition Coordinators for EC (to act as "client" and ensure appropriate individuals and resources are assigned to the projects):

- pre-cinema Mr FRANCIS
- posters Michelle Snapes (Stills Librarian from BFI and French, suggested by Mr FRANCIS; BFI have just acquired the very fine poster collection of David Robinson)

Mrs WIBOM, Mr FRANCIS and Mrs Snapes to visit Mr SCHMITT to make contacts and visit possible locations.

Budget

Regarding the total budget, Mr CINCOTTI estimated that, at a rough calculation, he thought it would cost at least 10 million Belgian francs. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that not all the activities would need to be funded from the joint FIAF/CNC budget. At Stockholm, for instance, the National Gallery had funded most of the work for the poster exhibition and she expected the Paris Museums would take an interest in the same way, funding it from their regular exhibition budgets.

It was agreed that it would be useful in addition to seek commercial sponsorship for the exhibitions and perhaps other activities.

Mr BORDE pointed out that budgeting would be provisional, with various options, until decisions on exhibitions, etc, had been taken.

Decision : Budget Coordinator for EC: Mr BORDE (ex officio)

FIAF Posters

Mr DE VAAL asked if it had been agreed to have a special poster for FIAF's 50th Anniversary designed by a famous artist; he recalled that for a Congress in Venice everyone received a poster designed by Chagall.

Suggestions included Fellini, an animation film designer (funded perhaps by the Czech or Hungarian archive, the Canadian Office National du Cinéma or Richard Williams. Mr DE VAAL pointed out that there would also be additional posters for the Exhibitions.

Decision : No coordinator appointed

FIAF directory ("bottin")

Decisions : Mrs VAN DER ELST to coordinate

Mr BORDE to provide 7-8 pages on the history of FIAF

Mr DAUDELIN to prepare the questionnaire

Symposium

Decision : Mr BORDE to coordinate in association with French archives.

Travelling programme

There was an extended discussion on the nature of the travelling programme: whether it should be restricted to showing in archives, to reduce copyright problems, or to a wider audience to attract greater publicity for FIAF's work.

Mr DE VAAL pointed out that, even though Moscow had offered to make prints, archives would not want to send them the negatives. Mrs BOWSER suggested that many archives could afford to make a feature film print themselves for such a prestigious "world tour"; the small archives could accept Moscow's offer and perhaps even have negatives made. Mr DE VAAL pointed to the increasing discoveries of tinted films but it was very expensive to make new copies.

Mr SPEHR suggested the archives could be asked to select for the programme one outstanding film they had preserved and indicate if they can supply a print: this would give archives flexibility in choosing which films and how many they would like to show as their own contribution to celebrating FIAF's anniversary.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that most countries had a Goethe Institute, French Institute and British Council: perhaps they could be approached to provide

the transport services which he felt was the most difficult part. At a later stage in the discussion, some people envisaged that these organisations might be asked to show the programmes as well as providing a transport service between archives.

Mrs WIBOM envisaged a travelling programme of say 10-15 films which should be coordinated by someone used to working in programming. Mr DE VAAL suggested they should not hurry to decide on the programme content as there would be new discoveries between 1985 and 1988. Mrs WIBOM felt the circulating programme should not be new discoveries but very well-known restored films representing the bulk of film history. It would be nice to have early colour films but the audience aimed at were not film specialists and would not realise how special they were.

Mr DE VAAL stressed that if the travelling programme was to be shown in the archives, it should be unique in some way, to distinguish it from the regular programmes.

Mrs BOWSER mentioned that their Programming Officer was very keen on the idea of a travelling programme based on one representative and beautifully restored film from each archive. She and Mr SPEHR mentioned similar programmes on a smaller scale prepared already by MM DAUDELIN and KULA.

Mr NAIR was certain that most of the FIAF archives would already be planning their own celebrations of the Anniversary: he felt the important point was to make a larger audience, outside the regular archive clientele, aware of FIAF's contribution. He would therefore like to see showings in the public commercial theatres.

In answer to Mr NAIR and Mr DE VAAL, Mrs ORBANZ felt a programme of restored films from as many archives as possible was in itself a sensation compared with traditional programmes with worn-out prints, scratches, poor sound, etc. For copyright reasons, it would be much simpler to restrict it to showing in the archives.

She mentioned that a FIAF 50th Anniversary Logo would be needed for the films in the travelling programme.

Decision :

Coordinator to be Mrs BOWSER (starting after her sabbatical);
Mr SCHOU volunteered to assist, drawing on 1986 Canberra experience.

Silent Film with live orchestra

Mr BORDE warned that this would be very expensive and would therefore be the project to abandon if there were budget problems (possibly \$40,000).

Mr DAUDELIN recalled that several films had been presented in this way recently and felt that the money could be found if only for a chamber orchestra; CNC were rich.

Decision : No coordinator nominated

International Film Festivals

Mr KLAUE recalled the proposal to make publicity for FIAF through active participation in Film Festivals (film showings, exhibitions, round table, press conferences, participation in jury).

Decisions : Coordinators were suggested as follows:

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Mrs ORBANZ | Berlin (retrospective on colour) |
| Mr SCHMITT | Cannes |
| Mr CINCOTTI | Venice |
| Mrs BOWSER | New York |
| Mr KLAUE | Leipzig; Karlovy Vary (with Mr Levy); Tashkent (with Mr Strotchkov) |
| Mrs WIBOM | FIAPF Festival Committee (meeting Paris, 11.85) |

Decision : No overall "1988" coordinator for FIAF was nominated.

4.4 1989 Lisbon and subsequent years

The Lisbon invitation had been accepted. Invitations, more or less firm, for subsequent years had been received from Cuba, Madrid, Mexico and Poona but no decisions were needed yet.

Mr DAUDELIN and Mrs ORBANZ recalled that, in considering invitations for future years, the EC should take into account the strategic factors listed by Mr KULA and the idea of preparing a 10-year plan to ensure a satisfactory regional balance. At the same time, FIAF should take into account the fact that many countries could not afford to support a Congress without assistance.

Action : Mrs ORBANZ and Mr DAUDELIN to prepare a working paper for discussion at the next Congress (see item 11.6).

5 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

5.1 New Candidates for Observership

5.1a Washington: Human Studies Film Archives, Smithsonian

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the dossier was complete and the archive itself seemed to be well-organised. It was in the Department of Anthropology of the Museum of Natural History, under the umbrella of the Smithsonian Institution. They only had about 100 completed films but had some 5 million metres of 16mm film and videotape representing more than 150 ethnographic filming projects.

Mrs BOWSER and Mr SPEHR warmly supported their candidature: they were serious professionals and well-known to the other FIAF archives through their participation in the American Archives Group. As a specialist archive, they were likely to want to remain Observers.

In response to two questions from Mr KLAUE, Mr SPEHR explained that the Smithsonian was a very diverse and scattered organisation. He didn't think there were any other departments with film collections so FIAF was unlikely to receive other applications from within the same institution. The departments within the Smithsonian, being so diverse, operated independently and he thought the Human Studies Film Archives would satisfy FIAF on the question of autonomy should they ever decide to apply for full membership.

Decision : Voting by show of hands: unanimous.

5.1b Lima: Cinemateca de Lima

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the dossier was incomplete. There was no formal act of foundation or statutes and rules; they were independent and very poor, with the staff being unpaid enthusiasts. They had no preservation activities and had been functioning primarily as a cineclub, using films from other sources, trying to make public opinion aware of their cultural heritage and the need to preserve it.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that he and Mrs VAN DER ELST had met them for the first time a year ago at the Latin American seminar and at that time he had not been convinced they would achieve very much. However, the documents showed they had a very clear concept of what they wanted to achieve and they now needed all the encouragement FIAF could give them. He had suggested they should apply for Unesco support (possibly for a fellowship to visit Uruguay the only other private archive in South

America) but he did not think they had done so. Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that becoming Observers within FIAF might help them to obtain support from their national authorities although it would be a long, hard struggle.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested that, even though they could not be accepted on the basis of the present dossier, they should be sent some FIAF publications, especially the Basic Manual, and encouraged to apply for Unesco support for the visit to Uruguay or to the next FIAF Summer School.

Decision : Candidature premature. Send encouraging letter and publications as above. Formally advise existing Observer in Lima.

5.1c Filmoteca Vaticana, Vatican City

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that the President of the Pontifical Commission, responsible for the Vatican archive had visited Mrs VAN DER ELST in Brussels and subsequently submitted an application to join, complete with comprehensive dossier. He regretted that, in spite of their proximity, he had not yet been able to meet them himself.

It was essentially a specialised archive, concerned uniquely with the Catholic Church. It was funded by the Holy See (The 1959 Act of Foundation in Latin was signed by Pope John 23) and had limited autonomy, similar to that of many member archives. They had provided a preliminary list of some 600 titles, mostly documentaries and newsreels on Papal visits, etc, which probably existed elsewhere; much of their material was still uncatalogued. Their prime reason for joining FIAF was their need for access to professional advice on preservation. They had plans to build new storage but he would probably offer them the use of his archive's own new facilities.

In the discussion, Mr FRANCIS expressed his concern at the number of specialised archives that were asking to join FIAF. He felt they would be making heavy demands on the national archives: they would start exercising their rights to seek material from other archives, but, being for the most part supranational, would be unable to offer any reciprocal possibilities. His own archive, for instance, had a lot of material that he knew would be of interest to such specialised archives but he had his own priorities and simply could not cope with ever-increasing demands for copies from these sorts of archives. He felt it might be important to put this on record in advance to avoid any misunderstandings or ill-feeling in the future.

Mrs BOWSER suggested Mr FRANCIS' concern was unwarranted: she felt the specialised archives were joining primarily for access to advice and

support on preservation of the material they had already, not to extend their collections via FIAF members. FIAF's main concern was preservation of the world's film heritage and she therefore welcomed organisations that were contributing to that mission, especially in specialist, supra-national domains, which the national archives were not able to cover in the same depth.

Mrs HARRISON mentioned that the services need not necessarily be only one way. The Library of Congress had recently acquired the anthropological films of Margaret Mead and the Smithsonian had been extremely helpful with advice on them.

Mr SPEHR appreciated the contrasting positions of both Mr FRANCIS and Mrs BOWSER but felt that, although one might be obliged because of practical resource limitations to limit the material one was able to supply to non-national archives, it was nevertheless important to welcome them to FIAF and encourage them in their serious work of collecting and preserving yet another part of the world's film heritage.

Mr CINCOTTI suggested one already had a precedent in the case of the Imperial War Museum which, while being specialist, was now a full Member of FIAF. In his proposals for amending the Statutes and Rules, he would be suggesting a separate category for Observers who would never qualify to become Members. Meanwhile, under the present Statutes and Rules, he considered that FIAF could not refuse admission to an archive that met all the specified requirements for admission.

Mrs WIBOM acknowledged Mr FRANCIS' concerns, but stressed that membership of FIAF did not oblige any member to make exchanges; it was the prerogative of each archive to decide on each individual case.

Transcriber's Note:

From the discussion here and later, there still seems to be some confusion over extent of rights:

- Do full Members have automatic rights to receive any films they request of
 - i other Members ?
 - ii Observers ?
- Or do they have the right to decide on each individual case ?
- Do Observers
 - i have no automatic right to receive films they request from Members ?
 - ii " " " " " " Observers ?
 - iii have the obligation to supply any film requested by a Member ? (who pays ?)

Mr BORDE agreed with Mrs BOWSER's reasons for supporting their candidature. To clarify his understanding of the present Statutes & Rules, he asked Mr CINCOTTI if one could expect the Vatican Archive, as a FIAF Observer, to respond to requests to loan films for a Catholic retrospective. Mr CINCOTTI indicated that it was not simply an "expectation" but a right that existed between all full Members, but not between Observers.

Mr FRANCIS made it clear that he was not against the Vatican archive in particular but simply warning of potential problems. The case of the Imperial War Museum was different as they had a statutory obligation to collect films in specified domains and his archive therefore automatically handed over anything that fell within them. The Human Studies Archive was also somewhat different as they were collecting material that might not find its way into any archive, whereas the Vatican collection seemed to be primarily copies that might exist elsewhere. He repeated his fear that the Vatican would be a "demanding" archive and, for political reasons, it would be difficult for him to refuse.

Mr DE VAAL suggested, in the light of the discussion, it might be necessary to consider redefining the rights of Observers. Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that he had already drafted text to discriminate between what might be called "permanent" Observers and those who were Candidate Members.

Decision: 10 in favour, 1 abstention.

5.2 Reconfirmation of Members

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that of the 8 Members due for reconfirmation, 3 had not replied: Frankfurt, Torino, Rio de Janeiro.

5.2.1 East Berlin: Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR

Mr CINCOTTI reported that a very complete dossier had been supplied and he recommended their reconfirmation.

Decision: Unanimously in favour.

5.2.2 Budapest: Magyar Filmintézet

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that there had been a modification of the Statutes to reflect their attachment to the Hungarian Film Institute, with the same individual cited as Director of the Archive and of the Institute, and a Head of the Archive reporting to him.

Mrs VAN DER ELST understood from the dossier that the Institute saw itself as the FIAF member rather than just the Archive. Mr FRANCIS mentioned that he had received the same impression from the Hungarian Minister of Culture who by chance had recently lunched with him in London; however he acknowledged that senior officials, like the Minister, might not necessarily be aware of the exact situation.

Mrs BOWSER mentioned that the Director, Mr Nemeskürty, had asked for her advice on who should attend the New York Congress; at the time she had

not known that Márta Luttor had been made Head of the Archive so her advice had not clarified the situation for them. It was suggested that Mr Nemeskürty himself would not qualify to attend, as although he was Director of the Institute and of the Archive, he was neither Head of the Archive itself, nor a responsible staff member of the archive.

Mrs VAN DER ELST felt the situation was similar to that of 6 years ago and there had simply been a name change; at that time, the EC had had a similar discussion and decided the situation was different from that of the British and Swedish Film Institutes.

Mr KLAUE thought there was no significant change and FIAF could not interfere, except perhaps in the letter of confirmation to stress that the Head of the Archive should be the person to attend FIAF activities, in accordance with our Article 23. In any case, Mr Nemeskürty was not interested in attending such meetings; he was a creative writer, film maker and historian and was in no way interested in administrative matters. It was clear however that he supported the archive and would ensure that they obtained appropriate support from the authorities.

Mr FRANCIS added that the Minister of Culture was also very interested in the film archive and was giving it a lot of support; he had in fact been surprised at the BFI situation, where the Institute was at the centre, with the Archive being just one among several activities; for the Minister, the archive was the central core. Mr LAURITZEN suggested the Hungarian arrangement had some similarity with the Norwegian Film Institute, which was also primarily an archive.

Decision : Unanimously in favour. The letter of re-confirmation to refer to Article 23 re participation in FIAF activities.

5.2.3 Madrid: Filmoteca Española

Mr CINCOTTI reported that this archive also had a change in statutes and was now one of 3 departments of the Instituto de la Cinematografía y de los Artes Audiovisuales, an autonomous organisation under the direction of the Minister of Culture with a Director-General.

Both he and Mr DAUDELIN reported they had differing reports from different people on the effect of the changes but in general it seemed to be an improvement, particularly from the financial point of view, even though on paper they might seem to have less autonomy.

Mr CINCOTTI felt these were examples of an inevitable trend as government authorities attempted to group and fund national audio-visual activities under one organisational umbrella. Mr BORDE agreed: ten years

ago, they had been fiercely concerned to defend archives' autonomy; now that archive work became increasingly expensive, especially for those with legal deposit responsibilities, it was inevitable that there should be an evolution whereby archives became part of state institutions. In France, for example, Bois d'Arcy was a department of the Ministry of Culture, but this did not prevent it from engaging in outstanding preservation work. It was unrealistic to insist on total autonomy.

Mr CINCOTTI stressed that, whatever was enshrined in official documents like Statutes and Rules, the degree of autonomy depended on individual situations. FIAF could not interfere internally but could only monitor an archive's autonomy in its relations with FIAF members and, if necessary, reconsider its position.

Decision : Unanimously in favour.

5.2.4 Oslo: Norsk Filminstitutt

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that the dossier was complete. Mrs VAN DER ELST congratulated them on submitting their Rules and Statutes in 3 languages: Norwegian, French and English.

Decision: Unanimously in favour.

5.2.5 Sofia: Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka

Mr CINCOTTI summarised the dossier and confirmed it was in order.

Decision: Unanimously in favour.

5.2.6 Frankfurt/Wiesbaden: Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde

Mr CINCOTTI reported that no documents had been received and Mrs VAN DER ELST added that it was probably a simple oversight as the secretary confirmed the documents had been prepared.

Decision: Await information.

5.2.7 Torino: Museo Nazionale del Cinema

Mr CINCOTTI reported that no documents had been received, perhaps because of recent changes : the archive had recently moved location and Mrs Prolo had officially retired as Director.

Decision: Await information.

5.2.8 Rio de Janeiro: Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna

Mr CINCOTTI reported that no information had been received. Mrs VAN DER

ELST had written in May pointing out that 3 years' subscriptions were still outstanding, but there had been no response. Mr DAUDELIN reported he had met Mr ALVES-NETTO recently and he had confirmed he would be sending the information immediately on his return. Apparently, he was still trying to find ways of paying the FIAF subscriptions, perhaps via a large lump sum covering several years to be sent by Embrafilme.

It was agreed that, although everyone appreciated their difficulties, FIAF had no choice but to state that they could not be reconfirmed and FIAF would have to invoke the suspension process.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed to write officially but at the same time would remind them of his own archive's offer to pay the subscriptions for them in exchange for copying of Italian films held in the Rio archive.

At the end of Day 3, Mr FRANCIS reported they had just received a cable from Mr ALVES-NETTO saying the archive was closed for rebuilding and regretting that reconfirmation papers could not be sent.

Decision : Mr CINCOTTI to write.

5.3 Reconfirmation of Observers

5.3.1 Alger: Cinémathèque Algérienne

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that Alger was not confirmed in New York because no Annual Report had been supplied. A very sketchy two-page Report had now been received.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested that in the reconfirmation letter, they should be asked to submit future Reports on time and try to make them more informative for their colleagues in FIAF. In particular, there was no word on preservation which should be their major priority. Mr BORDE suggested that, in the acquisitions information, they should at least distinguish between feature films and shorts.

Decision: Unanimously in favour, subject to letter making points above.

5.4 Other Membership Questions

5.4.1 Members due for Reconfirmation

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that, in addition to the 3 Members not discussed in London, the next members due for Reconfirmation were:

Bucharest, Canberra, Wien (2), Montréal, Helsinki, Berlin (West)

5.4.2 Bogota: Fundacion Cinemateca Colombiana (Observer)

Mr CINCOTTI reported for the record that on June 14 the above archive had formally resigned from FIAF, expressing their regret that this was necessary for financial reasons. The membership had already been informed.

Mr CINCOTTI pointed out an anomaly in the Statutes and Rules which indicated that one could not resign without fulfilling outstanding obligations to FIAF and its members: in this case, they were resigning because they could not fulfill their obligation to pay their subscription; if they could fulfill the obligation, then they would not need to resign.

Action: Add to list of required Rule changes.

5.4.3 Tehran: Film-Khane-Ye Melli-E Iran

Mr KLAUE reported that the Secretariat had received a cable from them in June complaining that they had wasted their time in Switzerland trying to obtain visas to attend the New York Congress in April. They blamed FIAF for not ensuring that the host archive's State Department would issue visas to all participants, and for not informing those archives that would be refused. They asked FIAF to take action against the host archive for breaking FIAF Rules.

Mr KLAUE had pointed out in his reply that neither FIAF nor the host archive could be expected to help if they were not informed that help was needed. In spite of advice from the host archive, they had not even applied for their visas until a week in advance, knowing there was no US embassy in their own country.

Their reply had been more restrained than the original cable. However, they added a further complaint that their case was not mentioned in the "Variety" report on FIAF's official protest that the North Koreans had been refused visas.

Mr KLAUE suggested that Mr CINCOTTI, as the new Secretary-General, should write again, pointing out that FIAF had done the utmost considering the very short notice and reminding them once more to follow the advice of the host archive if they wanted to go to Canberra.

Finally, Mr CINCOTTI reported another curious letter from the Tehran archive, dated June 22, asking for the names and addresses of organisations which had the royalty rights for a list of classic films they wanted. He would suggest they make contact direct, not via FIAF.

Decision: Mr CINCOTTI to write two separate letters.

5.4.4 Cairo: Al-Archive Al-Kawmy Lil-Film

Mr KLAUE reported that he visited them in 1973 and again in September of this year. They were still in a poor situation, through lack of funds and government support, and there had been very little development.

In discussing how FIAF might assist them, he had suggested FIAF could help them draft an application to Unesco for a visiting expert as an outsider might help them achieve more than they had been able to on their own. He had also had meetings with a group of 30 journalists and the Minister of Culture to try and help get support. The journalists were aware of the importance of the archive but were critical of the activity of FIAF's Observer: they expected them to be doing more to preserve the national film production, which was the largest archive in the Arab world and had the longest history.

Another suggestion was that it might be useful to have an EC meeting in Cairo to attract more public attention to the needs of the archive.

5.4.5 Dublin

Mr FRANCIS reported that Mrs Ruth Riddick, who had attended the congress in New York, was no longer associated with the Irish film campaign, but he had no further information.

5.4.6 Paris: Cinémathèque Française

Mr BORDE reported that they were developing under the guidance of a serious new Director, Mr Bernard Lartarjet, Mr Vincent Pinel, a competent technical specialist in charge of preservation and Mr Bernard Martinand in charge of programming and exchanges who previously had very little power. They were collaborating on exchanges every week.

Mr CINCOTTI reported they were cooperating on the restoration of a major silent French film, "Casanova" by Volkoff. Mr DE VAAL confirmed they had also been in contact a number of times and the situation was much improved; however, whenever he advised them, in accordance with Article 102, of his relations with Lille, they always asked why, so it seemed they still needed "education". Mr BORDE agreed and volunteered to remind them. In this connection, Mr CINCOTTI referred to the circular letter he had drafted to remind members of the importance of Article 102.

Mrs WIBOM reported difficulties she had over a Swedish retrospective in Paris they had been working on since the Stockholm Congress, including lack of reciprocity. In addition, she had the impression that the new staff were still not really aware of the problems of the past (with Mr Ledoux, herself and other archives) and were unwilling to investigate them.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the resolution of disputes was a bilateral issue but the archive had been warned repeatedly that they would need to be resolved before FIAF could accept them as full Members as there were members who would object very strongly.

Break for lunch

After the lunch break, Mrs WIBOM again asked for advice on how the situation could be resolved as it seemed unclear which archives still wanted action. It was suggested that the Cinémathèque Française could be encouraged to write to all archives who were FIAF members in 1960, asking them to put in writing their understanding of the position and any claims they wished to pursue.

Mrs BOWSER, Mr FRANCIS and Mr BORDE stated that they would not be pursuing claims themselves but recognised that other archives had outstanding grievances. Mr KLAUE listed the archives that had had complaints in the past: New York, London, Brussels, Berlin, Stockholm, Moscow, Eastman House.

Decision : Mrs WIBOM to suggest privately that they write a circular letter to the 1960 members.

5.4.7 Group of Francophone archives

In the course of the discussion on the Cinémathèque Française, Mr BORDE reported progress on the activities of the Francophone archives in preparing a comprehensive list of all existing French feature films. There were no plans to set up a formal organisation, it was simply a working group (comprising at present Montréal, Luxembourg, Lausanne, Bois d'Arcy, Cinémathèque Française, Toulouse, Cinémathèque Universitaire; Bruxelles claimed they could not join as Belgium was bi-lingual). They had met in June.

Starting with 1930-40, Toulouse was collating the lists of holdings of the 7 archives in order to identify which films appeared to be lost; they would then be sending the consolidated list to all FIAF members, in the hope that some missing items might be recovered. For the period 1919-29, Bois d'Arcy was starting from the existing Chirac catalogue.

5.4.8 Roma: Cineteca Nazionale

Mr CINCOTTI reported that they had had a "fantasy-documentary" film made of the construction of their new vaults and the importance of preservation. It was completed in June and had won several prizes at National and International Festivals of industrial films. He hoped to show it at Canberra and would prepare a note for the Bulletin.

6 AMENDMENT OF FIAF STATUTES & RULES

Mr CINCOTTI introduced the proposed changes which were available in French and English and made some additional verbal corrections.

One major objective had been to reconcile some mis-matches between the Statutes and Rules. He had prepared some modifications of the Statutes, which if accepted would require corresponding modification of the Rules.

The first major change he proposed was to redefine the categories of membership: Members, with a sub-category for Candidate Members, and Observers. The category "Observer" would be reserved for those organisations which had no aspirations or possibility to become full members. He further suggested that only Members and Observers should be considered "affiliates" of the Federation. By redefining "Observers" as a separate category, he felt it would be easier for the Federation to accept more organisations that were concerned with preservation but would never qualify as full Members.

The other changes were primarily administrative improvements. There were also some problems in reconciling the exact intentions of the French and English versions. He mentioned he had received a very useful document from Mr KLAUE and, although his draft Statutes had already been sent to Brussels, he had incorporated almost all the suggestions regarding the Rules. He had not incorporated any changes to the election procedures as he felt this needed further discussion first.

Mr CINCOTTI opened the discussion with mention of the difficulty of terminology: one could not logically be a "candidate" to be a "Candidate Member". Mr FRANCIS accepted the concept of the 3 types but was not happy with the term "candidate"; he recalled that "associate" was the obvious word in English but FIAF's previous use of the term might make it unacceptable. Mr CINCOTTI felt that "associate" did not match his concept of candidature.

Mrs BOWSER was opposed to the concept and felt it might be better if it was left not too closely defined. She felt when an archive first presented itself, it was not appropriate to make a final decision on their ultimate fate and it would be better left open. In addition, there ought to be distinctions between the categories in the privileges, the duties and the costs.

Mrs ORBANZ strongly supported Mrs BOWSER's views that the interpretation should be left more open. Mr KLAUE recalled that it had been decided to reduce from 3 to 2 categories before, in an attempt to

keep it flexible and not too precise. However, at that time they were not faced with so many specialised archives wanting to join. He appreciated Mr CINCOTTI's intentions but suggested a better solution would be to keep 2 categories but to define the Observer category more precisely, to indicate that Observer covers both possibilities: permanent Observers and candidate members.

Mr FRANCIS supported Mrs BOWSER's concept of retaining 2 categories but with the introduction of a staged development: Observers, Provisional Member, Member. One would enter only as an Observer and, after 2 years, might qualify as Provisional Member.

Mr NAIR felt it was important to clarify that everyone first joined as an Observer and how long they had to remain before progressing.

Mr BORDE recalled that in the past FIAF had had "correspondents" and "associates" and both had been discontinued; he agreed with Mrs BOWSER that the present situation was both flexible and pragmatic and worked very well. He also suggested that the new wording proposed implied that one could anyway pass from Observer to Member without passing via a Candidate Member stage so the new category was unnecessary.

From her experience as Executive Secretary, Mrs VAN DER ELST agreed with Mr BORDE and Mr KLAUE but felt it would be useful if the rights and obligations of Observers were more clearly defined.

Mrs WIBOM felt it might be more satisfactory to have more neutral terminology as for instance the Categories A, B and C used by Unesco.

Mr DAUDELIN thought it was regrettable that some archives, as for example Bois d'Arcy, remained Observers for years even though they were qualified to become full Members. He felt more thought should be given to defining the differences between the categories. Later, Mr NAIR felt FIAF should consider its stance when faced with archives that failed to apply for the next stage even though it was obvious they qualified.

As a result of the discussion, Mr CINCOTTI put forward an alternative proposal. At the moment, would-be Members had a provisional stage of at least 2 years as Observers; however, Observers had no provisional stage and were admitted straightaway. It might be preferable to have a two-year provisional stage, prior to being accepted as either Observer or Member, so that both sides could get to know each other better and review the situation, before considering a more permanent status.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the annual Reconfirmation Procedures for Observers were established to provide such a review.

Mrs BOWSER added another advantage of the present system: if archives were labelled "Candidate Members" it would be embarrassing if they were subsequently refused membership.

Mr FRANCIS felt Mr CINCOTTI's new proposal corresponded to his own ideas: everyone started as Observers; one would then pass to the next stage which would be either a permanent stage or a stage on the way to full Membership; only full Members could claim the exchange privileges. He didn't like the term "provisonal" or "candidate" for the second stage and again suggested "associate" as the most obvious English word.

Mrs ORBANZ could not understand why it was necessary to define the status of Observer more clearly. She appreciated Mr FRANCIS' concern at the increasing number of archives that would be entitled to claim films but could see no other reason.

The meeting adjourned for a tea break and more informal discussions

Mrs WIBOM resumed the meeting by asking for a show of hands on whether the EC wanted to stay with 2 categories or change to 3. Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that he was himself happy to retain the two categories, as long as there was an amendment so that, just as Members went through a pre-stage as Observers, the Observers too should go through some pre-stage before being accepted as Observers.

Mrs WIBOM agreed, saying it was unsatisfactory that an archive newly joining the Federation should have the same status as an archive like Bois d'Arcy which had been an Observer for 10 years. After an initial two years, they should be classified as perhaps B members (present Observers) or C members (present full Members).

Mrs ORBANZ felt it would be difficult to define. Mr KLAUE could see no reason to change; in the case of Bois d'Arcy, it had always been known that they stayed Observers for internal reasons.

Mr NAIR suggested it might be useful in the Reconfirmation Procedure to ask long-standing Observers why they were not applying to become full Members, in order to identify any problems they might have.

Mr SPEHR supported Mrs BOWSER's view of the advantage of the flexibility of the present system.

Mr BORDE explained that it was important to have this very flexible category of Observer in order to establish some FIAF presence in many of the countries of the Third World, in accordance with the intentions of the Unesco Recommendation. In this context, FIAF was happy to encourage

organisations, like University cineclubs for example, that were not yet real archives, but at least were interested in film as cultural heritage. Although Mr CINCOTTI pointed out that under his proposal, such organisations could still be welcomed within FIAF from the beginning and become Observers after two years, he saw no advantage in the proposed change.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that, the day before, they had already decided that the archive in Lima was not sufficiently developed to be admitted as an Observer. Mr CINCOTTI stressed that, under his proposal, they could have been accepted. Mr BORDE acknowledged that, if there had been no other archive in Peru, he would have wanted to take them in as Observers under the present system, as an embryo archive in a country that would otherwise have no FIAF presence. Mr BORDE feared however that Mr CINCOTTI's principle of welcoming almost any organisation initially could be damaging to FIAF's reputation.

It was finally decided to leave Article 3 unchanged, keeping 2 categories only.

Other changes

The EC then began a review of the detailed changes proposed by Mr CINCOTTI.

Article 1, para 2:

- a agreed to insert "collection";
it was felt "art" was adequate to express idea of "creativity of man" and one could remove ambiguities by saying "all" and "or": "...all film as art or historic document";
Mr FRANCIS suggested "record" was less specific than "document" in English.
- b no decision on choice between "conservation" and "preservation";
proposed text simplified by ending "relating to the above"
- c to extend ambitions in line with FIAF's maturity, changed to:
"to encourage in all countries the creation and development of film archives devoted to safeguarding cinematographic heritage, nationally and internationally, and to bring such organisations together;"
French prefer "patrimoine" for English "heritage"
- d to meet Mr CINCOTTI's stress on preservation and to eliminate reference to exchanges, which caused misunderstandings in the industry:
"to develop cooperation between its members and ensure the continued preservation and availability internationally of films and related material."

At this point, Mrs BOWSER, Mrs WIBOM and others suggested it would be better to discuss the wording in a sub-group, with Mr CINCOTTI being advised by a native English and native French speaker. Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested the sub-group could make use of the record of similar discussions held some five years ago. Mr FRANCIS suggested it would be helpful if Mr CINCOTTI could outline to the EC the intentions behind each of the suggested changes.

Mr FRANCIS asked if it were possible to combine the Statutes and Rules together as it was always confusing and time-consuming in discussions to have to refer to two places. Mr BORDE confirmed that, under French law, the Statutes had to be published in the Official Journal and made available to third parties but the Rules could remain private. Mrs BOWSER was under the impression that only the Statutes had the force of law so it was better to restrict them to a statement of principles. It was proposed that the Statutes could be restricted to simply 5 or 6 Articles, with all the detail in the Rules.

This, however, was not possible as Mr BORDE recalled that the Statutes of Associations had to include definitions of Members, the General Assembly, the offices, Executive Committee or any organisation of power, provisions for dissolution, modification of Statutes and finances. He suspected that there was not much one could delete as the original Statutes would have been prepared by Mr Langlois in accordance with the requirements of French law. However, the section on arbitration could be transferred to the Rules.

Mr CINCOTTI then began to summarise the other changes he had proposed:

- i he had extended the power of the EC in relation to Observers. As the EC already had the power to decide on their acceptance, he thought it was logical the EC should also decide on deletion, rather than referring to the GA.
- ii as agreed previously, non-submission of an Annual Report was an alternative ground for deletion, in addition to the existing non-payment of subscription; ie deletion can be for either not both.

At this point, Mrs BOWSER referred to Article 14g, duties of the GA, where "approve" had been changed to "decide", which was surrendering a EC privilege. This revealed disagreement over the interpretation of the words "approve" and "decide". Mrs BOWSER thought the GA had the right to "approve" or "disapprove" but not to "decide". Mr CINCOTTI felt there were two options: retain for the EC the right to decide in which case the EC had simply to communicate its decision to the GA; if, on the other hand, the GA had the right to "approve", that implied the right not to approve, in other words, to decide. He had recommended that : for the Observers the EC should decide; for Members, the EC should propose and the GA should decide. However, he was quite happy to have the EC make the decision for Members also and eliminate Article 14g.

Mr BORDE felt it was important in the interests of democracy that the GA should retain some powers. Mrs HARRISON suggested that "decide" introduced the right to discuss the issues whereas "approve" implied simply a yes/no decision on the EC's recommendation.

Mr NAIR asked how one should interpret a decision by the GA to reject the EC's proposals: was it a vote of non-confidence in the EC ? and if so, what would be the subsequent procedure ? Mr CINCOTTI stressed that the case of non-confidence did not arise because the EC in such circumstances would be "proposing" not "deciding".

Mr FRANCIS opened up the question of principle, referring both to Mr KLAUE's comment on IASA's restriction of the GA to 2 half-days and to their regrets that elections caused no changes on the EC. He felt that Mr CINCOTTI's proposals would encourage members to try to join the EC to have more power. He felt this would be a good idea as it would both reduce the time spent in GA and encourage people to want to be elected to the EC.

Arbitration : Mr CINCOTTI had also introduced some changes concerning the Arbitration arrangements, especially the idea of having a jury in a dispute between a member and the EC. The Jury would only be formed in disputes between members, concerning infractions of the Statutes and Rules.

Article 26: In response to Mrs BOWSER who asked why Statute modifications required the support of 10 instead of 5 members, Mr CINCOTTI said it simply reflected the original proportion, given the doubling in total numbers.

Time delays: Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that he had tended to extend the time available for certain tasks, to make them more realistic, especially in view of poor international postal services.

Rules: Mr CINCOTTI summarised the changes he proposed: most were consequential on changes in the Statutes; or designed to simplify requirements (eg description of material rather than list of all holdings); or to find more acceptable terminology ("briefing visit" rather than "inspection").

For practical reasons, he suggested the visit could be any time, not necessarily a special visit immediately before considering an archive for full Membership. He had amended the text to allow for the existence of more than one member per country.

In Article 19, he had suggested suspension should not be indefinite so, if no other decision was taken within two years, there would be automatic reinstatement.

Mr CINCOTTI had also removed references to Members as individuals rather than organisations, eg Article 26 amend to "delegate from another member"; Article 24 Statutes: remove reference to death of member.

Mr CINCOTTI then referred to some of the comments in the English text made by the translator:

Article 2g Rules: insert "copy of" its last yearly balance sheet

Article 5 Rules: proposals or recommendations ? decision or confirmation?

Article 8 Rules: only 1 visit is envisaged.

Article 42 Rules: he envisaged a limit to the total number of Honorary Members but invited comments on the actual number.

Reconfirmation

In the light of the decision not to have a provisional category, his proposal in Article 8 Statutes that Observers should be reconfirmed every 3 years instead of every year was withdrawn.

As numbers increased, however, it would be necessary to increase the time interval for reconfirmation of members, so that there is enough time for each case to be properly reviewed. Perhaps 6 or 8 years ? Mr FRANCIS would prefer to keep it at 5 years so that FIAF was kept informed of changes. Mr DAUDELIN felt the plans to simplify the reconfirmation procedure with a questionnaire would speed up the process. Mrs WIBOM suggested the Deputy Secretary-General could be given responsibility for Reconfirmation. Mr CINCOTTI suggested the problem was not simply the checking of the dossiers in advance but the discussion time in the EC itself. Mrs WIBOM felt that extended discussion in the EC was not necessary: they should delegate their responsibility to one or two of their members and, with the questionnaire approach, the dossiers themselves should be more manageable.

Mr FRANCIS stressed that, if one took the reconfirmation procedure seriously, then it should not be extended beyond 5 years, even though some members found it a nuisance to prepare the dossiers. In fact, he thought it was useful for the archive itself to have to take stock and perhaps use the occasion to re-negotiate its position with its own authorities.

Decision :

The Secretary-General to take fuller responsibility for reconfirmation, simply advising the EC of difficult cases.

Mr DAUDELIN to continue work on the draft questionnaire.

Article 61 d & 78 Rules: The proposal that accounts be approved 6-monthly, instead of quarterly, reflected the current practice.

Article 74 Rules: eliminate restriction on Executive Secretary's use of the Budget.

Article 77 Rules: extensions for subscription changed to coincide with the GA as there are no possible sanctions for non-payment by the end of the year.

Article 81 Rules: presently auditing within 4 months which means that in some cases the accounts will have to be approved in the GM of the second year following; amended in discussion to 2 months so that it will always be in time for the GA of the following year.

Article 82 + Rules on Commissions: proposes that President and members be named every 2 years instead of every year to give them time to complete projects. Mrs WIBOM thought 1 year was useful in the case of members not pulling their weight. Mr KLAUE felt the emphasis of Commission membership should be participation in specific projects; it should not be seen as an advisory role, involving simply attending the scheduled meetings. Some projects lasted more than 10 years, so he would not like to see a time limit. Mrs HARRISON mentioned one of their problems was to find members willing to serve. Mrs WIBOM felt it was important for the Presidents to have the right not to reconfirm members who were not satisfactory.

Mrs VAN DER ELST produced some recommendations prepared by the Commissions themselves some time ago, suggesting that article 84 should be amended so that the Chairmanship and membership of commissions should be reconsidered every two years by the Commissions and recommendations presented to the EC for approval.

Mr FRANCIS felt the Commissions should become more important and was not happy at the way they were represented at the EC: perhaps they could be the Reserve Members? This would enable their archive to pay for their presence and they could serve the need to stand in on voting. He was not happy with the existing situation where the presence of a Commission President depended on his archive's financial situation. Mr CINCOTTI was a bit concerned that this might make them even more permanent members than the rest of the EC which had to submit to re-election every 2 years; however he agreed that a way ought to be found to ensure their attendance at the EC meetings.

Mrs WIBOM said that she was concerned at the number of people involved at every EC meeting which was rather too large for an effective working group. She appreciated the presence of the Commission Presidents but pointed out their presence was not foreseen in the Statutes or Rules.

The discussion was completed on Day 3

Appointment of Working Party for Statutes & Rules

Mrs WIBOM reported that Mr CINCOTTI & Mr BORDE had agreed to meet in December or January to work on the text of the Statutes & Rules, in accordance with the discussions so far. She wanted to restrict the discussion that morning to the EC views on the composition of the EC and the election procedures.

Mrs BOWSER suggested there should be a native English speaker in the Working Party and recommended David Francis. It was suggested they should first prepare a French version and then Mr FRANCIS would join at the translation stage. Mr SPEHR mentioned a third stage when the EC or a sub-Committee should evaluate the proposed changes in a more considered way. Mr DAUDELIN suggested that Mr FRANCIS's contribution should not be confined to the translation stage: there were so many cultural differences between the Latins and Anglo-Saxons that it was important for both sides to contribute to the basic drafting.

Decision: Working group to consist of MM CINCOTTI, BORDE, FRANCIS and Mrs VAN DER ELST and supply 2-language proposals to the EC by February so they can be fully discussed in Canberra.

Article 17 : Elections

Mrs WIBOM started by saying it was embarrassing for all that they had spent some 4 hours on the elections in New York and ended with the same group of people serving as in the previous term. It was important to encourage new members to participate in the work of the Federation although it was encouraging that more were participating in the Commissions.

Concerning the EC itself, she regretted that with all the Commission Heads and Honorary Members there were some 20 people round the table which was not an efficient number for useful discussions: it took time to attract everyone's attention, it took time to arrive at decisions. She would like to see a delegation of tasks and responsibilities so that it was not necessary for everyone to study every question in detail.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested the members of the EC as well as the 3 officers should be restricted to 3 terms. Mr CINCOTTI preferred a partial rotation system whereby perhaps a third of the members stood down each time; there was simply a technical problem to start such a system.

Mrs WIBOM reverted to the question of the total number of people: at present there were 14 elected members (11 members, 3 reserve members), the 3 Commission Heads and, say, up to 3 Honorary Members.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was important to take into account the financial aspects: with a smaller Committee, FIAF could help finance the participation of the members and the Commission Heads to ensure attendance, instead of being dependent on the resources and good will of the archives of the serving members and of the host archive.

Mrs WIBOM asked if it would be feasible to invite the Reserve Members only if the regular members were unable to attend. Mrs ORBANZ disagreed as the Reserve Members needed background information which they would

lose by simply attending the odd meeting when their vote was needed. Mr KLAUE pointed out that on the practical level it would not work as, with the present meeting in London, they had not known in advance who would not be able to attend.

Mr FRANCIS was not enthusiastic about the Reserve system as it implied two classes of member; he would prefer all members to be full members but with not all necessary for a quorum. Mr LAURITZEN said the reserve system was common in Scandinavia and he thought it very practical.

Mr CINCOTTI wondered if one could have a smaller working group, perhaps the 3 officers and the 3 Vice Presidents, who would meet more often than the main EC to handle the daily affairs of the Federation. Mr KLAUE had suggested something similar some years previously and pointed out the good and bad sides: it created the idea of a small power group within the EC which was rather undemocratic; on the other hand, the number of operational decisions that have to be taken is increasing and one could often not wait for the next meeting of the EC as a decision was needed. This had meant in practice that he, as President, had had to take decisions on his own whereas he would have preferred to be able to discuss them with at least some of his colleagues. Mrs VAN DER ELST felt such an arrangement would help her in her work, even if contact was only by telephone. Mr CINCOTTI pointed out there was a risk that, for practical reasons, one would concentrate the functions among members drawn from the same geographical area. Mr FRANCIS suggested it should be an informal group, not specified in the Rules.

Mr FRANCIS pointed out that the cost of hosting an EC was significant. He suggested that as there were now many events to which archivists were invited, they could seek possibilities for the EC meeting to be held at the same time and be funded as part of that event.

Mrs WIBOM suggested the interim meetings of the small group should be held in Brussels so they could gain closer insight into the work of the Secretariat.

In response to a question from Mr NAIR on the composition of the informal group, Mrs WIBOM suggested it should consist of the 3 officers and 3 Vice-Presidents plus any one else whose presence they felt was necessary.

Reverting to the total number, it was generally agreed that 14 was too many. Mr DAUDELIN proposed a total of 11 with no reserve members. Mr DE VAAL objected that FIAF was becoming larger and more international and, with a smaller group, would not have a good representation. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that the task of the EC was not to be representative but to manage the affairs of the whole Federation. They could always invite

additional people if necessary. Mr DE VAAL felt one should envisage the possibility of a European-only EC being elected and the effect that would have; Mr DAUDELIN felt it was up to the GA members and, in recent years, they had become aware of the desirability of good regional representation.

Mrs BOWSER was generally in favour but there was a disadvantage that fewer people in the EC would mean fewer people in the GA who were well informed when it came to decision-making. Mrs WIBOM felt it was the responsibility of the EC to inform the GA adequately so they could make valid decisions.

Mrs WIBOM referred also to the burden on the archives hosting EC meetings, with the increasing number of people involved: the size of meeting rooms, the cost of extra simultaneous translation equipment, entertainment, etc. Mrs BOWSER agreed that such practical problems were considerable. However, she pointed out that there were only 14 people actively contributing to the discussion as the Honorary Members and Commission Heads were not normally active.

Mr FRANCIS felt that if there were no reserve members they would make more effort to ensure the participation of the full members, for example, with visas.

Mr KLAUE felt one should resolve the position of the Commission Heads; even if they were not considered part of the EC, they should put in the Rules that they should be invited to all EC meetings. Mr FRANCIS and others preferred to retain flexibility by not putting it in the Rules but acknowledged the force of Mr KLAUE's argument that as long as it was not in the Rules, it was not understood by their own archives as one of the obligations of office which meant it was often difficult for Commission Heads to attend. Mr CINCOTTI suggested the formula he had proposed, that the "Heads of Commissions must report to the EC", would be flexible enough to imply that their presence was obligatory whenever the EC required it. Mr SCHOU felt that could mean that the Report could be in writing; he added that he did not understand why his presence was needed as well as a written Report.

Mrs WIBOM felt it was a great strain for the Commission Heads to attend both EC meetings in addition to all their other work. It was natural they should be invited to the EC immediately before the Congress but that should be sufficient unless there was some emergency during the year. She asked the Commission Heads for their views.

Mr SCHOU said he managed to attend by scheduling the Preservation Commission meetings at the same time as the EC. He enjoyed attending the EC meetings and, although he felt it was not necessary for him to be present for all items, he welcomed the opportunity to meet informally

with the different members of the EC.

Mrs HARRISON confirmed that it was time-consuming and it was often difficult for her to get funding to attend the between-Congress meetings. However, she agreed with Mr SCHOU that it was extremely useful to have the continued contact.

Mrs ORBANZ felt it was important that they were present and their contribution on various points of the agenda was very useful.

Mr CINCOTTI felt their presence was very useful, if not essential but he did not see they could be considered as full voting Members of the EC as they were named by the EC itself, not elected by the GA.

Mrs BOWSER had always supported their presence as she considered the Commission work to be the real work of the Federation; if the work was to continue along the lines desired by the EC, it was important to be in constant personal contact with the Commissions.

Mr DE VAAL agreed that the heart of the Federation's activity was the work of the EC and the work of the 3 Commissions.

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled that Guidelines already existed for the work of the Commissions and their communications with the EC.

Mr KLAUE raised two problems concerning representation on the EC:

- i in a recent discussion he had had with a very large archive which was a long-standing member of FIAF, it had been suggested to him that members of the EC should be elected as representatives of archives rather than in their personal capacity. He had been asked to put this forward for discussion at the EC.
- ii he felt that, with its increasing size, FIAF had to recognise that centralisation presented problems, especially for the small, poor archives in developing countries, who could not find the resources to attend "world" meetings and participate in the activities of the Federation. Perhaps regional representation on the EC was not the answer but FIAF should nevertheless recognise the need for closer cooperation of archives on a regional level.

On (i), Mr LAURITZEN felt it would be dangerous to change; as an example, they would have lost the participation of Mrs BOWSER during her sabbatical. Mr NAIR felt one should take both factors into account, the individual and the work of the archive concerned. He added that the Commission Heads should be ex officio members but it was pointed out that they were not voting members. Mr CINCOTTI agreed with Mr LAURITZEN and mentioned that such a change, which would allow the

archives to nominate non-elected individuals to attend the EC, would overthrow the democratic concept of voting for individuals; in addition, there was the possibility that people thus nominated would be bureaucrats who were not technically familiar with archive work.

Decision on (i): There was general consensus that the present system of personal representation should be retained.

On the question of regional representation, Mrs WIBOM pointed out that many informal groups of archives had already been established: the Latin American archives, the North American archives and the French-speaking archives.

Mr KLAUE suggested FIAF should examine whether it might be easier for archives to join a Regional organisation rather than coming to world-wide FIAF events. He acknowledged the formation of these informal groups but asked whether FIAF wanted to play a more official role in supporting them, perhaps providing a coordinator. Help was not needed for the groups mentioned, nor the Scandinavian or Socialist countries, but in regions like Asia he felt the groups would not be formed without some impetus from outside.

Mr FRANCIS suggested as a small step the placing of EC meetings in such regions, with an additional "open" day devoted to the problems of interest to archives in the region. This would obviously have a cost implication as such archives would not be able to fund the EC meetings without FIAF help.

Mr SPEHR felt that formal regional representation in the EC was not particularly desirable. He felt it would be more practical to have a nominating committee charged by the EC with ensuring that there were suitable candidates from all regions. Mrs BOWSER agreed that this should be the function of the proposed election committee. Mrs WIBOM suggested the Working Group should be charged with finding a formula for discussion at the next meeting. Mr KLAUE agreed to supply Mr CINCOTTI with the IASA documents although he felt their solution wasn't very satisfactory.

Decisions on (ii): Regional representation on the EC informally only. EC members to consider other ways of supporting archives in developing regions and bring ideas to Canberra.

Working Group to find formula for including election committee in Statutes & Rules.

Break for coffee

7 REPORT ON PREPARATIONS FOR THE CANBERRA CONGRESS

(This item was discussed after item 8)

Mr SCHOU first read Mr Edmondson's letter of 19 September to Mrs WIBOM, as President, in which he regretted his unavoidable absence from the meeting in London and then reviewed the written progress report, dated October 1985.

Mrs WIBOM asked if it was possible for those not attending the symposia to view some recent Australian films: Mr SCHOU agreed to investigate the possibilities.

The second EC meeting was scheduled during an extended lunch break, 12-2, on Friday, April 18, the second of the 3 Symposium days. They could manage in a separate room, with tape recording but without interpreting equipment.

On translation facilities, he added that a Russian interpreter would also be available. They expected no visa problems as long as applications were in at least 2 months in advance: Mrs WIBOM suggested "3 months" should be put in the next Newsletter. Mrs VAN DER ELST recommended their form should include an option "I/We will NOT attend" to make it easier to calculate numbers in advance.

Seminar for developing archives

Unfortunately there would now be no direct funding from Unesco. The NFSA had therefore budgeted an extra A\$33,000 and hoped to bring some 6 - 8 participants from countries like Papua New Guinea, Thailand, Fiji and Indonesia. They would welcome advice from EC members who had been on missions to suggest suitable candidates. Mr FRANCIS recalled he had supplied a list at the end of his Mission Report.

Mr KLAUE suggested it might be possible for one or two participants to apply for fellowships via their own national commissions as this would come from a separate Unesco budget.

Mrs WIBOM said that people in Unesco claimed they had received no application from Australia for the seminar but Mr SCHOU indicated he had a tape recording of a conversation with Mr Arnaldo, mentioning amounts up to \$40,000, and they also had a formal acknowledgement from the Unesco Paris office of their written application.

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled that there was money in the FIAF budget for Summer School Fellowship training and it was agreed that this could be used for one candidate (the 100,000 Belgian francs available was equivalent to the return air fare).

Budget

In addition to the A\$33,000 for the Seminar for developing archives, the Archive had budgeted A\$86,000 for the Congress and symposia, including the FIAF contribution of A\$11,000 (450,000 Belgian francs).

In response to Mr KLAUE, Mr SCHOU explained that they were seeking commercial sponsorship and there were some organisations, like tobacco companies, that the government disapproved of as sponsors. The phrase "acceptance of sponsorship will be subject to EC approval" was simply to give the EC a similar option to veto any sponsors they were unhappy about.

They had 13 applications so far for a share of the A\$20,000 travel subsidy but were advised to set some aside for late applicants and keep a political balance. It was suggested that the Secretariat should purchase the tickets as they would be cheaper if bought in Europe than in Australia. Internal flights in Australia were quite expensive (Sydney-Canberra return A\$170) so they should try to get them added to the international flight. There were special package tours to the other capital cities.

The EC formally approved the proposed Visitors' Fees. In response to Mr CINCOTTI, Mr SCHOU said they had made no provision to make charges for accompanying spouses. Mrs WIBOM asked the EC to consider this point of principle as it was a heavy burden for the host archive. Mr FRANCIS and Mrs BOWSER agreed that it was becoming a serious problem, not just for special events, transport, etc. but for the regular meals. It was suggested that for Canberra and for all future events, there should be a fixed spouse fee, known in advance. In response to Mr FRANCIS, Mr SCHOU said that estimates for catering had been based on 100 participants; Mrs BOWSER confirmed the New York figure was very close to this.

Symposia

Mr SCHOU and Mrs HARRISON reported on the provisional plans for the Computer Applications Symposium. The NFSA would be paying for one contributor to attend and they had agreed this should be Roger Smither who would be giving the keynote address; the participation of the others would depend on the availability of funding. Mrs BOWSER regretted that the Museum could not fund Jon Gartenberg; Mr FRANCIS had not been approached re Roger Holman but thought it would be very unlikely. Mrs HARRISON said they hoped the computer manufacturers might be interested to help.

On the question of funding, Mrs HARRISON had been asked by her boss to try to arrange that Commission meetings coincided with the annual Congress so that there would only be one trip to fund. At present she had no funds to go to Canberra herself although Mrs Baylis had offered her personal hospitality.

Regarding the Film Restoration Symposium, they were hoping to work on a catalogue of restored/reconstructed films but needed first to agree on some definitions. Mrs BOWSER suggested they should consult film historians as well as technicians. Mr SCHOU agreed and added that the Goethe Institute had already agreed to pay for Mr Patalas' travel to Canberra.

8 REPORTS OF THE SPECIALISED COMMISSIONS

8.1 Documentation Commission

Mr Michael Moulds, Editor of PIP, reported on behalf of Mrs Staykova who regretted she was unable to attend.

FIAF Classification scheme (point 3)

He reported drafts of all sections were ready and this was close to a final stage. He would be having a final meeting in January with Karen Jones. The Users' version would be done first, in looseleaf for easy amendments; they hoped Aslib would again publish the printed version.

PIP (point 1)

The day to day work was continuing normally except for a cash flow problem. The new distributor for the Annual Volumes could not easily cope with the American market which had been badly neglected by the AFI; they were however trying to bring up to date the standing order list so that the next volume could be distributed without problems.

The income from annual volumes was low because of the lack of sales in the US market but before the end of the year they hoped to add more sales of the Film volume in the US, the TV volume in the UK & US and the 1984 Film volume.

M. CINCOTTI asked how many copies were printed and sold. In the UK, sales are roughly 250, in the US probably more than 300; nearly all being standing orders as very few single copies were sold.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked for a report on the publicity for PIP and FIAF, as it seemed in particular that no-one was aware of the existence of the last 3 FIAF publications. There had been no "organised" mailing this year but over the last two years they had collected some 200 additional addresses which had been sent the leaflet mentioning the new publications.

The new FIAF leaflet and price list had not yet been distributed to the full mailing list. Mr FRANCIS mentioned in particular that someone from INA

had not received information; Mr MOULDS pointed out they were a very fragmented organisation and it was difficult to identify the right person.

Office location & computing needs

PIP let an office to an organisation called Infodoc who in turn allow PIP to use their computer. Unfortunately, at the end of 1985, Infodoc were due to move out of town which would mean it would no longer be practical to use their computer. (Much time would be lost in travelling; and, because they would be working away from their own office, they would not be able to check back on previous records or do anything else while waiting for the printer to produce proofs.)

He was proposing to the Documentation Commission that they should obtain an electronic typewriter so there would be no interruption of service. One advantage would be better quality printing.

Mrs BOWSER asked if it was possible to accept Infodoc's invitation to move with them but he said it was too small. Mr FRANCIS added that the present accommodation was comparatively cheap and, unless there was a huge increase in 12 months' time, he thought it would probably be worth staying.

In response to Mrs VAN DER ELST, he said it would be a great help if they could have their own personal computer. He added that he had become aware that under the Infodoc arrangement, they were not in fact getting the full advantages of using a computer: for instance, they had to produce the indexes instead of having them generated automatically by the software. They could get a very good system going for an initial cost of £7-8,000 with annual operational costs of about £1,000. The hardware cost was quite high because they would need 10 megabyte storage. He had a quote of £5,600 for hardware plus consultancy at £250 per day.

He had not considered making a formal request for such a level of funding but Mrs WIBOM suggested the EC should consider such a request. In response to Mr SPEHR, Mr MOULDS reported that the subscribers would not see a major difference in the product they received, except that it was likely that with computer-generated indexing there would be more indexing. Operationally it would also be more satisfactory as the 2 1/2 people engaged on the project could all learn to use the computer instead of being restricted to the one person allowed access to the Infodoc machine.

Mr BORDE asked for confirmation that the present FIAF loan of £2,000 could be refunded by the end of 1985 as scheduled. Mr MOULDS said they expected to be able to refund it with the sales of the 1983 or, if not, the 1984 volume at the end of the year.

Mr KLAUE suggested the Documentation Commission should discuss the question at their next meeting to be held in November. There would be a break in the service if a decision was postponed until the Canberra EC meeting so it was suggested that this would be an appropriate decision for the "inner" EC to take. Mr FRANCIS warned that it might take 3 to 6 months from the decision in order to get a new system working.

Supporters

Mrs WIBOM then referred to a letter from Mrs STAYKOVA to the PIP Supporters, concerning the continued funding of the project after 1986. Mrs ORBANZ thought it was a matter for the Supporters to discuss together in Canberra. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that unless the Supporters were willing to continue their support, it would be difficult to continue with the project and therefore inappropriate to consider purchasing a computer. Mr CINCOTTI confirmed his long-held position that the PIP was an essential FIAF project that should be continued at any price. Mrs WIBOM and Mrs BOWSER confirmed that they would be continuing their support.

Decision: Mrs VAN DER ELST to call Mrs STAYKOVA to agree procedure to ensure Supporters' replies were received in time for November meeting of Documentation Commission and discussion of purchase of computer.

New member: Mrs Snapes

Mr CINCOTTI referred to a formal request to the EC from Mrs STAYKOVA that Mrs Michelle Snapes be accepted as a member of the Commission, mentioning this was warmly supported by Karen Jones, Mr Moulds, Mrs Thorpe and Mr Spiess. Mr FRANCIS had not known of the request but assumed that Mrs Snapes would be funding her participation from her budget in the Information Division of the BFI. There was some thought that the Commission was getting rather large but Mr KLAUE felt the EC should leave that decision to the Commission as it was their responsibility to work within their Budget. Mrs BOWSER added that she had already been working for some time as an expert adviser and deserved formal recognition of her services to the Commission.

Decision: Approval subject to confirmation that her participation would be funded by her own Division in BFI, not the NFA.

Mr NAIR asked what possibilities there were of increasing the number of PIP supporters from the present total of 16. Mr BORDE asked if the socialist countries should still receive PIP for free, as the original concession had been made some 15 years ago when they had problems finding hard currency. Mr MOULDS explained that the socialist countries which did not have microfiche readers received a free annual volume

the provisional title "FIAF Cataloguing Rules"; Mr CINCOTTI suggested "FIAF Moving Image Cataloguing Rules" would be more appropriate.

Next Commission Meetings & Budget

Mrs HARRISON closed by thanking Mr DE VAAL for offering to provide a meeting place for the next meeting in March 1986. The staying costs would however have to be met from the FIAF budget. If there was any money left over, it would be used to finance her trip to Canberra as the archive, which had been able to fund her trip to London, could not also fund the trip to Canberra in addition to Mr SPEHR.

In the discussion, Mr DE VAAL regretted that he could not find the money to host the Commission although they were trying to find the funds to host the EC.

Meeting with Head of BFI Publications

At this point, Mr FRANCIS introduced Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, Head of BFI Publications, who had at short notice agreed to join the EC for a short discussion on publications and lunch. He distributed copies of their two catalogues.

The BFI acted as a commercial book publisher but also as suppliers of non-commercial scholarly documentation which they supplied primarily through their mailing lists. He regretted that through an oversight they had not yet implemented a plan to ensure that all FIAF members received their documentation and information on books which could be obtained at a discount.

They shared with other organisations the problems of making known the availability of their products, both in the UK and internationally. Even in the UK they had found it difficult to build up a mailing list of relevant individuals in relevant institutions. Internationally, it was even more difficult but he was willing to discuss the possibility of pooling resources.

In response to Mrs WIBOM's question about estimates of market size, he said their own guideline was that they could sell 500 copies of anything but they were always trying to extend their mailing lists to extend the core of regular buyers. They had made no systematic analysis of the percentage response to mailshots. They were willing to sell to bookshops worldwide and already had successful arrangements in W Europe and Scandinavia; they were currently negotiating with Collet's to enable them to sell more widely into E Europe. Normally, however, specialist books were sold by mailing list rather than through the book trade. Their US distributor tried to get books reviewed in "Choice". However the BFI could not afford distributor discounts for the more scholarly publications and catalogues and had not sent copies direct for review in the US Library Journals. Mr SPEHR recommended the bibliographic databases like the US OCLC; at present, they used the British Library Cataloguing System and recognised they ought to be on the Library of Congress system but did not qualify, as they did not publish in the US.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned they had been fairly successful in advertising a mail order service in specialist film magazines. Mr NOWELL-SMITH said they had tried this occasionally with Screen and Sight & Sound with uneven success; the main volume of sales came from their regular mailing list.

In response to Mr NAIR who asked if they had links with specialist English-language publishers in other countries, he mentioned "amicable agreements" with publishers in Australia, Canada and the USA; an arrangement with a distributor in India had not worked but they were considering an exchange relationship with another. Mr NAIR suggested they could usefully work with Seagull.

To help Mrs VAN DER ELST compile a mailing list, Mr NOWELL-SMITH said he knew of no international film list that was available for sale, but the circulation list of a specialist magazine, like "International Collector", might be useful. They had found it quite useful to advertise in Sight & Sound, although they were able to negotiate a special rate. The choice of payment arrangements and acceptable currencies was important: £, dollars and Swiss francs were the best.

Mrs WIBOM formally thanked Mr NOWELL-SMITH and the discussion continued over lunch. At lunch, the EC was also joined by Roger Whitney, BFI Documentation Officer, and Frances Thorpe.

8.3 Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU reported they had been fortunate enough to have two meetings in two months: 4 days each, after the New York Congress and before the London EC meeting.

1 Membership & Participation

i He asked the EC for formal approval to take Mr Joao Socrates de Oliveira on to the Preservation Commission so that South America would be represented.

Decision : Unanimous approval.

ii He was going to spend one week with Gosfilmofond in Moscow to try to recruit someone to join the E European Sub-Commission or the main Commission (depending on the language needs of the individual).

iii Whenever possible, they were inviting visitors to attend the Commission meetings to get some feedback from other specialists.

2 Progress Reports

Of the 25 Commission projects, he commented on those described in his written report on which some progress had been made.

In connection with the Technical Manual, they wanted the papers to be available wherever possible in English, French, German and Spanish but had no budget left for translation (50 pages by Harold Brown, 25 by Hans Karnstädt).

It was felt that Unesco would not fund such a project but money could be found in the FIAF Special Publications budget for important preservation documents which needed wide circulation. Mrs VAN DER ELST asked if someone working in a French-speaking archive could be found to do the translation as ideally one should always translate into one's native tongue. If no alternative could be found, Jill Johnson was willing to make the initial translation into French of Mr Brown's paper which Franz Schmitt could then edit for technical terminology and accuracy. Mr SCHOU reported that Mr Gonzales Casanova had offered to take care of the translations into Spanish but he was not sure how long it would take.

As Chairman of the Commission, he paid tribute to the members for the impressive contributions they had been making.

Re 2.6, he added that Kodak were willing to supply B&W duplicating emulsions on polyester base subject to a minimum of only 38,000 feet and had not mentioned any price increase. Mr SPEHR reported that they had been trying for years to obtain polyester base material; they had been told dupe negative stock could not be provided at all and, when they got the fine grain stock, they had to return it all. In processing, they found they had to have cores of at least 3" diameter to stop it fixing itself. Mr SCHOU acknowledged that this was a problem but they wanted to test the material further to see if it could be used.

Re 2.7, the 2000 tests referred to had already been carried out by a University team located by the Czech film archive. Mr SCHOU had met Klaus Hendrix (?) working in Ottawa where they had successfully used fumigation without adverse effects.

Re 2.9, the educational film on the burning of cellulose nitrate films was almost complete and they all sympathised with Mr Schmitt that, with their own recent fire, he would now have more footage to add to the compilation.

Re 2.10, he reported there had been some misunderstanding regarding unauthorised expenditure in Vienna on a Preservation Commission logo and stationery. He had taken steps to ensure nothing similar would happen again.

He closed his report with renewed thanks to Mrs BOWSER and Mr FRANCIS for arranging meetings in New York and London, to Mr KLAUE for his invitation to Berlin in October/November 1986, and paid tribute to Mr Paul de Burgh for his work on the test charts for the multiple printing tests.

Mrs WIBOM thanked him warmly for his report and the work of the Preservation Commission.

Mr KLAUE suggested that the other Commissions should not be encouraged to produce their own logo. Mr SCHOU explained that for the many films, videotapes and slide shows they planned it was necessary to have a visual image that could be associated with FIAF and its preservation activities. In response to Mr NAIR, he explained that the existing FIAF logo did not register very well on film.

9 PROJECTS & PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

9.1 Embryo 3 (New York)

Mrs BOWSER reported that Ron Moaglioizzi, in charge of this project, had bought himself a hard disc home computer. In addition, he was doing some research himself and she was pleased that he was training himself to do research in early film history. Copies should be ready by early 1986.

9.2 Silent Films Catalogue (Brussels)

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the main body of the catalogue was complete except for France as no cards had been returned by Bois d'Arcy or the Cinémathèque Française. They had asked if the index could be done outside on a microcomputer as it would take so much time to do manually and the Belgian archive themselves had neither hardware nor budget. However, Mrs Coppens of the Belgian archive would be willing to do the work if FIAF could cover the cost.

Mrs Coppens was leaving the archive in mid-1986 and Mr Ledoux was keen that the work should be completed before her departure. There was some discussion, therefore, of what to do about the French contributions as the French archives kept saying they had no time or staff to work on this project (They were also behind with their indexing for PIP). Mr BORDE suggested they should be given a final deadline of 2 more months. Mr DAUDELIN repeated Mr Ledoux's concern that the survey would lose its value if the major French collections were missing.

Mr SPEHR reported that his archive had not made its returns yet as the original inquiry was sent to AFI and they finally received the request in August; it was a long job and he couldn't expect to deliver before January.

Decision: FIAF to cover the cost of computer indexing by Mrs Coppens. Mr BORDE will telephone Mr Schmitt to urge action.

9.3 Publication of Historical Symposium, Vienna (Dr Fritz)

Mrs ORBANZ reported that the proofs were currently being checked by the authors.

9.4 Annual Bibliography of FIAF members' publication

9.5 International bibliography of old cinematographic equipment

Nothing new to report on either project.

9.6 Revised edition of the "Handbook for Film Archives" (Mrs BOWSER/Mr KUIPER)

Mrs BOWSER reported she was still awaiting revisions from two of the Commissions. Mr SCHOU accepted a deadline of June 1, 1986.

9.7 Glossary of Laboratory Terms (Mr P SPEHR)

Madalene Matz is working on it in Washington and he should have something to pass to Mr SCHOU in Canberra (not December 1985 as previously intended).

9.8 FIAF Bulletin (Mr DE VAAL)

Mr DE VAAL reported they would be having a new cover from issue 31. He regretted that the Technical Column was still very poor and hoped for more contributions from the Preservation Commission. They were now getting news of the 40th and 50th Anniversaries of the Polish and Czech archives which he planned to leave unedited.

Mr LAURITZEN agreed to prepare some memories of FIAF's first 50 years for the Spring issue. Mr KLAUE reported that Mr Pogacic had already published his memories of FIAF in a Yugoslavian film review and suggested that Mrs VAN DER ELST should ask for copies so it can be translated for some future issue.

Mrs ORBANZ suggested it would be useful for their 50th Anniversary to have an index of the technical or historical articles in the Bulletin. Mr SCHOU said they were already searching back numbers for the Technical Manual.

Mr SPEHR suggested that for the Anniversary it might be worthwhile to microfilm the complete set, to form the history of the organisation over the years. Mr BORDE thought it might be particularly interesting to microfilm the first series, of the 1950's. Mrs WIBOM suggested that someone should investigate the cost and present as a possible project to the GA in Canberra.

Decision: The Secretariat to investigate.

9.9 List of 100 "Classic" Films (Secretariat)

Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed she had received a number of lists from Mr FRANCIS and had located the list prepared by Mr LAURITZEN and published with the Minutes of the Bucharest Congress.

Mrs BOWSER suggested that the Bulletin should be used to notify people that the lists existed and copies could be obtained on demand from the Secretariat. Special requests for such lists had already been received from the South Koreans, Bangladesh, Thai and some Latin American countries.

9.10 Statistics on film archives' activities (Mr W KLAUE/Mr S KULA)

Mr KLAUE would remind Mr KULA that he had promised to update the draft.

New Projects

9.11 Proceedings of New York Slapstick Symposium (Mrs BOWSER)

Mrs BOWSER had the tapes and reported that some of the speakers were updating their papers. She hoped to have it completed in 1986 as a small publication by the Secretariat. She would like to have included stills but thought this would make it too expensive.

9.12 Report on New York Technical Symposium (Mr SCHOU)

Mr SCHOU reported they had already produced a review which they would pass to the Secretariat for the Technical Column of the Bulletin.

9.13 Catalogue of Restored Films (MM Edmondson & Schou)

Mr SCHOU confirmed they would work on this after Canberra.

Unadopted Projects

9.14 FIAF ID Card

Mrs ORBANZ recalled this had been suggested in Open Forum but was not being pursued.

9.15 FIAF Award

Mrs ORBANZ recalled that there had been frequent talk of having a FIAF Medal to honour people although she personally was against the idea of medals. (Mr FRANCIS mentioned that his archive made attractive medals from silver retrieved from the laboratory)

She suggested it would be nice to dedicate a film restoration to someone FIAF wanted to honour. Mr CINCOTTI reported they had recently done something similar in Rome in honour of John Casavetes who had helped the archive and provided money for the restoration of one film: they had put a dedication to him at the beginning of the restored film. There was a practical difficulty inasmuch as it was an archive, and not FIAF itself, that did the restoration work but Mrs ORBANZ did not see this was a problem.

Action: None needed at present.

Item 10 & part of 11 were discussed out of sequence after item 5 in the afternoon of Day 2. Mr DE VAAL was absent from that session.

10 FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr BORDE opened by paying homage to his predecessor as Treasurer, Mr DE VAAL, who had transformed the somewhat "dramatic" financial situation of FIAF into something very much more healthy. He also paid tribute to Mrs VAN DER ELST for her efficient day-to-day management of the accounts.

10.1 1985 Accounts

Mr BORDE explained that the expenditure on the Congress and the Executive Committee had exceeded budget because of movement in the dollar. As there was a significant underspend on Special Missions, they had been able to pay Mr SCHOU's fare to visit Gosfilmofond on Preservation Commission business.

Subscription income was below budget primarily because of the three years' outstanding from Rio and Bucharest. Income from FIAF publications was significantly below budget, in spite of the allocation of 60,000 Bf to publicity.

10.2 PIP Accounts

As in previous years, the main concern was the failure to increase sales. In fact there had even been some cancellations from non-FIAF subscribers because of budget restrictions.

Mr DAUDELIN wondered if FIAF had in fact already reached its potential market but Mrs VAN DER ESLT felt there would be significant increase in sales, particularly of the 3 new publications from the Cataloguing Commission, if one could make them better known. Mr DAUDELIN thought it would be interesting to find out the estimated market size identified by specialist publishers in the field. He felt more books were being issued but many were not selling well. Mr FRANCIS volunteered to invite the BFI Publications Manager to join the meeting at lunchtime the next day to explore possible new approaches to promotion.

(Meeting reported after item 8.2)

Finally, Mr BORDE reported that they had loaned a sum of £2,000 to PIP, repayable by the end of the year, to assist with a cash flow problem.

11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Evaluation of Restoration Symposium

Mrs WIBOM warmly thanked Mr FRANCIS for organising the Symposium which they had found extremely interesting and useful.

Mr FRANCIS reported that the starting point was his belief that it was important to use the opportunity provided by the presence of the Preservation Commission and the Executive Committee to organise some event at which the 20 or so archivists gathered together should talk about some aspect of work in progress.

In this particular case, the topic was chosen because the public face of restoration was an active, current issue and there was a lot to report. He mentioned that the success depended entirely on the serious contributions made by the speakers and there was very little organisation involved. He suggested "symposium" was somewhat grand a word for what he had seen as an informal forum or exchange of experiences and views.

Mr SCHOU asked for views on what might be done in the "follow-up" Restoration Symposium in Canberra. Mrs BOWSER would like to see the emergence of a statement on the philosophy and ethics of film restoration, that could be published. Mr SPEHR supported this but thought it was necessary to have some position papers prepared in advance to bring out some live controversy in the discussions. In spite of Mr FRANCIS' encouragement, people had been reluctant to address the controversial issues confronting archives; for instance, the conflicts experienced by institutions where the public was seeking "glamorous" projects while there were many "non-glamorous" projects to attend to as well. Later in the discussion, he mentioned as another example a recording technician who wanted to clean up the sound track of "The Jazz Singer", so that it would no longer resemble anything that could have been produced at the time.

Mr BORDE thought it was interesting that film archives were only now addressing publicly the problems of the limits and the ethics of restoration, which were problems that had been addressed in architecture, painting and other arts, for many years. He thought it was very important to talk about it in Canberra.

Mr FRANCIS supported Mr SPEHR's point and wanted to stress that the archives should have the same rules for all their holdings, not just the "showpieces". Like Mrs BOWSER, he would like to see some publication emerge, perhaps a small booklet on the ethics of restoration with some attractive illustrations.

Mr FRANCIS then reverted to his opening comments, saying he would like something similar to happen on every occasion the EC met. It need only be something simple, perhaps half a day, with maybe only one person making a presentation about their current archive work. He liked the idea that one of the Commissions should be meeting at the same time as the EC so that there was more interaction between individuals in the Commissions and the EC and the "event" or "workshop" could be a joint occasion.

Mrs WIBOM thought the London event had been useful as a forerunner to the more formal Canberra Symposium.

Mr SCHOU recalled that when he had tried to give a more informative presentation at the General Assembly, he had been criticised for "trapping" the members to sit in on a technical presentation. Mr KLAUE pointed out that in that case it was too technical. At Canberra, he thought it important to separate the sessions covering the technical and the ethical aspects.

11.2 Next EC Meetings

Day 2 discussion

Mr DAUDELIN reported he had a message from Mr ALVES-NETTO confirming his invitation to host an EC meeting in November 1986, immediately before the Rio Festival. The airlines would be willing to offer reduced fares. He would however need an immediate decision.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that Mr DE VAAL had spoken of inviting the EC to Amsterdam as it was the year of his retirement.

Mr DAUDELIN raised the problem of timing. He felt late September had been a difficult time for several members. The Congress in 1987 was scheduled for May so they could meet in the previous December or even January 1987.

It was decided one could not accept the Rio invitation for 1986, because of the distance (in the same year as Canberra) and the possibility that they might at that time be suspended for "technical" non-payment of subscriptions.

Day 3

Mr DE VAAL hoped the EC would be able to come to Amsterdam in 1986 but could not issue an official invitation until his Board of Directors had met. It could be any time. Mr SPEHR pointed out that October was budget time for himself, Mr KULA and perhaps others, so the EC decided on November. Decisions: Accept Amsterdam and thank Rio, expressing hope that the EC might be invited there another year.

11.3 Next NGO meeting: 20/21 March 1986

It was agreed that Mr KLAUE should represent FIAF at the next NGO meeting in Paris in March 1986. This would be useful as he could also attend the joint planning meeting for the Berlin Congress being held in Paris at the same time.

11.4 50th Anniversary Planning

Mrs WIBOM suggested Mr Franz Schmitt should be invited to the second EC meeting in Canberra, as the host of the 1988 Congress.

11.5 Computer for FIAF

Mrs WIBOM suggested Mrs VAN DER ELST should be given formal authority to purchase the computer she decides is most suitable, seeking help as necessary.

It was already planned to use it for word processing, the Union Catalogue and the Unesco Survey.

11.6 Future Congresses

Mr CINCOTTI raised the question of scheduling future congresses as there had been a request from Madrid to organise the congress of 1992 to coincide with the 500th Anniversary of Christopher Columbus.

Mrs WIBOM reported that Mr DAUDELIN and Mrs ORBANZ had as promised prepared a suggested schedule to provide a good geographical balance:

| | | |
|------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1986 | Canberra | fixed |
| 1987 | Berlin | fixed |
| 1988 | Paris : 50th Anniversary | fixed |
| 1989 | Lisbon | invitation accepted |
| 1990 | Cuba | invitation received |
| 1991 | Central/Eastern Europe | |
| 1992 | India | invitation received |
| 1993 | Europe ? | |
| 1994 | North America | |
| 1995 | China or North Africa | |

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled there was also an open invitation outstanding from Mexico. Mr CINCOTTI asked if India could accept 1993 to allow Madrid to take 1992: Mr NAIR preferred 1990 as it was their Silver Jubilee but could take 1991.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the purpose of preparing an advance schedule was to encourage archives to submit invitations. In particular, it had been noted that no archive from the East had come forward in recent years.

Decision : Accept invitations for 1990-92 subject to GA approval. Revise schedule for presenting to GA in Canberra as follows:

| | | |
|------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1989 | Lisbon | invitation accepted |
| 1990 | Cuba | invitation received |
| 1991 | India | invitation received |
| 1992 | Madrid | invitation received |
| 1993 | North America | Mexico ?? |
| 1994 | Central/Eastern Europe | |
| 1995 | China/North Africa | |

Mrs WIBOM then formally closed the meeting with thanks to Mr FRANCIS for hosting the meeting so generously, to his staff for their help, to the technical staff, to Jill Johnson for interpreting and to all present for their contributions.

Mr FRANCIS reminded members that they could use their Gold Pass at any time to get free admission to National Film Theatre screenings.

EC members were invited to visit the PIP offices before reassembling for a farewell dinner.

Finally, he reported that in spite of repeated attempts during the meeting they had been unable to make contact with the Mexican archives following the recent earthquake. It was learnt subsequently that both archives were unharmed.

MINUTES

FIAT/FIAF Meeting, London, 2 October 1985

Present:

| | | |
|------|---|-------------------|
| FIAF | Executive Committee (see separate list) | |
| FIAT | Mrs Anne HANFORD | President |
| | Mr Fernando LABRADA | Secretary General |
| | Mr Philippe PONCIN | (INA, Paris) |

Mrs WIBOM began by formally welcoming the 3 representatives from FIAT, and invited Mrs HANFORD, as President of FIAT, to open the discussion.

Agenda

- F1 Unesco Survey
- F2 Joint Technical Symposium in Berlin
- F3 Stockholm Proceedings
- F4 Cooperation in other areas

F1 Unesco Survey

Mr KLAUE summarised the position to date. The Survey report was needed for the Round Table evaluating the Implementation of the 1980 recommendation which Unesco had agreed to postpone from 1987 to 1988 (to coincide with the 50th Anniversary Congress). He suggested they should plan to have the Report completed at least 12 months in advance, ie say, early 1987.

To meet this timescale, he suggested they should coordinate by letter and meet again at the Berlin Film Festival in November to finalise the questionnaire so it can be translated as necessary and printed by the end of 1985.

Mrs WIBOM felt it was urgent to produce a budget and project plan which she could submit to Unesco when agreeing the contract so that everyone had a realistic estimate of the amount of work involved (most of which would be largely voluntary). Mr LABRADA had done some preliminary budgeting for mailing, computer analysis, etc. and suggested they could produce a budget within 2-3 weeks. It was formally acknowledged that, although the Unesco contract was with FIAF, an appropriate portion of the money would of course be passed to FIAT.

F2 Joint Technical Symposium in Berlin

Mrs ORBANZ summarised the decisions taken at the Working Party meeting held in London on Monday 29 September. Details were clarified in discussion as follows:

Planning Committee members

FIAF: Mrs ORBANZ, MM FRANCIS, KONLECHNER, SCHOU
(Absent: MM KAHLENBERG, KLAUE, KULA)

FIAT: Mrs HANFORD, MM LABRADA, PONCIN

IASA: Mr Lloyd STICKLES, Mr George BOSTON (attended the meeting in London and will participate in the next meeting)
(Absent: Mr Dietrich SCHULLER)

Coordination

Mrs ORBANZ is responsible for overall organisation and coordination with assistance from all members of the Planning Committee.

Theme

Conservation, Preservation and Obsolescence of Technical Equipment :
Film, Video and Sound Recordings

Events

Talks and demonstrations on each aspect of the theme.

The papers should be written to a high technical and scientific standard, while at the same time offering practical recommendations.

The lectures with the demonstrations should be aimed at a well-informed but not necessarily specialised public.

At the end, there will be a Round Table discussion on "The Ethics of Preservation".

Planning schedule

Next meeting spring 1986, hopefully in Paris. They would bring for discussion and decision their lists of proposals for experts to be invited as speakers, together with details of manufacturers and the equipment they could be invited to exhibit.

Draft papers should be ready by autumn 1986 for review at a further meeting in Berlin (West). They will be distributed among the experts in advance so that they can be stimulated by each other's content and avoid overlaps.

During the meeting in Berlin (West) the Planning Committee will hold a rehearsal in the Congress Hall to coordinate the technical aspects of the presentations.

Unesco Consultation on Equipment for Archive work

Two days, scheduled after the Symposium, using some Symposium speakers and some additional. Mrs ORBANZ would need help from the EC as well as FIAT and IASA in preparing proposals for Unesco.

Unesco project on Curriculum Development for Archive staff

This was not discussed at the Monday meeting but should be discussed later by the EC.

Keynote address

Mr FRANCIS reported on the Group's suggestion that they should seek an individual with an international reputation in the "established" fine arts who would be willing to give a keynote address, stressing the importance of film, television and sound in 20th century cultural and historical life. He felt it was important to attract the attention of the media to the occasion and to the anomalous fact that film, television and sound remained the "poor relations" compared to the other arts. As example, he mentioned that here at the South Bank in London, the theatres, concert halls and art gallery were in magnificent buildings funded with public money while the Film Theatre was tucked away under the bridge and had to pay rent.

They were looking for help in identifying "the ideal person" from the arts field with an international reputation, probably European as the Congress would be in Europe, who would attract the press. The proposal was warmly welcomed.

In the discussion, it was agreed that it would be useful to invite film makers and TV producers to attend the Round Table on the "Ethics of Preservation", both to attract media attention to the event and because the topic concerned them. In response to a question from Mr CINCOTTI, Mr FRANCIS and Mr SCHOU mentioned as example the problems of sound restoration: should one aim to restore to the original quality with all its imperfections or use today's technology to make a "better" version ?

While the Joint Symposium was the responsibility of FIAF, FIAT and IASA, it was agreed that the other NGO's should be invited to participate at their own cost. Mrs ORBANZ reported they had room for up to 400 participants at the Technical Symposium and could therefore accommodate other interested people.

Mrs HANFORD confirmed with Mrs ORBANZ that, for the exhibition, FIAT would concentrate on electronic equipment and methods of reproduction and leave all film to FIAF. She mentioned that FIAT had independently come up with three themes which fitted very well with the overall plan:

- choice of best material for preservation purposes and related equipment
- new recording systems, including digital and video disk
- list of equipment useful in television archives

On the question of equipment, Mr SCHOU mentioned that as part of a Preservation Commission project they had already approached some 50 manufacturers whose equipment they wished to evaluate. They would be collecting evaluations from users and, from the results of this project, would make their selection of the equipment they would like exhibited at Berlin. Both FIAF and FIAT representatives agreed that on this occasion it would be preferable to invite the selected manufacturers to exhibit free of charge, rather than allowing in anyone who was willing to pay to exhibit.

F3 Stockholm Proceedings

Mrs HANFORD expressed their embarrassment and apologies for the long delay. The Proceedings were due to be published in Rio de Janeiro as a Special Number of the FIAT Bulletin by their member, Edna Palatnik of Rede Globo. They had expected it to be ready shortly after the New York Congress but, in spite of numerous telexes to Rio de Janeiro, they still had no news or explanation for the delay and Mrs Palatnik had not attended their recent Council meeting.

At the suggestion of Mr FRANCIS, it was agreed that Mr Socrates d'Oliveira who was still in London should be asked to make direct contact on his return and deliver a letter from Mrs HANFORD.

F4 Cooperation in other areas

F4.1 Commissions

Mrs WIBOM asked the Commission Heads to report on cooperation so far.

i Cataloguing

Mrs HARRISON reported that their forthcoming publication, "International Rules for Cataloguing", would be made available to other NGO's, especially FIAT. Work had been delayed because of other projects but they expected to discuss a draft in the Commission's next meeting in March 1986.

She explained that, to assist in international networking, they were keeping close to IFLA's work on standardised punctuation and format but could not do so for item cataloguing. Mrs HANFORD agreed that the international standards based on printed material were not suitable for moving images.

Mrs HANFORD mentioned that Stellen Norlander, Chairman of the FIAT Cataloguing Commission, would be joining them at lunchtime.

ii Preservation

Mr SCHOU confirmed that they had been in constant contact with Mr KULA, member of both FIAF and FIAT, who edited part of the Volkmann document, but he understood the FIAT Technical Group was not yet very active.

Mrs HANFORD explained that Mr PONCIN was going to organise a separate European Technical Group, both because of the problems of long-distance communication and because Europe and North America technologies were often developing in different ways. She hoped they would become more active and be able to cooperate with the various regional sub-Groups of FIAF's Commission.

Mr SCHOU was anxious to keep in touch with the activities of IFTC and Dr Roads to avoid overlap but Mr FRANCIS and Mrs HANFORD felt no advantage would be gained and it would be best simply to ignore them, leaving it to them to make contact if interested.

iii Documentation

In the absence of Mrs STAYKOVA, Mrs BOWSER responded that there was no equivalent Commission within FIAT. In its new edition of the Directory of Film and Television Documentation Resources, the Commission would include the names and addresses of all FIAT as well as FIAF members whether they had replied to the questionnaire or not.

F4.2 Mutual publicity

On the question of exchange of publications and publicity material, Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that although Michael Moulds, Editor of PIP, was responsible for distributing FIAF publicity material, she would have to investigate progress as she had just discovered that many had not received the new leaflets. Mrs HANFORD agreed to obtain the names and addresses of the Heads of Documentation Departments of FIAT members so that publicity information reached the right individual. FIAF in turn would be pleased to help publicise FIAT publications among its members.

F4.3 Deposit of TV films in national archives

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that, although television companies were probably the most prolific makers of films, they seemed to be exempt from legal deposit legislation as their films were not considered to be "national productions". In Italy, the archives had good relations with RAI but had failed to persuade them to make voluntary deposits. This meant that the recent "made for television" films of people like Antonioni, the Taviani brothers, Fellini, Bertolucci, were not deposited with the national archives. He asked if FIAT could take some steps to encourage its members to consider the importance of changing their attitude and

working with the archives to ensure that at least some television films were retained nationally for posterity.

Mrs HANFORD agreed it was an important problem and there was generally no legal mechanism although in some cases FIAT members had quite close relations with their national archives, as for example in Spain and the UK. In many cases, there were economic constraints rather than lack of good will. Mr LABRADA added the situation was complicated by the fact that many FIAT members were private or regional organisations.

Mr CINCOTTI stressed he was looking for voluntary bilateral arrangements between the national archives and the public, private or regional television companies and hoped that FIAT could make some kind of formal recommendation to actively encourage its members to think along such lines. Mrs HANFORD felt their members would be sympathetic in theory but unable to change the present situation because of their own economic constraints: if there were national legislation, then presumably appropriate financial provision would also have to be made. Mr CINCOTTI declared that in some cases the national archives themselves would be willing to pay for the copies.

Mr SPEHR had some experiences from both sides as the Library of Congress was member of both FIAF and FIAT, and purchased material from diverse sources. One of the problems was the concern of lawyers to protect the producers' rights. He suggested FIAF and FIAT could usefully prepare a sample legal document, which clarified that the archives were not interested in acquiring broadcast rights or the rights to sell to third parties.

Mrs HANFORD felt there were other problems, particularly conflict with the agreements made with artists who appeared in the programmes. Mr SPEHR acknowledged this was a problem and for many companies it would present too much hassle to go back and clear with each artist involved. However, he felt that many artists would be pleased to have their work preserved for posterity and, if FIAF/FIAT could produce a suggested form of wording that would stress that artists' commercial interests would not be affected, then the way could be made clear in the future.

Mrs HANFORD readily agreed that they would be pleased to inform their members of FIAF's concern but warned that progress would probably be limited, primarily because of legal and economic constraints rather than lack of good will.

Mrs WIBOM closed the session by thanking the FIAT members for their participation and their continuing cooperation.

Informal FIAF/FIAT discussions continued over lunch