

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Habana, 5 - 7 December 1987

Members	Anna-Lena WIBOM	President	
	Guido CINCOTTI	Secretary-General	
	Raymond BORDE	Treasurer	Absent.
	Wolfgang KLAUE	Vice President	
	Hector GARCIA MESA	Vice President	
	Eva ORBANZ	Vice President	
	Eileen BOWSER		
	Robert DAUDELIN	Deputy Secretary General	
	David FRANCIS		
	Maria Rita GALVAO		
P K NAIR		Delayed	
Luis DE PINA	Deputy Treasurer		
Bob ROSEN			
Commission Heads	Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing	
	Henning SCHOU	Preservation	ABSENT
	Michelle SNAPES	Documentation	ABSENT
Executive Secretary Interpreter		Brigitte VAN DER ELST	
		Jill JOHNSON	

FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page
1 Adoption of the Agenda	2
2 Approval of Minutes of the Berlin EC Meetings	2
3 Membership Questions	
3.1 Reconfirmation of Members	2
Beijing, Los Angeles, Montevideo, Pyongyuang	
* Reconfirmation procedures & questionnaire	
3.2 Reconfirmation of Observers	4
Madison, Washington (HSFA), Reykjavik, Manila, Managua	
* Discussion of cool & cold storage facilities	
3.3 New Candidates for Observership	7
Bogota, Bangkok, Jerusalem, Paris (M. d'Art Mod)	
3.4 Miscellaneous	11
Caracas; London, Paris, South Africa	
3.5 General discussion on membership of Cinema Museums or Specialised Collections	13
3.6 General discussion on Honorary Membership	17
a Roll of Honour, contd.	20
b Honorary Members, contd	23
4 Financial Report	24
5 Reports from the Specialised Commissions	
5.1 Preservation Commission	26
* Travel Funds for Commission Members	
5.2 Cataloguing Commission	27
5.3 Documentation Commission	29
6 Report from PIP (International Index to Film Periodicals)	30
7 Projects and Publications Underway	32
8 Relations with International Organisations	
8.1 Unesco	35
8.2 Council of Europe: ECTVY 1988	38
8.3-7 ICA; IFTC; FIAT; FIAPF, NGO's Liaison Group	39
9 Future Congresses	
9.1 1988: Paris	44
9.2 1989: Lisbon	52
9.3 1990: Havana	53
10 Any Other Business	
10.1 Latin American Regional Preservation Center	54
10.2 Next EC Meeting	55

Annex Discussion Document relating to 3.5 (Mr FRANCIS)

MINUTES

Mr Hector GARCIA MESA, Head of the Cinemateca de Cuba, welcomed the Executive Committee (EC) to Habana and the International Conference Center, the proposed location for the 1990 Congress. He introduced Mr Julio GARCIA ESPINOSA, Vice Minister of Culture, President of ICAIC (the Cuban Film Institute) and of the 9th Festival of the New Latin American Film Festival, a film-maker and former student of Mr CINCOTTI in Rome.

Mr GARCIA ESPINOSA said they were proud to host FIAF's EC meeting and were very impressed by the work done by FIAF over the last 50 years to safeguard the world's audio-visual cultural heritage. He mentioned the work of its specialised Commissions, the encouragement of new archives, the seminars held with Unesco help in the Third World and its contribution to Unesco's 1980 Recommendation on the safeguarding of the moving image. They were pleased at FIAF's decision to hold its 1990 Congress in Habana which they took as a sign of awareness of the economic difficulties of the region and the alarming risks to their common heritage.

The new International Film School at San Antonio las Bañas and the Film Foundation which the EC had visited the day before represented their hopes for the future. He paid tribute to Mr GARCIA MESA and the collaboration of the Cinemateca in the work of the Film School, in particular in training the young to appreciate the importance of the archive's role. He knew that FIAF would appreciate the generosity of Mr Gabriel Garcia Marquez who, through the Film Foundation, was making it possible to set up Regional Centers in Latin America to protect their heritage. As had just been announced the first centre would be set up in Sao Paulo under the direction of the Cinemateca Brasileira and the Foundation hoped it could look to FIAF for moral if not material support for this ambitious project.

On behalf of the EC, Mrs WIBOM warmly thanked Mr GARCIA ESPINOSA and mentioned they had been impressed by Cuba's achievements in production, archiving and now most recently the creation of the new International Film School. Many steps taken by the Cuban Government in the realm of the audio-visual could be taken as examples to governments and archives around the world. Mrs Maria Rita GALVAO, from the Cinemateca Brasileira, took the opportunity to thank Mr GARCIA ESPINOSA, Mr GARCIA MESA and the Foundation for their confidence in choosing her archive for the first Regional Centre.

After a short break, Mrs WIBOM formally opened the business meeting. She thanked Mr GARCIA MESA for making the meeting possible, and thanked all for coming, in particular Mrs HARRISON who had come at her own expense.

Apologies had been received from Mr BORDE (for health reasons) and Mr SCHOU (budgetary). Mr FRANCIS recalled for the record that, as agreed at her appointment, Mrs SNAPES was not present at intermediate EC meetings as it was not feasible for her to leave the archive at the same time as himself. It was hoped Mr NAIR would be coming later.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The proposed Agenda was adopted subject to some minor additions.

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF BERLIN MEETINGS

Mrs WIBOM reported that lengthy comments had been sent by Mr SCHOU which could be taken up under the relevant points of the Agenda.

The following corrections to the Minutes were requested:

- Mr CINCOTTI noted that Mr NAIR's name had been inadvertently omitted from the list of participants at the second EC meeting.
- Mr KLAUE asked for corrections to middle of page 6, as follows:
 - Syria: Cinema Organisation of the Government
Small collection exists but no awareness of need for archive yet.
 - Afghanistan
Small collection of Afghan films but no archive activities yet.
- Mr DAUDELIN asked for correction of the Senegal film-maker's name mentioned on page 6.

The Minutes were approved subject to these amendments.

3 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

3.1 Reconfirmation of Members

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the 4 dossiers outstanding from Berlin had now arrived and he could recommend the Reconfirmation of them all. Before discussing them, he mentioned that in spite of written reminders from the Secretariat on Reconfirmation procedures, archives were submitting the questionnaire alone, without any supplementary information on developments in their last 5 years.

3.1a Beijing: Zhongguo Dianying Ziliaoguan (China Film Archive)
This was an example of an archive that had sent the questionnaire alone, but it did contain statistics on films preserved, the size of vaults, etc.
Decision : Confirmed.

3.1b Los Angeles: National Center for Film & Video Preservation, AFI

In this case, the questionnaire was supported by extra information, including a useful organisation chart and indication of relations with other US archives. They had no laboratory but some 25% of their budget was spent on restoration.

Mrs BOWSER mentioned they were still in a transition period pending the appointment of the Director. She recalled the special position they had, in that their films were passed to other archives for preservation. It was important when considering statistics for North America, that the films and the budgets were not counted at both the Center and the receiving archive. Mr ROSEN agreed, stressing that they were administering but not actually spending all the monies themselves.

Decision : Confirmed.

3.1c Montevideo: Cinemateca Uruguay

Apart from the questionnaire and a rather complicated organisation chart, they had not sent much information. They mentioned the climatic conditions for 3 vaults (one for nitrate) but it was not clear if they were already in use. It seemed that less than 10% of the budget was spent on preservation. About one third of the revenue seemed to come from individual subscriptions or ticket sales.

Mrs GALVAO mentioned that the Cinemateca was preserving the national production but did not need a huge budget as the national production was quite small. They are also doing a service to preservation of Latin American cinema by purchasing films for preservation which the countries of origin often cannot afford to obtain and preserve for themselves.

Decision : Confirmed.

3.1d Pyongyang: Choson Minjujui Inmingonghwaguk Kugga Yonghwa Munhongo (National Film Archive of DPRK)

This dossier had only just arrived and consisted simply of the questionnaire which contained the following statistics: more than 10,000 features and 5,000 shorts; vaults of 20,000 square metres to excellent standards; 40% of the budget was spent on preservation, 10% on salaries, 20% on acquisitions (in addition to legal deposit), 10% on cataloguing.

Mr KLAUE suggested that to overcome the delays in the mail, FIAF should again send communications to his archive for transmission via the Korean Embassy, as had been done in the past.

Decision : Confirmed.

Action: Secretariat to amend mail arrangements.

3.1e Reconfirmation procedures & Amendment of Questionnaire

In the discussion, Mr ROSEN pointed out it was difficult to evaluate the significance of the % budget allocations when there was no indication of the actual total of money involved. Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that some archives were supplying this information and agreed that it would be easier if the questionnaire were amended to include this.

Mr DAUDELIN deplored the fact that archives were not supplying the information required by the Rules and asked that a stronger reminder should be sent in the Secretariat's letter and included in the questionnaire itself.

Action: Secretariat (as above).

3.2 Reconfirmation of Observers

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that 5 Observers had not submitted their Annual Report by the time of the Berlin meeting and one subscription was unpaid. Reports had been received from 3 (Madison, Reykjavik, Washington (HSFA)) who could now be reconfirmed. There was no sign of life from Managua or Manila.

Reykjavik

Mr CINCOTTI noted that Reykjavik now had a new Director. Mrs WIBOM was disturbed at some points in the report which did not accord with her understanding of the present situation. She regretted they had not attended a single FIAF Congress in their 4 or 5 years of affiliation and would try to encourage them to attend FIAF meetings.

Discussion of cool and cold storage facilities

Mrs WIBOM noted from the Washington HFSA report that the cold storage vaults were "not functioning" because of control difficulties. Someone from Koblenz had reported similar difficulties: for the last year they had been unable to control humidity even in empty vaults so dared not use them. She was appalled at the situation and asked if the Technical Commission could help: if there was a problem that technicians in advanced countries like USA and West Germany could not control, then perhaps FIAF should not be encouraging other archives to make the huge investments needed to construct cold vaults in the first place.

Mr ROSEN agreed that several archives seemed to be having problems, including his own (cool storage) and the Library of Congress.

Mr KLAUE felt it was a complex but very urgent question. He reported that the recent Survey on the UNESCO Recommendation had revealed a shocking situation worldwide: very few archives had facilities for preserving colour film and of those, very few were able to undertake restoration. He felt the

cold storage problem could however be solved: Norway, Sweden and his own archive had all been successful, even though after tremendous difficulties. It had taken them 3 years to get the plant to work as intended. He suggested a meeting of specialists on colour film storage (and perhaps also restoration), to share experiences of this very technical matter.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was important to distinguish between "cool" and "cold" storage.

Mr GARCIA MESA reported they had just received a grant of \$1 million to work on the problem of preservation of the film heritage of Cuba, and also that of the Caribbean, Central and Latin America. They were very anxious to support a meeting of specialists as they certainly did not want to mis-use such a large sum of money. They had talked of having a meeting of the Preservation Commission in Habana in 1990 but perhaps they should not wait so long as the vaults were already under construction.

Mrs WIBOM stressed that in addition to colour film specialists they would also need the advice of specialists in buildings. All were asked to help in seeking out relevant specialists.

Action: All as above. Secretariat to keep on Agenda.

Manila: Film Archive of the Philippines

Mrs WIBOM reported she had spent 5 days in August there with Mr Arnaldo from Unesco. On the first day, Mr DE PEDRO had resigned from the Archive. It was thought he would be replaced by Mr Umberto Avelana, a well-known documentary film-maker, in his early 70's with a reputation beyond reproach and respected by all in the film world. She had met a committee which was considering how to organise all aspects of the film world (production, distribution, archiving) and they were all agreed on the need to help the archive.

She had also visited the Philippine Cinema Center, a huge 6-storey building with 9 film theatres, 3 for 600 - 1500 seats, and 6 for 100 - 300 seats, a large exhibition space, none of which had been used since the change of regime. The electricity had been cut off and everything was mouldering in the humid climate. Mr DE PEDRO had tried to protect the archive material on the ground floor by running power from the street lighting. He and his wife and a few volunteers had been working unpaid over the last 18 months since funding had been cut off. They had generated some funds through providing a small copying and cafeteria service. She regretted he had still not sent in his Report but was full of admiration for his attempts to survive under such conditions.

Mrs ORBANZ suggested they might be reluctant to report when they had no archive activities to boast of. She felt they should be encouraged to at least keep contact with FIAF and indicate the very understandable reasons for their non-compliance.

Later, Mr FRANCIS queried the use of "formal letter of non-confirmation" in the last Minutes (Berlin, page 13): it was agreed that it was simply a letter advising them of their position and asking them to comply with the Rules to avoid deletion.

Decision: Secretary General to encourage them to send their last two Reports to avoid deletion at the next GA.

Managua: Cinemateca de Nicaragua

No official news had been received from this Archive. Mr GARCIA MESA reported he had had a letter from the Director of the Archive but it dealt only with film and documentation exchanges which they wished to continue. Mrs GALVAO had received a similar letter.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that all documents were being sent through the Embassy to ensure they were received but they had still received no sign for the last two years. No-one from the Archive was expected at the Havana Film Festival but Mr GARCIA MESA agreed to approach the representatives of the Film Institute for information and ask them to deliver a new reminder letter from FIAF.

Mr DE PINA reported his archive had been asked for documentation in June 1986 which he had sent via the Embassy but there was no acknowledgment. Mrs WIBOM thought that most archives would have received the same circular request. Mr KLAUE said Mr Varga was visiting GDR and might be in Berlin on his return. He was also expected in Rio.

Action: Ask Festival delegates from Managua to act as courier for FIAF letter. Copies of the letter to be passed to Mr KLAUE and Mrs GALVAO in the hope that they might see Mr Varga. Mr GARCIA MESA offered to send a personal letter as well.

3.3 New Candidates for Observership

3.3a Bogota: Fundación Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that in Berlin they had discussed at length the situation and relationship between the two Archives and confirmed the existing Observer, Cinemateca Distrital (Berlin Minutes, EC1 pp 7-8, 14; EC2 pp 7-9). As agreed, they had then written to the two organisations, asking CD in particular for information on the current situation.

They now had to consider the formal application of the new Fundacion which had arrived too late for decision in Berlin.

Mrs GALVAO had as agreed written personally to the head of each organisation. Maria Elvira Talero, CD, had said nothing new but Claudia Triana (FPFC) had sent a copy of the 99-year draft agreement of cooperation between the two archives (concerning particularly the terms of transfer of the national films) and the following clarifications:

- CD is still doing preservation work as they are still holding all the films (but they are not doing anything more than before)
- Only national productions films will be transferred to FPFC
- CD will continue to acquire films as they (not FPFC) have the task of looking for films within the country.
- CD's main activity will be research on the historical development of cinema in Colombia, looking for national films and projections; plus preservation until such time as the films are passed to FPFC.
- cooperation primarily through joint projections.

Mr GARCIA MESA understood CD would continue to preserve non-national films.

Mr ROSEN asked why the second organisation had been created, was it to obtain better funding or for some other reason? No-one felt able to answer that question.

Mr DAUDELIN felt that with each new set of documents the situation seemed more confusing, partly he supposed because they were writing in a foreign language (English). There did not appear to be any more films or any more preservation activity than when there was only one organisation and he did not see why two organisations should be admitted to FIAF.

Mrs BOWSER agreed but added that in any case all the documents seemed to refer to the future. FIAF should retain the status quo until the changes are actually made.

Mr CINCOTTI understood the original Cinemateca was and would remain primarily a diffusion organisation, while preservation activities would transfer to the new organisation. This made sense of the transfer of Mrs Triana. He suspected that when the next time came round for reconfirmation, they would find that the Cinemateca Distrital was no longer eligible.

Mrs GALVAO said the agreement document was due to be signed in October. It was felt by all however that the wording of the CD letter of November 5 implied it had not yet been signed.

Mr FRANCIS supported Mrs BOWSER's idea of retaining the status quo until one had evidence that changes had actually taken place. He noted that sometimes it was necessary to recognise an organisation through which funds were delivered (as was the case for example with the Los Angeles National Center for Film and Video Preservation) even though it did not increase the money available or the number of films preserved. He understood the Foundation was set up to make more public and private funding available for preservation and it was possible that they would end up with something very similar to the American situation.

Mrs VAN DER ELST quoted from Mr CINCOTTI's letter given to Mr Nieto in Berlin, which stated that the EC had studied the dossier and FIAF was willing to accept them as Observers, although the Rules did not allow this to happen until the EC meeting in December. Mr CINCOTTI acknowledged that his letter had been a bit premature but he felt FIAF could tolerate both organisations as Observers for the period of 18 months until the next Confirmation.

Mrs GALVAO, Mrs WIBOM and others agreed with this view. Mr GARCIA MESA suggested they should meanwhile both be sent a questionnaire on the situation and their answers compared.

Mr DAUDELIN was not happy with the solution as it diminished the importance of joining FIAF; he did not like the idea of accepting an organisation that had not yet shown any evidence of relevant activities.

Mr ROSEN recalled that Mr Nieto in Berlin had been particularly keen to be accepted by FIAF so that back home they could steer the organisation more forcefully towards preservation activities.

Mr FRANCIS felt that Mr CINCOTTI's letter was not a commitment to accept them as Observers. The Berlin Minutes (EC2 page 9) clearly said that the Rules obliged FIAF "first to take written views from the existing Observer/Member". FIAF had done this and the response had not been

satisfactory and the situation was still unclear. He thought there was only one course to take: retain the existing Observer until the situation was clarified and the changes had been seen to have taken place.

Mrs GALVAO felt that if FIAF did not accept the Fundacion now they might lose the opportunity to support the cause of preservation in Colombia.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that in Mr Nieto's letter of September 1987 he had mentioned they were busy receiving lots of films from national producers so they were not only receiving transfers of films in the Cinemateca.

Mr KLAUE agreed with Mrs BOWSER that FIAF should not accept organisations only on the strength of their projects but on their achievements. He felt they should keep the door open, in a positive way, but they should not be accepted at this time. He supported Mr GARCIA MESA's suggestion of a questionnaire to be sent to both.

Mr GARCIA MESA quoted from a letter received a week previously from Mrs Triana giving information on the Fundacion's activities and projects but he felt they should not be accepted yet. He had promised to telephone both organisations from Habana.

Decision : Mr GARCIA MESA and Mrs GALVAO to prepare a letter in Spanish to both organisations, with assistance from Mr DAUDELIN, regretting that the situation was still not clear for a decision to be made. They should also prepare a questionnaire to both, to be returned in time for study in Paris.

3.3b Bangkok: National Film Archive of Thailand

In response to questions from Mr DAUDELIN, Mrs WIBOM explained that the Director of the Thai Film Archive Project from the beginning had been Penpan Jarernporn who had had a formal museum training and was well established in museum and government circles. Dome Sukvong was Technical and Artistic Director and was still there but expected to leave in a couple of years to start the Thai Film Foundation that would also be concerned with production and distribution. He was confident that Penpan Jarernporn was sufficiently well-established to manage without him and he would certainly not consider anyone else. They had complemented each other admirably.

They had recently finished decorating their 170-seat theatre but had no air-conditioning. Meanwhile, they were screening in other locations. The Film Archive Project was adopted in 1984 and the Fine Arts Minister had assured her that it was part of a 5-year plan so it would be definitely on its own feet. They had been promised 9 staff in January 1988 and increased independence. They had already been transferred from a division of the

National Galleries to a division of the National Archives (but staying in the same building) which seemed an excellent step.

Mr KLAUE who had visited them recently confirmed that the institution certainly existed: it had a film collection, a Documentation Department, preservation activities initiated with support from other archives, particularly Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany. They had made remarkable progress, thanks to great enthusiasm but very little financial support.

Decision : Unanimously accepted.

3.3c Jerusalem: Jewish Film Archives

Mr CINCOTTI reported that their letter and dossier, dated November 16 1987, had been accompanied by a letter of the same date to the existing FIAF Member.

Mrs BOWSER reported that Mrs VAN LEER had privately said she was opposed to accepting the organisation in FIAF but would not necessarily be able to give formal reasons. The University had originally agreed to give the collection to the Israel Film Archives but then Marilyn Koolik had decided to keep them. It was non-profit making but seemed to operate in the same way as a commercial stock-footage library. Mrs BOWSER added that she was disappointed at the lack of preservation activity by the existing Member which spent most energy showing films from other countries.

Mr FRANCIS had also recently met Mrs VAN LEER and mentioned two points of information, without comment. He confirmed, from his contacts with Henderson's Laboratories, that they had already quoted for the nitrate copying mentioned in the dossier and he felt the job would proceed. He felt Mrs VAN LEER also opposed them because although new preservation negatives were produced in connection with "Palestine", the major TV programme produced in the UK, the negatives were left in the Imperial War Museum and not requested by the Jewish Film Archive.

Mrs ORBANZ had had a long conversation with Marilyn Koolik before the Berlin Congress. She had claimed they were offered a collection that Mrs VAN LEER didn't want. Whether this was true or not, Mrs ORBANZ was impressed by her documentation and her enthusiasm to preserve that kind of material.

Mrs VAN DER ELST drew attention to the fact that the dossier lacked the signed letter of agreement with the existing FIAF affiliate and it was the task of the candidate to provide it.

Decision : Postpone until dossier completed.

3.3d Paris: Musée National d'Art Moderne (Beaubourg)

Mr CINCOTTI reported that in this case the dossier also lacked the signed agreement of existing Member(s).

Mr BORDE had written to draw attention to this but added that this was a good example of the problem of the increasing number of museums, rather than true archives, which were interested in joining FIAF. He had suggested two possible solutions:

- accept them as Subscribers, recommending them to cooperate with existing national Members.
- create a new category of membership.

Mr FRANCIS suggested that the EC should first discuss the general question under 3.5 (and the working paper produced by Mr KLAUE and himself) before responding to this particular application.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that the Director had just resigned but Mrs WIBOM mentioned the new Director was eager for a decision.

Decision : Postpone until dossier complete. Write explaining this and the fact that FIAF was considering the general problem of how best to assist museums which were not primarily archives for preservation.

3.4 Miscellaneous

3.4a Caracas: Cinemateca de Venezuela

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the promised subscription had still not been received.

Mr GARCIA MESA reported that a lady from the Atheneo de Caracas reported that Mr Izaguirre was about to retire and the archive was almost paralysed. Mrs GALVAO reported that Joaõ Socrates had just been in Caracas for a Unesco meeting. He had visited the archive and, in Mr Izaguirre's absence, been warmly received by his Deputy. He was preparing a report for Unesco with copy for FIAF on all his visits: the Cinemateca, the National Archive, a large laboratory (one of 4 in Caracas) and the National Film Library which has a very large film collection. They had not known previously that the National Film Library existed yet it had a larger collection and better facilities than the Cinemateca.

Mr CINCOTTI recalled from the Berlin meeting that they had been re-admitted "applicable from receipt of subscription" (Berlin Minutes, page 4)

Decision : They cannot be considered as "re-admitted" until payment received.

3.4b Requests for Information

Mr CINCOTTI reported the various requests for information about FIAF from potential candidates:

- **London: Cinema Museum**

A Mr Tony Fletcher had sent a hand-written letter for information.

- **Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale
département de la Phonatèque et de l'Audio-Visuel**

They had written for information 4 years ago and would now like to be Subscribers.

- **South Africa: State Film Archive**

They had already been in touch with FIAF 15 and 4 years ago and the same Mr Lang had again written to express interest in becoming Observers. On the last occasion, FIAF had decided not to accept countries that were not members of Unesco (although he was not sure if that reason had been given to them). In response to this last request, Mrs VAN DER ELST had written on behalf of the Secretary General on September 7 to say the matter would be routinely referred to the EC but mentioning Mr CINCOTTI's personal view was unfavourable.

There was no need to discuss the question at this stage as no formal application had been made. However, Mr FRANCIS and Mrs WIBOM felt they should both find time to discuss the situation, at least informally, so they were not as unprepared as they were when the application was last discussed in the General Assembly. Mr KLAUE felt it was important to refer to the Stockholm Minutes for the wording of the GA's decision and Mr DAUDELIN recalled it was also discussed in Belgrade.

Decision : Consider under point 10 of this meeting.

Addition to 3.4: South Africa

In its final session, the EC reviewed the portion of the 1983 Stockholm Minutes covering the General Assembly's discussion whether to consider an application for membership from South Africa. Mr CINCOTTI stressed there was no requirement to discuss as no application had been submitted.

Action: None.

3.5 General Discussion on Membership of Cinema Museums or Specialised Collections

The EC studied the discussion document prepared by Mr FRANCIS (Annex I).

Mr KLAUE reported that it was agreed that the Film Institute in Dusseldorf will call, within the European Year of Cinema and Television, for a meeting of European film museums with the intention of forming an international association. Mr KLAUE himself had recently met with the Head of the Institute to discuss potential participants. The new organisation would be interested to explore the possibility of attachment to existing organisations, either ICOM (International Council of Museums) or FIAF. He suggested someone from FIAF should attend the meeting and FIAF should therefore consider its position before that meeting.

Mr ROSEN reported he had recently met with a non-film museum and a programming agency, both of whom were interested in applying for Observer status within FIAF in order to obtain films. He felt that organisations which undertook the onerous and non-glamorous work of preservation tended to use their programming activity as a means to attract attention, and thus, support and funding. He queried whether FIAF wanted to make the privilege of film exchange available to organisations that were not making such contributions to preservation.

Mr FRANCIS felt the discussion should be confined initially to film museums. He felt FIAF should not admit them into its existing structure but it would be easier to reject them if there were a film museum organisation that they could join, especially if the proposed European association expanded to become international.

Mrs ORBANZ felt FIAF had little to offer film museums and they would get more help on things like photos and posters from traditional museums. Mr FRANCIS felt there was a much wider issue as most film museums would want to project films and would therefore require quality copies. In his own case, their new museum was planning to show 360 classic films a year for which they would require perfect copies and all the necessary restoration was being paid for with museum money. He felt it quite likely that museum restoration programmes in some countries would be able to achieve more than the national archive.

Mrs WIBOM agreed and pointed out that FIAF archives would be constantly asked for help from the national museums. As the museums were likely to attract funding, they had to decide whether it would be more advantageous for the preservation movement to welcome them to FIAF or find some other form of cooperation.

Mrs BOWSER felt links and cooperation between two international organisations would be the ideal solution as it would avoid diluting the idea of "true" preservation archives.

Mr ROSEN felt that a film museum that developed its own preservation programme would be acceptable within FIAF. For short term preservation projects, the museums could surely cooperate on a bilateral basis with their local archive.

Mr DE PINA asked for clarification of what was understood by film museum; he felt FIAF already counted film museums within its membership, some closely linked with the archive, as in Portugal. Mr FRANCIS agreed, citing Turin as excellent example, but said there was "a new breed" of film museums set up as a separate organisations whose main purpose was exhibition, similar to painting and sculpture museums, in this case, exhibiting cinema material together with projection of films. He cited as example Frankfurt, the Museums of the Moving Image in America and in the UK and said there were about a dozen formed in the last 3 or 4 years. Few of them had a preservation programme and could perhaps best be described as providing "permanent exhibitions" rather than being museums in the traditional sense.

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that the word "museum" was used to mean very different things, citing for example the Belgian Cinémathèque Royale which always added Musée de Cinéma to its title and the Museums in Turin and Vienna. He was not happy with the comparison with fine art museums or galleries as, although they both showed the product (picture or film), a fine arts museum very seldom exhibited the production-related artefacts (easels, brushes, palettes, etc) as well.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed that some museums were exactly like archives while some only showed objects, and added the examples of film collections of production companies like Gaumont and of libraries like the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Mrs WIBOM felt they had at least clarified that the word "museum" in the title was not the significant factor in deciding whether an organisation qualified to join FIAF or not. Any organisation with a substantial preservation programme could be considered regardless of its name. She noted that quite a lot of municipalities with money were now offering alternatives to the commercial circuits and offering programmes illustrating cinema history.

Mr FRANCIS stressed that the "object" of a cinema museum is the film itself, not still photographs and other artefacts. To get the films shown up to the quality demanded of objects in a fine art museum, he felt any museum would

need to develop its own preservation programme. Mrs ORBANZ replied that, although they had a very high standard in London, other museums were happy to show a video-cassette and would not engage in preservation.

Mr KLAUE said they should decide how they wished to interpret their own FIAF Statutes: museums that did not have their own film preservation programme were nevertheless fulfilling some of the aims of the Federation as mentioned in Article 1 (... collection and preservation of documentation, ensure international availability of films and documents, to promote film art and film culture and encourage historical research..... ..Members also authorised and indeed encouraged to collect and exhibit cinema artefacts). He agreed with Mrs BOWSER that FIAF should wait and offer cooperation via the new organisation uniting museums.

Mr ROSEN understood the FIAF Statutes indicated that preservation was a necessary requirement. He felt there were many possibilities for co-operation with the new museums but they should not necessarily be part of FIAF. He was an adviser on two museums in process of being established and gave two examples of how as a FIAF member he had been able to help them and at the same time promote FIAF's aims:

- he had suggested their exhibitions should include an exhibition about preservation
- through their need of good copies for programming, they could contribute to the archive's preservation work.

Mrs BOWSER saw many parallels with the development of FIAT when larger film archives began to collect television and join both organisations. Within FIAF some members have a fully operating cinema museum and might well want to join the new museum organisation as well. She felt the two organisations should be able to work closely together but any organisation joining FIAF should have preservation of film as its chief priority and activity.

After a short break, Mr FRANCIS spoke to the second part of his paper suggesting that FIAF should open its doors to museums, documentation centres, screening and specialist film organisations, but as "observers" which would be redefined as a non-membership category. He felt it was essential for FIAF to define its overall policy towards the various proliferating organisations before it became swamped considering individual applications.

Mr ROSEN referred to FAC and TAC in America which had expanded to some 50 or 60 organisations, including large and small collections. The agenda for

discussion had become so diffuse that there was less of use for the nitrate holding archives. With a broad group of observers with different characteristics, then the agenda for discussion and the focus would inevitably change and they had to decide whether this was wanted. Mrs WIBOM referred to Mr FRANCIS' comment that FIAF was "becoming too large and too diverse" and said it was important to decide whether to accept diversity or not. It was after all a fact of life that with the changing media scene, archives were moving away from the model of the 1920's and 30's.

Mrs ORBANZ thought archives today were much more specialised and the Statutes reflect the situation of the 1930's when archives did so many other activities besides preservation. She felt they should concentrate on selecting on the basis of priority to preservation work. She recalled the EC meeting in London when they had discussed at length the possibility of a third group within FIAF and, although she recognised the need to encourage embryo archives, she preferred to keep the existing categories. Mrs BOWSER mentioned that an American Subscriber was calling itself an Observer and, in trying to define the difference, noted that the only practical difference was that Observers had an automatic right to attend meetings and Subscribers had to ask to be invited.

Mr FRANCIS regretted having to ask for consideration of new membership categories so soon after the recently completed revision of the Statutes and Rules but felt that the increasing interest from diverse organisations made it essential for FIAF to agree on its basic underlying policies rather than simply react to each individual application. In fact, he would like to see at every EC meeting a general membership policy discussion so that the Federation would be constantly monitoring current trends without being tied to specific cases.

Mrs WIBOM suggested there should be a more detailed paper for the next EC meeting plus discussion at least once a year and introduction of possible changes to the Statutes every 3 years.

Decision : Working group of Mr FRANCIS, Mr ROSEN and Mrs ORBANZ to prepare more detailed discussion paper for next EC meeting.

3.6 General Discussion on Honorary Membership

This point was discussed on all three days of the EC meeting. For more convenient reference, the discussions are recorded as follows:

- 3.6 General Discussion on Honorary Membership & Roll of Honour: Day 1
- 3.6a Roll of Honour: Discussion of Day 2, followed by that of Day 3
- 3.6b Honorary Membership: Discussion of Day 2, followed by that of Day 3

Mrs WIBOM recalled that there were two propositions on the table, Mr BORDE had proposed Mr DE VAAL should be nominated as an Honorary Member and Mr SCHOU had proposed Mr Harold BROWN. According to the Rules, the number was limited to 5 and, although not written down, it was assumed that it was a life-time appointment. There were now 4 Honorary Members: Mr Svoboda, Mr Lauritzen, Mr Toepfritz and Mr Pogacic.

The general feeling of the EC had been that they did not want to enlarge the number of people attending EC meetings: a large group was expensive for the organisers to house, feed and transport and on some occasions the EC group had added up to 25 people.

Mrs WIBOM reported that, in exploring the question of Honorary Membership with several EC members individually, the idea had emerged of creating a new solution, a "Roll of Honour" which would enable FIAF to honour not only its former members but also other cinema-related personalities (actors, technicians, lawyers, etc.) who had been or might be useful to FIAF or to individual archives. It would be strictly honorary, with virtually no duties or privileges, except perhaps to appear on the letterhead, be invited to a dinner the night before a Congress and the opportunity to attend the GA and meet former colleagues. The 50th Anniversary in Paris would be a good occasion to inaugurate such a new system and it could perhaps help FIAF become better known.

Mrs GALVAO understood the principal reason for having the Honorary Members was so they could help the EC with their experience. Mrs WIBOM explained that was the idea but the present HMs had been out of the archive world for many years and were less in touch with current situations; however, they could always be consulted on an ad hoc basis.

Mr KLAUE said there were two problems on the table: first, how to honour contributions to the Federation or individual archives, as for example Harold Brown; second, how to avoid the participation of too many people at EC meetings. For the Roll of Honour, they would have to decide who could make the decisions on admission, the criteria, the relationship with existing HMs. Alternatively, they could propose another change to the Rules to extend the number of HMs beyond the present 5, up to say 25; with such a large number, they would obviously have to delete the right to attend the EC meetings.

Mr DAUDELIN thought one of the problems was the mix of short and medium term requirements and what could be done with or without changes to Rules. If they were to increase the number of HMs or limit the time they could serve, they would certainly have to revise the Rules. On the other hand, the idea of appointing a Committee of Honour for the 50th Anniversary and have names identifiable by the general public like Antonioni, Bergman, etc., on the letterhead would certainly help to attract interest and could surely be done without requiring any change to the Statutes or Rules. Similarly, if they were to use the device to attract funding or sponsorship in some way, he felt the EC could go ahead and make the arrangements without requiring any change to the Statutes or Rules.

As for Mr DE VAAL's position, he felt it was quite delicate: he was a long-term friend of many of them and had served the Federation for many years but he was not convinced that retirement should automatically lead to appointment as Honorary Member. With the limit of 5, it would not be feasible to honour all retiring servants of the Federation in this way.

Mrs BOWSER felt they should not yet talk about the individual cases. There would be an increasing problem, simply because the Federation was increasing in size and more and more long-standing archivists were approaching retirement. It seemed inevitable that they would have to reconsider the Rules. She felt they needed the continuity of people as they retired and, although they had to limit the numbers at meetings, she felt HM's should at least have the opportunity to attend EC meetings for a given number of years (say 2 or 5) and be especially invited for specific needs.

Mr FRANCIS suggested it was not necessary to change the Rules as it only said they "may" be invited to EC meetings, in other words, the EC already had the right to decide. On the question of appointments, the EC's role was to vote on nominations and put them to the GA for decision by secret ballot. As he saw it, there was one vacant place but the EC could put forward as many nominations as it saw fit. Finally, bearing in mind that they had changed the Rules to allow rotation of the Federation's Officers and EC members to encourage change, they could put a Resolution to the GA to provide a similar turnover in HM's. The Roll of Honour was a separate issue.

Mr KLAUE agreed with Mr FRANCIS that there was no need to change the Rules for HM's and they could treat the Roll of Honour as a separate issue. In any case, if they chose to discontinue the category of HM's, time would resolve it, as no-one was immortal. Mr DAUDELIN agreed they should use the existing wording of Rule 40 and invite HM's only when appropriate.

Mr CINCOTTI felt it strange that they should now be trying to dispose of HM's

when the purpose of electing them was to honour them and benefit from their experience. He felt it was a contradiction in terms to limit them to a certain number of years. He liked the idea of a Roll or Committee of Honour for the 50th Anniversary and thought the existing HMs could figure on it; later, it could be dissolved or remain as a permanent Committee, depending on what seemed appropriate at the time. However, if they wanted to go ahead for Paris, they would have to act very quickly.

Mrs ORBANZ agreed with Mr CINCOTTI. They had limited the number to 5 to stress the importance of the honour and, in her opinion, their contributions to the EC meetings had been very useful. Similarly, she felt it was not very honourable to limit the number of years. She felt that in organising a Congress, the attendance of Honorary Members did not make all that difference. She approved the idea of a Roll of Honour but didn't want to see the two ideas confused.

Mr ROSEN suggested there were 3 different issues:

- what was the appropriate involvement of HMs in the Federation's activities;
- the arbitrary and self-defeating limit to number of HMs; perhaps they could keep the group exclusive by introducing some provision that, for example, they could not introduce more than one new HM per year.
- the Roll of Honour which he thought was an exciting idea but one that would also create many selection problems.

Mrs BOWSER felt the Roll of Honour was too important to be rushed through in time for Paris and should first be discussed in the GA. Mrs WIBOM felt the situation was awkward as there were no formal criteria for nominating HMs. They would need criteria for the Roll of Honour but she would like the EC to present at least a few names in Paris. Mrs ORBANZ felt every individual around the table would come up with different lists of names reflecting different ideas about what the Roll of Honour should represent.

Returning to the question of HMs, Mr FRANCIS felt it was difficult to vote on two names in the EC when there was only one place available. Mr DAUDELIN felt they should vote on all names and put all forward for voting by the GA but Mr ROSEN felt that if one wanted to honour someone, one could not do it competitively in open assembly. Mrs GALVAO agreed and felt it would be extremely embarrassing. Mrs WIBOM felt the Roll of Honour would be a solution to avoid giving offense.

Mrs BOWSER felt they could only vote on the second candidate if the first was rejected. Mr FRANCIS felt it was not obvious that Mr DE VAAL was the first candidate, referring to the Berlin Minutes (EC2, page 12) when Mr SCHOU

spoke of Mr BROWN being turned down previously. The EC was not clear whether Mr BROWN had been formally nominated and, if so, whether it was before or after Mr DE VAAL. Mr SCHOU's telexed comments on the Berlin Minutes said:

"As stated during the meeting, I wish to nominate Mr Harold Brown as an Honorary Member for (in the words of the BKSTS) 'his unique and life-long (50 years) contribution to the rescue and preservation of Britain's film heritage and for his profound influence on film conservation throughout the world.'

There were therefore two nominations on the table. The EC voted first on Mr DE VAAL and the results were as follows: 9 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention. As Mr DE VAAL obtained the necessary two-thirds majority, there was no further place available and so no voting on Mr BROWN.

Later in the meeting, Mr FRANCIS asked for confirmation that Mr Harold Brown's nomination had been recorded and would be considered as soon as there was a vacancy.

Decision : Mr DE VAAL's nomination would be put before the GA in Paris.

Day 2

Mr GARCIA MESA opened with some information on the difficulties Mr NAIR had been having in getting permissions to attend the EC meeting and what had been done to try and help. Mr NAIR had not arrived on the expected flights but they were still hoping he would arrive.

3.6a Roll of Honour, contd.

It was suggested it would be helpful to put forward suggested names to help clarify who they wanted. Mr ROSEN identified two possible directions:

- i the "greats" or "monuments" in the history of cinema
eg Capra
- ii the major contributors to the archive movement
eg Martin Scorsese

Mr FRANCIS supported the second part and suggested it should be more precise and honour contributions to film preservation. He felt there should be a citation in each case to ensure that the nomination was really justified. Mrs BOWSER and Mr CINCOTTI both agreed. In the first category Mr CINCOTTI would name Fellini but, in the second, Luigi Comencini, although his contribution was of course not so widely known in the outside world.

Mr DAUDELIN felt the Roll of Honour would not serve its function of increasing FIAF's visibility if the names were not well-known. He felt there should be a maximum of say 10 - 15 names so the list was a real statement. He thought

they could arrange a Press Conference where some of these people were present, with perhaps an accompanying publication of some kind defining their contributions and containing statements from them on the importance of the archives.

Mr DE PINA felt one could introduce a third category of people who could make financial contributions, as for example someone from the manufacturing side, like Kodak, Eastman, Debie or Philips. Later, he mentioned they should also consider people like the millionaire who had provided the first reflex camera for an exhibition in Rio.

Mr FRANCIS cited Paul Getty Junior who had done so much for his archive and was also a film enthusiast and suggested there should perhaps be a fourth category of benefactors from outside the industry.

Mr CINCOTTI stressed they would have to approach the individuals concerned to make sure they were willing. Mr DAUDELIN felt they should not have too many on the final list. In response to Mrs ORBANZ, Mrs WIBOM suggested they should decide later how to handle the list and questions like if and how they would add to it in later years.

Decision : Working Group (Mr CINCOTTI, Mr ROSEN, Mr DAUDELIN) to compile a list of some 15-20 suggestions for review under point 10 of the Agenda.

Day 3 Addition to 3.6a: Roll of Honour

In the final discussion, Mr ROSEN reported for the Working Group (MM CINCOTTI, DAUDELIN, DE PINA and himself).

They suggested the following criteria:

The members of this Roll of Honour are distinguished individuals who have made a significant contribution to the goals of the Federation and by that we mean film-makers (cinéastes rather than metteurs en scène), or scholars whose work exemplifies or supports the cultural mission of film archives, benefactors and supporters of archives and individuals who have contributed to the arts, industry and technologies of film archiving.

The initial list, as a proposal from the EC, would be presented to the GA for ratification, with perhaps an initial 5 to 12 names, and additions would be limited to say 2 a year, to a maximum of say 25.

Nominations would take the form of written proposals (say 500 words) from an archive.

They also wanted to insist on some demonstrable tie-in with archives: eg directly supporting archives, embodying in their work the use of archives, respect and understanding of film history.

There had agreed on 8 names more or less unanimously; other names put forward had helped identify further issues for discussion.

The 8 initial names, giving a good international spread, were:
Luigi Comencini, Lillian Gish, Ingmar Bergman, Carlos Alvarez, Joris Ivens, Satijagit Ray (subject to PK Nair's approval), Jean-Luc Godard and Jay Leyda.

The other names and the issues they raised were:

- Harold Brown:
did the Federation want individuals directly associated with archives and, if so, how was this different from acknowledging them as Honorary Members ?
- Wim Wenders: should they try to include more contemporary film makers
- Scorsese: there was already one US national on the list for this year; how important was geographical balance ?

They had not found anyone appropriate who would be representative of:

- Eastern Europe:
Regrettably Alexandrov was already dead.
Janczo was suggested but they didn't know of any connection with the archive movement
- Africa: Ousmane was suggested but again there was no known link to archives.

Mr FRANCIS noted that there seemed to be 3 possible categories but all seemed to come from the first category (film-makers). He suggested they should nominate only a couple of names for the 50th Anniversary.

Mrs ORBANZ felt the EC should not be making decisions on such an important issue and the membership should be consulted to decide direct or via a jury that they appointed for the specific purpose. Mrs BOWSER warmly supported this point of view. Mr FRANCIS suggested they could start on the 100th Anniversary of the Cinema instead. Mr ROSEN acknowledged that it was an area where everyone in the Federation would be expected to have strong views. Mr DAUDELIN thought it was an excellent idea but too late for them to use the prestigious names for the Anniversary. They should refine their proposals in Paris and present them to the GA there.

Action: Working Group to prepare final written proposals for discussion by EC and then GA in Paris.

3.6b Honorary Members (Day 2 contd)

Mrs WIBOM asked the EC for their opinions on the functions and possible time limits.

Mrs BOWSER felt an honour could not be withdrawn but it was reasonable to limit the number of years they could attend the EC meetings to, say, 2 years, purely on practical grounds. Mr CINCOTTI and Mr FRANCIS agreed and Mr FRANCIS suggested they should only be invited to the meetings associated with the Congress but Mrs ORBANZ felt this was not a friendly step, especially as they were unlikely to come to the ones in between. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that this was the first EC meeting in her recollection at which there had been no Honorary Members.

Decision : Mrs BOWSER and Mrs ORBANZ to prepare guidelines for discussion under point 10 of the Agenda.

Day 3 Addition to 3.6b: Honorary Members

In the final session, Mrs ORBANZ and Mrs BOWSER presented the proposals they had drafted since the first discussion:

Preamble:

In keeping with FIAF's new policies of rotation, that is, limiting the terms of elected officers and members of the EC, we are trying to find a way to limit the participation of Honorary Members in the EC meetings. It seems more necessary to reconsider their role now that we have the possibility of 5 HMs attending EC meetings. Fully appreciating the value to the Federation of their combined experiences, we do find it to be an unfair proportion of HMs to the Ordinary Members who must leave after a period of time, while HMs will remain for their lifetime. Of course HMs do not vote but they are often very influential in the discussions. Without having to change our Rules concerning HMs the EC may change the old tradition of inviting HMs to its meetings.

Proposal 1:

We propose that the HMs arrange among themselves an equitable system of rotation whereby no more than 2 would attend the same EC meeting except when specially invited in such circumstances as the 50th Anniversary Celebrations or when a specific HM was needed for the work of the EC.

Proposal 2:

We propose to modify the former practice by inviting HMs to attend the meetings immediately before Congresses but not the mid-year meeting except when specially invited for a specific purpose.

Mrs BOWSER reported they had abandoned her proposal to limit participation for two years as, under the present circumstances, this would mean that suddenly they would pass from 5 to 0 Honorary Members. Mrs ORBANZ preferred the second alternative as it didn't seem easy for the HMs themselves to arrange who was to attend.

Mr CINCOTTI was not happy with either but had no better solution to offer. Mrs WIBOM wanted a combination of the two but thought the second alternative was the only practical one. She was a bit concerned at the

thought of having 5 HMs present for the full 3 days of the EC meeting in Paris (Mrs ORBANZ recalled that there would only be 4 at that stage) and Mrs VAN DER ELST warned that the proposed meeting room was about a quarter of the one they were using in Cuba. Mrs BOWSER suggested that the statement was prepared for the HMs only and was not for presentation to the GA. Mrs VAN DER ELST thought the HMs themselves would prefer the second solution as it would give them the opportunity to be together if they did attend.

Mr ROSEN talked about the practice in other organisations he knew where Past Presidents continued to attend for a year or two to provide the benefits of their knowledge and a certain continuity. He had never known a case where a past contribution was honoured by a right to permanent attendance in the ongoing business and it seemed quite inappropriate.

It was confirmed that HMs should continue to receive the Minutes of all the EC meetings.

Mrs VAN DER ELST later pointed out that the new Rules already said "may be invited", whereas the new proposal said "will be invited", and it was agreed to modify the wording accordingly.

Decision : Proposal 2 adopted and to be put before the HMs in Paris.

4 FINANCIAL REPORT

In the absence of Mr BORDE, Mr DE PINA presented the Financial Report.

4.1 Provisional Accounts for 1987

Mr BORDE had written suggesting that it should not be necessary to raise the subscription before 1990, especially as the strength of the Swiss dollar had already created a technical increase for many. However, he thought it would be inevitable for that year. Mr DE PINA suggested they should in any case explore the twin possibilities of reducing expenditure and increasing the Federation's income. Mrs VAN DER ELST drew attention to the substantial second Reserve which remained in spite of the agreed write-offs.

Mrs ORBANZ asked if, when they came to consider the subscription rates for 1990, they could explore alternative systems, as for example relating the subscription to a percentage of the individual archive budgets.

Mr KLAUE felt any increase should be accompanied by a careful explanation of why it was absolutely necessary. He mentioned the Roumanian archive which had been unable to pay the last increase. It was a very serious problem for poor countries and countries with non-convertible currencies.

Mrs WIBOM welcomed the idea of exploring alternative financial possibilities. She suggested they should investigate taxation schemes for international organisations, possible sponsorship and fund-raising possibilities, and creation of a fund to assist poor archives to travel to Congresses. She felt it was the role of the Treasurer to coordinate this and mentioned that she and Mr ROSEN would be willing to work on the problem.

Mr ROSEN suggested there were a range of organisations (like Kodak, Rockefeller Foundation and some Japanese equipment and film manufacturers) that might be willing to help an international organisation. These were organisations which he thought were not generally interested in helping individual archives so an approach to them would not be in competition with member archives.

Decision : Working group of 4 (Mr BORDE, Mrs VAN DER ELST, Mrs WIBOM and Mr ROSEN) to develop ideas.

4.2 Budget for 1989

Mr DE PINA and Mrs VAN DER ELST indicated the reasons for the variations from the budget for 1988. The estimated subscriptions were reduced as it was thought the figure for 1988 had been too ambitious. No information was available on possible support from Unesco.

Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested it would be useful for members if the office subscribed to a telefax service. Several members already used the service and of course anyone could use it via a local post office. It would cost about 20,000 Belgian francs a year.

Mrs WIBOM suggested that, as the Federation had good reserves, they should double the amount allocated to "Summer School & Training Fund" or open a new budget heading, "Development Fund". Perhaps in future they should consider allocating a specific percentage to such a fund. They had talked for a long time about the possibility of the richer archives helping the poorer ones and she felt it was time to do something. She suggested they should open this to discussion in the GA.

Mr FRANCIS commented that the interest on unpaid subscriptions would go a long way to meeting the proposed increase in the training fund. He suggested the larger organisations should be encouraged to volunteer to pay their subscriptions on time and pay a penalty if late. They could for example make a nominal increase in the subscription level but, if you paid on time, you would pay at the existing lower rate but any such scheme should be voluntary.

Decision : 1989 Budget approved with incorporation of suggestions.
No increase of subscription for 1989.

5 REPORTS FROM THE SPECIALIST COMMISSIONS

5.1 Preservation Commission

In the absence of Mr SCHOU, the EC reviewed his written Report.

On point 3.9, Vinegar Syndrome, Mr FRANCIS said the Report on the second year of research had now been received. In the first year, they had identified that the acetate film base was taking on up to 30% water; they had now discovered that the catalyst was metal, as illustrated by photographs of the results of accelerated ageing tests which he had brought with him. They had therefore recommended master material should be stored in glass rather than plastic whose ingredients may not always be inert. All the tests had been on acetate but they believed the metal would have the same effect on nitrate. As the results were so significant, he had contributed a further £5,000 (in addition to the £1,500 per year for 3 years paid so far) for them to complete tests on cans of different composition and coating by the end of March 1988. However, he suggested that if further research was indicated, FIAF should be prepared to contribute or seek help from other organisations.

Mrs WIBOM suggested Mr SCHOU's list of thanks should include mention of these contributions from Mr FRANCIS' archive.

Three reports of related research were also mentioned:

- Mrs BOWSER had brought for the Bulletin a one-page report from Peter Williamson on the testing of plastic storage containers in the States. An American company, Plastic Real Corporation of America (?) was now producing cans of inert materials for archival storage.
- Mrs GALVAO mentioned that Mr Joao Socrates would be sending a report on the same topic to Mr SCHOU.
- Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that the Agfa representative was still researching and believed the cause was the nitrate.

Travel Funds for Commission members

Mrs WIBOM referred to Mr SCHOU's telex about the difficulties of funding travel for Commission meetings and the agreement that FIAF would fund the travel for him and Mr Socrates to the PC meeting after Paris out of the 1987 Preservation Commission surplus.

Mrs HARRISON said this raised the general problem of all Commissions, especially with the US \$ being so low. They would like to be able to fund travel for a Commission member from a developing country. Mrs WIBOM suggested the question should be discussed in the GA in Paris in connection with the proposed Development Fund.

Decision : Mr KLAUE to prepare introductory paper.

Membership of Commissions

In Mr SCHOU's letter to Mrs WIBOM, he was unhappy that retired archivists had to be nominated as "consultants" rather than "members" of the Commissions. As their contribution was not affected by whether an expert was labelled "consultant" or "member", the EC did not understand the problem. In trying to understand Mr SCHOU's reasoning, Mrs BOWSER suggested it might be thought more of an honour to be a member and, if one was attached to an organisation, it might affect whether one could obtain travel funds, but this had no bearing on Mr Brown's case.

Mrs HARRISON found the device very useful to continue to profit from ex-members' experience but at the same time to inject new blood from serving members of archive staff. She saw no problem with labelling.

Mr FRANCIS disagreed with Mr SCHOU's suggestion and said it would be much easier for his archive to justify providing a new Commission member, if Mr Brown remained a consultant rather than a member.

Action: Mrs WIBOM to explain the reasoning to Mr SCHOU.

Mr SCHOU had again asked for information on the procedure for membership changes and would be referred to the new Rules in which it was clearly set out. His full Commission, including himself, was subject to reconfirmation every two years so his responsibility was to formally submit his new list.

It was generally agreed that it was a wise procedure to have prospective new members attend as observers or visitors before decisions were made on either side.

Action: Secretary-General to ask Mr SCHOU (and the other Commission Heads) to submit proposed list of members for decision in Paris, having obtained clearance and permissions from the archives concerned. Secretariat to answer points in Mr SCHOU's letter.

5.2 Cataloguing Commission

Mrs HARRISON opened by mentioning that they were very happy with their new Member, Vladimir Opela, who had actively contributed at his first meeting. Mr FRANCIS confirmed that Mr Roger Holman had resigned after many years' service as he felt it was someone else's turn. She would like all the remaining to be considered for reconfirmation. There were 8 serving members and one vacancy which was larger than the 7 envisaged by Rule 78. Mrs HARRISON felt 9 was a useful number and everyone was contributing effectively.

She then reviewed each section of her written Report and invited comments.

1 Cataloguing Rules

Mr KLAUE suggested the draft of the Cataloguing Rules (point 1) should be sent to IASA and the ICA Audio-Visual Working Group.

2 Glossary Supplements

Mr CINCOTTI reported the Italian version had already been sent off and Mrs WIBOM said Mr Lindfors was working on the Swedish.

There would be no problem on copyright permission for the Eastern Europeans to re-publish the English with their own language versions.

Action: Commission members concerned to write to the Secretary-General asking for formal permission.

4 Technical Guidelines

Mr KLAUE said the two people working on the Technical Guidelines (point 4) had decided not to delay any longer waiting for a response from Mr SCHOU and would pass the document to the Secretariat for publication. Mrs VAN DER ELST explained that Mr SCHOU had passed them to Philippe Poncin of INA who had not replied. Mr FRANCIS believed FIAT had already published something on television terms; if so, the FIAF document could contain the reference.

Action: Mr FRANCIS to send copy of FIAT document to Mrs HARRISON.

6 ISIS

Mrs HARRISON agreed with Mr KLAUE's suggestion that Mr Smither's report on ISIS (point 6) was so useful that it should be published in the Bulletin.

Mrs BOWSER asked if it could be edited to make it more accessible to readers, in particular cutting the recommendations for software development (pp5-7).

Point 7, referring to possible Unesco funding of Mr Pereira, would also need editing in the light of what was agreed. Mrs GALVAO said the archive could not fund his participation as they already had 2 staff (Mr Socrates and herself) attending FIAF meetings. In addition, as foreseen in point 4, top of page 4, Mr Socrates' Commission work was already encroaching on time needed for his archive duties. Mrs WIBOM asked Mrs GALVAO to consider whether Mr Pereira would have time to work on the project if funding was found. Mrs HARRISON explained that Unesco were keen for the Commission to use (and promote) ISIS but at the moment no-one on the Commission had experience of using it. This was the background to the suggestion that Unesco should provide funding for Mr Pereira to join the Commission as the ISIS user but she thought the chances were low. Apart from Brazil, the only other users or potential users were India, Canada (Ottawa) and Madrid.

Unesco had contributed \$6,000 for 10 people to meet for two days and Mr Smither to prepare a Report.

Mrs HARRISON again stressed that they could not recommend any particular software package as its usefulness would depend on the archive's needs and systems. She had found in the Library of Congress that there was a Federal Library Information Committee which had prepared a long list of US software; the Commission had a copy and could publish it within FIAF if it was thought useful.

The EC thanked Mr Smither for his report and any editing for the Bulletin would be submitted to him for approval. Mrs WIBOM formally thanked Mrs HARRISON for her Report. She also thanked Mrs VAN DER ELST for receiving the Commission in her home, providing meeting room and accommodation.

Action: Mrs HARRISON to submit formal written request for reconfirmation of Commission members for consideration in Paris.

5.3 Documentation Commission

Mr FRANCIS commented Ms Snapes' Report as follows:

i Membership

Ms Snapes had put forward 3 names and invited suggestions for 3 more. It was suggested Michael Moulds, Editor of PIP and a paid employee, should be an ex officio Member rather than a member, which Michael acknowledged was a more logical relationship.

Mrs BOWSER felt she was no longer sufficiently in touch to make suggestions but in any event suggested the Commission members themselves should be better placed to seek out fellow experts.

Mrs WIBOM was surprised that the former Commission had been reconvened to meet in Paris, when Ms Snapes had been given the opportunity to start anew and especially before the members had been approved by the EC.

Mr FRANCIS felt Ms Snapes had been put in a difficult position starting from scratch; she needed help from others with Commission experience and had in fact only re-appointed 3 members with the intention that at their first meeting they should pool ideas on other possible candidates in the light of their needs.

Mrs WIBOM asked that Mr FRANCIS ensure that Ms Snapes is familiar with the relevant Statutes & Rules. Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed that the new version was being printed.

ii St James's Press & International Directory (point 4)

Mr FRANCIS asked that this should be held over until after the PIP/St James's Press discussion. Mrs BOWSER noted that the EC should have been consulted and there could be no direct contract between publisher and Commission. She felt they should be stopped immediately but feared that they may have already made an agreement.

In the subsequent discussion, there was general concern that Commission Heads and Project managers needed reminding of the limit of their responsibilities; any commitments must be signed by the President or the Secretary General.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to draft reminder to Commission Heads and Project managers, stressing that they had no authority to commit the Federation to anything. Mr FRANCIS to investigate status of negotiations with St James's Press on his return to London.

iii International Directory of Cinematographers & Designers (point 2)

The Report suggested that "the status of this working group is not yet clearly defined within the new Commission" but Mrs BOWSER reminded the EC that it had already decided that the group should be separate from the Commission and report directly to the EC. It was a project which runs on its own without the need for supervision and, by separating it, it enabled them to get new blood into the Commission.

Mr KLAUE said the costs involved were simply the staying costs for 3 people meeting once a year which till then had been met from the Documentation Commission budget. They had to decide whether it would still be paid from the Commission budget or taken from another budget heading. The group were assuming FIAF would continue to fund them for their 1988 meeting which they hoped to have in Paris.

Decision: The Directory is formally transferred out of the Documentation Commission into the list of Projects. Mr Krautz to be asked to formally submit his request for funding, defining what is required.

6 REPORT FROM PIP (INTERNATIONAL INDEX TO FILM PERIODICALS)

Mr FRANCIS said he had visited the Editor in his new location quite recently and found he was feeling very isolated. He asked that anyone visiting London would try to make time to visit him.

i US payments

In the Report it was asserted that "some US librarians are reluctant (or not allowed) to make payments outside the USA." Neither Mrs BOWSER nor

Mrs HARRISON were aware of such a situation but would look into ways of finding a solution. It was however often disproportionately expensive to transfer small amounts. Mrs VAN DER ELST agreed and reported that on payments for FIAF publications costing \$20 or \$30 they were quite likely to lose half in bank charges. She had been told by the Brussels bank that if FIAF opened a bank account overseas, it would need a permanent deposit of \$10,000. Mrs BOWSER was sure one of the US institutions could provide the service.

Action: Mrs BOWSER to ask the Commission member in her archive to investigate.

ii Distribution

a St James's Press

Mr FRANCIS had brought all the correspondence with him but noted it was difficult to decipher just what was owing. If anyone wanted to spend the time on it, he suggested the letters of 29 January 1987 from Karen Jones and the reply of February 9 would be the best starting point. Mr DAUDELIN suggested they could write a routine letter asking for a financial report on sales, together with remittance, for FIAF's own report on its fiscal year.

Mrs BOWSER thought it was strange that St James' were unable to provide sales figures routinely like any other publishers. As the arrangement was so unsatisfactory it was agreed to cancel the agreement, with timing to be decided by the Editor to suit the project's best interests.

Decision: Mr Moulds and Mrs VAN DER ELST to draft formal cancellation letter to be signed by Mr BORDE.

b Saur

Mr KLAUE asked if any action had been taken following Saur's second letter, of June 16, 1987, which Eberhard Spiess had translated and sent to Mr Moulds, in which they said:

"our interest remains in the Index and I invite you to send me as soon as possible the complete set of documents on it to consider if we can reach an agreement"

They were a big publishing house working well with FIAF on other projects and, although there was nothing definite, it was a chance worth pursuing. Mr FRANCIS said Mr Moulds had mentioned the renewed possibility but he did not know what response had been made, if any.

c Via NGO's: ICA and IFLA

Mr KLAUE recalled that both ICA and IFLA had invited PIP to advertise free of charge in their Bulletins and asked if this had been followed up and what the results had been.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST/Mr FRANCIS to ask Mr Moulds to report progress.

d UK Distributor for worldwide sales

Mr FRANCIS reported that Mr Moulds had found a local agent who was willing to mail worldwide against a handling charge of only 25p per book, a charge which would be more than offset by their preferential bulk postage rates, making a very attractive deal.

Decision: Consider after resolution of situation at St James's Press.

iii Accounts

Mr FRANCIS noted that the delays caused by relocation and staff changes meant that in 1988 there would be two annual volumes coming out which would increase both expenditure and income.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said she still found it very difficult to interpret the information supplied by Mr Moulds as there was never any attempt at an annual balance sheet. Perhaps they should find a small accountant to help.

Action: Mr FRANCIS to find an accountant.

7 PROJECTS & PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

7.1 Treasures from the Film Archives (New York)

Mrs BOWSER confirmed the contract with Scarecrow was signed and they were currently finalising computer output format. Probable date of publication in 6 months.

7.2 Silent Films Catalogue (Brussels)

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr Ledoux said it was now being proof read and publication was expected in January/February 1988.

7.3 Vienna Historical Symposium Papers (Wien FA)

Still no news.

7.4 Slapstick Symposium Papers (New York)

Mrs BOWSER reported text was now in Brussels and Mrs VAN DER ELST said they were working with designer on the cover and expected to publish in a couple of months.

7.5 Bibliography of Catalogues of Old Cinematographic Equipment (Montreal)

Mr DAUDELIN said there was nothing new to report on this ongoing project.

7.6 Revised Edition of the "Handbook for Film Archives" (Mrs BOWSER/JOHN KUIPER)

Mrs BOWSER reported that delays in obtaining final copy from contributors

meant that she was not available to work on it immediately and it had to be rescheduled with John Kuiper who had changed jobs. She hoped to have more specific news in Paris.

7.7 Glossary of Laboratory Terms (Mr SPEHR/Mr SCHOU)

There was no news.

7.8 FIAF Bulletin (Mr DAUDELIN)

Mr DAUDELIN reported that issue 35 was due out in January and the Editors would be working on it in Cuba.

Mrs ORBANZ raised again the question if the Bulletin could be distributed more widely as other organisations were interested in it, particularly the NGO's who were interested in the technical content. Mr DAUDELIN said it would have to be resolved in the General Assembly and several members objected. Mrs BOWSER stressed the main objection was the Executive Report to its membership. However, it had been agreed that they could photocopy articles if the authors had not put a restriction on them.

Mr KLAUE supported Mrs ORBANZ' suggestion as he was often asked for regular information on FIAF activities as was done by the other NGO's (IASA, ICA and IFLA). He was strongly in favour of having a Bulletin available on subscription to a wider audience and that internal information should be made available through an alternative channel.

Mr CINCOTTI felt there might be a legal problem if the Bulletin was published more widely in certain countries.

Mr ROSEN asked if it was considered an "internal" document only for traditional reasons or whether there was some other impediment.

Mr DAUDELIN thought the only reason was the EC Report summary prepared by Mrs BOWSER which could be distributed directly by mail. Mrs BOWSER recalled how Mr Kula had warned how Bulletins could grow into "monsters" once they went public. One advantage of the present system was that they had the possibility to speak frankly among members, although she was not sure how many contributors thought that way.

Mrs ORBANZ had studied the last four or five issues and found no "secrets" apart from the EC Report. She pointed out that they were not considering selling it from bookstalls but perhaps having it available in specialist libraries. She asked how many times contributors had asked for information to be restricted. Mr DAUDELIN recalled there had been restrictions on some survey figures.

Mrs BOWSER felt they should define what public they wanted to reach. Mr ROSEN understood it was not to be a publication in the regular sense (with its attendant marketing and distribution problems) but simply broader dissemination of information about FIAF's activities to interested parties and professionals outside the Federation.

Mrs WIBOM thought its main advantage would be as a vehicle to publicise the work of the Federation, its ideas, achievements and indeed its failures. Mrs ORBANZ asked if they might be able to distribute the Technical sections. Mr DAUDELIN felt the Bulletin could not meet Mrs WIBOM's needs for a better "public image" but felt there could be a way to publish it, or portions of it, for the NGO's etc.

Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed that she had plenty of spare copies so could send the technical material to the NGO's, etc., on request.

Action: Editorial Committee to explore possibilities and report in Paris.

7.9 Revision of Statistics on Film Archive Activities (Mr KLAUE)

Mr KLAUE said no progress had been made but there had been many suggestions and he recognised that it was urgent to prepare a revision in time to be used for the new Annual Reports.

Action: Mr KLAUE to provide revision for Secretariat to use in January 1988.

7.10 Restoration Symposium Canberra (MM Edmondson/Schou)

Mrs VAN DER ELST quoted from Mr SCHOU's report that work was in progress.

Mrs HARRISON asked if there had been any response to the requests in Berlin to publish the Canberra Computer Symposium. There was no mention of it. Mr DAUDELIN suggested that after two years it was no longer relevant and Mrs HARRISON acknowledged that this could well be true.

Action: List the Canberra Computer Symposium as a separate project for follow-up.

7.11 Bibliography of FIAF Members' Publications (Ottawa/Secretariat)

Mr DAUDELIN reported he had just received the 1986 version which was better quality than previously.

7.12 Berlin Technical Symposium (Mrs ORBANZ)

Mrs ORBANZ asked that this item be added to the list as she had brought with her a mock-up of what was planned. Unfortunately, it would be in English only and not in French as well as originally hoped.

The document was being prepared with the help of 3 Editors: Helen Harrison for IASA, Philippe Poncin for FIAT and Hennig SCHOU for FIAF. One third of the papers had already been passed to the publisher and all but two had been received from the speakers (Peter Konlechner and Brian Jenkinson (FIAT)). They were planning a print order of 1000, including 300 free copies for the delegates. They would be able to decide on price later when they had more information on costs.

She would like to include the papers on "Ethics of Restoration" even though it was planned to consider them in the Canberra document as well. At the end, she also planned to include a short description of the 3 sponsoring organisations. The final papers of the two Unesco consultations would be published separately in January. All the publication costs were being met from the Congress Budget.

Target publication: End of January but not later than end of March 1988.

8 RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

8.1 Unesco

Mr KLAUE reported as follows:

i Unesco General Assembly

Mr KLAUE had attended for 3 days because it was the occasion he received the Unesco Silver Medal. He mentioned that for the first time many delegates spoke about the importance of preserving moving image archives, including Thailand, Indonesia, Peru, France and other countries. This was remarkable and he felt FIAF should be preparing its members better to brief their national delegates as funding is based on the speeches and the attention given to various activities by the national delegates. In addition, FIAF should be sure to attend the two or three days when these topics are discussed and make a statement to underline FIAF's interest and the importance of its work.

On this occasion he had been able to use the opportunity of receiving the medal to talk about film preservation and, with the Acting Director General's speech and his own, about twenty minutes was devoted to the topic.

ii Possible future projects

He had discussed possibilities with Mr Arnaldo but nothing had been decided yet for the next two-year period, although there was some sympathy for the following projects:

- Round Table, 1 day in Paris after 1988 Congress, on problems of moving image archives to define tasks for the next medium term plan of Unesco from 1991-96.

- Publication of Survey on 1980 Recommendation
- Regional Seminars in 1988: Requests received from Argentina and from Mexico. Unesco would only support one, probably Mexico because of the election and possible changes.
- Regional Seminar in Thailand in 1988 or later, with an advanced workshop on preservation and restoration.
- Support for research in Czechoslovakia on treatments against fungus and bacteria, which was crucial for tropical countries.
- Study on possibility of Regional Preservation Centre in Asia; however, after several studies, it was apparent that no single country could do this alone and there would be communication problems if done jointly.
- Travelling fellowship for one person from Indonesia to visit archives in Europe, with hopefully host archives covering staying costs.
- Promotion of mini/micro ISIS, especially in archives not yet using computers.

He had mentioned a number of other possible requests that might emerge from current FIAF activities but there was no immediate interest from Unesco:

- Publications: Cataloguing Rules, new FIAF Handbook
- Data-base development at Secretariat
- Next Joint Technical Symposium, for 1990 or 1991.
- Material support requests from many individual archives
- Sensibilisation activities in countries where there is film and tv production but no archives, especially in Africa.

The United Nations had decided that 1988-1998 should be a Decade for Cultural Development and, as the period included the 100th Anniversary of the Development of Cinematography in 1995, they should exchange ideas in Paris on how to mark the occasion.

Mrs GALVAO asked if there was anything specific about Africa arising from the meeting in Mozambique. Mr KLAUE said there had been talk of sending a mission to francophone African countries to persuade governments of the need to preserve moving images and plan a small regional meeting.

Mr GARCIA MESA asked if there was any chance that Unesco could help bring people from Latin America or Africa to the 1990 Symposium in Habana. Mr KLAUE said if seminars were supported in both 1988 and 1989, there would be very little chance for a regional activity in 1990; he felt they should concentrate on the 1990 Congress; this would need withdrawing one of the earlier requests but he suggested the Latin American group should agree among themselves what would be preferable. Mr GARCIA MESA mentioned the Latin American film archives were meeting in Habana in the next few days but unfortunately no-one from Mexico or Argentina would be there.

Restitution of films to former colonies

Mr DE PINA mentioned that the Portuguese archive had hundreds of documentations about Angola and Mozambique, made from the 1930's and up to the time of independence. His archive planned to identify, catalogue and copy selected films for the two countries concerned and asked if Unesco could help. Mr KLAUE said there was some funding available for restitution of art and films but it worked only on request from the countries themselves. For example, Unesco was supporting the printing of material on the Solomon Islands. Mr GARCIA MESA mentioned that when visiting Angola some three years ago he was told the request had already been submitted to Unesco. Mr KLAUE said that very often people made verbal requests without following them up officially so nothing got done. He recommended encouraging countries to apply officially and send copies of the requests to the FIAF Secretariat so that FIAF could try and help progress them. In his discussions with Mr Arnaldo there had never been any mention of such a request from Angola. In response to Mrs GALVAO, he said that the Recommendation from the meeting would not be sufficient, even though a Unesco representative was present.

Application for "A" Status

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that in her own discussions with Mr Arnaldo he had expressed interest in various projects but there was not much money available. There were 3 categories of affiliation, A, B and C status. FIAF was currently B status, which meant they could have contracts, but if they obtained A status there was a possibility to obtain direct funding. With A Status, Unesco would be obliged to consult FIAF on all matters relating to audio-visual expenditure and policies. This would give FIAF more information on what was happening in the audio-visual area and more influence on policies. The forms should be completed by the end of 1987 to be in time for consideration at the March 1988 meeting.

Action: Secretariat to send in application form.

Co-ordination Committee of the Technical Commissions of the International Federations for Audio, Film and Television Archives (abbreviation: C-C)

Mrs ORBANZ commented her written reports on the creation of this Committee which had been discussed at the Unesco Consultation in Berlin in May and had had its first subsequent meeting in Paris, July 2 and 3. They hoped to meet next in Madrid in May 1988.

It had been felt in Berlin that they needed more contact between the archives, the industry and the standardisation group. No action or funding was expected from FIAF but the continued existence of the CC depended entirely on Unesco for travel and staying costs. Mr KLAUE felt it unlikely that Unesco would continue and there were signs of a lack of both money and interest.

FIAF and the other NGO's therefore had to decide whether they would be willing to contribute to support the continuation of the work.

8.2 Council of Europe: European Cinema & Television Year (ECTVY) 1988

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported many projects had been suggested but there was very little money available. FIAF had been asked to coordinate and prepare a "livre blanc" on the preservation of moving images. There was no way she could coordinate on her own, especially without money. She had written to the national committees asking for their cooperation and concrete proposals but with very little response.

Mrs ORBANZ understood from the meeting she attended that FIAF was not meant to be so active. Everyone was talking about making reports but nothing was being done as there was very little money. She felt FIAF would be involved in coordinating only when the projects became a reality. Mrs VAN DER ELST said that since then there had been suggestions for many more projects and there were now about 15 projects for FIAF to coordinate.

Mr KLAUE asked if FIAF, as an international body, should be involved in coordinating projects within a single region. He thought the responsibility for coordination should lie with the group of Western European archives.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned documents he had received about various projects where the role of FIAF, FIAT and UCE (Union des Cinémathèques Européennes) seemed to be thoroughly confused. Mrs VAN DER ELST said that UCE was not a member of the Executive Committee of the Year which was why it was referred back to FIAF. Mrs WIBOM said that UCE represented only the 12 EEC countries.

Mr DE PINA said they were involved in several projects: nitrate recovery, the "livre blanc", development of the legal deposit system throughout Europe, and the campaign on the importance of archive restoration work. However, there was so much confusion on whether funding would be available that the Portuguese archive and television companies had decided to concentrate on marking the occasion independently. In Portugal itself they were working with TV to produce 4 TV programmes on the history of Portuguese cinema, a retrospective of re-discovered European films, a book on the relations between Portuguese and European cinema.

Mr CINCOTTI had attended a couple of meetings and also found it was very confusing. He felt they would all agree that FIAF should certainly not be involved in providing any funding to what was only a regional event.

Mr ROSEN suggested that FIAF could possibly play a coordinating role if funds were made available to hire someone for the purpose. If not, he thought it was obvious that FIAF had quite enough to do with its own projects.

Mrs WIBOM, as President of the Swedish National Committee, was very reluctant to involve FIAF but was angry to see organisations like IASA, FIAPF, FIAD and all international film organisations present when FIAF had not even been invited. She understood the Council of Europe (24 countries) was hoping for a substantial subsidy from the EEC (12 countries) but the decision was not expected now till February 1988, even though they had started talking about the Year in Vienna in 1986.

She suggested that Mrs VAN DER ELST should write saying FIAF was willing to coordinate, once there were active projects and provided funds were made available to hire someone for the purpose. Mr KLAUE was against this as it was outside FIAF's brief. He felt FIAF could support the Year, attend the meetings, support projects, call a meeting of the archives, but decisions and responsibilities for coordination of the projects should rest with the countries concerned. Mrs BOWSER agreed that FIAF had the knowledge but should only attend meetings as an observer and/or adviser. Mrs ORBANZ said she had stressed this at the meetings she had attended. In addition, she had agreed to produce a document describing FIAF's functions and activities.
Action: Mrs WIBOM and Mrs VAN DER ELST to prepare letter clarifying FIAF's position.

8.3 ICA

Mr CINCOTTI reported that he had attended part of their 4-day meeting at the beautiful Italian resort, Gordone Riviera, devoted primarily to technical reports.

Mr KLAUE recalled that in August 1988 they were holding their International Congress in Paris, devoted to "Archives and New Media", and he had been invited to speak. They would be publishing a special issue of "Archivum" on the topic for which he had provided an article on the training of archivists for audio-visual archives, based on the Round Table in Berlin. An increasing number of national archives were setting up audio-visual departments, especially in developing countries.

Joint ICA & National Archive of Canada Meeting

In the final session, Mr DAUDELIN and Mr KLAUE mentioned a meeting to be held in Ottawa, organised jointly by the ICA and the National Archive of Canada on the topic "Conservation in archives (papers, photos, norms ???, magnetic tapes, etc)". There was very little coverage of film archives and it was suggested that the Ottawa archive, part of the host archive, should be

asked to send a technician to the meeting and make a report for FIAF. They would also inform Mr Schou and put information about the meeting in the Bulletin in case others were interested.

Action : Mr DAUDELIN to put information in Bulletin and advise Mr Schou.

8.4 IFTC

Mr FRANCIS reported he had asked Roger Holman to attend the meeting of the IFTC Archives and Cataloguing Commission (known locally as the "Roads Show"). He had brought the documentation which seemed to consist almost entirely of work done by Roads under contract to Unesco and new proposals to Unesco. There was a new proposal for

"a Unesco consultatation on the urgent and important issue of obsolescence in audio-visual systems and to consider necessary counter-measures"

planned for November 1988, requesting \$5000. He also had the complete text of Roads' "World Communications Report", another Unesco contract, which covered the entire archive movement.

The meeting was primarily a technical symposium covering such topics as high definition television, optical disc technology, and really had little to do with archiving or cataloguing.

The level of Unesco support suggested that A Status certainly had advantages

8.5 FIAT

As Mr KULA was no longer on the EC, Mr FRANCIS took over responsibility for relations with FIAT as no-one else belonged. He had the Minutes of the last meeting in Montreal which included some interesting material:

- report on use of computers in TV archives (second part)
- article on new INA preservation facility for film and TV.

In general, he thought their Minutes and their Information Bulletin contained interesting information for FIAF.

Later in the meeting, Mr DE PINA raised the question of the large holdings of TV-transmitted film in TV archives. Mr FRANCIS explained that the TV archives saw themselves responsible for their total holdings, regardless of whether they were on film or tape. However, they were keen to benefit from FIAF's expertise in the area of film preservation, hence the continuing liaison between the different organisations.

8.6 FIAPF

Mrs WIBOM, who represents Sweden and Scandinavia in FIAPF, presented a document from FIAPF dated 23 November 1987. She had been talking with them about cooperation on the 50th Anniversary and they had then raised the question why archives could not accept their standard agreement on deposit conditions. She suggested that FIAF should tell them which points were unacceptable and why, or propose an alternative document, in order to have a better working relation.

Mr FRANCIS could see no benefit in giving reasons and did not want to get involved with FIAPF at all. Mr ROSEN said in North America they wanted to develop some model deposit agreements for the national archives but at the same time he appreciated Mr FRANCIS' view as some of the clauses were so totally unacceptable that he was not sure they wanted to start talking at all. In particular,

- there were no preservation clauses, nothing about the production of original materials;
- there was no distinction between copyright and property right and no archive would go to the expense of preservation if it meant handing over the new material to the copyright owner;
- there was no distinction between deposit and gift.

Mrs BOWSER thought they had agreed that as the international body they could not bind any of their individual members and they should not even be considering such a document.

Mr CINCOTTI asked if it was known if any archives had ever signed the document. Mr DAUDELIN mentioned Lausanne, Copenhagen, Stockholm. He felt it was rather strange to be still using a document which had been drafted in 1971 when there had been so many technical developments since. In Italy and other countries, there were now national laws permitting state archives to do things that were forbidden by the FIAPF agreement; in addition, many other archive activities were forbidden by the agreement. However, he was not against individual archives trying to find an acceptable form of agreement with FIAPF.

Mr FRANCIS was worried that Mrs WIBOM appeared to have initiated the discussion with FIAPF which he thought was potentially very damaging.

Mrs WIBOM explained that she had asked them a year ago if they would be willing to give a gala performance for the 50th Anniversary and at a more recent meeting. They had said it would be possible but they did not yet know what would be programmed. They had then raised the question of the document which she had said was very old and unacceptable to many in FIAF;

at which point they had expressed surprise and asked what was unacceptable. She did not know if members felt they needed to have good relations with FIAPF. She saw it as a paper tiger, struggling to survive, and not a threat and very different from the organisation she thought it was some 15 years ago. She asked if anyone knew of anyone having problems with FIAPF.

Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that the Chairman of the Board of the Deutsche Institut für Filmkunde was also Chairman of SPIO, the German film producers association and they were always intervening on screening matters which was extremely frustrating.

Mr DE PINA found it a bit strange as the Portuguese producers' association had only been in existence for 5 years but the archive had never had any contact with them or with FIAPF. It didn't seem to be very international as there were so many countries missing.

Mr ROSEN thought it was important in different countries to work out some forms of agreement between producers and archives but the question was with whom. In the United States, he thought they could work with individuals who were most friendly to preservation, like those sitting on the Board of the National Preservation Center, to agree a document that they could take back to their companies. He felt the trade organisation would be likely to be the most conservative and resistant to change.

Day 3

Before the discussions resumed, Mr GARCIA MESA gave information about

- the Press Conference he had arranged for the EC
- the proposed visit of the Television Newsreel team to film the EC meeting in session
- the tour of the Conference Centre (to be used for the 1990 Congress)
- the tour of Habana arranged for the EC

There was still no news of Mr NAIR who still seemed to be having difficulties even though his trip was being fully funded by the Cuban Archive.

Mrs WIBOM was grateful to Mr GARCIA MESA for ensuring that so many Cuban newspapers mentioned the FIAF EC meeting in Habana and giving publicity to archive preservation work.

He mentioned that the McLaren 50th Anniversary poster would be on display throughout the city; later, he would bring copies of posters for FIAF designed by Latin American artists for the EC to see.

FIAPF contd

Mrs WIBOM stressed that no archive was being pressured in any way but mentioned that small archives like hers found it difficult to initiate relations with producers unilaterally and therefore found it helpful to have a relation with the producers' association that was at least "relaxed".

Mr KLAUE said they had peaceful coexistence for 10 to 15 years after the quarrels in the past. He wondered whether any advantage was to be gained from a new dialogue. He didn't expect them to be willing to change the contract. However, he thought FIAF should try to define the legal position of archives (rights, duties, etc) and discuss questions of copyright with the relevant experts, including perhaps Unesco, before starting a dialogue with the producers.

Mr ROSEN felt that for some archives the contract, bad as it was, would be a big step forward while for others it would be a big step backwards. He thought it would be more helpful for archives to deal with producers at a national or regional level.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that there was a change of generation within FIAPF and the antagonistic individuals were nearly all gone. She felt there might be a benefit for some archives in moving forward in the dialogue with FIAPF.

Mrs BOWSER felt it should be raised in the General Assembly but for herself she was keen to "let sleeping dogs lie". Mr FRANCIS agreed it should be raised at the GA to find out which members, if any, were having difficulties. Then the more experienced archives could pass on their experiences to their members, without bothering with FIAPF. As long as there was no standard agreement, each archive could draft his own documents to meet individual circumstances which was much more flexible. Mr ROSEN felt it would be useful to make available to members a collection of sample documents (with names and identifying details removed) showing the kinds of deals they had been able to arrange.

Mrs WIBOM suggested Unesco legal departments might be able to help FIAF in defining the legal position of archives. Mr KLAUE pointed out they were all amateurs; he was willing to compile a list of problems but would need professional advice before going to Unesco copyright or legal specialists.
Action: Mr KLAUE to compile list of problems. Mrs WIBOM to respond politely to FIAPF letter.

8.7 NGO's Liaison Group

Mr KLAUE reported the next meeting was scheduled for 2 days in March in the Netherlands.

Decision: Mr KLAUE to attend.

9 FUTURE CONGRESSES

9.1 1988: Paris

Mrs VAN DER ELST commented her Reports on the status of preparations, mentioning there had been monthly meetings in Paris, attended also by Mrs WIBOM and Mr FRANCIS.

The auditorium for the GA and the symposium was a 300+ seat theatre, not a conventional meeting room, but there was no alternative. Delegates would be provided with hard-backed writing pads for taking notes and spare seats could be used for papers. There would be roving microphones. There was tight security in the Museum but they would have free access to the collections. Information was available on different hotels and it was hoped that all the EC would be in the Hotel Suffren la Tour.

On the visa question, the CNC had forwarded a list of countries to the Ministry but would-be delegates should apply well in advance as there might well be problems for some countries as France was requiring visas for countries that didn't previously need them. Mrs WIBOM suggested it was so important there should be a special circular on the one topic. Mr KLAUE said they needed an invitation sent by the French host, ideally addressed to the individuals, not the institutions. Typically they would need 4 to 6 weeks.

Mrs WIBOM suggested for future Congresses that they should add information about visas on the original application forms, asking people to indicate if they needed special individual invitations.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to update Congress form.

On the Symposium, Mr DAUDELIN reported that all the French speakers had confirmed but they were still awaiting replies from some of the foreign speakers (only one from outside FIAF). It was agreed that Mr DAUDELIN should chair the Symposium.

Round Table: "Brighton: Ten years after"

Mr DAUDELIN was a bit surprised to hear there were now some 10 speakers for the Round Table "Brighton: Ten years after" symposium and wondered if they should revise the timetable. Mrs VAN DER ELST understood it had been agreed to have only 7 speakers and it would be a half-day only. Mr FRANCIS suggested that if there was any danger of it encroaching on the Symposium, financially or time-wise, it might be more appropriate to cancel it; indeed it might be more appropriate to keep it for Lisbon where the same people were involved, provided Mr DE PINA agreed. Mr DE PINA saw no problem.

Mr ROSEN felt the enormous strength of Brighton was its depth and it would

undermine it to have so little time. Mrs BOWSER agreed that it was more logical to have the two Gaudreault projects together in Lisbon. Mr DAUDELIN welcomed the suggestion to cancel as it would give more time for discussion of the papers.

Decision: "Brighton: Ten years after" cancelled. Mr FRANCIS to write explaining the situation to Mr Gaudreault.

The 3 Exhibitions would last for 3 months, through till August.

Technical exhibition on archiving

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that Mr Schmitt was very disappointed not to have contributions from other members in spite of his requests. Mrs BOWSER said it was difficult to respond without specific requests. Later, Mrs WIBOM said they were working on producing a model of the FICA Box and an accompanying chart of explanation as Mr Schmitt was especially keen to obtain material or devices that had been devised by archives. Mrs VAN DER ELST stressed that it was urgent to get moving.

Dreams and Fantasies of the Pioneers & Posters

Mr FRANCIS described his proposals and asked for advice because there had been so many delays and difficulties in planning the exhibition (limitations on space, non-response of French administrators, etc). The aim was to show the wealth of material found within the archive movement that was not available elsewhere. The main problem now was the lack of a coordinator but Mrs WIBOM had recommended two individuals (Yacha David or Stanislas Tadora) who were specialists in organising exhibitions.

Mr FRANCIS pointed out that they might not be able to meet the Museum deadlines for the Exhibition and asked the EC view on whether it would be appropriate to have a "poster only" exhibition or posters plus something else that might be relevant. There was also the possibility that the fantasies exhibition would be in conflict with the posters if held in the same area. Mr ROSEN thought it was commonplace in museums for there to be a conflict between the Curators who wanted to exhibit "art" and the Education people who wanted it in context. If it would help Mr FRANCIS in his negotiations, then perhaps the EC should give him an official mandate to present both.

Everyone welcomed the proposals and Mr GARCIA MESA suggested they should make a video tape (or film) of the Exhibition and the whole Anniversary.

Mrs WIBOM thought the Musée D'Orsay were very enthusiastic about the exhibition. She thanked Mr FRANCIS for what he was doing and said they would all help as much as they could.

Films for showing at the Pioneers Exhibition

Mr FRANCIS had the list and said new 35mm prints would be needed as the show (one and a half hours) would be running daily for 3 months. He would be asking archives to make them as soon as possible and asked:

- if the costs would be met from the Congress budget;
- where they should be sent and who would be in charge of assembly, including the inter-titles between films.

Mrs VAN DER ELST and Mrs WIBOM understood Mr Schmitt had agreed to do the assembly and Mrs WIBOM confirmed that funds could be found from the Congress budget if the archives couldn't manage.

Documentation on early attempts at film preservation

Mr FRANCIS asked if it was still feasible to show this on a panel at the entrance.

Decision : Mr FRANCIS? to clarify separately with the Museum.

Catalogue

Mr FRANCIS was uneasy about the decision to have information on films to be shown downstairs included in the Pioneers exhibition. The Musée d'Orsay was preparing a leaflet for people going into the films.

Decision : Mr FRANCIS/Mrs VAN DER ELST ? to clarify with the Museum.

Postcards

Mr DE PINA asked if it was possible to generate some income by publishing postcards of some of the posters. Mrs WIBOM said it was being investigated but there were copyright problems. She suggested it might be a good idea to make postcards of the Maclaren poster which she thought everyone would buy.

Action : ???

Public Relations

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Marie-Danielle Boussière from CNC needed help as she knew nothing about FIAF. Mr FRANCIS had suggested preparing a press kit including various-length background articles on film preservation and different aspects of FIAF's work, perhaps in English and French.

Journalists would not want to spend time digging around and in any case this would ensure greater accuracy. Mr ROSEN agreed and added they also needed stills and cassettes in multiple copies of material that could be shown on television.

Mrs VAN DER ELST stressed that a coordinator was needed and Mrs WIBOM added that they had been unsuccessful in stirring Claude Beylie into action.

Mr ROSEN suggested an approach to the new Videothèque de Paris might present a solution as they had two missions: to collect film and tape about

the history of Paris but to record events in Paris. The production unit was large and well-funded by the City of Paris. They might be interested to pursue Mr GARCIA MESA's idea of recording the events or indeed to help produce some video materials for the media. He had had a number of dealings with them and was willing to approach them.

He also mentioned that it was extremely helpful if the journalists could be invited to a luncheon where they could meet some key people for interview.

Mr DE PINA mentioned that he had a team which could prepare articles for the Portuguese press in the period from January. He was also willing to prepare some general articles for publication in France: he suggested one article and one interview on the links between Portugal and France in the silent period.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested they needed articles with basic information and statistics on FIAF's work worldwide but prepared by someone who would make sure there was no mis-interpretation.

Mrs BOWSER thought it would be interesting to stress the cooperation between archives in the recovery and restoration of "lost" films, for example, the American archives recovering early American film from the New Zealand archives. She had also prepared a small article on the recovery of a "lost" Méliès film which might also be used as press kit material. Mrs WIBOM thought it would be interesting to ask Mrs Méliès to write on the help she had received from the many different archives.

Mr KLAUE was willing to contribute but could not coordinate. He thought there was a lot of material around which simply needed selection and editorial work, for example:

- back issues of the Bulletin
- Unesco Courier issue to be distributed (and/or reprinted)
- material collected for the Survey:
 - statistics (he was willing to prepare this)
 - photo-documentation
 - article on innovations in the 1980's, since the Recommendation
 - contribution on training of archivists.

Mr ROSEN warned they should plan the press kit carefully to have information on a few specific topics, for instance:

- the history of FIAF
- the 50th Anniversary Congress
- the goals of preservation and the accomplishments of the Federation with some statistics.
- the work of the Commissions.

They should not have too much or too many topics.

Action:

- Mrs VAN DER ELST or Mr BORDE to re-approach Claude Beylie or, failing him, someone else to coordinate public relations activities, including preparation of a suitable press-kit.
- Mrs BOWSER to check through back numbers of the Bulletin.
- Mr KLAUE to provide article incorporating statistical information
- All EC and others urged to provide material that could be used for other publications, independently of the press kit.
- No decision on possible approach to Vidéothèque de Paris to make film of the occasion.

Special Issue of Variety

Mrs WIBOM reported that Variety had expressed interest in making a special section in the issue after Cannes, with 10 pages devoted to FIAF provided there was a corresponding amount of advertising. They had done something similar for both Cinémathèque Française and MOMA (the relevant issues were shown to the meeting). FIAF had been invited to contribute material and Mrs WIBOM had already agreed to provide an article. Variety had offices in 20 cities and would send reporters to the local archives for articles and would also help in seeking advertisers. The Working Group thought it was an excellent opportunity for FIAF to make itself known and Mr ROSEN had volunteered to help. Mrs WIBOM suggested they all should approach film and television companies in their own countries to whom the archives had provided material, asking them to pay for an advertisement in which they thanked the archive for its contributions. The advertising rate was \$2000 per page.

In response to Mr KLAUE, it was confirmed that if there was a shortfall on the advertising, it would be met from the Congress Budget.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST

- to accept Variety's offer;
- to write to members to tell them they might be approached by the local reporter and encourage them to seek out advertisers.

After the break for lunch, the EC had

- a conducted tour of the Congress Centre which was to be used for the 1990 Congress
- a discussion of the new Latin American Preservation Centre (see 10.1)

FIAF poster

Mr DAUDELIN reported the poster had been printed; his archive would distribute it in the Americas and Bois d'Arcy would distribute elsewhere. He had printed 5,000 in total of which about 4,000 had been requested by the members in Berlin.

Mrs WIBOM reported that the Musée d'Orsay would create its own poster for the exhibitions but would like to incorporate elements of the FIAF poster design (same logo and typeface).

Livre d'Or

Mrs VAN DER ELST said all the archive information and photographs were ready and design work for the final publication approved. Mr Schmitt had found some sponsors (Kodak, Debie and another organisation).

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that the historical part was a bit thin and no text had been received from Mr Lauritzen. He regretted that Mr BORDE who was Editor for this section had not been able to come to Cuba but he was checking some of the facts and dates in the historical section with Jan de Vaal and Mrs VAN DER ELST. Mr TOEPLITZ's article was much longer than the others and while Mr FRANCIS had checked the English style, it was felt it would also be necessary to cut it to provide a better balance. He was not happy with the way it was shaping up as there was too much emphasis on the past and too little on the present and future. He suggested they might include a journalistic interview with Mrs WIBOM on FIAF today and tomorrow.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that free copies would be distributed to members and the press and the rest would be distributed and sold by If Diffusion, who suggested selling at 110 French francs, twice the estimated cost price. The format would be 20 x 21 cm and the print order would be for 2,000. They regretted that the many of the photos had been rather unimaginative.

FIAF Touring Show

Mrs BOWSER reported that the Cinémathèque Française had agreed to assemble the package to be circulated in Europe but had created a problem by choosing the Congress dates for the first showing: this meant that Bois d'Arcy saw it as a Congress event on which they should have been consulted, whereas she had planned it as a celebration of the Anniversary throughout the world. Otherwise, everything was going smoothly and the final information would be put in the Bulletin and members reminded to make firm bookings by a given deadline so the Shows could be scheduled. Mrs VAN DER ELST thought Mr Schmitt was only worried there might be some confusion on where to send the films. Mr Martinand of Cinémathèque Française was wondering why the films were coming to him so early and didn't seem to realise that work was involved on his side.

Requests had come from Milan (to celebrate their 50th Anniversary in April) and Mexico but it looked as if both the first showings would now be in June. Mrs BOWSER thought it quite likely there would be showings in 1989 and even 1990. Each archive could present the show exactly as they chose.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the Musée d'Orsay had also asked to show some of the films and were willing to obtain the necessary permissions themselves.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to ensure M. Pinel at CF was aware of the work involved in checking the quality of the prints as examples of FIAF members' restoration work and assembling the show for the first time.

FIAF Film Clip

Mr DAUDELIN said it was being made in the next few days and ready by mid-January in time for the travelling show. It had also been planned to offer copies to the archives for their own projections during 1988. It would cost very little to run off, say, 100 copies for use by archives and perhaps also the Film Festivals.

Action: Circular letter to members urgently asking for requests to Mr DAUDELIN by mid-January.

Display of FIAF Publications

Mrs WIBOM reported the Musée d'Orsay had offered a show-case for display and a selection could be on sale in their own bookshop. Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that the Berlin proceedings should be ready for sale by then.

Mr DE PINA offered to supply publications from his archive but it was felt they would only take FIAF publications.

Official Coordination & Administration

Mrs WIBOM recalled that Mr BORDE had originally been appointed the official FIAF coordinator but suggested that Mr Schmitt should now also be appointed as an official coordinator in recognition of the enormous amount of work he was undertaking.

Unfortunately their helper in Paris, Florence, had to leave in early January because her University programme had been unexpectedly rescheduled. CNC were appointing someone new immediately.

Mrs VAN DER ELST had suggested that Chantal VAN DEN BERGHE from the Secretariat should come to Paris during the Congress to provide extra help and to give the membership the chance to meet her. She also asked if she could be present during the Executive Committee so that she would know what was required and be able to stand in for Mrs VAN DER ELST if needed.

Guest List

A list of suggested guests was compiled, including non-FIAF personalities, former FIAF collaborators and NGO's.

Mr KLAUE suggested they should try to have the Director-General of Unesco present at the official occasion celebrating the 50th Anniversary. There was some discussion of whether NGO's should be asked to pay the full 1,000 FF fee for one-day's attendance at the GA. Mrs ORBANZ suggested FIAF should not charge and hope that they would be invited back without charge.

Decision : No charge to NGO's.

Action : Additional guest suggestions, with names and addresses, to be forward to Mrs VAN DER ELST.

Delegates from developing countries

Mrs VAN DER ELST said CNC would discuss this with the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs. If the Unesco Round Table went ahead as planned, there would be some money for travel from developing countries. FIAF had submitted a list of suggestions to CNC.

Mrs ORBANZ suggested that any money "saved" from the Variety deal should be spent to enable people from developing countries to attend the Congress. Mrs WIBOM felt that this particular Congress did not offer very much to non-archivists.

Mrs VAN DER ELST hoped that as many archives as possible would be represented and suggested someone should make a special effort to encourage the Turks. Mr DAUDELIN suggested the Secretary General should write.

Action : Mrs WIBOM and Mrs VAN DER ELST to check through list of delegates and follow up reasons for any who had not registered.

Budget

Mrs WIBOM reported she and Mrs VAN DER ELST had recently reviewed the Budget and there seemed to be no problems.

Mr FRANCIS asked how organisers of particular projects could be sure they could commit necessary sums. Mrs WIBOM advised that copy letters to the Treasurer, Monsieur Auclair, would be sufficient. Contracts should be signed by her or the Treasurer.

Draft Agenda for the General Assembly

It was agreed that there should be a session for Members Only to stress that Members did have some special privileges.

Reports on Projects and Publications underway should all be in writing and Commission Heads should simply take time to stress the key points of their written reports. It was hoped to have all the documents available when people registered so they had time to read them.

Mrs VAN DER ELST noted that they would have to find time to talk about Future Congresses, in particular, deciding on the venue for 1991. There had been no invitation in writing. Mr DAUDELIN said Uruguay was ready to step in if there was a gap.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to write to ask Mr NAIR to clarify his position and ask him for his written invitation if 1991 was still possible.

Non-FIAF Projects

i Exhibition of Latin American Posters at the Maison de l'Amérique Latine

Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed that these modern posters would be shown at this museum in Bd Saint-Germain, near the Musée d'Orsay. They also had an elegant new 80-seat cinema and hoped to show some Latin American films as well, ideally with French sub-titles. They had a 20,000-name mailing list within Paris so there would be excellent coverage. They planned to show for one month and would make no charge.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST and Mr GARCIA MESA to liaise.

ii Possible Link between the Congress and the European Year of Cinema & Television

In response to Mr DE PINA, Mrs WIBOM felt the Year would like to be associated with FIAF's Anniversary but saw no gain for FIAF. She didn't like their logo and didn't expect they would have any money. Mr DE PINA thought there were sure to be television programmes on the importance of the work of film restoration and preservation throughout the year and he thought it would be useful for FIAF to be mentioned.

Mr CINCOTTI understood that the Year was in any case due to begin on July 1, after the FIAF Congress.

Action: None.

9.2 1989: Lisbon

Mr DE PINA said his archive was celebrating its 40th Anniversary in 1988 and they would be marking it in some way. In addition everything was well under control for the 1989 Congress:

Dates:

week of 10-17 April

EC and other meetings

17-18 April

General Assembly

19 (Wednesday)

Excursion outside Lisbon

20-21-22

Two symposia

Hotels: they were good standard and not expensive, between 5,000-10,000 ecus. He would like some indication on the likely number of delegates.

Visas: No problems expected for Portugal

Languages: French, English and perhaps Spanish. He assumed Portuguese was not feasible.

Budget: In addition to the FIAF Budget and a contribution from their own archive, they had been assured by the Secretary of State for Culture that there would be a subsidy from the 1989 budget. He envisaged no problems.

Symposia: Mr DAUDELIN reported that Mr Gaudreault was ready to review progress to date on his long-term project (1 day). He should be advised quickly of the new plans following the Paris cancellation. Mr DE PINA would like informaton on the projection time required for his project and for Brighton 10 years after.

Mrs WIBOM thanked Mr DE PINA and was glad that the Congress was in such capable hands.

9.3 1990: Havana

Mr GARCIA MESA had supplied detailed information in Berlin which would be presented at the Congress in Paris. Meanwhile, he wanted only to mention that he was considering a symposium, "Film archiving in developing countries", with one day each on:

- i Film preservation in tropical and sub-tropical climates
- ii The Latin American regional experience
- iii Film archive training courses and film schools.

There might also be a meeting of the Preservation Commission, before or after the Congress, which would be particularly useful for the Symposium. Mr KLAUE suggested Mr GARCIA MESA should immediately contact Mr SCHOU to start planning as the Commission should take an active role in the Symposium. For practical reasons, he thought the Commission meeting was better after the Congress, but it might be necessary to have it before for last minute preparations. Mr GARCIA MESA was particularly keen to have Vladimir Opela's participation because of his research interests (fungus).

Mr KLAUE thought the last topic ought to be extended to include other training places outside film schools, for example, in archives, libraries and universities. Mr GARCIA MESA was considering introducing such courses at the new International Film School.

Mrs WIBOM welcomed the topics and asked that he come to Paris with more detailed information on what help he needed from other FIAF members.

Mr FRANCIS asked if all three topics were intended to be technical as he felt up till now they had tried to have a balance of technical and cultural topics, except as in Stockholm and Berlin when they had had the Joint Technical

Symposia. Mr ROSEN felt some of the Third World cultural issues might be raised in Lisbon. Mr DE PINA said they would be circulating members shortly about their attitude to the proposed Lisbon symposium, "the cultural role of archives", and maybe the responses to that, due by Paris, would help Mr GARCIA MESA decide what cultural element, if any, he might like to cover in Habana.

10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Latin American Regional Preservation Centre

This point was discussed out of sequence, after lunch on Day 3

Mr Cosme Alves-Netto addressed the meeting in his capacity as Council Member of the Foundation for the New Latin American Cinema, representing the President, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, who was unable to come in person.

He, Mr GARCIA MESA and Mrs GALVAO gave details of the Foundation's proposal to set up Regional Preservation Centers in Latin America. They had just completed a series of articles for a book being printed in Uruguay on the history of silent films in Latin America and in the course of their researches found there was virtually nothing left of their film heritage of that period; they were increasingly aware that subsequent productions were also at risk. When Mr Marquez became aware of the situation and the huge investments needed for preservation, he conceived the idea of setting up Regional Centers for the preservation of Latin American film and was raising funds worldwide for the purpose. He was also investing royalties from his novels and 6 films (based on his short stories or novels) in this project and the new Film School.

Mrs GALVAO had prepared an initial project proposal which had now been approved. The project was in 3 Phases, the first being to find out more precisely the present situation throughout Latin America, the numbers of nitrate and acetate films, the facilities, the problems, etc. Funding had already been provided for the first Phase and a questionnaire prepared to provide data on each country for their subsequent planning. Initially she had been asked if Cinemateca Brasileira would set up and run a Centre in Sao Paulo for the restoration of Latin American films and video. She agreed but suggested there should be perhaps two or three Centres across the continent, with perhaps satellite centres in each archive with basic equipment.

Mr Alves Netto said the project was not possible without the help of FIAF and thought it was an excellent opportunity for long-term cooperation between FIAF and the Foundation which was ready to consider further related projects.

Everyone was very excited about the project. Mrs BOWSER said that in the United States they would be following the project with great interest and

hoping to benefit from the experience. In response to Mr KLAUE, who asked how far the Foundation could support the project, Mr Alves Netto confirmed that they had accepted to support the project as outlined by Mrs GALVAO and were ready to raise money for at least the next 5 years. Only after Phase I, would they know how much film needed restoration and thus how much funding was needed.

Mrs WIBOM was enthusiastic for the idea of regional centres and thought this might well be the solution of the future for other parts of the world. She asked how FIAF could participate in the project. Mrs GALVAO wanted Mr Socrates to discuss the project with the Preservation Commission and she herself would be seeking help and ideas from FIAF colleagues. At this point, Mr Alves Netto stressed that it was a FIAF project with Foundation funding. He hoped that it would be possible to set up something similar in Africa.

Mrs GALVAO warmly thanked Mr Alves Netto and through him, Mr Marquez and the Foundation, for their support and gave special thanks to Mr GARCIA MESA for his role in making it happen. Mrs WIBOM asked Mr Alves Netto to send FIAF's warmest thanks to Mr Marquez and the Foundation which she thought was one of the most exciting things to have ever happened to the Federation and the archive movement.

Mr GARCIA MESA confirmed that the FIAF would receive regular reports on the developing situation.

During the discussion, the ICAIC newsreel cameras came to film the discussion for Cuban television.

10.2 Next EC Meeting

Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that they could welcome the EC to Montreal in the autumn. He suggested November as their premises were being used for a Film Festival in October. They had an exhibition of drawings and art work by Emile Col which he would like the EC to have the opportunity to see.

Decision : Confirm dates in Paris.

The following points, returned to in the final session, are minuted as follows:

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------|----------|
| 10.3 | South Africa | see 3.4 |
| 10.4 | Honorary Members | see 3.6a |
| 10.5 | Roll of Honour | see 3.6b |
| 10.6 | ICA meeting in Ottawa | see 8.3 |

Mrs WIBOM then formally closed the meeting with thanks to all, in particular their hosts, Mr GARCIA MESA and his staff.