

HELSINKI

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
14 - 16 November 1989

Members

Robert DAUDELIN,	Montréal	President
Eva ORBANZ	West-Berlin	Secretary-General
Raymond BORDE	Toulouse	Treasurer
Wolfgang KLAUE	East-Berlin	Vice-President
Hector GARCIA MESA	Havana	Vice-President
Anna-Lena WIBOM	Stockholm	Vice-President
Eileen BOWSER	New York	
Guido CINCOTTI	Roma	
Christian DIMITRIU	Lausanne	Deputy Treasurer
David FRANCIS	London	Deputy Secretary-General
Maria-Rita GALVAO	São Paulo	<u>Absent</u>
Luis de PINA	Lisboa	
Bob ROSEN	Los Angeles	

Brigitte VAN DER ELST  
Jill JOHNSON

Executive Secretary  
Interpreter & Minutes Secretary

## A G E N D A

---

1.	Adoption of the agenda	1
2.	Approval of the Minutes of the Lisbon meeting	1
3.	Membership questions :	
3.1.	Report from the working group on membership	1
3.2.	Reconfirmation of Members: Amsterdam, Beograd, Istanbul, Moskva, Roma	8
3.3.	Reconfirmation of Observers : Cairo, Caracas	9
3.4.	New candidates for Observership:	
	Gemona: Cineteca del Friuli	11
	Valencia: Filmoteca Generalitat Valenciana	12
	Glasgow: Scottish Film Council	13
	Berkeley: Pacific Film Archive	14
	New York: Anthology Film Archives	15
	Tokyo: The National Film Center	16
3.5.	Miscellaneous: Other requests for affiliation	16
	New reconfirmation and annual statistics questionnaires	23
	Protest from the Nederlands Filmmuseum	17
	Changing situation at the NFA / London	18
	Belgium and Luxembourg	21
4.	Financial report. Report of the Fundraising Committee	24-26
5.	Report of the specialized Commissions	
5.1.	Cataloguing Commission	27
5.2.	Documentation Commission	27
5.3.	Preservation Commission	28
	Technical Consultation Committee report / 2d consultation	
	Joint Technical Symposium, Ottawa	
6.	Report of the Programming Committee	29
7.	Role of Commission Heads in EC meetings	33
8.	Projects and Publications	33
8.1	Projects and Publications underway	33
8.2	Marketing FIAF Publications	38
8.3	New FIAF Questionnaires	38
8.3bis	FIAF Logo	39
8.4	List of Non-FIAF Projects	39
8.5	GRAF Filmography	39
8.6	Negotiations with Saur	39
9.	Future Congresses	40
9.1.	Havana	40
9.2.	Athens 1991	41
9.3.	Poona 1992	42
9.4.	Procedure for selection of symposium topics	43
9.5.	New ways of organizing Congresses	43
9.6.	Managing General Assemblies	43

10. Relations with Unesco and other international organizations	4
10.1 Unesco	4
10.2 IASA	4
10.3 Council of Europe	4
10.4 Domitor	4
11. Legal problems in film archives (Unesco draft)	4
12. Miscellaneous	4
12.1 Next EC meeting	4
12.2 Mr Frantz Schmitt	4

**Q1 What happens with existing Observers if the proposed changes are implemented?**

Mr Francis began by recalling that they proposed to discontinue the term "Observer" so existing Observers would become one of the following:

- Candidate Members = Provisional Members
- Associates = Those not eligible to become full Members

Rather than making an immediate decision, the EC had several options:

- wait for reconfirmation and then decide
- wait for time period to run out (max 6 years as Candidate Member) and then decide if they qualify as Full Members or Associates.

Mr Klaue suggested all existing Observers should initially be offered the status of Candidate Members and their eligibility for the new categories could be determined at their next reconfirmation, which under the new system would be 5 years. This longer period might be quite useful to give both the EC and the archives time to decide. Some members felt they could phase in the system using the existing 2 year reconfirmation period and Mr Francis suggested on reflection that 3 years would fit in better with the 6 years allowed for becoming eligible for Full Membership.

Mr Cincotti warned that it was not only the EC that would make the decisions: some archives ineligible for Full Membership might prefer to leave the Federation rather than stay as Associates. Perhaps Candidates could be asked in advance if they were willing to accept either outcome once their candidate period had elapsed. Mr Francis added that the Working Group wanted to make it clear to archives that the time limit and the transfer to Associate status was not a "punishment", in fact it had been introduced particularly to give archives some bargaining power with their authorities.

**Decisions:**

- Reconfirmation proposal amended from 2 to 3 years.
- All Observers automatically offered status of Candidate Member
- Final category decided at each archive's next reconfirmation

**Q2 What are the substantive criteria to assess preservation activities?**

Mr Francis acknowledged that this was the most difficult question and they may find it impossible to formulate anything sufficiently unambiguously.

- They had proposed two criteria both of which should be satisfied:
- 10% of budget, excluding staff costs, to be spent on preservation
  - storage conditions to match Preservation Commission's recommendations.

Mr Daudelin was uneasy at financial criteria as he felt clever accountants could present the figures to please FIAF. There was of course a limit to what FIAF could do to verify the validity of figures. Mr Francis acknowledged the problem and, as an alternative, suggested that, once there was a national filmography for each country, there might be a way to relate the preservation activity to the national production. He recognised this too could present many problems, especially for countries with multiple archives.

Mr Rosen reiterated the importance of a clear definition of what was understood by "preservation": was it production of masters of national production or simply continuing to hold masters of national production. He would prefer phrasing like "substantive, significant or major part of budget and of national production", to demonstrate the importance of the issue and avoid the 10% trap. Mrs Bowser felt that they all knew from past experience that one could not make it totally objective and there would always be a need for the EC to use its own subjective judgment.

Mr Francis pointed out that they had included a clear definition of what would be considered satisfactory preservation. On storage condition, they could build in criteria rather than insisting on full observance of the Commission Rules. He was willing to compromise on the wording of the criteria but would be very reluctant to drop the spirit of both of them as they represented a major part of the reason for change. He was willing to drop mention of a specific percentage and suggested they could ask for some written statement demonstrating that the preservation work was serious (eg number of films preserved, etc).

Mrs Wibom felt they already had a powerful tool in the Annual Reports which could help them decide how serious the archives were. They could perhaps ask for more precise information but already, if one compared the Reports from a single archive over several years, they presented a very useful picture of their progress and achievements. She felt these were much more informative than the Reconfirmation forms. Many archives already listed the names of the films they preserved each year: this was manageable for the majority where there might be only some 4 to 8 films per year although it might present a problem where larger numbers were involved. Mr Francis agreed with this point and recalled that the proposal already stated that more attention would be paid to the Annual Reports and "other sources of information".

Mr de Pina felt there would be problems with the phrase "national heritage", especially in the case of multiple archives as in Italy where only one archive was by law preserving the negatives and masters and the others were preserving only copies. Mr Cincotti mentioned that the law tended to refer to production after a certain date (1949 in Italy) so the other archives could well be preserving earlier material. Mr Francis agreed that this was a problem area that was already coming up in the case of Observers in countries where there was already a national archive with overall responsibility for national production: was it ever going to be possible to define the percentage of national production the additional archives should be responsible for in order to qualify as full members.

Mrs Orbanz was not happy with the insistence on "national production": in Germany, as in Italy, there was an official archive with overall responsibility but they could not do everything and the archives agreed on a division of tasks. In addition, the archive in W.Berlin is specialising in preserving foreign productions that were dubbed into German, which were also an important part of the cultural heritage. Similarly in North America and Latin America archives were preserving films to have them available for the region: work may be duplicated but they could not get the films otherwise. She was happier with the existing definition of preservation, which allowed for special collections, without the insistence on national production.

Mr Klaue had the opposite view. He felt they should work to strengthen the philosophy behind the new proposal which was that if each country preserved its own national production, then worldwide, the moving image heritage would be preserved. This was also the thinking of the Unesco recommendation that every country should give priority to its national production. Only this approach would avoid the waste of money through duplication of efforts. This was in fact a clarification of what was already in the FIAF Statutes in the phrase "working on a national level". The approach had the added advantage that it would enable them to resist the anticipated explosion of archives wanting to join FIAF. They could become Associates but only achieve full Membership of FIAF if their national preservation activity was significant.

He agreed FIAF should consider how to define "national production" especially as the existing Statutes allowed the definition of "film" to include video-tape (ie television) and other support media. Mrs Wibom felt there were various definitions of national production available, mostly related to the founding systems for new "national" productions which typically referred to "30% participation of creative and financial contributions". She felt there should be no problems for new productions although because of geographical and political changes there could well be problems for past productions.

Mr Cincotti stressed there was already a recognition of the importance for the national cultural heritage of foreign films shown in a country, whether dubbed, sub-titled or shown in the original. FIAF should encourage their preservation and also that of related documents, like sound recordings (phonogrammes), etc. Mr Francis agreed that these additional items had been included when talking to Unesco in the context of acquisition; in the context of preservation, he agreed with Mr Klaue that the absolute priority was to ensure that national production was preserved nationally.

Mr Borde thought it would be much more practical to simply use the term "national production" without further detail and without specific figures. In Toulouse for example, when they received recent films on voluntary deposit, they were spending 10% of their budget on making copies of the old films which urgently needed to be copied for preservation purposes.

[The EC were hosted for lunch by the Finnish Film Foundation, who administer government funding for new Finnish productions (features, documentaries, childrens'films)]

After the break, Mr Francis reported he felt they could come to some satisfactory wording to get the information required. However, he felt they should consider the implications for the new batch of Observer candidates they would be considering later in Helsinki, many of whom were only involved in national production from the very early period. Were they all agreed that, if accepted now, these would probably become Associates at the Reconfirmation stage? Mr Rosen added that there would also be new applications from young archives that FIAF would expect to develop from Candidate Members into Full Members, as they took responsibility for and spent a major part of their budget on preservation activity of a major part of their country's national production.

**Decision:** The EC members agreed and approved the idea that the proposals clearly implied that the progression from Candidate Member to Full Member or Associate would depend on the nature of the individual archive's activity.

**Q3 What are the implications of the changes for organisation of Congress and General Assembly?**

Mr Francis felt everyone agreed that it was not possible to extend the number of days allocated to the annual Congress as people were already beginning to feel they were spending too long away from their archives. They had identified 3 possible approaches:

1. Like FIAT, have the GA only every 2 years
2. Like IASA, reduce the GA to half a day at the beginning and end and include Commission presentations in parallel with the Working Groups.
3. Reduce to only 1 Symposium to allow more time for Working Groups and specialist presentations.

Mr Francis agreed with Mr Daudelin's written submission that the symposia were probably the most important and participative activity and should not be scheduled in parallel with other activities; he was inclined to favour finding time by reducing the GA business meetings (either to once every two years or to shorter sessions). Mrs Bowser felt the most important part was the Open Forum which gave the opportunity for a free exchange of ideas on members' preoccupations. For her, the only option was to have the symposia and working groups in parallel, obliging participants to choose. Already, at previous Congresses, they had offered participants the choice between symposia on different specialist areas and this could surely be continued.

Mr Daudelin recalled that a major problem each year were the Commission Reports: there was an enormous amount of valuable work being done during the year but often very little response from the GA. Mrs Wiborn agreed and suggested that each Commission could have the option for a one-day seminar to present and discuss its work in detail with those who were specifically interested and could participate with their views and feedback. Mr Schou had already begun something similar with his lunchtime session on Preservation Commission's work in Lisbon.

Mr Daudelin suggested the Commissions could still prepare their written Reports for everyone but delegates would choose which workshop to attend in the light of their personal concern. Mrs Bowser warned that this would create extra work for the Commissions: this year they were all spending considerable time preparing for Havana. Mr Daudelin suggested this was a much greater incentive than to deliver a Report of a year's work to the GA and have it received in total silence. Mrs Orbanz added that the presentations need not be confined to Commission members.

Mr Klaue suggested the following patterns for 5-day Congresses:

- Election years: 2 days GA (1 at beginning, 1 at end); 1 day Symposium with plenary session; 2 days of Commission workshops, meeting of working groups
- Non-Election years: 1 day GA (half at beginning, half at end); 2 days for Symposia with plenary sessions; 2 days for working groups and Commissions.

In both cases, they should have written reports on Commission work prepared and circulated in advance. He thought they could also find a way to have the EC Report prepared in advance or, if discussed at the meeting before the GA, prepared quickly for distribution at the meeting.

Mr Francis and others in the EC warmly supported this model.

Mr Daudelin reverted to the problem of the first session of the GA which regularly turned out to have little substance to it. Mrs Orbanz suggested they could always start with Open Forum before the first coffee break. Many felt this was not feasible as people were not warmed up but Mrs Wibom felt it would be a great psychological advantage to give the participants the chance to put forward new ideas while there was still time to discuss them informally, instead of the last session when it was too late. Mr Francis felt Open Forum in non-election years would be best in the final half-day GA session: people would have already been doing a lot of talking so it should be a much better session than when the GA precede all the other activities.

#### Organisation of the Working Groups

Mrs Bowser was concerned that some delegates would not necessarily find a group of interest to them. Mr Francis felt the situation was much worse at present. There should be no shortage of topics: from the 13 replies alone, they had received 5 new suggestions. Even if delegates were not interested in any of the "official" groups, at least they would have time to meet others informally. One of the problems with the recently "over-organised" congresses was that there was no time to sit down with people on a bilateral basis to discuss shared interests or problems. Mr Rosen pointed out there would be some extra load for the host and perhaps the Secretariat, as they would need to collect and distribute information on at least some of the working groups in advance and ensure appropriate rooms were available. All agreed that people should be free to attend whatever groups interested them.

#### **Decisions:**

- Support the general philosophy as presented in the proposals, stressing above all that Congresses should not exceed the existing 5 working days.
- Suggest Mr Klaue's solution as a possible implementation but leaving freedom to adapt to special needs (as for instance the JTS in Berlin)
- Introduce concept in Habana and propose experiment in Athens.
- Present detail as separate item on GA Agenda so it does not obscure main issues of proposed changes to Membership policy.

#### **Q4 Is it possible to have regional centres and possibly regional representation?**

Mr Francis recalled that Mr Klaue had often said it had not been too successful with other international organisations. Nevertheless, there had been a number of suggestions, including that of a reduced fee for participation only at regional level. There were many reasons why regional meetings might be of interest: shared climatic conditions, cultural agreements, levels of development, size, etc.



Mr Rosen felt that instead of introducing regionalisation from the centre, they should encourage members with regional interests to use the facility for setting up working groups which had just been discussed.

Mr Klaue addressed 3 problems: regional meetings, regional membership and regional representation. He felt all kinds of regional gatherings should be tolerated but without giving them any formal status within FIAF. At present they had many thriving informal groups that had sprung up through shared interests (Latin American, North American, West and East European archives, francophones and lusophones) and he thought their existence was helpful to the Federation, the individual archives and the archive movement as a whole. On other regions, like Africa and Asia, there was insufficient activity to justify the creation of regional groups although the situation might change in the longer term. The related question of regional membership would raise all sorts of problems in determining who would share the privilege of membership; it might lead to the suggestion of collective membership, perhaps just one member for Germany (Federal Republic) and this was against the whole spirit of FIAF's membership being open to individual archives. Similarly the question of regional representation on the EC, the Commissions, etc. would raise all sorts of problems (for example, finance for attendance at meetings and procedures) with no obvious benefits. In particular, they would lose the benefit of having members elected in their personal capacity for the contributions they could make to the work of the Federation.

Mrs Bowser supported Mr Klaue's views; the existing regional groupings were particularly valuable because they had grown spontaneously out of people's needs. She added that with the proliferation of working groups, they should also bear in mind the financial implications of providing more simultaneous translations but Mr Daudelin felt that that would impose an impossible burden and on the practical level each group should determine one language of communication.

Mrs Orbanz asked if there was any provision for working groups to report to the GA and it was agreed that there would be no formal requirement but any group was free to contribute as it wished to Open Forum. All felt the proposed approach was the most flexible and practical.

**Q5 How can we ensure the EC is representative? Will it be necessary to provide financial support (travel and staying costs) for those archives that could not otherwise participate?**

Mr Francis summarised the dilemma that as long as FIAF wanted the EC to be a body to which people were elected on an individual basis, it would be difficult to ensure it was fully representative. As long as individuals had to pay their own expenses, the EC would tend to be dominated by the richer archives which were mostly in Europe and North America; in consequence, the meetings would tend to be hosted in those regions, imposing a heavier travel burden on any representatives from further afield. If they decided financial support was necessary, then they had to find a source of funding (outside support, increased subscriptions, dropping funding for some other project) and some mechanism for selecting recipients.

On the question of providing financial support for EC members, Mr Francis warned that they should try to find it from the FIAF budget rather than rely on outside sponsorship which might not provide continuity. He felt they should seriously consider finding ways to set aside money for an "EC Support Fund" as they had already done for the "Development Fund".

**Decisions:**

Mr Francis confirmed that Mr Rosen had agreed to revise the paper to take into account the EC discussion. The paper could then be distributed some weeks before Havana and presented at the GA in a not too formal way so that the different points were clearly seen as suggestions for discussion rather than something imposed by the EC. They should plant some questions to encourage active debate and participation from the floor. There would be no specific suggestions for subscription fees for the new categories, simply an indication of the proposed proportional differences.

**3.2 Reconfirmation of Members**

**3.2a Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum**

Mrs Orbanz reported there seemed to be no changes except that they had more money. Mr Francis was concerned about the large amount of money budgeted for distribution of new films, including money for acquisitions. This new activity enabled them to increase their budget but Mr Daudelin pointed out that FIAF had been very critical of the Austrian archives when they had done the same. Mrs Wibom and Mrs Orbanz confirmed it was done within their organisation but by a different department although it was not always easy to keep the separation. Mr Rosen suggested the point should be discussed when they came to consider the proposed Programming Commission. Mr Francis felt FIAF should at least ask for informations.

**Decision:** Unanimous reconfirmation. Decision to ask for information.

**RVD (Netherland Information Service)**

During the discussion, Mr Klaue suggested that, as the existing Member had now written that they had no objection to the candidature of RVD (the Netherland Information Service) as Observers, FIAF should write to the candidate and ask if they still wished to proceed.

**Decision:** Secretariat to write to Robert Egeter van Kuyk.

**3.2b Beograd: Jugoslovenska Kinoteka**

Mr Pogacic had telephoned that there would soon be a new Director but no information had been received officially.

**Decision:** Postpone till Havana meeting.

**3.2c Istanbul: Sinema-TV Enstitüsü**

Mrs Orbanz reported everything seemed to be in order and there seemed to be no changes except for the new nitrate vault and nitrate copying plan.

Mr Francis had no reservations about their Reconfirmation but felt it would be interesting for FIAF to have information on how the new legal deposit system worked in their country. He noted that the income from outside work by their quality laboratory had now reached 50% of their total budget which seemed rather high.

**Decision:** Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.2d

Mrs C  
impre  
had b  
Decis

3.2e

Mrs  
growi  
asked  
the c  
techn  
resea  
showe  
Decis

3.2f

Mrs  
East-

3.3 E

Mrs  
bienn  
witho

3.3a

They  
sever  
for a  
to th  
asked  
Cine  
coun  
ment  
smal.  
"idea  
detai  
"Egy  
part  
gove  
Cine  
space  
build

### **3.2d Moskva: Gosfilmofond**

Mrs Orbanz confirmed there were no changes and added that she was very impressed by the amount of work they did; for instance, for Pordenone they had been able to make entirely new prints.

**Decision:** Unanimous reconfirmation.

### **3.2e Roma: Cineteca Nazionale**

Mrs Orbanz confirmed there were no changes except that the archive was growing bigger. After the vote and the return of Mr Cincotti, Mrs Orbanz asked for information on the roles of the two "collaborators" mentioned in the organisation chart: one was administrative, the vacant post was technical and the work was currently being done by two part-time external researchers. Mr Cincotti corrected a clerical error on the chart which showed 10 arrows for two people.

**Decision:** Unanimous reconfirmation.

### **3.2f Future Reconfirmations**

Mrs van der Elst mentioned the archives to be considered in 1990 would be: East-Berlin, Milano, Seoul, Madrid, Budapest, Oslo, Sofia and Wellington.

### **3.3 Reconfirmation of Observers**

Mrs Orbanz suggested that in future it would be best to schedule the biennial Reconfirmation of Observers for the EC meeting prior the Congress without elections. There were two special cases to be discussed.

#### **3.3a Cairo: National Film Archive**

They were deleted a year ago as they had not paid or sent their Report for several years. They had now supplied the missing reports and subscriptions for all the years except the one they were deleted. They were now writing to the archives for help and seemed to be full of activity. Mr Daudelin asked for clarification of their letter and the proposed new archive at Cinema City; he thought a holding of 1324 films was very small for a country that had so much production and was concerned that there was little mention of preservation. Mrs Orbanz recalled that they had always had a small collection. They were now asking FIAF archives for advice on building "ideal archive" but had not replied to Mrs van der Elst's letter asking for details of help needed. Mr Francis suggested the letterhead with mention of "Egyptian Film Center" was new and might imply that the archive was now part of the production operation. Mr Klaue said the Center was the government's administration of cinematography, including the archive. Cinema City included government and private production facilities and some space had been allocated for archive storage. They had been talking of building a new archive for a very long time and he was not convinced it

would become a reality. He recalled there was a second institution that had ambitious archive plans for the country, including non-government productions, and there may still be a difficult situation between the two. He suggested FIAF should write to encourage them, perhaps by asking them about legal deposit and stressing the importance of it for building up an archive of all national production, and encouraging them to visit new archives, perhaps via the bilateral Cultural Agreements between countries. He had arranged an extensive tour for them to visit European archives at the time of the Berlin Congress but they had not responded. Mrs Wibom mentioned they had visited Stockholm in 1988.

Mrs Wibom mentioned that their friend the filmmaker Victor Stolov, who had filmed extensively in Egypt and knew everyone, would be going back to Egypt: she had given him a letter for the archive together with a copy of the old FIAF Handbook so that he could make contact and bring back some information on what was happening. Mr Garcia Mesa suggested FIAF should make every effort to bring them to the Havana Congress, perhaps by funding their travel if other priorities allowed.

Mr Cincotti mentioned that he might be in Egypt in December and if so could visit them; he could also investigate possibility of getting financial help for them.

Mrs Orbanz explained that she had heard from the Egyptian National Film Archive that the second institution, **Academy of the Arts**, which had written to FIAF and individual members for help in building up its collection, was simply building a collection for student access and had no preservation intentions.

**Decision:** Reinstate as Observer in accordance with Rule 17, offering help and encouraging them to come to Havana.

### 3.3b Caracas: Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela

They had been formally deleted in Berlin as they had not paid or sent report for 3 years in spite of reminders. Now they had sent a cheque for 2 years but without any letter or explanation and still no Reports.

Mr Garcia Mesa had phoned them and reported he now had the names of the new Director and his deputy. They confirmed they had sent the money for two years and were trying for the third and had promised to send their Report for 1987-88 but it had not been received. The Director had since written to him confirming they were happy to be rejoining FIAF and hoped to come to Havana. It was also hoped they would be at the meeting of Latin American archives to be held in Havana later in November.

Mr Garcia Mesa had heard from Mrs Galvao and Mr Socrates that the other archive in Caracas, the **Instituto Nacional (National Library)**, were very serious people and undertaking important preservation work on a large collection of films.

Mrs Orbanz felt it was frustrating that the Cineteca were constantly promising but there were still no reports. Mrs van der Elst said

Mr  
org  
Dire  
the

Mr  
info  
kee  
Hav  
Hav

Dec  
and

3.4

3.4a

Mrs  
answ  
invi  
(Jun  
Mila  
thei  
sign

Mr  
12  
Mrs  
Mr  
cour  
agre  
colla  
out  
issue  
arch  
Germ  
requ

Mr  
"arch  
prese  
admi  
whic  
such  
Fede  
Obse  
circu  
Obse

Mr  
Fede  
howe  
were  
doings

Mr Socrates had not been happy with the Cineteca; he had felt the other organisation would be much better. Mr Garcia Mesa pointed out that the new Director had inherited a bad situation and they should at least hear what they were trying to do now before making a decision.

Mr Daudelin pointed out it was an automatic procedure and FIAF needed information via the Reports before admitting them. Mr Klaue suggested FIAF keep the money and advise them they have the chance to make a report in Havana. Mr Daudelin felt FIAF should insist they submit their Report before Havana.

**Decision:** Confirm that they cannot be reinstated until Reports are received and approved.

### **3.4 New Candidates for Observership**

#### **3.4a Gemona: Cinemateca de Friuli**

Mrs Orbanz noted that the replies to the EC's previous questions had been answered in the candidate's letter of October 6. In response to the invitation to comment on the application, there had only been a reply (June 3) from one of the existing Italian archives, Cineteca Italiana of Milan, who were against the proliferation of "film libraries" in Italy and their joining FIAF. Mrs van der Elst pointed out that they had nevertheless signed documents of collaboration with both Bologne and Gemona.

Mr Francis recalled the discussion in Lisbon on the interpretation of Rule 12 and he felt it imperative to agree on a single interpretation. Mrs Orbanz noted that existing archives were "invited to comment" (or as Mr Klaue later said "provide a written opinion") on applications from their country but they generally simply signed (or omitted to sign) the agreement. Several EC members felt that to sign the agreement to collaborate was tantamount to approving the application. Mr Rosen pointed out that in this case the comment did not address any of the substantive issues in relation to the candidate so was worthless. In any case, existing archives had no power of veto. Mrs Orbanz asked if anyone had visited Gemona while in Pordenone but it was pointed out that visits were not required for Observer candidates.

Mr Cincotti again addressed the issue of the proliferation of regional "archives" throughout Italy. Many, Gemona included, did virtually no preservation. Mr Daudelin felt that under the new proposals they could be admitted as Associates but this would not give them the right to exchange which was probably the main attraction. Mr Dimitriu felt it desirable that such organisations should have the opportunity to be associated with the Federation, without being full members, as they would not accept any more Observers until the Rules were changed. Mr Francis felt that now they had circulated the new proposals, it would be better not to accept any more Observers.

Mr Klaue and others pointed out that delay was not possible as the Federation always had to operate under its existing Rules. It was agreed however that they could certainly alert all new candidates that changes were being actively discussed and Mrs van der Elst said she was already doing that.

Mrs van der Elst pointed out that applicants could be admitted as Observers and by the time they came to reconfirmation, hopefully the new Rules would be in force and they could transfer to become Associates. In any case, being an Observer gave them no more rights than they would have as Associates.

Returning to the case of Gemona, Mr Borde had the impression they did excellent work for the Festival, in historical research and publications but were weak on preservation. He asked if their collections were only 9,5mm but no-one knew. Mr Cincotti said they belonged to the Italian Association of Cinema Research. Mr de Pina mentioned they certainly had some unique films as they had supplied 5 Italian films for a Lisbon retrospective that were not obtainable from elsewhere.

Mr Daudelin pointed out that their letter of October 6 had supplied the information requested by the EC. The Federation already had long-standing Observers, like Lyon, who seemed to be doing considerably less than Gemona.

**Decision:** 9 in favour, 3 abstentions

#### **3.4b Valencia: Filmoteca Generalitat Valenciana**

Mrs Orbanz reviewed the extensive documents supplied by this small regional archive which was created just over a year ago and had some 1000 films and in particular, films and complete supporting documentation from certain film-makers from Valencia. The EC also had the letter from the existing member in Madrid indicating the collaboration with the two regional archives, in Valencia and San Sebastian (Basque), in recovery of early silent films. They had no opposition to their joining FIAF if they satisfied the requirements but warned that these were only 2 of 17 separate "comunautés autonomes" in Spain.

Mr Cincotti acknowledged that it was quite small but he thought it was useful that they were planning to recover their own regional films, a task which should be encouraged. The new Director, who was well known to them, was serious and involved in film for many years. Although they were not operating at national, or international level, he felt their regional work would be very valuable. Having voted for Gemona, he felt bound to vote for Valencia. Mr Borde acknowledged they were serious but still very small; he feared most that by admitting them, one would open the breach for all 17 regional archives so would abstain.

Mr de Pina pointed out that Spanish law required the regional archives to preserve regional production. It was a serious organisation which already had good relations with his archive. He stressed that many of the 17 regions would have no local production so the threat was not so great as they might think.

Mr Daudelin quoted from a letter signed jointly by the two regional archives of San Sebastian and Valencia. They began by expressing their appreciation of the work done by the National Archive in Madrid and their collaboration but went on to complain that to have only one Spanish member in FIAF did not reflect the national situation which consisted of several autonomous regions. They also regretted that the National archive did not give them access to international contact or to FIAF information, activities or publications; in addition, they never consulted the regional archives on matters discussed by FIAF or allowed them to organise exhibitions of FIAF member programmes. The regional archives felt they should have equal rights with the national archive and therefore sought to join FIAF directly.

Mr Rosen mentioned they had declared their intention to apply eventually for full membership so suggested it was important to clarify that accepting them as Observers did not imply they would necessarily qualify as full Members.

Mr Francis drew attention to Annex 1E which clarified that Valencia was not just a region, but considered as a separate country in its own right, with its own budget and political rights, just as Scotland was considered as a separate country within the United Kingdom (unlike Wales or Northern Ireland or any of the regions of England). He felt these two cases, Valencia and Scotland, should be viewed in a different way from purely regional archives. Mr Dimitriu added that on that basis FIAF should expect applications from 23 or 25 would-be Observers from Switzerland.

**Decision:** 9 in favour, 3 abstentions

### **3.4c Glasgow: Scottish Film Archive**

Mrs Orbanz introduced the file submitted by the Scottish Film Council on behalf of the Scottish Film Archive, one of its department. The Council itself would become independent of its parent organisation (the Scottish Council for Educational Technology) in April 1990.

Mr Francis said that, although the application was from the Chairman and Director of the Council (and countersigned by the Archivist), it was important for FIAF to stress, as in the case of the Irish Film Institute and Archive and related cases, that it was the Archive itself that was being considered and/or accepted.

He very much admired the work they did, which was very impressive within their terms of reference, working as a regional or "national" archive within the UK. He noted they hoped to become a Full Member but did not think they could qualify. However, he had excellent relations with them: any material they found was always offered to his archive and if he did accept it, then he would give them a copy; if he couldnt accept it but it was of local interest, then they would pay for his archive to make a preservation copy which they would then preserve. Because Scotland was a separate nation within the UK, they had separate funding which meant they were finding additional money for UK archive work, rather than competing for funds from his sources.

He had some questions and reservations:

- page 4: he did not like the idea of nitrate being junked and felt such a practice should be queried though he recognised it happened elsewhere.
- he did not understand the reference to "purchase for resale" in the budget
- He was certainly not happy with the statement on Q5 of the form that the Council is responsible for funding and policy making
- He felt the reply to Q14 that they had their own laboratory must be a mistake.
- On Q21, he noted sales to TV were quite high (28% of income) but pointed out that this was generally local material and they were absolutely rigorous in their observation of copyright, etc.
- In response to Mr Klaue, he confirmed that he believed the Library, and certainly the Collection of Apparatus, was under Archive control.
- He added that in recent years Scotland had started to become a film producing nation and had 4 feature films at this year's Edinburgh Festival.
- He confirmed that the change of statutes scheduled for 1 April 1990 would certainly take place.

**Decision:** 11 in favour, 1 abstention. The letter to point out that it is the Archive that is being admitted and that, in accordance with FIAF's rules on autonomy, it was expected that the archive would be responsible for its own policy-making.

#### 3.4d Berkeley: Pacific Film Archive

Mrs Orbanz noted that the collection was very special, though it was neither national nor regional. Mr Rosen explained that the founding document was absent as it would be that of the University itself. Mr Daudelin found it rather disturbing that only 1% of their feature films were national and were in any case only viewing copies, and that only 2% of the budget was devoted to preservation, which seemed totally at variance with the Federation's requirements.

Mrs Bowser appreciated that at least the application was very honest and straightforward about their activities. She had come prepared to recommend them but was surprised that the preservation figure was so low as she had thought they would base their case on their important preservation work for independent cinema. Mr Rosen felt they had understated their case:

- they were very preservation-conscious, active members of the North American preservation community;
- their cataloguing was to international standards for sharing with other archives;
- they were acquiring and handling responsibly nitrate materials which were sent to his archive for physical restoration;
- their programmes stressed the importance of preservation and they were effective positive contributors to the preservation effort in North America.



Mr Garcia Mesa had been very impressed with his visit last July when he had unofficially "inspected" them. He confirmed that they were very active in all activities of a film archive and were attracting large numbers of students to be interested in their work; on the preservation side, they were actively collaborating with the other American archives. Mrs Wibom had taught at the archive for 3 months and was also very impressed by their activities. They had started as a student film society but were now working closely with the University's film department. Their marked interest in preservation had stemmed from their own experiences realising the fragility of their own collection. Mrs Orbanz was particularly impressed by their cataloguing of the Daiei Collections.

Mr Daudelin drew a parallel with the long-standing Observer, Cinémathèque Universitaire de Paris, which rescued valuable films but, as far as he knew did no active preservation work on them. It was felt PFA did more than that.

**Decision:** 8 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention.

#### **3.4e New York: Anthology Film Archives**

Mrs Orbanz noted that this too was a very special collection. They had given considerable detail about their preservation activities although she was not sure if it was real preservation. Mr Rosen said that in his role on the panel of the NEA (National Endowment for the Arts) he had seen them repeatedly receive funding as they were perceived by their peers to be doing "serious preservation work" on experimental films. Neither he nor Mrs Bowser was personally familiar with their preservation work and Mrs Bowser felt that, in spite of the AFA's own publicity, her archive probably preserved more independent film than they did. From the knowledge she did have, she was not satisfied they understood preservation principles.

Mrs Wibom reported she had been cooperating with them since the 1960's and attending their screenings. It may well be that other bodies were now doing more preservation of the new American cinema but they had done remarkable pioneer work. Mrs Bowser felt that, even in the 1960's, that was simply their propaganda. Mrs Wibom said that, like most other archives, they were becoming increasingly aware of the importance of preservation and when she visited them the previous month they were eager for information on the vinegar syndrome.

Mr Rosen acknowledged that they may be open to criticism but they had been in existence for many years, had the support of at least a certain sector of the independent film community, and were doing some preservation work. Anything that encouraged them to be more responsible in preservation was to the better.

**Decision:** 9 in favour, 3 abstentions.

### 3.4f Tokyo: National Film Center

Mrs Orbanz mentioned that the dossier was very complete and they were all impressed with their collections and the work being done.

Mrs Wibom who had recently visited them on the occasion of the Tokyo Film Festival confirmed that Mr Maruo had retired but the application was in the name of Mr Itoshi Osaki, Director of the parent organisation, the Museum of Modern Art, a government body. They have 11 staff including 3 excellent young people but not one technician. They had a beautiful new building for the vaults and a wonderful new film theatre but very little space for offices or working on films. Sadly, the facilities were not being used at all, because of "administrative" problems. They have difficulty getting films because of long-standing mistrust between the film community and the government who in the war had simply given their films away.

Mrs Bowser reported that at the time of her visit the vaults did hold some films and there were a couple of workers there. Her main complaint was that they planned to copy their nitrate films, currently held in the laboratories, and then jettison them as they claimed they could not get permission to build nitrate vaults because of the fire risk. She acknowledged that they did have problems with the government and their lack of autonomy and felt that FIAF had been waiting so long for them to join that it would be best to admit them and then try to help them to get things improved later.

There was some discussion of the budget of 6m yen which was felt not particularly large for such a rich country.

Mr Cincotti was not happy about the temperature and humidity figures given for the colour vaults (page 10)

Decision: 11 in favour, 1 abstention.

### 3.5 Miscellaneous

#### - **Puerto Rico**

Mr Garcia Mesa reported there was a new archive there which hoped to come to Havana. He had advised them how to apply to join FIAF but the Secretariat had heard nothing.

#### - **New York: National Center for Jewish Films**

These were currently Subscribers and had not followed up their application.

#### - **Costa Rica: Archivo Nacional**

Mrs van der Elst said they were working to prepare their application.

#### - **Cyprus: Minister of Interior, Information Office**

They were hoping to set up an archive and, following Mr Olli Alho's visit, they had asked for information on FIAF publications and some had been sent free.

#### - **The Academy of Motion Pictures, Arts & Sciences (Hollywood)**

They have expressed interest in joining

#### - **Caracas: Bibliothèque Nationale**

FIAF was still in contact

- **Hong Kong**

They had received the Report from Sam Kula who was still awaiting a reaction from the government on his Feasibility Study for an archive. Mr Francis mentioned that subsequently Mr Lee had visited him in London and there were problems because of the uncertain political future there.

- **Brussels: Cinémathèque Royale**

They had a letter reporting that Gabrielle Claes had been appointed as the new Director. She had sent a message through Mrs van der Elst that she hoped to be active in FIAF and come to Havana.

- **Pordenone**

Mrs Bowser referred to 3 documents, the first one addressed to the film historians and archivists at Pordenone saying it was "shocking to see how professional film archives of Italy, France and the United States ... and FIAF film archives ... are collaborating in the destruction of the Desmet Collection"...

She felt this needed some sort of official response from FIAF but noted that document 2 which was also distributed at Pordenone, was an excellent response from the film archives of the European Community. Document 3 was a response drafted later by the American archives in Miami.

The Americans had suggested that if the Nederlands Film Museum could afford to supply a negative of the title logo they had designed, then they would find the money to make positive copies to attach to the prints. She hoped that finding a way to acknowledge the source of prints would be one of the topics considered by the proposed Programming Group.

**Decision:** FIAF to send a similar brief letter of support to the Nederlands Film Museum saying they were indeed following FIAF principles.

- **Changing situation in France**

Mr Borde reported that Jack Lang, Minister of Culture, had entrusted to a publisher, Christian Bourgois, an enquiry into the preservation of the audiovisual heritage. His Report which had been distributed (with copies to the FIAF President and to himself) was concerned with:

i Access of public to early archive materials

This would create problems with producers and distributors but was outside his present concern

ii Proposal to create a new agency for preserving the audio-visual heritage (APA: Agence du Patrimoine Audio-Visuel)

This would bring together all the organisations that had film collections including government institutions (like Bois d'Arcy, l'Etablissement Cinématographique des Armées), private organisations (like the Cinémathèque Française, Cinémathèque de Toulouse and the Cinémathèque Universitaire) and Foundations (like the Fondation Albert Kahn). The new agency would take over all the technical staff of these different organisations, including responsibility for their pay and professional training. It would set up each year a joint programme of film restoration and was charged with setting up as quickly as possible a medium-term plan for nitrate transfers.

In a sense, this responded to their dreams of a "National Cinémathèque". The government had finally recognised the size of the problem and the need for substantial government funding for preserving the audiovisual heritage. They felt a single source of funding would be preferable to the present rather more random system. He hoped it would come into effect during 1990.

Mr Rosen asked if it would be possible to have details as they would be useful as a model in trying to persuade the American Congress to do something similar. Mr Borde offered to give him a photocopy of the relevant pages of the Bourgois report.

Mrs Wibom mentioned the departure of Mr Schmitt and asked for information on the role of Bois d'Arcy. Mr Borde said the different organisations would maintain their own character but Bois d'Arcy would be the core of the new APA "federation". In response to Mr de Pina, he said the television production companies had their own archiving organisation, INA.

- **Institut de Cinéma Slovaque**

Mr Borde reported he had received a letter from them saying they planned to archive Czech, Slovak and even some foreign films.

[end of day 1]

- **Changing situation in London**

Mr Francis recalled that it was the responsibility of FIAF members to advise the EC if anything happened internally which might be contrary to the rules of FIAF or the terms of the last Reconfirmation situation. He therefore had to report on a restructuring proposal, presented by the new Director of the BFI (appointed about a year ago, formerly its Administrator) which would affect the NFA.

The paper states that it was arrived at "as a result of consultation with senior staff members". It was prepared after the most recent 5-year planning process when each department submits proposals for the coming 5 years. The archive plan had been discussed in detail and approved and indeed contained some things he would have liked to have seen in the previous plan. However, he, as Head of the Archive, had certainly not been consulted on the ideas contained in the new paper which was conceived and written by the Director. Indeed, he had only been able to see the part relating to the Archive the day before it was distributed to all staff.

There were many proposals in the paper which he found disturbing which he would attempt to summarise in order of importance:

1. Transfer of viewing copies out of Archive control  
It was proposed that a certain percentage of the viewing copies given to the archive under a deposit agreement signed by the Archive Curator, in the name of the archive and on behalf of the BFI, should be passed to the Distribution Division. The Distribution Division supplies films to other parts of the BFI (eg the National Film Theatre and regional film theatres) and also to other users, like film festivals.
2. Transfer of Production Library out of Archive control  
The Production Library which supplies clips to television would also be transferred to the Distribution Division.
3. Disappearance of title "National Film Archive".  
What remained of the archive would be renamed "BFI Collections".

4. Transfer of Cataloguing Section out of Archive control

The Cataloguing Section, or at least part of it, would be transferred with all parts of the Institute dealing with "data" (including the Library) to a section to be regarded as the Computerisation or Information Section of the Institute.

5. Change of Staffing of the Archive

The post of Deputy Curator, formerly held by Michelle Aubert and established for 30 years, was to be abolished, leaving no assistance to the Curator in the management of 150 staff.

Mr Francis said it was difficult to see what the Director hoped to achieve but it was suspected that he felt the archive contained assets that could be exploited commercially. As long as the prints remained in the Archive, they would be inaccessible because of the strict observance by the Archive of copyright and deposit obligations. Mr Francis cited as example the archive's collection of positive prints of American features which he would regard as master material until his American colleagues in FIAF could confirm that the films were being adequately preserved elsewhere. He could see these being withdrawn from preservation status and made available for showing in BFI national and regional theatres, in order to cut down on the costs of importing viewing prints from America. They might even be offered to film festivals who would be prepared to pay significant sums for the use of rarer films.

The proposals reflected the "functionalist" theory of management, grouping together all activities of a similar type (eg access or preservation) regardless of their inter-relationship. This had one positive side as, under preservation, the archive would regain control of still, set designs, posters, artifacts, and all special collections now held by the Library. This reversed the decisions of previous Directors: the last one had removed stills from the archive, the one before had removed the Library. He suspected there was a feeling that the archive was too powerful within the BFI. It was the part which received substantial government funding and he supposed the idea was that if the archive could be integrated with the various parts of BFI, then the other activities of the BFI might be more protected in times of financial stringency and the fear, under a Conservative Thatcher government, of attempts at privatisation. The National Film Theatre and the Museum of the Moving Image might well be prime targets for privatisation.

Mr Francis then explained that he was particularly concerned about the first two points: transfer of viewing prints and Production Library out of archive control to a Division which did not have the same meticulous attitude about copyright as the archive. He had already declared to the Director that, if the proposal was implemented, he would immediately resign as he felt no archivist, certainly no FIAF member, could accept that material entrusted to the archive, with legally binding contracts, could be removed from the archive's control. To stress the importance of these points, he had passed to the new Director a copy of the FIAF Reconfirmation papers, signed in 1988 by the previous Director and confirming that the archive has autonomy on policy, staff recruitment, use of budget, etc.

He was not sure what FIAF could do to help but hoped the Director would reconsider the implications of his proposals. Perhaps he might ask later for a letter from the FIAF President to the Chairman or the Director after the so-called consultation process. The archive staff were vehement in their opposition but there seemed to be no sign of amending the proposals before the proposed implementation date of January 1, 1990.

Mr Rosen asked about the implications for loan of prints to other archives and non-archives. It was not fully defined but informally it seemed the intention was to make everyone pay and the BFI itself would be happy to pay for what it needed. Decisions as to whether to observe the FIAF Article requiring FIAF members in a country to be consulted in the case of loans to third parties would be in the hands of the Distribution Division. The Head of the Division and the Director both claim that Distribution would observe the same criteria as the Archive. However, Distribution Libraries were not noted to lose if they were to have complaints from the occasional rights holder. For the archive, the process of clearing copyright played an important part in their relations with producers and distributors and reinforced the element of trust which was essential if they were to continue to receive new holdings. (Mr Francis mentioned that he even cleared copyright for loaning a videocassette to J.Paul Getty, the archive's main benefactor). The archive receives a copy of every American film released and he was sure this was because they were absolutely meticulous in observing rights. A Distribution Library staffed by ex commercial distribution staff could very quickly destroy that goodwill by being cavalier about rights.

After some detailed discussion, the EC decided that some action should be taken and Mr Daudelin, as President, asked Mr Francis for guidance on how and when FIAF could help. Mr Francis said, that if the proposals were not modified, then as a Member of FIAF he would have to write formally to FIAF, with copy to his Director, to explain that he felt the archive was no longer qualified to be a Member. If he had to send such a letter, he would of course want a prompt reply and, as the EC was not due to meet again until April, he asked if the main contents of a reply to such a letter could be drafted in Helsinki and held in readiness. Mrs Orbanz felt it important to give some formal warning to the Director of the implications during the consultation process, before it was too late. Mr Francis explained that, in response to the submission of the FIAF Reconfirmation documents, the Director had already said that membership of FIAF was not all that important anyway. In response to Mr Daudelin, he suggested FIAF's response could be addressed to the Chairman of the Board, who was at least a film-maker, and the Director, with copy to himself.

**Decision:** Mrs Orbanz, as Secretary General, to prepare a suitable draft.

**- Bologna**

Mr Daudelin asked Mr Cincotti for information on the proposed Restoration School as a long text had been submitted for the Bulletin. He felt Mr Schou, Head of the Preservation Commission, should be given the chance to comment before it was published. Mr Cincotti replied that the Italian archives had been asked to join a plea, regretting that there was no national film restoration or training centre, and to support the creation of an international laboratory, under the auspices of the Emilia Romagna Regional Institute of Culture Heritage, and Museums (Biens Culturels et Musées) ie not the Bologna archive itself. They planned a cultural and technical training workshop in November 1990, with national and international experts, to start a new generation of young restorers but he was not sure how feasible it was. Certainly the Region had access to funding which was useful but he was not sure how they could claim there was an international lack of trained staff if they expected to find qualified staff from within Italy to run the seminars.

Mrs van der Elst believed Mr Schou had been invited and was intending to go. Mr Daudelin thought the programme looked similar to a FIAF basic Summer School and if it was put in the Bulletin it might imply FIAF approval.

**- Belgium and Luxembourg**

Mr Daudelin reported that the new curator in Brussels had written to all members of the EC asking for a clarification of the relations between the archives of the two countries, but allegedly without wanting to make a formal complaint. She feared Luxembourg's relations with the Belgian distributors could endanger the Belgian archive's work. He referred to the relevant Article: Article 95 especially para b.2 and Article 82 if it came to a need for arbitration, which they obviously hoped to avoid if only on grounds of time and expense. It was obvious from the letter that the Belgian archive considered the Luxembourg archive as an unwanted second archive in Belgium, rather than the archive of a separate country, especially as there was no independent distribution in Luxembourg. He did not think there was anything new compared with the complaint presented by Mr Ledoux which itself had not been considered grounds for refusing Luxembourg as a FIAF Member. He recalled however there had been uneasiness at the time at the idea of continuing hostility between the two archives and the situation was obviously not improving.

Mr Rosen suggested the solution might depend on whether the distributors were officially registered in Belgium, Luxembourg or both countries. FIAF was concerned with "territorial boundaries" and whether the distribution of films in Luxembourg was legally registered in Luxembourg (which was OK) or only in Belgium (which implied the Luxembourg archive was encroaching on foreign territory).

Mr Francis pointed out that in Luxembourg, the archivists had refused to accept the situation and demanded the films from the distributors in Belgium. The question of whether he should be paying for them was a separate issue. Mrs van der Elst suggested that by doing that he might be depriving the Belgian archive of its copy of the films.

Mr Borde said there was no question of arbitration at this stage as there was no formal complaint. They should first attempt resolution by informal means and "dedramatise" the situation. The letter mentioned two "complaints": payments to obtain films and the use of the Municipal Hall for commercial screenings. The fairest approach would be to invite the other side to respond and then encourage them to sit down together and resolve the issues themselves: as far as he knew the two archives had not had a dialogue for twenty years!

Mr Daudelin felt that before looking at the issues in the letter, they should be better informed on the actual legal points raised by Mr Rosen and Mr Francis: the legal status of the distributors in the two countries. Mr Rosen said the question of payment might be regrettable but there was nothing in the Statutes and Rules forbidding it; the only valid question was the territorial one.

Mrs van der Elst pointed out that the problem here was that Luxembourg was allegedly trespassing on another territory, contrary to Article 95b. If it was to be considered as the same or a joint territory, then they should have been asked to sign a collaboration agreement in the normal way, when Luxembourg was accepted as Member.

Mr Francis was not sure they should adopt Mr Borde's approach because the new letter was essentially the same as that of Mr Ledoux which the old EC had decided was not a relevant factor in their decision because Luxembourg was a separate country. They could only reopen the issue on the basis of new information or because the new EC wanted to overturn the decision of the old EC. Mr Klaue felt the situation was different because previously Mr Ledoux had been asked repeatedly for evidence and had produced none whereas this time there was an offer to provide chapter and verse.

Mrs Bowser also felt the complaint was different on the counts mentioned but also because the first time it concerned a membership application and now it was a complaint against an existing Member.

Mrs Wiborn mentioned that the last issue of "Media" dealt with distribution rights in Europe after 1992. The trend would be increasingly for distributors to buy the rights for linguistic areas rather than territories, and indeed this had been already going on for the last 4 or 5 years. Although it was necessary to find a practical solution for the two countries concerned, they should all recognise that the world was changing fast and they needed to adjust accordingly. Through her position in the Institute, which was involved in buying, selling, producing as well as preserving, she was aware of these changes and felt FIAF should be taking them into account.

**Decision:** Mr Daudelin to draft a letter to Mrs Claes, suggesting a meeting with Mr Junk, with the participation of an EC member if they wished, in the hope that they could come to an amicable solution. If she wished to make a formal complaint, then she should quote the relevant articles and supporting facts but the EC hoped she would decide this was not necessary. The FIAF letter to be signed by Mrs Orbanz, as Secretary General.



**- Guatemala**

Mr Garcia Mesa had brought a Report in Spanish about the situation in Guatemala. It appears that the old archive at the University, Enrique Tores is still in existence. The collection is seriously at risk because of the poor climatization of the vaults. They will be represented at the Havana Congress and he had advised them what to send to the Secretariat for their application to become Observers.

**- Colombia**

Mr Garcia Mesa reported there was now a serious situation between the Cinemateca Distrital and the new Foundation headed by Claudia Triana. He had received a letter from the Director, Augusto Bernal, complaining that they were in danger of being taken over by the new Foundation. Mr Garcia Mesa had urged Mr Bernal to attend the meeting of the Latin American film archives due to be held in Buenos Aires the week after the FIAF meeting in Helsinki, in the hope that they could resolve the problem between themselves before formally seeking FIAF's help.

[Note: The Buenos Aires meeting was being funded by Unesco and the Argentinian Government and the agenda included relations between Latin American archives and the regional centre in Latin America, Micro-ISIS, funding, etc.]

**- New Questionnaire for Reconfirmation & Annual Statistics**

Mr Daudelin recalled that Mrs Wibom had asked for the contents of this to be reconsidered and, in this context, the EC should consider the third draft questionnaire for the Statistics prepared by Mrs Aubert.

Mrs Aubert had written that she had redesigned the questionnaire to be easy to complete and easy to analyse and volunteered to do the analysis for the first year.

Mr Rosen said that in their membership discussion and the search for good quantitative and qualitative criteria, they had been aware of the importance of a good questionnaire to elicit such information. He found this draft unsatisfactory on 3 points:

- there was no quantitative factor or sense of the scale of activity
- there was no distinction between what happened in the current year and the overall situation
- some important areas, like cataloguing, were not even mentioned

After some discussion of the usefulness of the detailed information given in the questionnaire, it was agreed to make no change but to underline in the reminder letter the importance of supplying the statistics so that FIAF could collate and use the information for propaganda on behalf of all archives worldwide.

**- Mrs Wibom's proposal to change presentation of the Annual report**

Mrs van der Elst recalled that Mrs Wibom had wanted the President's Report and the Commission Reports to be included with the individual archive reports to give an overview of the Federation's activities in each year.

Mr Klaue pointed out that the time scale was impossible as even now, the draft of the President's Report was produced at the last minute immediately before the congress.

Mrs Orbanz said they could not publish the Annual Reports after the Congress as the Congress was the opportunity to discuss the contents with the delegates. But anyway the President's report and the Commission reports were always published in the Minutes of the GA.

**Decision:** No change.

#### **4. FINANCIAL REPORT**

##### **4.1 Financial Report for 1989**

Mr Borde first reviewed the list of outstanding subscriptions and confirmed that payments had since been received from Hanoi, Cairo and Milan. There was still no news from Manila concerning 2 years outstanding, 1988 and 1989, but it seemed the delay from Reykjavik for the same two years was purely administrative. He was more concerned about Rio de Janeiro who was also two years behind.

##### **4.2 Draft Budget for 1991**

Mr Borde reported that the figures for staff costs and external work fees showed a variation between the headings but not overall, because Mrs Chantal van den Berghe would be working freelance rather than as a paid employee and Mrs van der Elst would be using part-time the services of another person, who it was hoped would eventually become her successor.

In general terms, they had allowed an increase of 5% for inflation. The amount for Special Publications had been significantly reduced and the support to PIP was due to end in 1991 when it should be self-supporting.

He recalled they had not increased the Subscriptions for many years and had supported the deficit in the last 3 years by drawing on the first Reserve Fund but it was now time to make the increase from the present rates of 2850 and 400 Swiss francs for Members and Observers respectively. They had not prepared any proposals as it depended on whether the EC wanted a single increase to a figure that would be held for 5 years or whether they wanted to introduce some annual index linking. Mr Francis suggested that at this stage they should calculate how much money was needed to cover the planned expenses so that this could be taken into account when considering the new Membership Proposals, which included a provision to introduce new subscription rates for the 3 new categories of membership. Mr Cincotti suggested it was legally more correct to set the subscriptions for one year at a time in the light of the anticipated expenses.

Mrs Wibom stressed that if they were expecting to ask the GA in Havana to recommend a subscription increase, then they should give members some advance warning as they would need to allow for this in their internal budgeting.

Mr Klaue asked if it was really necessary as the number of members was increasing: they had already accepted 6 new Observers in Helsinki. He pointed out that an increase for many archives, which had to find hard currency to pay their subscription, would be outside their own authorisation. They would have to apply to other institutions for the increase and, to do this, it would not be sufficient to mention simply "inflation", it would need to be supported by fact and argument. He warned that it might have the effect of decreasing their overall income, as existing Members might decide to transfer to the cheaper category.

Mr Daudelin asked if the Secretariat could calculate whether the subscriptions from new Observers could be sufficient to bridge the gap. In any case, he would prefer that they did not attempt to discuss subscription rates at the same time as they discussed the new membership structure, as it would be complicated enough already. Mrs Wibom pointed out that the first-year cost of each new Observer exceeded their subscription so the new Observers were increasing the deficit.

Mr Francis asked if the Fund Raising Committee had had ideas to find funding for some of the activities currently paid for out of subscriptions. Mrs Wibom replied that their first priority had been to provide help for bringing delegates to Havana; they had suggestions for the future but nothing relevant to the immediate discussion.

Mr Klaue called for a very clear and detailed statement of the budgetary situation of the Federation with various options to reduce expenditure and the implications of each. They could even include the effect of such extreme measures as closing the Secretariat. Mrs van der Elst agreed it would be much more satisfactory to review subscription levels once the new membership structure had been agreed. In the meantime, it would be possible to reduce expenses by reducing allocations to individual budget headings under Special Expenses, including the Commissions and Publications. Mr Rosen recalled that there was a problem that they were considering proposing the establishment of yet another Commission in Havana.

In the light of the discussion, Mr Daudelin formally asked the EC to approve the proposal that Mr Borde and Mrs van der Elst should be asked to prepare very detailed financial statements for Havana and include the cost to the Federation of each Observer and Member.

Meanwhile, to avoid mixing a discussion of subscription increases with the discussion of membership structure, he felt they should present the GA with a balanced budget for 1991 based on the present level of subscriptions.

[The discussion was resumed after lunch]

Later in the day, Mr Borde and Mrs van der Elst presented to the EC their suggestions for arriving at a balanced budget for 1991, which were agreed. All the proposed reductions came under Special Expenses: a major reduction in Executive Committee expenses; reduced funding for Commissions and Special Missions; no funding at all for Special Publications and Publicity for FIAF publications.

The reduction in Executive Committee expenses could be achieved by cutting out simultaneous translation as, now that he and Mr Cincotti, the chief users, were about to retire, it could be assumed that in future all EC members would speak English.

Mr Borde recalled that they had a Reserve Fund of 3 million Belgian francs (held in Swiss francs) which they would not be touching. This would be mentioned, as usual, to reassure members that FIAF had financial security but it was pointed out it represented less than one-year's budget.

In the discussion, Mr Daudelin asked that they should not use the term "crisis budget" before the GA, but rather to stress that it was a well-balanced budget.

Mrs Orbanz recalled that they were trying to extend the range of people serving on the EC, which would be defeated if they cut out the interpreting, thus restricting membership to anglophones. She would prefer to keep the interpreting service in the EC, and have further cuts in the Commission work, which would have the advantage of bringing home to the membership the reduction in the Federation's activities which would occur as the direct effect of not increasing the subscription. Mr Daudelin felt that the areas that they wanted to see better represented on the EC were English-speaking. He was very keen that the Commission work should not be curtailed. Mrs Wibom agreed with Mrs Orbanz that two languages should be available but suggested they could find the money perhaps from outside sources if the need arose after the new elections. Mrs Bowser reminded the EC that they were considering emergency measures for one year only.

Mr de Pina suggested that, rather than trying to reduce expenses further, they should find ways to increase the revenue and gave several suggestions:

- every archive should be asked to devote one programme a year to FIAF and give FIAF the revenue
- increase the charges for TV rights & pass extra to FIAF
- increase the charges for video & pass extra to FIAF

These suggestions were noted by the Fund-Raising Committee.

#### **4.3 Fund-Raising Committee**

Mrs Wibom said they had had their first meeting in Helsinki the day before but each had been working on it since Lisbon. They had restricted their proposals at this stage to finding ways to support the Havana Congress.

Mr Rosen mentioned that he had received an encouraging response from the Rockefeller Foundation where he had previous contacts and which had international interests.

Mr Garcia Mesa expressed his warm thanks and confirmed that the list of potential recipients had already been prepared for the EC to decide on priorities.

In Switzerland, Mr Dimitriu had approached some 25 institutions which had helped the Swiss archive in the past but pointed out that many were very traditional so, instead of stressing the need of 3rd world archives to go to Cuba, his initial approach had been more general. Two responded positively and he hoped to get travel funding for one person from each of them.

In the  
for 2

Mrs W  
Swede  
govern  
that i  
World  
only p  
and w  
follow  
- bags  
- a FI  
- a gr  
She ho  
a simi  
Denma  
countr  
was to  
money  
One e  
Comm

Mrs W  
propos  
outside  
be dis  
Federa  
govern  
money  
Mr Ga  
as soo

Decisio  
(possib  
in Haw

5. RE

Mrs va  
regrett

5.1 C

There  
Thanks  
Comm

5.2 D

In resp  
would  
the UF

In the USA, Mrs Bowser reported that Mary Lee Bandy hoped to get funding for 2 delegates and perhaps a third, via the Asia Society.

Mrs Wibom noted that every country offered different opportunities. In Sweden, the main source of funding for Third World countries was the government. She had asked for \$40,000 for the Havana Congress, stressing that it was an international seminar particularly for archives of Third World countries. They replied they would not give more than \$20,000, and only provided she specified the individuals concerned, where they came from and why they should be funded. In addition, she had obtained money for the following:

- bags for the FICA box which India was not able to use (?)
- a FICA Box for Bangladesh
- a grant of \$10,000 for the Latin American Film School in Cuba.

She hoped they could also get funding from other countries where there was a similar attitude to Third World countries, eg Canada, Norway, Finland and Denmark. If they could obtain, say \$5,000 each year, from say 10 to 12 countries, it would make a significant contribution. The important thing was to prepare a one-page statement, clarifying the purposes for which the money was required and how it would be administered and controlled.

One example of desirable change, was the fact that neither the EC nor the Commissions reflected the composition of the membership.

Mrs Wibom said that the Fund-Raising Committee would prepare a paper on its proposed operation, identifying some categories of projects for which outside funding might be sought. This would be circulated so that it could be discussed in Havana and thereafter used as a discussion document by Federation members, who should be encouraged to approach their individual governments. Mr Rosen warned that the membership should not assume that the money will automatically come rolling in.

Mr Garcia Mesa asked for a written summary of the commitments/hopes to date as soon as possible, to assist him in his planning.

**Decision:** Fund-Raising Committee to prepare paper by date to be agreed (possibly December 15). Final paper, approved by EC, to be presented to GA in Havana as part of the Financial Report.

## 5. REPORT OF THE SPECIALISED COMMISSIONS

Mrs van der Elst gave the greetings from the three Commission heads who regretted to be unable to attend the EC meeting.

### 5.1 Cataloguing Commission

There were no comments to the written report sent by Mrs Harrison. Thanks were expressed to the President and members of the Cataloguing Commission.

### 5.2 Documentation Commission

In response to Mr Garcia Mesa, Mrs van der Elst reported that Mrs Aubert would continue for the time being as Commission Head, since her move from the UK to Bois d'Arcy.

After some discussion about the aims of the Documentation and Cataloguing Commissions, the EC favoured the idea of an open discussion in Havana and a move towards redefining the overall objectives. One also needed to discuss with the Commission Heads how to have some rotation within the membership of a Commission. Mr Francis recalled that the Rules 77-79 gave the EC all the powers they needed.

**Action:** Mrs Bowser and Mr Klaue to prepare a general discussion concerning FIAF Commissions and role of Commission heads at EC meetings.

Mrs van der Elst asked for response to Mrs Aubert's questions:

- 2. approval of Nancy Goldman as member, if Pacific Film Archive admitted as Observer. Decision: Approved
- 1.6. Questionnaire: Decision: discussed under Agenda item 8.1.

### 5.3 Preservation Commission

Mrs van der Elst said the latest Report was in the Bulletin. Mr Francis asked to put on the record the fact that he had offered the Preservation Commission facilities for meeting in Berkhamsted in December, but in spite of repeated cables, there had been no formal response which he found rather disappointing. Both Mrs van der Elst and Mrs Orbanz knew that Mr Schou was unable to accept the invitation and the latter had repeatedly urged him to at least have the courtesy to inform Mr Francis.

### 5.4 Technical Coordinating Committee

(2nd Consultation between archives and manufacturers)

Mrs Orbanz reported on the 2-day meeting in Vienna to which they had invited carrier manufacturers for discussion and exchange of practical advice.

The Minutes would be circulated but she read out the principal recommendations and points made:

- There was a need to encourage cooperation between tape and machine manufacturers in the development of new formats (this applied to television)
- The word "archival" was weak and unclear; they should encourage the use instead of "life expectancy" for carriers and "long term storage". The word "archival" should not be used in advertising. This had occurred in the context of Compact disks which the manufacturers admitted did not last "forever".
- On the question of life expectancy, where the archivists wanted 100 years, the manufacturers were at least willing to admit they could not guarantee 100 years, which was an important step forward.
- The manufacturers also admitted that the artificial aging tests had little value.

Mrs Orbanz said the vision of regular meetings was becoming a reality and, for instance, at the IASA Standards sub-groups there was regular talk of the TCC. The manufacturers were becoming interested; Afga and Kodak were already coming to the JTS in Ottawa and she expected more. She hoped that FIAF would be well represented through its technicians.

There was a further TCC meeting in Oxford at the IASA Congress but no-one represented FIAF on the technical side. The main purpose was to organise the Ottawa programme. Preliminary information was in the Bulletin and there would be further Consultation with manufacturers in Ottawa as well as the Joint Technical Symposium. IASA's Congresses were organised by an Organising Committee which distributed responsibility of the TCC but the administration was being provided by Fred Granger, of the Museum of Civilisation in Hull (Canada) where the meetings would be held.

Immediately after the JTS, there would be the IASA Congress and the ARSC Conference (Association of Recorded Sound Collections, which had American members only), which were open to all JTS participants.

Mrs Orbanz closed by mentioning she found the work of the Group very stimulating and useful.

Mr Francis mentioned that Michelle Edge would be introducing the research work at the JTS. He felt this personal introduction to the Final Report was essential and better than simply circulating the Report to members as he had found he could not even understand the lay summary. Mrs Orbanz said Ms Edge had presented the material very well in Oxford but it was essential to have technical archivists present in Ottawa to put the right questions.

Mr Klaue thought FIAF had a certain moral obligation to ensure that there were at least a few JTS participants from FIAF.

On FIAF participation, Mr Francis said there had been quite a lot of enthusiasm, especially about the work on the vinegar syndrome. Tony Cook had prepared a questionnaire to assess the size of the problem in television archives. He suspected it might be bigger for them, in which case, they would be likely to be interested to attend and hopefully the richer resources of the television companies could be used to help in the research and testing.

Mrs van der Elst asked if any financial support was available, as she had had a request from Columbia. Mrs Orbanz reported they were trying to get some support from UNESCO.

Mr Francis reiterated the need to have FIAF participation, especially as the manufacturers were now interested to talk to the archives. It would be disastrous if FIAF was not properly represented.

## 6. REPORT OF THE PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

Mr Daudelin explained that the report had been drafted in Helsinki by himself, Mr Borde and Mr de Pina, taking into account various meetings and written contributions since the Lisbon Congress, especially from members of the Portuguese archive.

Mr Rosen felt it was important to clarify that they were interested in the cultural issues of an archive and not solely with the traditional activities of programming and exhibition. He suggested the following goals:

1. To explore issues and exchange information on the cultural uses of the archives for purposes of screening, research and education, including the manufacture of copies for screenings, copyright questions, design of facilities, uses of new technologies, presentational and publicity strategies and guidelines for access.
2. Development of collaborative projects in these areas of general interest to the Federation
3. Helping to define the relationship of the cultural uses of a collection to the goals of preservation, documentation and cataloguing.

Activities might include:

1. On-site cinemathèque screenings and preservations
2. Exchange and loan of holdings with affiliates and with others
3. Study, research and educational access to the collection
4. Circulating collections
5. Other uses of the collection for purposes of archive production, audio-visual publication and educational application.

Mrs Bowser made two comments on the Working Group's paper:

- last item page 1: should include "in cooperation with the Documentation Commission", as they were very active in this area.
- Perhaps the Group could be composed of active programmers who were already regularly meeting at the Film Festivals and would thus not need to incur extra meeting expenses. However, as many were not active in FIAF, this would mean ensuring that someone from the EC was delegated to participate to ensure that FIAF concerns were given appropriate priority.

Mr Garcia Mesa raised a point he had mentioned before: was there a list of films in the public domain? Mr. Daudelin reported there was one in the United States, but Mrs Bowser emphasised that each list would be country specific so of little use for FIAF as a whole. Even the American list was not reliable.

Mrs Wiborn made two points. First, she was surprised there was no mention in the paper of activities for children and young people and the need to ensure that the awareness of past classics was kept alive for the future generations. In Tokyo recently, she had compared 10 lists of the 100 best films and felt that the fact that the last one, compiled in 1983, included only 7 silent films, was a powerful indicator that early films were simply disappearing from cultural consciousness, a situation which archives could work to remedy. They were working quite a lot with children in Sweden. She suggested the new group could encourage archive contacts with school authorities to bring the audio-visual heritage into the general teaching plan.

Secondly, she felt that although the Programming specialists should be aware of recommended standards for projection speeds, etc., it was the job of the Preservation Commission to make the recommendations. Mrs Bowser agreed it was not their task to make the recommendations, but she thought it was very valuable for the Programmers to consider ways to ensure the standards were widely disseminated and observed.



Mr Daudelin stressed that they had tried not to impose an agenda on the proposed Group but to make suggestions. They felt it was important that the new Commission should work in very close collaboration with the others.

Mrs Wibom sympathised with the idea that the programmers should meet at Film Festivals but felt their prime interest was to meet with the archivists. She recalled how much she had wanted to make contact with FIAF during her 15 years as a programmer and how she always felt an outsider. Mr Daudelin recalled that this was the thinking of the Lisbon symposium organisers who felt FIAF was losing touch with its programming colleagues and their views should be considered within the GA.

Mr Francis wondered if it was the right time to be thinking of a new Commission when the Membership Working Group's proposals might involve changes in the existing Commissions and the Federation's way of working. Perhaps they would do better with a series of Working Groups, each responsible for picking up the various aspects of the paper : some (like projection standards) needed to be discussed with the Preservation Group, others were quite independent of existing Commission topics. This could offer a more flexible approach and encourage cross-fertilisation.

Mr Borde recalled the origins of the proposal for a Programming Group at the Lisbon symposium where it was recognised that there were very specific programming problems, which did not exist 10 or 20 years previously, due to the increased competition from "salles d'art et d'essai" and from television screenings of old films. These purely programming problems had nothing to do with the issues treated by the other Commissions. He recognised that there would be occasions when they would need to cooperate with the other Commissions but the bulk of their work was specific to programming alone.

Mrs Orbanz felt it was important to have a group devoted to Programming as the Statutes and Rules did specify that it was an activity every archive should be involved in. She would prefer to call it Access, to include other cultural aspects, like research, as well as simply programming.

Mrs Bowser recalled from her personal experience of the beginning of two Commissions that there had been considerable waste of time for want of terms of reference. She felt the EC should prepare as comprehensive a list as possible of the range of topics that might be considered by the group to help them get started; they would not be able to tackle everything but the EC should guide them on what FIAF felt were important issues.

Mr de Pina felt the Commission would provide an opportunity to cooperate to bring good cinema to many regions of the Third World which till now only had access to video and "bad" films.

Mr Daudelin said the next step, if the EC agreed to the formation of the new Commission, was to formally propose that to the GA. From the experience in Lisbon, they could assume it would be welcomed. He thought it was an important statement by the Federation, to the outside world as well, that it gave as much importance to questions of cultural access, as to preservation, cataloguing and documentation. If approved, the EC would then have to appoint a President and provide Guidelines.

Mrs Wibom recognised the importance of the issue but felt, with the proposed changes in membership policy and the present financial situation, it was not the right moment to propose a new Commission. Mr Daudelin replied that the Federation should respond to the perceived need of both existing and new members who were interested in screenings. By acknowledging this and setting up a Commission for them but with wider terms of reference, covering all aspects of access and linking it with the Federation's archival objectives, they could use the opportunity to ensure that programming and screenings were pursued in the context of FIAF's aims.

On the question of finance for Commissions, Mrs van der Elst mentioned that they should perhaps limit the numbers. The Cataloguing Commission now had 9 members which was expensive for FIAF when it had to pay staying costs for each one. Mrs Bowser suggested the Commissions should not be restricted on numbers but should be allowed a certain sum of money for staying costs, which they could distribute as they saw fit, perhaps supplementing it with "their own money"

Mr Dimitriu said the discussions and perhaps the papers in Lisbon and Helsinki left him still uncertain. Perhaps it would be good to bring in a new emphasis, especially as they were shortly coming to the 100th Anniversary of the cinema and risked losing the technical knowledge on how to project films. He also thought it would be useful in highlighting the importance of the legal aspects of programming (which would be relevant to the problems currently being experienced in London).

At the end of the discussion, the EC were asked to decide on the various alternatives:

- recommendation of a Commission as proposed by the 3 EC members who had prepared the document which they believed reflected the needs and wishes of the membership
- creation of a Working Group to undertake one specific task, as proposed by Mr Klaue and Mr Francis
- creation of a Working Group whose task would be to define the the Agenda for, say, the first two years of a Commission, as proposed by Mr Rosen.

Mrs Bowser felt that if funding was available then there was not much difference between a Working Group and a Commission except terminology and she would prefer to use the term Commission to highlight FIAF's view of the importance area. Mr Klaue felt the important difference was that the Commissions were bound by the formal Rules, were left very free to define their own terms of reference and could not be disbanded easily, whereas Working Groups could be set up for specific tasks, limited in time, after which a decision would have to be made on continuation or disbanding.

Mr Cincotti envisaged to be addressed:

- contact and links with commercial programmers and film distributors
- contact with government bodies
- problems of cultural distribution between companies
- customs and perhaps fiscal problems

Many of these problems were important to the life of archives and even of FIAF itself.

Mr Garcia Mesa was very much in favour of setting up the Commission and stressed that programming was vitally important for many Third World archives as a mean of attracting the attention of government authorities and the general public. In some cases, it was their only activity and it was important to encourage them to relate it to the other functions of an archive. Later, he added that while they took no notice of the Preservation Commission and its recommendations, they would pay attention to specialised Programming Commission and be persuaded that they should not even show their national films until they had first been preserved.

Mr Klaue added to his proposal the notion that by starting with a Working Group, the Group could demonstrate that it could find practice ways to cooperate to manage its work. This had been one of the basic problems for Commissions in the past. Mrs van der Elst, Mr Orbanz and Mr Cincotti all agreed with this comment.

**Decision:** Present to the GA the outcome of the discussion and the two possible approaches:

- Commission
- Working Group with precise mandate and time limit (eg 5 people for 2 years).

Mr Daudelin to prepare presentation paper for approval by the EC in Havana before the GA, including an appropriate title (Programming or Access, etc). Because of the lack of agreement, they could not distribute anything to the Members in advance.

[End of Day 2]

## 7. ROLE OF COMMISSION HEADS IN EC MEETINGS

See Decision under 5.2

## 8. PROJECTS & PUBLICATIONS

### 8.1 Projects and Publications underway

#### **P1 100th Anniversary of the Cinema/1892-1897**

The EC spent some minutes reading the 3-page November 6 document prepared by Mr Francis and Mr Daudelin referred the EC to previous documents (Lisbon Minutes p16, Paris May 1988, etc).

Mr Francis felt the most successful way to operate was to have strong involvement from the countries hosting Congresses during the relevant years, with the emphasis on their particular contribution and experiences of the beginnings of cinema. There should of course also be a Coordinating Group representing the EC through the years to ensure that the outcomes of the celebrations at each Congress (in the form of publications or touring programmes) were used for promotional activities in other countries.

Mrs Bowser liked the approach in small parts which would be manageable and contribute to an impressive whole. In the USA, they were planning to start in 1993 and spread over several years, in order not to lose the initiative. There was already a campaign for a commemorative postage stamp. Mr Daudelin asked the EC for advice on FIAF's starting year, given that they had recently copied 80 Lumière films shown in Montevideo (the archive still had the camera in its office) and it would be nice to reproduce the programme as it would have been presented, but 1993 would be too early for that. Mr Daudelin suggested they should start small but lead up to 1995 for the big event. Later he suggested each Commission should be encouraged to develop a relevant project.

Mr Rosen felt FIAF should move fast to set up an overall FIAF identity for the celebrations, throughout the world, perhaps calling it the "Years of Discovery" (Mr Francis suggested "Les Années Folles"). He said there would be many organisations taking initiatives who would be looking to FIAF for help so they had to be prepared. Mrs Bowser mentioned the requests every archive could expect from television and suggested some common title and materials to emphasise FIAF involvement and the importance of archive work.

In connection with Point 9, Mr Garcia Mesa recalled Philippe Jacquier ?, the great-grandson of the Lumière cameraman, whom they had met at the Paris Congress in 1988. He had a scholarship from the French government to research and produce a book and a film for the 100th anniversary and had already visited places like Havana, Mexico and Japan. He was very serious and enthusiastic. Mr Daudelin had also met him and suggested he would be very happy for his researches to be associated with the FIAF celebrations.

Mr Rosen insisted that they must use the opportunity to focus on the preservation issue, perhaps using the phrase "Countdown to the year 2000", celebrating 100 years, showing what was left but also showing how much was already lost and how much more will be lost without more attention to the work of the archives. He suggested they should have a brochure to be distributed widely to the press and elsewhere. It should have two functions: to provide information about the period and the truly international explosion, together with information about the importance of restoration and preservation, stressing that time was running out.

Mr Francis had intended to add to his paper the idea of some sort of information pack that could be prepared for the Secretariat to distribute in response to inquiries. It should include:

- a filmography of programmes about preservation and the work of archives
- selected films about the early days of cinema
- reference to selected articles and books about the period

They should of course be items that were well-researched, preferably promoting the work of FIAF archives and staff. In response to Mrs van der Elst, Mr Rosen confirmed that he thought it would be easy enough to find sponsorship for such a publication.

Mrs Orbanz felt they all had many ideas but they should stop the discussion there and appoint a Working Group to progress it and prepare something that could be submitted to the press in Havana to launch FIAF's role.

In the discussion on the Working Group, Mrs Orbanz suggested there should be one member from each Commission, not necessarily the Head. Mr Francis hoped there would be 3 members from the EC, representing a good balance of different interests, but felt the Working Group should be restricted to a maximum of 6 or 7.

**Decision:** Working Group ideally to consist of

- EC Mr Francis, Mr Klaue
- Commissions ?3 to be nominated, hopefully including Noelle Giret
- Others Paul Spehr

Mr Francis explained that the original document had been split in two parts, Handling and Shipment.

#### **P2 Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films**

Mr Francis explained the original document had been split in two parts, Handling and Shipment.

For the revision of the Shipment side, they would need to collect information from each country. He had therefore prepared a very detailed questionnaire. The questions from n° 8 onwards were not strictly relevant to Shipment so could be eliminated but he thought it might be useful for FIAF to have a central record of the information on nitrate Handling facilities in different places, for future reference. Mr Klaue suggested a further useful question:

- "Is there legislation in your country for the transportation and handling of dangerous goods? Is nitrate film included in it?"

This would encourage the archives to find out whether legislation existed.

Mr Francis mentioned that he had received no input from Mr Schou.

**Decision:** New version to be translated by the Secretariat into French and circulated in both languages.

#### **P3 International Index to Film & TV Periodicals (PIP)**

Mr Daudelin referred the EC to Mr Moulds' Report and accompanying letter to Mr Francis which required some sort of response because of the financial and computer implications.

Mr Francis was a little concerned that the recommendation was for Amstrad which was the cheaper solution but not IBM-compatible. He was not qualified himself to decide. The EC agreed that Mr Moulds should consult with his accountant and Roger Smither and use the last year of the FIAF grant (1990) to buy whatever they decided between them was most appropriate.

#### **P4 FIAF Summer School in Berkhamstead**

Mr Francis reported that Mr Klaue would be visiting in March 1990 to talk about the organisation. The UK could not obtain any money directly from Unesco so he asked if FIAF could make an application to Unesco to bring people to the workshop, without stressing the UK involvement.

He hoped to be able to run it for about the same charges as were made in Berlin. To keep the costs down, they hoped to house participants in private school across the road, during school holidays. They were asking the British Council for help with staying cost but travel was a problem.

Mr Klaue reported that he and Mrs Orbanz hoped to meet the new Unesco person in charge of audiovisual archives in December and find out whether the application should come from FIAF or the countries of the participating delegates.

#### **P5 Revised Edition of the Handbook**

Mrs Bowser thought some people would have already seen the publishers' Catalogue, listing the Revised Edition as due out in March 1990. As they were not setting type or having professional proofreading, they had been able to bring the price down to \$27 (compared with \$40 for the first edition). Susan Dalton had volunteered to have her people proof-read and John Kuiper's staff in Texas were handling the format conversion (she believed at no charge).

There were substantial revisions, including a chapter on archival management by John Kuiper with some input from herself.

In response to Mrs Orbanz, she said they would earn normal royalties once they had earned back the copies supplied to FIAF at cost.

#### **P6 Glossary of Laboratory Terms**

Mrs Orbanz reported Mr Spehr had written to say he hoped to have a manuscript ready for Havana.

#### **P7 FIAF Bulletin: New Editor, new team**

Mr Daudelin started by thanking Mrs Bowser publicly for taking over the job as Editor, and especially for doing so earlier than intended and getting the last issue out.

Mrs Bowser confirmed that Jonathan Dennis had agreed enthusiastically to be Assistant Editor and had put forward interesting ideas as well as questions on what was feasible, including ways of making it more attractive while not too glossy, so they would be meeting with Mrs van der Elst in Havana. One of the suggestions was to have some issues on special topics and so they were going to experiment with one on the Restoration of the Old Cinemas and had already asked for contributions. In connection with the Technical Column, although Mr Schou had explained that technical papers required perhaps years of research they hoped to find a way to attract small technical news items for the Column.

If articles were sent for typing to the Secretariat on a dripfeed basis, it would be easier to handle them.

**Action:** Mrs van der Elst to publicise copy date.

#### **P8 Proceedings of the Canberra Restoration Symposium**

Mrs van der Elst mentioned there was no further information since the Report to Lisbon when they said it was ready and asked for some funding help from FIAF. She had twice confirmed that the financial support was available but there had been no response.

**Action:** Reminder from the Secretariat to proceed and ensure it is ready for Havana and Ottawa. After then, it would be too out-of-date.

**P9 B**  
Mr Da  
the 19  
issue s  
The le  
should

Mr Da  
but th  
take o  
publica  
quickly  
current  
country  
howeve  
Elst, w  
comple

**P10 In**  
Mr Kla  
(Czech  
Union)  
States  
genera

**P11 P**  
Mr de  
were g  
end of

**P12 P**  
Mr Fra  
for the  
**Action:**

**P13 P**  
Mrs O  
it was  
Dr Fri  
it was  
certain  
felt it  
possible

**Action:**  
otherw

**P9 Bibliography of FIAF Members' Publications**

Mr Daudelin had been advised by Mrs Vosikovska that the computer output for the 1988 issue should be ready by February/March 1990. This was their last issue so FIAF had to find someone willing to take over for 1989 onwards. The letter asking members for input should go out in late December and they should try to get it published faster than the 1988 issue.

Mr Daudelin said his archive could manage to take over the job if necessary but they had thought it would be nice balance if a Socialist country could take over, especially as it meant they would receive a number of publications free of charge. Mr Klaue was asked if he could find someone quickly but he explained that there were various problems: Bulgaria was currently without a director, Hungary was barely surviving due to the country's economic situation, Poland was in economic difficulties. He would however approach Poland and Czechoslovakia and report back to Mrs van der Elst, who stressed the importance of someone who could be relied upon to complete the job on time.

**P10 International Directory of Cinematographers, etc**

Mr Klaue reported that Vol 9 (Hungary) was distributed and Vol 10 (Czechoslovakia) would be ready mid 1990 and Vol 11 (FRGermany or Soviet Union) would be ready in 1991. Volumes were in preparation for the United States of America, Cuba, and China was under discussion, together with a general register of all volumes published to date.

**P11 Proceedings of the Lisbon Symposium**

Mr de Pina reported the translations of the presentations and discussions were going ahead and should be ready for sending to the Secretariat by the end of November.

**P12 Preservation levy for television use**

Mr Francis had taken no action as he had understood this was a suggestion for the Fund-Raising Committee.

**Action:** Delete from list and pass to Fund-Raising Committee.

**P13 Proceedings of the Vienna Symposium (1984)**

Mrs Orbanz said this had to be reinstated on the list as Saur had decided it was too small a subject for them to handle. They had not approached Dr Fritz or knew what stage he had got to. Mr Klaue felt that even though it was now very late, it was valuable to have it published as it was certainly of interest for Central Europe. In view of the long delay, he felt it should now be done in the easiest, fastest and sheapest way possible, without illustrations and with a very limited print run.

**Action:** Mrs Orbanz to write as above, giving Havana as final deadline, otherwise it would be deleted.

## 8.2 Marketing FIAF Publications

Mr Dimitriu reported on an experiment to promote FIAF publications in Switzerland. He had sent a letter describing 5 or 6 publications to the regional and specialist archives who were beginning to complain they had no information about preservation, etc. The result had been fairly modest in that they had received orders for 6 or 7 copies of each book. He had also put a small announcement in the archive Bulletin which had resulted in enquiries from non-FIAF archives abroad but in this case they had referred them to their national archives.

Mrs van der Elst suggested they should photocopy the letter for other archives to use.

Later, Mrs van der Elst reported they were preparing a new leaflet of FIAF publications, of which thousands of copies would be distributed. The plan was to quote prices to the general public but members would be able to buy additional copies at the bookshop discount (typically 25% or 30%). They were deleting items for which they had very few copies but she asked for some policy advice on some past publications:

- Cataloguing Book: should it be reprinted?
  - Rappallo Symposium: would Mr Cincotti be able to sell the remaining 100 copies in Italy? (He agreed it should be deleted from the list and he would take 80 copies).

In answer to a question from Mr Francis, she explained that the pricing on old publications depended on the individual items. She felt Cinema 1900-1906 would always keep its value whereas volumes like the JTS would get out of date. However, the original French version of the Handbook would keep its price as the new version would not be available in French. Mrs Bowser asked that the old English version be deleted altogether.

## 8.3 New FIAF Questionnaires

Mrs van der Elst introduced the two questionnaires drafted by Mrs Aubert to obtain information on the status of FIAF Projects and Publications. For the 3rd questionnaire on FIAF Activities (statistics) see 3.5

Mrs Orbanz felt the one on Publications could be useful and was very similar to the questions they had been asked by Saur. She had doubts about the Projects questionnaire as the range of relevant questions would vary much more. Mrs Bowser suggested question 3.3 on Publications should be reworded to indicate that the FIAF officer signed the contract, not the person preparing the book. Mr Klaue suggested the idea could also be used for publications that Saur might publish; many of the questions on page 2 would be Saur's decision, not FIAF's.

Mr Francis felt they would be more useful as Checklists, rather than as a formal questionnaire.

**Decision:** It was agreed that both questionnaires should be treated in that way.



### **8.3 bia FIAF Logo**

Mrs van der Elst showed the logo which was being used now and it was agreed that it should appear on future FIAF publications whenever possible.

### **8.4 List of Non-FIAF Projects**

Mr Francis recalled that he had suggested this in Lisbon as a way for FIAF to give recognition to worthwhile external projects, like the current Chaplin Project.

### **8.5 GRAF Filmography**

Mr Daudelin had written to André Gaudreault as agreed to confirm FIAF would buy 100 copies at no more than 100FF per copy, provided that the FIAF name appeared on the cover and acknowledgement was made to the contributions made by the FIAF archives.

Mr Francis said the publishers objected to be told what to put on their covers and he had agreed that FIAF on the Title page would be a satisfactory alternative; in any case, FIAF would see the draft of the actual text. It would be launched in Pordenone 1990 with a programme of the films covered. He felt someone from FIAF should be seen and possibly speak at the public presentation. The publishers were happy with the FIAF support and would not therefore need BFI support as well.

### **8.6 Negotiations with Saur**

Mr Klaue repeated the information he had given at previous meetings on the background to the discussions with Saur. He said they were very close to reaching agreement in principle for a non-exclusive arrangement for them to publish FIAF publications. They would open a new series for film, television and sound archives, alongside the series on paper archives, on librarianship and on specialised books.

Copyright would belong to FIAF but there would be no royalties. The first copies would be provided free of charge. For bulk orders of 50 copies more, FIAF would get discount of 45%, including transport costs, for delivery to one place. For additional copies purchased singly, FIAF or its members would get a discount of 35%.

The contract would include FIAF's recommendation that the selling price should not exceed 100DM (say \$50 or \$60) which led the publisher to say that no publication should exceed 250-300 pages and none should be less than 100 pages. Format and style would be similar to the International Directory of Cinematographers they were already publishing for FIAF.

FIAF should appoint an Editorial Board to give advice to the publisher on the publication programme and approve specific books. Initially, Mrs Orbanz and himself had fulfilled this role but he felt when the agreement was signed, a Board would be formally established. If other international organisations contribute to the audiovisual archive series, then they should have their own Editorial Board; FIAF should have no responsibility for IASA or FIAT publications.

He listed again the publications in which Saur had expressed interest:

- Cataloguing Rules
- Dictionary of technical terms used in film archives
- Report on survey on moving image heritage
- Guide for technical equipment required in audio visual archives (from Technical Commissions of NGO's)
- Bibliography on audio-visual archives (from Helen Harrison, IASA)
  - Manual on preservation of film, tape and sound material (to be discussed at next Round Table of NGOs; Saur were keen as they already had publications on preservation of other materials)
- 2 projects on archive holdings, relating to German collections
- Glossary of AV archive terms (to be discussed with NGOs)
- Filmography of Brazilian production (proposed by Mrs Galvao)
- Training of AV archivists (joint NGO work under Unesco contract)

They seemed very forward looking and keen to secure market for audiovisual archive publications. They were aware of limited market but were flexible enough to handle publications from 30 copies up to thousands.

They had also expressed interest in selling the Glossary of filmographic terms but that was not discussed in detail as in that case FIAF would insist on royalties.

On the question of the Editorial Board, Mrs Bowser remarked that the full EC was FIAF's Editorial Board and, as an elected body, was subject to change. It was pointed out that Saur required a small Board for quick decisions and so agreed that Mrs Orbanz and Mr Klaue would be the Board as far as Saur was concerned, and report back to the EC to keep them fully informed and receive their advice.

**Action:** Negotiations to continue.

## 9 FUTURE CONGRESSES

### 9.1 1990: Havana

Mrs van der Elst expected to send the Newsletter 4 out immediately after Helsinki. The following points of details were confirmed:

- UNESCO paper on Micro-Isis to be prepared by person living in Havana.
  - Sam Kula would deliver his paper on video preservation in Havana; the present Head of archive, Ms Vosikoska could not attend.
  - There was some discussion on whether the Preservation Commission could meet in Ottawa as they would want to be there for the high level JTS discussions with the manufacturers, leaving the Curators to present the more basic papers in Havana. It was later confirmed that the Commission would meet in Ottawa.
- Dates were confirmed as follows:
  - Sunday, 15 April: Arrival
  - Mon - Wed, 16, 17, 18: EC meeting
  - Th - Frid, 19, 20: GA
  - Sat, 21: Symposium: Historical: L.Am. film
  - Sund, 22: Symposium: Preservation
  - Mond, 23 morning: Symposium: Cataloguing
  - afternoon: Symposium: Documentation

The second EC meeting, to evaluate the Congress, would be held in the evening of 21 or 22 April.

Review of GA Agenda:

Mrs Orbanz suggested they should omit the session for members only as there were no applications for full Member. A half-day had been allocated to the Working Session on Membership Policy. It was agreed that the proposal for a new Programming Commission should figure as a separate item on the Agenda.

On the other Commission Reports, Mrs Wibon pleaded that the written Reports should be distributed but the Heads of the Commissions should present one particular item in an interesting and hopefully interactive way.

Mrs Orbanz felt they could not yet move the whole way towards the Workshop idea, especially as this year the Commissions were busy preparing the Symposia.

Commission Heads should have to structure the sessions at the EC meeting before the GA.

**9.2. 1991: Athens**

Mrs van der Elst reported on her visit to Athens in September to inspect conference locations and some hotels. She spent most of the time with Mr Adamopolos and Emilia Mates, the only secretary in the archive. She saw Maria Komninos and Aglia Mitropolos and also Mr Stamatis Tripos, member of the Board and a well-known Greek cameraman, with good links with television, to discuss the proposed symposia. There was some confusion until they understood that the FIAF Symposium was on the use of video in film archives and would be organised by a FIAF working group, with just one Greek representative for liaison purposes. They had no video at the archive and it was agreed that, because of his TV links, Mr Tripos would liaise. The symposium would be held at the auditorium in the War Museum which had interpreting and multi-format projection facilities.

The second symposium, on FIAF's archive policy towards independent cinema, would be organised by the Greek archive, provided further help was given in defining the theme.

Maria Komninos and Th. Adamopolos would be coming to Havana and could discuss further details, including proposed new format for Congresses, with Symposia in the middle.

Dates: The Greek Orthodox Easter was on April 7 so all hotels would be full. They therefore proposed new dates:

- EC: Fri - Sund, 12, 13, 14
- GA: Mon - Tues - Wed, 15, 16, 17 morning
- New EC: Wed afternoon, 17
- Symposia: Th - Frid (Sat?), 18, 19, 20 or perhaps only 2 days
- Excursion: Sunday 21

In discussion, these dates were amended, provided this was possible with meeting rooms reservation:

- GA Day 1: Mond 15
- Symposia: Tues/Wed 16, 17
- Working Groups: Thursday 18
- GA Day 2: Friday 19
- Excursion: Saturday 20

The Greeks said siestas were essential so the schedule would be unusual:

morning sessions	9 - 1, lunch till 2.30,
afternoon sessions	5 - 8, dinner at 9pm

For the GA, Mrs van der Elst had found the Caravel Hotel which had a room for 200 people and she had provisionally reserved 60 rooms. A single room with American breakfast was \$50, double \$70. She had also tried a cheaper hotel, Alessandros, which was satisfactory and other smaller ones could be found.

#### Working Group for Video Symposium

The most urgent priority was to propose a working group for the Video symposium, to meet in London or Brussels. Mr Francis volunteered to host the group in Berkhamstead as his video staff would be very happy to get involved and do experiments.

Mr Rosen mentioned that he had been working with the Rockefeller Foundation in connection with a budget of \$5 million which they had set aside for projects relating to the use of video for the dissemination of film. They might be interested in contributing to the Symposium.

Mr Klaue recalled the Group should look at the position paper circulated by Mr Garcia Mesa on behalf of the Latin American film archives, including video as a substitute for film preservation. This was apparently to be discussed at the Havana Open Forum and at the Buenos Aires meeting in November 89 which might generate some new ideas.

**Decision:** Working Group of Mrs Wibom, Mr Francis, Mr Rosen and Mr Tripos to meet quickly and decide.

#### 9.3 1992: Poona

Mrs van der Elst reported on a letter received early November from Mr Nair confirming that the government had approved the invitation for the 1992 FIAF Congress to be held in Poona. Taking into account the climate, they recommended late February or early March. The following details were proposed:

- Meetings in archive auditorium (max 350 people)
  - Hotels being negotiated: 2 5-star (Blue Diamont, Ashoka Executive)
  - Simultaneous translation: being explored.
  - Duration: 10 days in total
    - . EC 3 days
    - . Symposia: Historical 2 days, Technical 1 day
    - . Excursion: 1 day
    - . Special screenings: 1 day
    - . Symposium assessing situation of Asian film archives: 1 day
- (subject to Unesco funding)
- Symposium topics:
    - . Religion in cinema, myths, mythology and epic
      - . Computerisation of archival data & assessment of recent developments and possibilities of standardisation for storing and retrieval of data.
      - or . Follow-up of Havana symposium on problems of preserving film and video material in humid climates.

- Budget: \$200,000 requested and being considered. Final figures should be available by Havana.

Mrs Wibom confirmed that Mr Nair had told her personally that although he had been scheduled to retire in 1991 he would be there for the Congress.

#### **9.4 Procedures for selection of symposium topics (Minutes p27)**

Mrs Orbanz recalled that the EC wanted to ensure a good balance and build up a reserve of suitable topics. Mr Daudelin noted that the Congress of Athens and Poona gave good examples of two extremes but it was noted that Mr Nair's suggestions did not reflect the idea of a dialogue. He hoped that topics would reflect the current concerns of members.

Mr Klaue suggested that all members should be invited through the Bulletin to write in with suggestions for subjects for future symposia so they could be reviewed during the Open Forum in Havana.

**Decision:** agreed.

#### **9.5 New ways of organising congresses (EC2 Minutes page 9)**

#### **9.6 Managing General Assemblies (EC2 Minutes, page 9)**

Both these points were already being implemented. On the question of election rules, Mrs Orbanz reported that she and Mrs van der Elst had studied the Statutes and Rules and noted there had never been any change but that they had never been executed properly for the election of the EC members.

Mr Daudelin suggested it would be more practical to have one person presiding the session and a different person responsible for presiding over the elections. The latter should be someone neutral, perhaps an Honorary Member, who should study the Rules (nos. 33-34) carefully and work with Mrs van der Elst to ensure that all voting slips, etc, were ready.

### **10. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO & OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

#### **10.1 Unesco**

Mr Klaue reported on 3 meetings with Unesco. The first attended by Mrs Orbanz with other NGOs was to follow up a letter asking Unesco to pay more attention to audio-visual archives. Unesco had confirmed they were aware but no more money than the \$110,000 budgeted for the next two years. They were also told that from 1990 responsibility for audio-visual archives would pass from the Communication Division (Mr Arnaldo) to PGI (Programme General d'Information) which covered "archives" in general.

The second meeting was a RAMP consultation (Record Archives Management Programme), setting general goals for the next 4 or 5 years for PGI, including the integration of audio-visual archives. He was the only representative of an AV archive and the rest of the small group consisted of traditional archivists from Canada, United States, Zimbabwe and some other developing countries who expressed the usual scepticism towards audiovisual materials. The section, mentioning the integration of AV archives, also mentioned the need for cooperation between the various Federations (FIAF, FIAT, IASA, ICA and IFLA). They should make sure that their voice was heard as there was the obvious danger that AV archives would be assimilated within traditional archives and their problems would get less attention than in the Communications Division.

There were signs of justification for this danger in the third meeting he attended, the Unesco General Assembly which began a few weeks previously. There was a draft resolution from GDR to pay more attention to audio-visual archives which was actively opposed in the PGI Working Commission by the President of the National Archives of Canada and by France who both took the view that there was no reason to single out audio-visual archives from any other carriers, such as medieval documents, computer tapes, historical posters or maps. Mr Klaue felt there was absolutely no comparison particularly as AV materials had such a totally different role in society.

The result was that the draft was not accepted or voted on and a vague compromise was reached with slight modification of the working in some paragraphs to specifically mention audio-visual archives.

They had been invited to prepare proposals for long-term goals for the development of film archives, with specific objectives for the next 8-10 years with Unesco support. The Cuba agenda was already very full so perhaps they should discuss it at the next autumn meeting. They could also put in a proposal in the context of the United Nations Decade for Cultural Development which continued until 1997.

## 10.2 IASA

Mrs Orbanz attended their conference in Oxford and Mr Francis and Anne Hanford of FIAT had also attended the session when they discussed the future. IASA too was considering changing its internal structure because they had problems with too many commissions and a lack of rules.

Of more interest to FIAF and FIAT, was the fact they were considering opening their association to audiovisual collections. There was increasing pressure for traditional archives to take on audio-visual collections and, naturally, they needed more information in those areas. Mr Francis and Mrs Handford described FIAF and FIAT activities and there was a strong interest in working together, particularly on technical aspects, also including cataloguing, documentation, training, legal questions, publications.

All sides agreed that working together would not mean that any organisation would lose its identity. The task was to find better ways of communication. Mr Arnaldo had suggested that if they did merge, then together they would be that much larger, have greater worldwide coverage, more power and impact on Unesco, with the possibility of A Status which could mean more money. However, the 3 Federations felt the solution was to stay separate but propose joint projects to Unesco. The Annual Round Table meetings would therefore tend to be project based.

IASA had discussed the idea of having Joint Congresses, where the Federations could run their GA in parallel, but they would meet together in symposia and workshops to discuss joint problems. They had looked at each other's plans for Joint Congresses and there was a slight possibility of doing something in Brussels. However, Mrs Orbanz would like the EC to express its interest to the basic principle.

Mr Klaus was not in favour as he did not feel they had so many joint activities. It was better to concentrate on joint projects for foreseeable future at least. Mr Francis agreed that the 3 organisations were very different and it would be very difficult to get together in one Congress.

Mr Rosen suggested there might also be scope for cooperation at Commission level. Mrs Orbanz asked if they should invite their Commissions to consider possible joint ventures as Preservation was already doing via the TCC. Mr Daudelin suggested Mrs Orbanz could report back that FIAF was open to ideas at Commission, Symposia or individual project level but thought joint Congresses would not be practical.

### 10.3 Council of Europe

Before she left, Mrs Wibom had advised Mrs van der Elst there was nothing to be reported.

### 10.4 Domitor

Mr Daudelin had nothing specific to say but asked for it to be put on the Agenda as it kept appearing with FIAF's name associated to it. Mr Francis and Mrs Bowser were both closely associated with the planning of a meeting in Quebec City in June 1990. Mr Francis said Domitor could not operate as a research organisation without the cooperation of archives. He hoped the relationships would continue to be good although there were problems because Domitor had no resources of its own.

## **11. LEGAL PROBLEMS IN FILM ARCHIVES (Unesco draft)**

Mr Borde introduced the Report prepared by Birgit Kofler under contract with Unesco, who works with Mr Carlos Arnaldo in the Development Division and is a qualified practitioner in international law. She had consulted FIAF in Brussels. As the title indicates, the intention was to produce a clear and simple guide for member states on the "Legal problems relating to audio-visual archives".

At present, FIAF's role was simply to examine the Report and indicate if there were any objections. Mr Arnaldo's office was in the process of compiling the existing national legislations relating especially to authors'rights to provide a reference framework. It was planned to have a Working group meeting in Paris very shortly to go further, to which FIAF would be invited. He had examined the document and, as he had already told her, he found it excellent in the sense that he had no criticisms to make: there were no mistakes and the ideas had been presented exactly in accordance with FIAF's own ideas.

Mr Borde had highlighted some of the key elements and left the EC to study the document. He was satisfied that it contained nothing that could give them cause for concern and, on the contrary, reflected their own ideals. Mr Cincotti totally supported Mr Borde's view of the document which was excellent. He had one or two minor suggestions for amending the working.

Mr Klaue commented that this was not an official document. It was based on FIAF's recommendations and those of other organisations but did not yet have the approval of Unesco. He suggested to nominate Mr Borde to attend the meeting in Paris on December 5 and, as he would be in Paris for another meeting in December 4, he would also try to participate.

**Action:** Mrs van der Elst to advice Mr Arnaldo who will be attending.

#### Meeting on Piracy at Unesco

Mr Borde had represented FIAF at a meeting covering piracy of books, sound recordings and video cassettes. He had made two points on behalf of FIAF, first to describe the piracy techniques used for cinema films and the rigorous policy of FIAF and its members to protect their collections and all rights holders. He had participated in a working group to prepare recommendations.

## **12. MISCELLANEOUS**

### **12.1 Next EC meeting**

Mrs van der Elst reported that Poland had made a tentative invitation for the EC meeting after Havana but had to withdraw it in August because of the economical situation. Mr Daudelin reported Mr Dimitriu had offered to host an EC meeting in Lausanne whenever needed and they could provide free hotel rooms for 3 participants, perhaps more. Mr Klaue had a verbal invitation from Jerusalem when he went there for the Festival; he had suggested they issue a formal invitation. Mr Daudelin said they should think about the travel involved; Mrs Bowser hoped they could have a more central location as their travel budgets were fully stretched.

**Action:** Mrs van der Elst to write to Jerusalem.



## 12.2 Mr Frantz Schmitt

Mr Daudelin reported that Frantz Schmitt had written personally to him at home and to Mrs van der Elst, stating that he was no longer at Bois d'Arcy, confirming that he was at the disposition of CNC who were still his employer. He asked for his personal address to be given to anyone who would like to be in touch with him. There was little that FIAF could do to intervene in a purely national decision but they had been able to draw the attention of the Minister to the role played by Mr Schmitt in the Preservation Commission and that Bois d'Arcy had always respected FIAF Rules and cooperated with its members. Currently he is in charge of the photographic collections at the Centre National de la Photographie at Saint-Cyr.

Mr Daudelin confirmed that he had formally withdrawn from the Preservation Commission and would not be able to deliver his paper in Havana. As President of the Federation, he had written to Lang and had a reply from someone at CNC explaining they were restructuring; he had also written officially to Mr Schmitt saying FIAF was stunned by the information and thanking him for all the work he had done on the Commission and the relations they had through the years.

The meeting was formally closed and thanks were expressed to the host during an informal meeting in the Finnish Film Archive.