

**FIAF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Cancun, November 30, December 1 and 2, 1995**

Present :

**Officers**

Michelle AUBERT  
Roger SMITHER  
Mary Lea BANDY

President  
Secretary General  
Treasurer

**Members**

Hoos BLOTKAMP  
Paolo CHERCHI USAI  
Gabrielle CLAES  
Robert DAUDELIN  
Clyde JEAUVONS  
Jorge NIETO  
Vladimir OPELA  
José Maria PRADO  
Steven RICCI  
Ivan TRUJILLO BOLIO

**Commission Heads**

Joao BENARD DA COSTA  
Henning SCHOU

Commission for Programming and Access to Collections  
Technical Commission

**Brussels Office**

Christian DIMITRIU

Senior Administrator

Excused :

Ronald MAGLIOZZI  
Harriet HARRISON

Documentation Commission  
Cataloguing Commission

**FIAF Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Cancun, November 30, December 1 and 2, 1995**

**DRAFT AGENDA**

---

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes of the EC meetings in Los Angeles
3. Matters arising from the EC meetings in Los Angeles
4. Finances :
  - a. FIAF's current accounts
  - b. Draft budget for 1997
  - c. Plans for easing deficit
5. Image and Promotion of the Federation
  - a. "What is FIAF?" leaflet
  - b. Other
6. Membership questions
  - a. Reconfirmation of Members : Belgrade, Milano, Sofia + Members due for reconfirmation in 1996
  - b. New candidates for affiliation:
    - b.1. Centre National de l'Audiovisuel (Luxembourg)
    - b.2. Stayajit Ray Archives (Calcutta)
    - b.3. Bibliotekavdelinga i Rana (Mo i Rana)
    - b.4. Archivo de Imagenes en Movimiento (Santiago-Chile)
    - b.5. Fundacion Cinemateca del Caribe (Barranquilla-Colombia)
  - c. Candidate for Provisional Membership: Filmoteca de la Generalitat Valenciana
  - d. Candidate for (full)Membership:
    - d.1. Fundacion Cinemateca Nacional (Caracas)
    - d.2. Filmoteca Vaticana
  - e. Long-term Provisional Members
  - f. Recruitment of new affiliates
  - g. FIAF subscribers : list of services (to be) offered
  - h. Membership miscellaneous
7. Senior Administrator's Report
8. Reports from FIAF specialized Commissions and working groups
  - a. Technical Commission
  - b. Cataloguing Commission
  - c. Documentation Commission
  - d. Commission for Programming and Access to Collections
  - e. Long-Term Plan for FIAF/Future of the Commissions

9. Projects and publications underway
  - a. FIAF Journal of Film Preservation
  - b. FIAF Summer School
  - c. P.I.P. / International FilmArchive CD-ROM
  - d. Proceedings of the Newsreel Symposium 1993
  - e. Central Database of FIAF Members' holdings
  - f. other
  
10. Future Congresses
  - a. Jerusalem 1996
  - b. Cartagena 1997
  - c. 1998 and beyond
  
11. Relations with Unesco and other international organisations
  - a. Relations with Unesco (C. Dimitriu)
  - b. Report on IASA/IFTA Conference (C. Jeavons)
  - c. ASEAN archiving
  - d. Council of Europe
  
12. Any other business

**FIAF Executive Committee Meeting  
Cancun, November 30, December 1 and 2, 1995**

**REVISED AGENDA**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Adoption of the agenda</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Approval of the Minutes of the EC meetings in Los Angeles</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Matters arising from the EC meetings in Los Angeles</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Image and promotion of the Federation</b>	<b>8</b>
a. "What is FIAF?" leaflet	8
b. Other	8
<b>5. Membership questions</b>	<b>9</b>
a. Reconfirmation of Members : Belgrade, Milano, Sofia + Members due for reconfirmation in 1996	9
b. New candidates for affiliation:	10
b.1. Centre National de l'Audiovisuel (Luxembourg)	10
b.2. Satyajit Ray Archives (Calcutta)	11
b.3. Bibliotekavdelinga i Rana (Mo i Rana)	11
b.4. Archivo de Imagenes en Movimiento (Santiago-Chile)	11
b.5. Fundacion Cinemateca del Caribe (Barranquilla-Colombia)	12
c. Candidate for Provisional Membership: Filmoteca de la Generalitat Valenciana	12
d. Candidate for (full)Membership:	13
d.1. Fundacion Cinemateca Nacional (Caracas)	13
d.2. Filmoteca Vaticana	13
e. Long-term Provisional Members	13
f. Recruitment of new affiliates	14
g. FIAF subscribers : list of services (to be) offered	14
h. Membership miscellaneous	14
<b>6. Reports from the specialized Commissions and working groups</b>	<b>20</b>
a. Technical Commission	20
b. Cataloguing Commission	20
c. Documentation Commission	21
d. Commission for Programming and Access to Collections	22
e. Long-Term Plan for FIAF/Future of the Commissions	23
<b>7. Relations with Unesco and other international organisations</b>	<b>25</b>
a. Relations with Unesco (C. Dimitriu)	25
b. Report on IASA/IFTA Conference (C. Jeavons)	25
c. ASEAN archiving	25
d. Council of Europe	25
<b>8. Future Congresses</b>	<b>14</b>
a. Jerusalem 1996	14
b. Cartagena 1997	16
c. 1998 and beyond	16

<b>9.</b>	<b>Senior Administrator's report</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Finances</b>	<b>18</b>
	a. FIAF's current accounts	18
	b. Draft budget for 1997	18
	c. Plans for easing deficit	18
<b>11.</b>	<b>Projects and Publications underway</b>	<b>23</b>
	a. FIAF Journal of Film Preservation	23
	b. FIAF Summer School	24
	c. P.I.P. / International FilmArchive CD-ROM	(21)
	d. Proceedings of the Newsreel Symposium 1993	(24)
	e. Central Database of FIAF Members' holdings	(22)

**MINUTES**

=====

**1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Following Ms AUBERT's suggestion, the draft agenda was re-ordered as on page 4 of the present report so as to allow EC members to discuss the renewal of Mr DIMITRIU's contract with FIAF during the first morning session of December 1 and also to make sure that everybody had the time to read the Treasurer's report in advance of the financial session.

**2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE EC MEETINGS IN LOS ANGELES**

Ms AUBERT called for any correction to the minutes of the EC meetings in Los Angeles.

There being none, the minutes were approved.

**3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE EC MEETINGS IN LOS ANGELES**

First EC meeting :

Page 7 (Centralized Database of FIAF holdings) : Mr JEAVONS believed we should have more discussion about this topic during this meeting.

Page 10 (Working group on training) : further to Mr DAUDELIN's question, it was noted that nothing new had happened since the Los Angeles Congress.

Page 21 (relations with FIAPF) : Ms AUBERT had made contacts with FIAPF since Los Angeles and would report later during this meeting.

Second EC meeting :

Page 6 (publication of proceedings) : Mr DAUDELIN and Mr CHERCHI USAI would revise Ms Mc BAIN's paper which she presented during the workshop on non-fiction films in Los Angeles, in order to have it published in the next issue of the Journal. Janet McBAIN to send copies of as many as possible of the workshop papers to be considered for publication in the *Journal*.

Page 6 (preparation of the symposium/workshop) : Mr JEAVONS had not yet made any formal recommendation about FIAF symposia's overall structure but he undertook to do so before Jerusalem. He needed first to talk with Mr SMITHER on this issue.

Page 8 (future congresses) : Mr SMITHER reported that the situation with Beijing had been clarified, as appeared in the circulated exchange of correspondence between the Secretary General and Mr Chen Jingliang after the L.A. Congress. As a result, our Chinese colleagues invited the EC to hold its meeting in Beijing in Autumn 1997.

Page 9 (copyright and legal deposit) : Ms AUBERT announced to Ms BLOTKAMP that she would soon send her the results of a survey on copyright and legal deposit that had just been carried out in France.

All of the other matters arising were covered by the items included in the present agenda.

#### 4 IMAGE AND PROMOTION OF THE FEDERATION

##### a. "What is FIAF ?" leaflet

The circulated English, French and Spanish versions of the document entitled "What is FIAF?" derived from a document presently sent by the Brussels Office to those institutions, students, researchers, etc., asking for information about FIAF.

The priority now was to transform this document into an attractive leaflet to be used as an information tool when approaching possible new affiliates and subscribers.

Several EC members expressed detailed comments on the circulated drafts, which Mr SMITHER took into account in order to reshape the English version. The latter would serve as a base for the French and Spanish translations and the whole would soon be sent to EC member for last comments and approval.

The Brussels Office was instructed to have the leaflet published in the three languages before the next Congress.

##### b. Other

As a way of promoting our Federation, it was agreed that a description of FIAF should appear on Internet in as many languages as possible (English, French and Spanish to start with). There was discussion whether each language should have its own site or whether a single multi-lingual site would be more efficient. Further to Ms AUBERT's suggestion, Mr RICCI agreed to draft a general publicity statement about FIAF which he would submit to the Officers soon after this meeting and put on Internet through UCLA's network.

As part of our self-promotion, Mr SMITHER raised the whole idea of a more active publication policy by the Federation, i.e. a policy that should go beyond describing FIAF and the PIP on internet and generate conventional publications on a more regular basis. He encouraged producing celebratory books that demonstrate the wealth of our collections. Mr SMITHER finally suggested that we invite every member to produce and publish good quality photographs of posters for which there is no copyright.

Ms CLAES agreed with Mr SMITHER that we should increase the production of our publications. She also called for a more active distribution policy. She informed the EC that Lumière was preparing a book about its achievements over the five past years, which, in her mind, would certainly promote the entire film archiving world.

Ms BLOTKAMP also supported Mr SMITHER and believed that the Editorial Board for the *Journal of Film Preservation* was a good place to develop and follow up ideas on a more active publication policy.

At this stage of the discussion, the director of the Cancun film festival joined the meeting room and welcomed everybody to Cancun. Ms AUBERT thanked our hosts for their hospitality in such an exceptional site and expressed her hope that FIAF members would take part in the Cancun film festival in the coming years.

## 5 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

### a. Reconfirmation of Members

#### Cineteca Italiana (Milano)

There being no objection to their reconfirmation, they were unanimously reconfirmed in their status of Member for another period of five years.

#### Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka (Sofia)

Mr DAUDELIN said that the last news he had received from Sofia were very sad (staff cuts,...). Ms AUBERT explained that the situation was very tense indeed, especially because the archive was now confronted with a dramatic decline of its screening attendancy. However, the Bulgarian Ministry of Culture was willing to act in favour of the archive and was therefore seeking support from France and Unesco.

There being no objection to their reconfirmation, they were unanimously reconfirmed in their status of Member for another period of five years.

#### Jugoslovenska Kinoteka (Beograd)

Their file stated "our statutes and rules, as well as the position and links with the authorities have not changed since 1994". Mr DAUDELIN thought we could not reconfirm them unless we knew more about the changes that had apparently occurred in 1994.

Ms AUBERT agreed and also warned against proceeding to their reconfirmation before receiving some clarification on the situation of African films that they were threatening to eliminate from their holdings unless they could sell them to other FIAF archives. This referred to a letter addressed by Belgrade to the Brussels Office after Los Angeles and which Ms VAN DER ELST had forwarded to Ms AUBERT. Ms AUBERT would soon provide Mr SMITHER with a copy of this letter.

Mr OPELA believed we should also learn more about the effects exerted by the splitting of the country on their collection's integrity. This raised the question of Belgrade's relations with Yugoslavia's former member states. In this respect, Ms AUBERT believed we should stress to Belgrade that, as a Member of FIAF, they must strictly follow the Federation's Statutes and Rules, that is make material available among archives, which also reflects the spirit of the Unesco Recommendation of 1980.

Decision : Mr SMITHER to write to Belgrade that before proceeding to their reconfirmation, the EC would need to receive some clarification regarding the points raised above.

The discussion on this candidature brought the following question to the floor : what is our relation either individually or collectively with FIAF Members who infringe FIAF's Statutes and Rules ?

In answer to Mr JEAVONS, Mr SMITHER recalled that, in the case of conflicts between FIAF archives, there existed a procedure in our Statutes and Rules to lay a formal charge against a delinquent Member.

When there was misbehaviour by somebody beyond the Member (e.g. a film festival), Mr SMITHER believed that the appropriate response was to return to the archive and leave it up to them to get tough with the guilty festival.

Mr JEAVONS believed that there should be a communication system whereby everybody would be warned about wrong behaviour by colleagues or festivals who are trying to use our archive material. The Brussels Office should be able to communicate with the membership on this issue on a fairly constant basis.



To Mr SMITHER, it was up to the members themselves 1) to initiate the complaint procedure and supply the details of the infringements to the Brussels Office, to the Secretary General or to both and 2) to indicate whether they want the center of FIAF to go in directly or to request that the information be immediately circulated to the membership to warn them off. In other words, the indication of what is being done and how serious is the wish to take it must in all cases come from the complaining member. There must be from the start an actual dossier.

Ms CLAES recalled that the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections planned to set up guidelines about how films should be properly presented within film festivals and to describe a kind of general attitude to adopt as a film archive towards film festivals.

Mr JEAVONS concluded that the symposium in Jerusalem would be a good place to encourage the membership to maintain control over the use of their holdings and to complain in case of mistreatment of their collections.

As regarded the circulated request made by the National Theater and Film Museum of Slovenia to Mr JEAVONS, Ms AUBERT explained that they constituted a completely separated body from the archive which was part of the Ministry of Culture and looked after the archiving of the national heritage. Their aim was to develop an international collection like the one they had before the war, to be presented in their film theater. They had excellent relations with the archive in Ljubljana but they were encountering difficulties in getting back foreign prints stored in Belgrade. Mr Silvan Furlan had approached Ms AUBERT for a possible affiliation to FIAF and learned that his institution was likely to fit the criteria for Associateship. He was now getting support from diplomatic circles in France and Great Britain. Ms AUBERT concluded that if and when they apply for affiliation to FIAF, we would have to discuss the problem raised earlier by Mr OPELA, i.e. the splitting of the former Yugoslav member states' collections.

## **b. New candidates for affiliation**

### **b.1. Centre National de l'Audiovisuel (Luxembourg)**

Already presented in L.A., this candidature was deferred for consideration in Cancun because Fred Junck wished to express some problems which he had with regard to this application, although the application file included a formal letter of agreement from La Cinémathèque Municipale.

Mr SMITHER reported that, according to Mr Junck, le Centre National de l'Audiovisuel was very closely linked to someone who was primarily interested in running a chain of five movie theaters in Luxembourg and closely tied to Luxembourg's television. This person was described by Mr Junck as having very limited interest in Luxembourg's cultural heritage and his motivations were supposedly merely the prestige and usefulness of belonging to FIAF rather than a serious commitment to archivism. Operating under the national government, the institution had more "muscle" than the Cinémathèque Municipale. Finally, Mr Junck had pointed out that the Luxembourg film history was small, which questioned the point of having two archives in such a small country.

Mr SMITHER then invited discussion on this candidature.

Although he agreed with Mr JEAVONS that we should look for other sources of information than Mr Junck's opinion, Mr CHERCHI USAI was very sensitive to the points spotted by the latter whom, he said, we all consider as one of the pioneers of the archival movement in Europe.

Underlining the limited size of their collection and their links with the Luxembourg commercial television, Ms CLAES felt that the candidate was no "FIAF archive" strictly speaking.

For Mr DAUDELIN, the problem was that once they are accepted as Provisional Member, they are on the way to become the second (full) Member of FIAF in a small country.

For these reasons, the Executive Committee was not happy with simply accepting this application as it stood.

Mr SMITHER undertook to request some clarification by asking them to receive the visit from a member of the EC (namely Ms CLAES) to learn more about the nature of their relationship with La Cinémathèque Municipale (how the collections complement each other and how they will collaborate in the future). This was agreed.

#### b.4. Satyajit Ray Archives (Calcutta)

The letter from Suresh Chabria expressed strong reservations in the second paragraph but Mr SMITHER pointed out that being a "fully-fledged" film archive was not necessary to become an Associate.

To Mr JEAVONS, the applicant fitted the criteria for Associateship, especially if it became a specialist collection. However, he was worried by the broader canvas of this application as it was all tied up with the Unesco project for the preservation of Satyajit Ray's oeuvre. The question was : if the application is accepted, is Mr CHABRIA willing to concede the preservation of Satyajit Ray's collection in Calcutta and not Puna? We were in danger of having conflicts of interests in the same country. Mr CHABRIA's opinion would be a key-factor in this.

Ms CLAES had heard from Mr CHABRIA that he was unhappy about the fact that the restoration of Satyajit Ray's oeuvre was a commercial enterprise, funded by commercial producers, which implied the choice of films with the most commercial possibilities. Besides, there was no return to India of this restoration enterprise.

Mr SMITHER suggested deferring consideration of their application until we got on to pt.7 "Relations with Unesco". A clear reason for not accepting them now was the absence of indication of their relationship with Puna as well as the lack of important documents such as the last annual balance sheet. The examination of their candidature was therefore postponed to Jerusalem.

#### b.2. Nasjonalbibliotekavdelinga I Rana (Mo i Rana)

Mr SMITHER said their file was complete. They had grown since the Mo i Rana Congress and were now equipped to preserve films.

In spite of repeated requests, our colleagues in Oslo had declined to give us their comments on the application. This raised the issue of whether or not we can effectively allow a colleague to block the application of a valid candidate simply by silence. Mr JEAVONS said that the lack of response from Oslo was probably due to constant changes in the Chief Executive at Det Norske Filminstituttet.

There was no other comment on the candidature.

Decision : the candidate was accepted as Provisional Member but at the same time Mr JEAVONS was to ask directly to his correspondent in Oslo his view on the candidature.

#### b.3. Archivo de Imagenes en Movimiento (Santiago-Chile)

There were, formally speaking, some problems that prevented the EC from accepting the candidate, at least as Provisional Member : besides the fact that the file was all written in Spanish, there was no balance sheet nor any explanation of the organisation's structure and the answers to questions 11 and 24 in the admission questionnaire were contradicting each other.

However, Mr DIMITRIU reported that Daniel Sandoval had phoned many times to Brussels and showed interest in applying to FIAF (as Provisional Member). According to Ms AUBERT, after being fully supported by the Ministry of Culture, the institution now seemed to move forward towards a more private-type cinematheque, slightly divorced from the government.

Ms AUBERT, Mr NIETO and Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO insisted that Daniel Sandoval had been trained properly and was doing excellent work in the cinematheque. Furthermore, Mr DAUDELIN believed that accepting them as Associate was a first step towards making them come closer to us.

Decision : the candidate was accepted as Associate and it was agreed that when we receive the missing pieces in their application file, we allow them to apply as Provisional Member.

b.5. Fundacion Cinemateca del Caribe (Colombia)

Referring to their application file, Mr SMITHER spoke in favour of their admission as Provisional Member.

However, Mr DAUDELIN suggested accepting them as Associate rather than Provisional Member, because he found that 1) their collection was rather small, 2) they were mostly interested in screening films and 3) there was already the Fundacion Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano operating on the same territory. As an Associate, they would have the possibility to grow up and become Provisional Member in due time.

Mr NIETO said their motivation was precisely to become full Member. He believed they had good reasons for this : 1) their starting collection could potentially and even rapidly become fairly large,  
2) they had serious plans to develop preservation facilities and already had a small proportion of their budget devoted to duplication.

Referring to the case of Porto Vecchio and San Sebastian, Ms AUBERT agreed with Mr DAUDELIN that they rather fitted the criteria for Associateship.

There was no other comment on this candidature and Mr SMITHER recommended to admit them as Provisional Member.

Decision : 9 in favour of their admission as Provisional Member  
4 abstentions

**c. Candidate for Provisional Membership: Filmoteca de la Generalitat Valenciana**

The archive was presently enrolled as Associate and asked to have their status changed to that of Provisional Member.

All EC members found their file entirely satisfactory and Mr CHERCHI USAI even thought that they fitted the criteria for Membership.

Mr PRADO had heard that they intended to become Member. This would make them politically stronger in their region and help them to receive more important financial support (as was the case of Filmoteca de Catalunya).

Mr SMITHER wanted to consider only what they had asked for. However, the EC agreed that, if they wished to proceed to Membership, we would allow them to submit their application sooner than in two years' time and maybe as soon as the Congress in Jerusalem. In case they applied for Membership, the recent visit made by Mr PRADO and Mr CHERCHI USAI to their premises could be considered as sufficient to meet the requisite of pt c) in Rule 5 in our Statutes and Rules.

Decision : unanimously accepted as Provisional Member. On behalf of the Secretary General, the Brussels Office was to inform them of the EC's agreement should they wish to apply for Membership.

#### **d. Candidates for Membership**

##### d.1. F.Cinematoteca Nacional (Caracas)

Referring to the minutes of the 1994 EC meeting in Rome, Mr SMITHER recalled that we inherited a previous agreement by the EC which enabled the present candidate to submit an application earlier than at the end of the 2-year probation period usually applied to Provisional Members.

Strictly speaking, this was an incomplete file as it lacked the annual balance sheet, among other documents.

Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO and Mr NIETO reported positively on their recent visit to the archive, explaining that they had strengthened their infrastructure with the support of the Organisation of American States. The continuity of the archive's functioning was guaranteed even though Oscar Lucien had left.

Decision : the EC unanimously agreed on the principle that their admission as Member of the Federation could be recommended to the next GA in Jerusalem, provided that the application procedure's formal requirements were fully met before the Congress. The Brussels Office would therefore have to remind them to send the missing documents in their application file as soon as possible.

##### d.2. Filmoteca Vaticana

Mr SMITHER explained that their application had been directly stimulated by his letter to long-standing Provisional Members of FIAF (cfr. pt 5.e.).

Formally speaking, this was a complete file, although the nature of their collection was not precisely defined nor was the nature of their preservation work. Ms AUBERT pointed out that they carried out their preservation activities in collaboration with Bologna and added that Domitor had been seriously involved in listing feature and documentary films with a religious subject (7.000 titles) in collaboration with Vaticano.

Mr SMITHER then called for a vote to be taken on the recommendation of their admission as Member of the Federation to the next General Assembly.

Decision : 9 in favour  
3 abstentions  
1 against

#### **e. Long-term Provisional Members**

Mr SMITHER commented on his circulated report about the investigation of intentions of Provisional Members of more than three years' standing.

To Ms AUBERT, the long-term goal of encouraging Provisional Members to apply for Membership was to have a more active Membership and to increase the number of our voting affiliates.

It was agreed to pursue those Provisional Members who did not reply this time to Mr SMITHER's survey.

Mr SMITHER's report brought about a discussion on the privileges linked to the status of Member of FIAF. Ms BANDY felt that many Provisional Members believed they could benefit from the same privileges as Members at a lower fee and might therefore not be interested in proceeding to Membership. What was actually the incentive for becoming a Member ?

Ms AUBERT suggested increasing the annual subscription fee for Provisional Members in order to distinguish clearly those who really want to become a Member. Ms BANDY warned against the risk of basing our discussion about affiliation structure on our financial needs. These were two separate issues. Mr SMITHER raised the possibility of reminding our Members that there are certain facilities they only need to extend to other Members. Mr JEAVONS advocated simplifying our present affiliation structure with only two categories: Members (with a probation period of two years) and Associates. Mr SMITHER drew the EC's attention that any modification in FIAF's existing affiliation structure would be subject to a special procedure for changing our Statutes and Rules.

Mr CHERCHI USAI deplored the lack of deterrents to ignore the privileges linked to the status of Member, especially as regarded the issue of exchange of materials between archives. He also invited for a deeper discussion about the principles that we wanted to stick to with regard to our strategy for expanding the Federation.

In their circulated letter addressed to Mr DIMITRIU, Filmoteca de Lima requested information about the privileges granted to FIAF Members. Ms CLAES believed that these should be pointed out to them by Mr SMITHER.

#### **f. Recruitment of new affiliates**

At Mr SMITHER's request, Mr DIMITRIU reported on the result of the recruitment action carried out by the Brussels Office and based on a list of institutions selected by Wolfgang Klaue from the World Directory of Moving Image and Sound Archives. This had generated two requests for affiliation so far : La Cinémathèque de Lorraine and The National Archives of Singapore.

The Secretary General informed the EC that the Brussels Office had made a comprehensive list of those institutions having enquired about affiliation to FIAF since 1990. The list was available here.

#### **g. FIAF subscribers : list of services (to be) offered**

Ms AUBERT decided to remove this item from pt 5 as she believed it was not related to membership questions and she suggested to discuss it the following day under "Senior Administrator's report".

#### **h. Membership miscellaneous**

Requests for consultancy : referring to the case of Hong Kong, Mr JEAVONS raised the problem of continuing to give free advice to fully-fledged archives which nevertheless do not proceed further with an application to FIAF. Ms AUBERT wanted us to be tough with such institutions. Mr SMITHER agreed and recommended sending an ultimatum to Hong Kong whereby they would be informed that they can no longer benefit from our free advice unless they apply to FIAF. To Mr JEAVONS, we could also charge them for training fees (partly to FIAF, partly to the training archive). He suggested that in future, all such requests for consultancy be cleared by the Brussels Office.

Associates fitting the criteria for Provisional Membership : Mr OPELA encouraged Mr SMITHER's suggestion to find out whether there were Associates that fitted the criteria for Provisional membership, especially in the case of Munich.

## **7 FUTURE CONGRESSES**

### **a. Jerusalem 1996**

#### a.1. Congress Schedule

Newsletter 2 (draft) was circulated. For time reasons, several EC members expressed their wish to leave Jerusalem earlier than on April 23.

The Brussels Office was therefore asked to discuss with our hosts the possibility of moving the GA forward and put the excursion at the end of the week, and to ask them to reduce the GA to one and a half day with the 2nd EC meeting using up the afternoon of the GA's second day.

Though he understood that some EC members were concerned by the length of the event as a whole, Mr SMITHER recalled that the EC had been encouraging the provision of gaps in the general schedule of our congresses so as to allow affinity groups to hold on separate sessions (cfr, among others, minutes of the second EC meeting in LA, page 6).

#### a.2. Symposium on archival rights

The working group entrusted with the preparation of the symposium was now composed of Ms BLOTKAMP and Ms CLAES. Mr RICCI accepted to join the group on an auxiliary basis.

Ms BLOTKAMP reported on her recent meeting with Ms CLAES here in Cancun. The working group wanted to achieve the following goals : 1) provoke discussions and therefore avoid lengthy speeches and 2) agree on basic archival rights we wanted to obtain in the future in order to fulfil properly our mission as archives; harmonize our demands into one single voice and ask lawyers to translate them into legal terms and make proposals at a higher level. However, Ms CLAES was aware that "one single voice" would be very hard to achieve as we did not all share exactly the same concerns.

The first day would consist of introductory speeches followed by short discussions and would end up in a summary of the discussions followed by a general discussion. There were two points of view from which the problems should be approached : 1) the outside world's point of view (mainly producers and distributors who consider archives mainly as a threat to their profit) and 2) the archival point of view. The latter included a) the purist point of view (i.e. the archive that feels responsible towards the material only), b) the « projection » point of view (i.e. the archive willing to focus on showing) and c) a combination of both points of view (i.e. the archive equally concerned with preserving and showing).

Ms AUBERT asked to start the first day with a brief note about *La Convention de Berne* and *Unesco's 1980 Recommendation* to remind participants of their importance in our negotiation with right-owners. Mr JEAVONS also called for information to be dispensed early in the proceeding on the "dangerous changes" that were about to take place in certain parts of the copyright world.

Ms BLOTKAMP therefore undertook to publish a reader to be circulated at the beginning of the first day. She also wanted to introduce some aspects of the discussions in the next issue of the *Journal of Film Preservation*.

The second day would raise three issues related to archival right matters and to be discussed in smaller groups : 1) to what extent do the new developments in new media affect the archival work, 2) archives acting as producers (i.e. using their holdings to make little TV programs of films on their own and 3) European developments like the European Convention for the safeguarding of the film heritage with their implications in the rest of the world. These discussions would end in a general debate where moderators would report on the discussions held in their group. The debate's conclusion should focus on the legal conditions required for archives to function properly.

Ms BLOTKAMP and Ms CLAES called for contributions to the discussions proposed above and for names of experts in the field of legal deposit. They insisted we needed "provocative" panelists. Ms AUBERT proposed two names, Mr JEAVONS proposed the name of Michael Henry and Mr SMITHER suggested that the Senior Administrator investigate with Amy Kronish the possibility of supporting, at least partly, external experts' travel and accomodation fees. Mr SMITHER also suggested to involve Amy Kronish in the discussions.

#### a.3. "Among the Ruins" program

Mr BENARD DA COSTA commented on his Commission's circulated proposal to hold a half-day symposium under the theme "Among the ruins". This would cover the "special

program to be announced" mentioned in Newsletter 2. Ms Lia van Leer warmly welcomed the project. So did the EC. Ms CLAES added that the Commission intended to have a booklet published for the Congress with an explanation about the general concept of the symposium and comments on the 8-10 planned film programs.

Mr DIMITRIU was entrusted with the responsibility of making sure that there would be sufficient secretarial assistance during the Congress in Jerusalem.

#### **b. Cartagena 1997**

Mr NIETO reported on the very favourable response from the membership to Mr DIMITRIU's request to take part in the symposium on Amateur Film. There already was enough material to plan eleven screening hours.

Both Ms AUBERT and Mr NIETO reported having had contacts with the European-based association INEDITS and encouraged collaboration with them for the symposium.

Ms CLAES insisted we should first of all define clearly the concept of "amateur film" in both English and French. Mr SMITHER was concerned that this definition be made clear to all those who had already accepted to participate. Ms BLOTKAMP asked for the help of the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections in defining the concept. Mr JEAUVONS did not want us to restrict ourselves to a narrow definition of "amateur" films (i.e. "home movies" as opposed to films made outside the main streams, i.e. "independent films"). In Mr SMITHER's mind, the real effort behind the symposium was to provide an opportunity for the whole membership to look at categories of films that do not normally come up for study in FIAF symposia.

Mr CHERCHI USAI suggested inviting external experts to discuss the definition of the concept and to interact with the membership during the Congress. Mr SCHOU suggested asking the speaker of the session on amateur film during the last AMIA conference in Toronto. Any suggestion for external expert should be sent to Mr NIETO and to the Brussels Office. Mr JEAUVONS and Mr SMITHER are supposed to send Mr NIETO their suggestions.

Mr SCHOU underlined the technical problems that might occur with the screening of copies of home movies with an archival value.

#### **c. 1998 and beyond**

Mr OPELA repeated his invitation for the 1998 Congress in Prague, Mr PRADO for the 1999 Congress in Madrid and Mr JEAUVONS for the Congress in the year 2000 in London.

The EC accepted Mr PRADO's invitation to host the EC meeting in Madrid in Autumn 1996 as well as the China Film Archive's invitation to host the EC meeting in Beijing in Autumn 1997. There still was no invitation for the EC meeting in Autumn 1998.

**Day 2 : the first morning session was held off the records in the presence of elected EC members in order to discuss the renewal of Mr DIMITRIU's contract with FIAF.**

### **9 SENIOR ADMINISTRATOR's REPORT**

Mr DIMITRIU commented on the various sections of his circulated written report. Referring to pt D (fields of activities that could improve FIAF's financial situation) and with regard to the discussions of the previous day, he re-ordered his priorities as follows :

#### **1. marketing of the CD-ROM**

2. subscribers recruitment campaigns. In Mr DIMITRIU's opinion, this implied that the Brussels Office be better equipped in terms of mailing facilities and better trained in terms of editorial and administrative skills.
3. sponsoring and fundraising. In answer to Mr RICCI, Mr DIMITRIU said that to be successful in raising funds, he needed 1) to be fully supported by the EC so as to speak with enough authority and 2) to receive practical guidelines.
4. increasing the subscriptions to the Journal of Film Preservation to make sure that, at least, all publication and distribution costs are covered. Mr DIMITRIU believed that the Brussels Office's staff needed to be better trained to meet publishing and distribution requirements.
5. active membership policy. Mr DIMITRIU put this priority at the end of the list because he felt there was no consensus among the GA nor the EC to expand actively our membership.

Mr DIMITRIU's report brought about some comments from the floor which could be summarized as follows :

The Senior Administrator said "he needed positive support and guidelines." In the EC's mind, the guidelines were already clearly stated in the Senior Administrator's job description. The EC expected the S.A. to fulfil his mission in a more complete way, especially as regarded the responsibility for the Brussels Office. In this respect, Mr JEAVONS and Mr RICCI invited Mr DIMITRIU to evaluate the staff level and cost that he considered as necessary to run the office efficiently. In other words, what was the optimal combination of forces and skills needed to enable him to fulfil his mandate ? Mr RICCI suggested that Mr DIMITRIU work out the results of this analysis into a proposal to the EC with a special emphasis on its financial implications. The EC and particularly the Treasurer would then see if the Federation can afford it. Both Ms BANDY and Ms AUBERT wished to receive a plan indicating who is doing what and in what amount of time.

Mr DAUDELIN made it very clear that the S.A.'s base of operation was Brussels and that the EC considered him as the anchor person of this Federation.

Mr DAUDELIN also invited Mr DIMITRIU to be more "imaginative", recalling that he had been hired especially because he was already supposed to know the needs of the membership. The S.A. should now come up with suggestions to have new needs formulated by the membership. Mr JEAVONS wanted a system of regular communication to be implemented whereby affiliates would be constantly informed of what is going on in the center of FIAF.

Referring to the S.A.'s duties and assignments, Mr JEAVONS believed it was up to the SenAd. to define priorities and work out strategies to achieve them.

Mr DAUDELIN regretted that Mr DIMITRIU was not "agressive" enough. For example, though it was not blind to the difficulties generated by the transition between Ms VAN DER ELST and Mr DIMITRIU, the EC would have expected the latter to proceed in a more proactive way in order to get his authority in place.

The Senior Administrator also wished to have more autonomy; to Mr JEAVONS, it was essential that the S.A. receive the EC's mandate to act on behalf of FIAF, with the risk of needing to be accountable for how his initiatives work out. This applied, among others, to the ambassadorial side of the job, which included promoting FIAF in the world and communicating with certain parts of the world with which we have no contact. It also applied to the S.A.'s autonomy in travelling for FIAF : Mr SMITHER favoured the idea of allocating a budget for travels and leaving Mr DIMITRIU to decide when and where to travel. Both Ms BANDY and Ms BLOTKAMP preferred the S.A. to make a proposal for anticipated travels and come up with figures for travelling to be approved by the EC. Mr DIMITRIU was open to both solutions. Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO believed that in any case, there was a need for a plan in order to guarantee the permanence of the Brussels Office during the Senior Administrator's absence.



There was some misunderstanding about the amount of the yearly fees granted to the Senior Administrator as the figures available (contract, 1995, accounts and draft 1996 budget) did not all correspond to each other (in any case, the result would be more favorable to FIAF than budgeted). Mr DIMITRIU explained that, in order to meet FIAF's possibilities, he envisaged to reduce by 30% the number of his work days in 1996 and undertook to send a clarification about the situation to the three Officers after the meeting. He needed first to talk with FIAF's auditor, Mr Poncelet, as he was the one who prepared his contract a year ago together with Ms van der Elst.

## **10 FINANCIAL REPORT**

### **a. Accounts for 1995**

Ms BANDY presented the current estimate of the 1995 calendar budget which she had examined in September with Ms van der Elst and more recently with FIAF's auditor, Mr Poncelet.

We were faced with the responsibility this year of combining the 62,000 US\$ deficit and the loan to PIP. The 1995 accounts were approved with the current deficit and Ms BANDY would examine with Mr Poncelet the most convenient way of easing it and paying off the P.I.P. debt (either gradually or in one payment in 1995), but she recommended not to touch our Reserve Fund in order to absorb these sums. Ms CLAES suggested asking for a loan, taking advantage of the low interest rates nowadays.

### **b. Plans for easing deficit and Budget for 1996**

#### b.1. Current membership fees

The fees had not been raised since 1992. No adjustment for inflationary effects had been made since then. Further to Ms CLAES' suggestion seconded by both Mr JEAVONS and Mr SMITHER, it was agreed that the Brussels Office and the Treasurer would study plans and procedures for adopting new fees to be submitted to the GA during the next Congress. Mr SMITHER believed that this required, among others, to identify the full cost of servicing the various membership categories. He also believed we should narrow the gap between Provisional members' and Members' fees

#### b.2. Voluntary membership fees

A total of 21 archives had agreed to pay a voluntary extra fee to FIAF for the year 1995. In line with Ms BANDY's suggestion, it was decided to ask 25 to 30 Members to accept a increase in membership fees in 1996 (90.000 BEF instead of 75.000). It should be pointed out to them that this special effort would enable us to offset the subscription debts of those affiliates in genuine financial hardship. Ms BANDY said that she and Mr Poncelet favoured the idea of inforcing this voluntary contribution as a permanent measure for our budget to take into account the loss of income due to certain archives that cannot pay.

About bad payers : Mr JEAVONS recommended to adopt a case by case approach with bad payers (i.e. individual contacts in collaboration between the Treasurer and the Brussels Office) and wanted the EC to decide with whom, among all our debtors, we should act on such a basis. It was also suggested to quote the rules about the risk of being expelled from the Federation to those whom we knew could pay their dues. Though there was no clear decision on this, the EC favoured Mr SMITHER's idea that if we create a mechanism to relate the overall sum of voluntary contributions to particular cases, we might not have to threaten to expel them from the Federation because they fail to pay their dues.

Cinematca Nacional del Ecuador (Quito) : Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO reported having carried out a training and film restoration program with Quito. Having received the support of Filmoteca de la UNAM to produce a film on these restorations, Quito had saved a certain amount of money which was agreed to allow them to pay their arrears of subscription to FIAF for one year. The Brussels office was to contact Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO regarding the practical details of this agreement and draft the invoice accordingly.

Fundacion Carmen Toscano I.A.P. (Mexico) : Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO believed they were in good financial situation and could therefore afford to pay their dues. He would contact them.

More alarming was the situation of Rio de Janeiro and La Paz. Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO believed we should 1) send an ultimatum to Rio as they seemed to have money and 2) ask for clarification to La Paz as their arguments for not paying their debts were always vague.

### b.3. FIAF Subscribers

FIAF now had 32 Subscribers, out of whom 25 had been recruited by Mr DIMITRIU over the past months. The S.A.'s budget for 1996 anticipated the recruitment of 48 additional subscribers in 1996. Ms BANDY wondered how Mr DIMITRIU intended to recruit and service such a high number of new subscribers. Mr SMITHER said we should not underestimate the cost of servicing a growing number of Subscribers. In the same way, as regarded the increase in subscriptions to FIAF CD-ROM as appeared in the S.A.'s Business Plan, Mr RICCI noted that the related costs (advertising campaign, service, support, phone calls...) were not reflected in the expenses. Mr CHERCHI USAI agreed with Ms CLAES that the CD-ROM product still needed improving and he feared that P.I.P.'s customers might not be interested in subscribing systematically every year to the CD-ROM. Mr RICCI asked for the Business Plan to be amended, pending more reliable guarantee that the planned income can be achieved.

### b.4. Other

Ms BANDY insisted we should look at areas that can be cut down, although she recognized there were limited possibilities of doing so. Ms BLOTKAMP believed it was up the Brussels Office to propose areas where these cuts could be applied.

## **c. Business plan 1996**

The EC asked Mr DIMITRIU to revise the Business plan 1996 in order to present a zero budget for 1996 to the next GA. The following elements should be taken into account :

- staff salaries and Senior Administrator's fees
- external accounting : current and special fees
- training of the staff for a modernized routine accounting system
- travel expenses for special missions
- annual FIAF subsidy for the Summer School

Referring to the PIP's financial report, Ms BANDY underlined that the PIP deficit budget included a generous contribution from FIAF archives and pointed out that we could not advance more money to the PIP in 1996 in order to have a balanced budget. During their meeting last September, Ms BANDY together with Mr Magliozzi and Mr Moulds discussed the possibility of moving the Michael Moulds' PIP and CD-ROM to Brussels « to save the cost of rent and equipment in London, balance the budgets of both these projects and give our CD-ROM product a competitive edge » (cfr. Documentation Commission Report). However, Ms BANDY found that this was no priority for 1996 given the cost that such an enterprise would generate for FIAF. In the meantime, PIP and Brussels budgets would be merged and the Brussels Office would try to take over some of the PIP office's proceedings to alleviate its work burden.

Mr DIMITRIU was asked to prepare and present to the Treasurer a zero-deficit draft budget for 1997 by 31 December 1995.

The audit recommended adopting a structure of reporting on our income and expenses on a monthly basis for the Officers, on a quarterly basis for the Executive Committee and on a semi-annual basis for the whole membership.

**Day 3 : the first morning session was held off the records in the presence of EC members only in order to finalise the discussion about the renewal of Mr DIMITRIU's contract with FIAF.**

When Mr DIMITRIU joined the meeting, Mr SMITHER announced that the EC had resolved to extend his contract for a further year but subject to re-negotiation in terms of remuneration, days worked and reporting procedure. These items would be examined in the new version of the contract. Part of the reporting procedure would be a review of his contract after a six months' period.

## **6 REPORT FROM THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS**

### **a. Technical Commission**

Further to Mr SCHOU's recommendation, Mr Noël Desmet of Cinémathèque Royale, Brussels and Mr Francisco Gaytan of the Filmoteca de la UNAM, Mexico D.F. were accepted as new members of the Commission.

Mr SCHOU took good note of Ms AUBERT's request that Mr Desmet serve as a link between the Commission and the Kaleidoscope group, while both bodies' reports should not be mixed.

With regard to the substantial grants allocated to Kaleidoscope, Mr SCHOU recommended focusing on possibilities of obtaining funds from the European Union. Ms AUBERT pointed out that Kaleidoscope was using FIAF's network to carry out its projects and therefore raised the possibility of asking them to share their subsidies with FIAF.

Ms AUBERT took good note of Ms CLAES's formal suggestion that we, as an international federation, start negotiating with Kodak, now that they had the monopoly since Agfa Gevaert no longer produced film support. She advocated that « we must fight hard to obtain better conditions at the level of FIAF ».

Talking about electronic restoration, Mr JEAUVONS wished the Brussels Office to 1) centralize approaches such as requests for collaboration on electronic restoration presently made to archives and 2) dispatch them towards the Commissions. This would also allow Commission Heads to assess the traffic and different approaches that are being made in their field of activity.

Mr SHOU informed the EC that the Commission had found a potential publisher for Jean-Pierre Verscheure's book but the translation of the test-chapter was very demanding, especially to make the text readable to a large audience. Mr Friend and Mr Gitt were to meet about the test-chapter and envisage the translation.

Ms AUBERT formally asked Mr SCHOU to make a distinction in his future reports between 1) the work carried out by the Commission and 2) FIAF archives' achievements in using new restoration technologies.

### **b. Cataloguing Commission**

Mr SMITHER reported on behalf of the retiring Commission President, Ms Harrison and as an ex-member of the Commission.

The EC approved Ms Harrison's recommendation that Ann Baylis of the National Film and Sound Archives of Australia succeed her as Head of the Commission, being aware of the fact that Ms Baylis would only be able to take up this position if FIAF covered a proportion of her travel costs. It was clearly established that in the present state of the Federation's finances, there was no possibility of increasing the budget earmarked for the Commissions.

In the short term, the newly accepted President would therefore have to cover her travel costs with the funding designated to this purpose. Mr SCHOU knew from experience that, when there is a need for extra-money for the Commissions, the request must be addressed to the Treasurer via the Brussels Office.

Referring to page 2 of the report (symposium on intellectual access), Mr SMITHER said this was a project that the Commission was very keen to contribute to a future Congress and which required important preparation.

Ms HARRISON seemed to have omitted from the report the discussion about the international database project which, Mr SMITHER said, required clear guidance from the EC and/or the membership. Carlos Roberto de Souza was already working on the computer format in which the information might be given in such a database. Mr SMITHER stressed that, based on a limited exercise, Mr Roberto de Souza already had much to illustrate why this was an extremely important issue. On the other hand, there already existed the Treasures database element on the FIAF CD-ROM. Furthermore, several members of the Cataloguing Commission who were already connected to Internet wanted 1) to point out the work already being done by many archives to make their information already available worldwide through Internet and 2) to question whether extracting data from an Internet-available catalog to put it into a database was a duplication of efforts or a diversion of efforts.

Although Ms HARRISON had checked that FIAF Cataloguing Rules for Film Archives were still in print at K.G. Saur, Mr SMITHER underlined that our contract with the publisher stipulated one year notice to stop collaboration, and asked whether we should not initiate this procedure.

Ms BLOTKAMP questioned the "absolute necessity" of carrying out our projects in the frame of existing Commissions. This referred to Mr Magliozzi's proposal for a project-structured approach for the Commissions (cfr. hereunder).

### c. Documentation Commission

Ms BANDY introduced Mr Magliozzi's report, saying he was very eager to hear the EC's comments on his introductory note. She believed that Mr Magliozzi's thoughts were meant to stir a very lively debate about the structure of Commissions as presently defined in FIAF's Statutes.

This issue being linked to the discussion on the future of Commissions (cfr. pt. 6.f. of this agenda) the account of both discussions has been worked out into one single report as can be read hereunder.

Ms BLOTKAMP called for a more supportive attitude of the EC towards the Commissions in front of the General Assembly. The report made by Commission Heads to the GA must reflect a full agreement between the Commissions and the EC. We should feel more responsible for what happens to the work of the Commissions, which implied examining closely the issues being worked on within the Commissions. Having the feeling that the EC lacked time during its meeting to feed into the Commission reports, Mr JEAVONS declared we therefore needed a procedure that provided practical work in our executive agenda. This implied getting through the routine more quickly

To Mr BENARD DA COSTA, Mr Magliozzi's concern was reflecting a « malaise » also felt by his Commission.

Ms AUBERT felt that the lack of sensitivity from the EC and the membership to the issues and concerns raised in the Commission reports was due to a failure in reporting procedure, and more particularly in the way projects' results are reported to the membership. We should further consider the idea of having smaller sessions dedicated to illustrate the projects carried out within Commissions. Mr CHERCHI USAI insinuated that these sessions should be focused on projects that archives perceive as "essential" to develop their activities.

Referring to the Statutes, Ms BANDY recalled that Commissions must carry out projects that help archives to develop their activities in line with FIAF's goals. Commissions should focus more on their fundamental purposes (e.g. the training of developing archives).

In accordance with Ms AUBERT, Mr SCHOU encouraged more dialog between the Commissions and the membership. We should find ways of stirring up our affiliates' response to Commissions' calls for collaboration and efforts to increase their membership. Ms AUBERT thought that, besides the Commissions, the membership should be encouraged to get more often together around certain projects. She believed that the membership itself should also think about the future of Commissions.

To Mr CHERCHI USAI, it was clear that the Commissions should be the interface between the membership and the « outside world ».

It was decided to ask Commission Heads to respond to and expand on Mr MAGLIOZZI's introductory notes early enough to allow EC members to read about what they think before the Congress in Jerusalem.

It was also suggested (but not formally decided) to devote half a day in the next EC to the future of FIAF and more particularly the future of Commissions.

Treasures Database Project: Ms CLAES's was worried that many elements of FIAF members' holdings were included on this database without them knowing it. As long as the question of the database's right-ownership was not clarified, she would oppose to the making public of the information already put on the database, although she approved the principle of exchanging information. Ms AUBERT recommended that Mr SMITHER write to Mr Magliozzi to reflect the EC's questions which Mr SMITHER formulated as follows : who does this work all belong to and where is it (in Susan Dalton's own database or in a public database) ? Susan Dalton should be asked to take the next opportunity of coming over to Europe to clarify this situation with Mr SMITHER.

As regarded Mr Moulds' intention to apply to Getty for funding, Mr JEAUVONS feared that such an application might be in conflict with his approach to Getty for obtaining funds for FIAF.

#### d. Commission for Programming and Access to Collections

Mr BENARD DA COSTA said that the Commission's last meeting had been held most recently in Paris, which explained why he had not had the time to prepare a written report.

During its meeting, the Commission had examined the following items :

1. The Programming Commission's workshop in Los Angeles on "How to Use Our Collections" had been affected by the simultaneity of other events and had therefore been less attended than expected. However, the debate had been very lively as the matters dealt with were central questions in archives' activities. These topics definitely needed further discussion within FIAF. The Commission had noted with interest Mr JEAUVONS' intervention according to which the question of access to non-fiction films should become a major item in the Commission's future contributions. Mr BENARD DA COSTA suggested that we publish Mr PAINI's paper in the next issue of the Journal of Film Preservation. He finally expressed his feeling that there was a general attitude of "anti-intellectualism" toward the film heritage as a whole whereas we had to defend the art of cinema, as an art that invented new forms to the service of fiction. The Commission also verified that many FIAF archives had non-fiction films; how to promote and program this heritage should therefore also become a major concern to the Commission.

Mr SMITHER welcomed the idea of carrying on the debate on non-fiction films in the Journal. It was agreed that the Commission would contribute Mr PAINI's paper to the next issue of the *Journal*, if possible with other contributions from Ms CLAES' and Mr JEAUVONS.

2. Jeu des catégories : un jeu pour le centenaire du cinéma. The publication had been most recently publicised in «Le Monde », with the immediate effect of stimulating orders by a public mainly composed of individuals, libraries and journalists. Mr BENARD DA COSTA believed this was very encouraging. He solicited the help of the Brussels Office in order to cover unanticipated publication costs (about 7.000 US\$). No decision was taken on this matter.

3. Manual on Access : reactions to the publication had been received from Wolfgang Klaue as well as the National Film and Sound Archives in Australia and were agreed to be published in the next issue of the Journal. Mr BENARD DA COSTA hoped to obtain further response from the membership and more especially the Executive Committee members.

The Commission was at a turning point : now that it had already accomplished a good deal of its primary mandate since its creation in 1990, Mr BENARD DA COSTA found this was the appropriate moment to leave the Commission's presidency over to somebody else. He therefore resigned from his post of president of the Commission and recommended that the EC accept Ms CLAES as his successor, while he wished to remain a member of the Commission.

A long discussion followed on the appropriateness of accepting as the new head of a Commission somebody who already stood as an elected member of the EC.

This brought about the question of whether or not we should maintain the recommendation issued by the EC during its Paris meeting in 1993 and according to which "The EC shall separate its function as a decision making body and an instrument of communication by holding separately sessions of elected members only and meetings of a wider group including Honorary Members and Presidents of Commissions."

The EC finally decided not to revoke the recommendation and unanimously accepted Ms CLAES as the new Head of the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections.

e. **Long-term plan for FIAF** : no report had been produced for this meeting.

f. **Future of the Commissions** : Cfr. supra, pt. 6.c.

## 11 PROJECTS AND PUBLICATION UNDERWAY

### a. **FIAF Journal of Film Preservation**

Mr CHERCHI USAI expressed the editorial board's disappointment with the last issue of the Journal that had just come out as it did not correspond to what they expected. Ms AUBERT believed that we needed a professional editorial executant. The question was : should he/she be based in Brussels or closer to the editorial group ?

Ms BANDY invited Mr DIMITRIU to do an evaluation of the Brussels office participation in the Journal and come back to the EC with an analysis showing 1) the level of work involved and 2) who is doing what.

Mr CHERCHI USAI wished to raise again the question of inserting a Newsletter about the Federation's current activities. He also evoked the possibility of skipping the next issue in order to take the time to reconsider the whole framework of the publication. This was also a matter of not spending the Federations money for the purpose of a project we were not fully satisfied with. Ms BANDY recalled that we would then fail to fulfil our commitments towards our Subscribers who were entitled to receive two issues per year. Mr DIMITRIU should think about this problem. The Treasurer finally stressed that this was not a question of finances but should only be taken as an opportunity to re-think the whole issue of the Journal.

Mr DAUDELIN wanted EC members to examine closely the present issue and formulate criticism and/or suggestions in very precise terms for the next EC meeting.

Ms BLOTKAMP stressed the urgency and importance of defining more clearly the targeted public of the Journal. Ms BANDY suggested that we might envisage to change again the name of the Journal.

As a way of improving the whole proofreading procedure, Mr DIMITRIU undertook to have all articles e-mailed to the Chief Editor.

The Senior Administrator was asked to study possibilities of improving the Journal's circulation networks.

Referring to past discussions in the EC, Mr SMITHER recalled that the idea of having our publications distributed via commercial outlets (namely Flicks Books) had died because the EC could not accept the publisher's wish to include the Journal in the contract. We should definitely re-examine our position on this aspect before attempting again to deal with commercial distributors.

#### **b. FIAF Summer School 1996**

Mr JEAVONS commented on his written report about the next Summer School to be held in Berkhamsted in June 1996 and urged EC members to circulate it among their archive's staff.

Participation and funding : the organizers intended to invite more people from FIAF to train, teach and participate in the course, provided that they received the full expected budget (including FIAF's 1996 subsidy - cfr. pt 10, c). Priority would be given to FIAF applicants. FIAT had been allowed to put forward up to five applicants provided that they came from archives that also held film collections. In return, FIAT would pay to the organizers a fee to support the general cost of the course. Unesco's subsidy would be mainly used to support applicants from developing countries.

Work programme : compared with last time, the course involved more practical work and left more free time to participants.

Mr SMITHER reported briefly on the publication of the book resulting from the 1993 Newsreel Symposium. This was now with the publishers, Flicks Books. It had originally been hoped to publish it before the end of 1995; on the new schedule, it should appear in March 1996.

#### **c. Logo project**

There having been so little response from the membership to Mr OPELA's repeated calls for participation in this project, the Cataloguing Commission had suggested to him to publish the Czech version only to demonstrate how beautiful the results can be, which, Mr SMITHER said, was actually the best way of encouraging the others to take part in the project - which demanded a tremendous amount of time from each participant.

Ms BLOTKAMP firmly believed in the potential interest that this project could stimulate outside FIAF and Mr DIMITRIU thought this was the kind of project which we could easily raise funds for. He therefore needed to speak further with Mr OPELA.

Mr SMITHER asked for this project to be put on the list of FIAF's « projects underway » and Mr OPELA would report on it during the General Assembly in Jerusalem.

## 12 RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

### a. Relations with Unesco

Referring to his written report about FIAF's relations with Unesco, Mr DIMITRIU expanded on the Satyajit Ray project. He would deliver a first draft report to Unesco by the end of 1995, intended to locate the oeuvre's elements and recommend to Unesco to carry on the restoration work.

Ms Teresa Wagner wanted us to recommend to Unesco an expert who could examine film elements available in India and inspect Indian laboratories to evaluate if they could suitably carry out the preservation work. The Technical Commission was asked to recommend someone as soon as possible.

Mr TRUJILLO BOLIO reported that the instauration of Unesco's Development Fund had inspired other possible donors for the funding of restoration projects in Latin-America. He had contacted the Director of ICI (Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericano) who had informed him of the possibilities of receiving funds for projects for which FIAF could serve as a clearing house. Ms AUBERT took good note of these possibilities.

### b. Relations with other international organisations

#### b.1. IASA

Mr JEAVONS, who had attended FIAT's and IASA's last joint conference, reported that, further to a postal vote, IASA's members had accepted the extension of their organisation to audiovisual archives and collections. Mr FRANCIS attended IASA's second meeting where he expressed his concern that this decision had been taken without previous discussion with FIAF. As a result, IASA's President asked FIAF to send a formal letter to IASA requiring some clarification about IASA's intentions. Mr SMITHER agreed to write such a letter. Ms AUBERT feared that many new archives holding film, television and sound materials might from now on be more interested in joining IASA than FIAF. She added that this should be taken into account in the frame of our membership expansion policy.

#### b.2. ASEAN film archiving

Mr SMITHER asked the EC whether we should encourage Mr Edmondson to work a little harder than he seemed to have done so far to encourage these new Asian archives also to think of applying to FIAF. Ms AUBERT reported having written to these archives to express her hope that they would become part of FIAF.

Ms AUBERT closed the meeting by thanking the interpreters and EC members as well as Commission heads for their participation.

February 1996