

F I A F \_\_\_\_\_

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

STOCKHOLM - MAY 1983

CONFIDENTIAL

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Stockholm, 27 - 29 May 1983

Members	W Klaue	President	
	R Daudelin	Secretary General	
	J de Vaal	Treasurer	
	R Borde	Vice President	Absent
	E Bowser	Vice President	
	D Francis	Vice President	
	T Andreykov		Absent
	G Cincotti		
	M Gonzales-Casanova		Absent
	E Orbanz		
	A-L Wibom		
Reserve Members	C Alves-Netto		
	M Strotchkov	(arrived Day 2)	
	S Kula		
Honorary Members	E Lauritzen		
	V Pogacic		Absent
	M Svoboda		Absent
	J Toeplitz		
	H Volkmann		Absent
Commission Heads	H Harrison	Cataloguing Commission	
	H Schou	Preservation Commission	
	M Staykova	Documentation Commission	
Executive Secretary	B van der Elst		

## A G E N D A

Item		Page
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Approval of the Minutes of the meeting in Madrid	1
3	Last Report on the Preparation of the Symposium	2
4	Membership Questions	2
4.1	New Candidates for Membership	2
	a Athens	
	b Bois d'Arcy	
4.2	Reconfirmation of Members	4
	a Mexico CN	
	b Mexico UNAM	
4.3	Istanbul	6
4.4	Reconfirmation of Observers	6
4.5	Miscellaneous	9
5	Financial Report: Interim report, January - May 1983	15
6	Examination of Main Points of General Meeting Agenda	16
7	Report on Preparations for 40th Congress, Vienna 1984	26
8	Any Other Business	26

## ANNEXES

1	Status of Visitors
2	Cataloguing Commission Report for EC

## Abbreviations

EC	Executive Committee
GM	General Meeting
!!	Points discussed but not on Agenda

## M I N U T E S

Mr KLAUE opened the meeting with a welcome to all present and regretted the unavoidable absence of 3 Members and 3 Honorary Members.

### 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted as presented with the exception that Point 3, Preparations for the Symposium, was postponed to the afternoon at the request of Mrs WIBOM.

### !! ATTENDANCE OF DIPLOMATS AT FIAF GENERAL MEETINGS

Mrs WIBOM asked for an urgent discussion of a cable from the Seoul Archive which needed a reply.

Mr KLAUE explained that the Archive had cabled that the Cultural and Information Attache of the Republic of Korea in Sweden would be attending the Congress in place of the Head of the Archive. He asked the EC to consider whether FIAF approved the principle that Archives should be represented by diplomats or Embassy representatives.

Mr DAUDELIN referred to Article 25 from which it was clear that only the Director or "responsible employees" of the Archive could attend as representatives of the Archive. Mr KLAUE and Mr DE VAAL agreed that it was a delicate matter and they did not wish to offend the Archive but it was agreed in discussion that the Rules should be enforced as diplomats would not have the necessary background to contribute.

### DECISIONS

MM KLAUE, DAUDELIN and Mrs WIBOM to draft reply cable with polite but firm refusal, referring to the FIAF Rules; the cable to be in the name of the EC and signed by Mr KLAUE.

Mr DAUDELIN to mention the matter of principle at the GM.

### 2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING IN MADRID

The Minutes were approved unanimously, subject to 3 minor amendments:

i Page 36 (bottom of page)

Mr KLAUE pointed out that the Decision had not been as strict as indicated. In the letter sent to the Archives they had said Conference Hosts would be invited to provide Spanish facilities wherever possible and, if they could not, the EC would try to provide assistance from the FIAF Budget.

ii Page 2

Mr SCHOU asked that his contribution to the work of the Organising Committee might be included as a matter for the record.

iii Page 13

The name missing from the second paragraph from the bottom should read "Mr KULA".

### 3 LAST REPORT ON THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE SYMPOSIUM

Mrs WIBOM distributed the programme of the first joint FIAF-FIAT Technical Symposium, entitled "Archiving of the Moving Image in the 21st Century" and reported that 28 FIAT delegates were expected.

The programme was reviewed by the EC and arrangements made for allocating delegates to the workshops of their choice. The Workshops would be repeated as necessary and it was agreed the minimum number of participants should be 3.

Mr ALVES-NETTO pointed out that this was the first occasion on which FIAF had been able to welcome so many delegates from less developed countries and he felt it was important that they had the opportunity to speak with the FIAF EC before the final joint session with FIAT. Mrs WIBOM reported that they had already requested an evening meeting with the EC and it was hoped there would also be many informal discussions during the Symposium.

Mr KULA felt the 15-minute session on FIAF/FIAT cooperation should include some assessment of the value of the Symposium and consideration of whether it would be useful to have further joint Symposia, say, every 3 to 5 years. One could also discuss the possibility of joint Technical Commissions on specific topics of mutual interest.

### 4 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

#### 4.1a New Candidates for Membership: ATHENS - TAINIOTHIKI TIS ELLADOS

Mr DAUDELIN thanked Mr CINCOTTI for his visit to Athens and his 5-page report of 28 April 1983 which answered almost all the questions. In general, he agreed with Mr CINCOTTI's favourable evaluation of the progress they had made in transformation from an organisation purely concerned with cineclub activity into a film archive concerned with preservation and conservation.

The first question which concerned him was why the Greek Retrospective in Belgium had been organised in cooperation with the Centre du Cinema grec instead of the Cinematheque. Mr DE VAAL mentioned that for the Greek retrospective in Holland they too had had to get help from the Centre du Cinema grec as the Cinematheque had been unable to supply the prints required. Neither Mr CINCOTTI nor any of the other members present knew much about the Centre and its relationship to the Cinematheque although it was thought the Centre had some government funding.

The second point raised by Mr DAUDELIN was the proportion of effort spent on preservation as compared with film screenings. Although progress had been made in preservation activities, he felt it was necessary to stress yet again that it should be considered as their main task. Mr KLAUE agreed; the sheer volume of films being shown abroad was impressive but with only 7 staff he wondered how they found time to do anything else. The storage conditions had been described but he would like particulars on the actual preservation work being undertaken.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was important to clarify whether films sent by FIAF archives were being shown in Athens only or whether they were being made available for showing elsewhere.

In response to these queries, Mr CINCOTTI felt that FIAF films were shown only in the Cinematheque. He thought there was a good balance between distribution and preservation activities and that work was beginning on conservation as well. They were not earning revenue from films loaned to the cineclubs and they were not providing films to the commercial cinemas d'essai. He felt totally reassured by the favourable comments he had had from people in Greece, both within and outside the Cinematheque. He said they had had a lot of difficulties following the earthquake 3 years previously, they had taken account of our suggestions and he felt they should be encouraged as an emerging Archive.

Mr DAUDELIN agreed and stressed that there were no grounds for rejecting them. We should simply reiterate the importance of further developing the real Archive activities.

In response to a question from Mr KLAUE about whether there was a national deposit law in Greece, Mr CINCOTTI and Mr DAUDELIN said there was no law but voluntary deposit was quite common, especially as some of the top film makers were on the Board of the Cinematheque.

Mr TOEPLITZ supported the Cinematheque saying that Mrs MITROPOULOS whom he had known for some 30 years was very devoted and, as there was no other archive in Greece, we could not expect anything better. Mr KLAUE agreed and said he was pleased with their unexpected progress.

Before closing the discussion, Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that prints supplied by the Cinematheque to other archives for Greek Weeks had been of very poor quality and did no service to the Greek cinema.

DECISION by secret ballot: 9 YES, 1 abstention.

4.1b New Candidates for Membership:  
BOIS D'ARCY - SERVICES DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

Mr DAUDELIN quoted from Mr BORDE's letter of May 18 in support of the candidates, stressing particularly the size of their collections and the quality of their preservation work. He then reviewed the dossier in detail, noting that all questions were answered precisely and in accordance with FIAF requirements. He mentioned that FIAF had been hoping for many years that Bois d'Arcy would apply for full membership.

Mr KULA opened the discussion by pointing out that these two organisations (Athens and Bois d'Arcy) represented the two extremes of organisations within FIAF; one was very active in promoting the exhibition of films, the other had a massive collection and excellent preservation facilities but had a very limited cultural programme. FIAF could press for a good balance between cultural and conservation activities but could not demand it or require any fixed percentage of budget or effort should go to one or the other. We should accept both kinds of organisation and recognise there would always be a range of different organisations within the Federation.

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that in fact Bois d'Arcy had recently become more

active on the cultural side, as witnessed by their intervention at Cannes, the weekly screenings organised at the Beaubourg in Paris and the circulation of good quality programmes on, for instance, l'Herbier and Melies.

In response to an enquiry from Mr KLAUE about members' experience of film exchanges, Mrs BOWSER, MM DE VAAL, KULA and DAUDELIN all reported favourably. Mrs WIBOM and Mr FRANCIS however reported that they never succeeded in exchanges and had to buy films if needed as Bois d'Arcy were only interested in French films themselves. Mrs WIBOM had sent them some French nitrate films as a gift.

Mr FRANCIS also mentioned that he had been advised that the Melies anthology was in fact of very poor quality and he had been surprised that Bois d'Arcy had allowed them to be issued in that state. He added that he was surprised that they reported, on page 13 of their brochure, they had prepared master negatives of only 1206 films since February 1982. He felt this was a low figure in view of their facilities but Mr KULA pointed out it was probably higher than the total collection of some other members!

On the question of a possible inspection visit, Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that this was at the discretion of the EC but in any case a number of EC members had visited them recently and the Head of the Preservation Commission had spent one and a half days there.

DECISION by secret ballot: 10 YES (unanimous).

!! REQUEST FOR INFORMATION FOR PRESERVATION COMMISSION

In the course of the above discussion, Mr SCHOU pointed out how useful it would be for the Preservation Commission to have access to the preservation activities described in membership applications. It was agreed the Head of the Preservation Commission could have relevant extracts, but not the full dossier which was reserved for the EC. The other Commissions did not require the information.

- 4.2 Reconfirmation of Members
- a MEXICO CITY - CINETECA NACIONAL DE MEXICO
  - b - FILMOTECA DE LA UNAM

Mr DAUDELIN introduced the discussion by referring to the last meeting at which the Cineteca Nacional dossier had been incomplete and that of UNAM had arrived too late for discussion. He had written to them and received replies from both.

Starting with UNAM, Mr DAUDELIN mentioned the points that required attention:

- examples of cooperation with national film organisations (2e)
- copy of budget showing proportion spent on preservation (2g)
- organisation chart, clarifying how the archive functions
- letter of cooperation between CN and UNAM
- subscriptions for 1981 and 1982 (1981 since received)

Some of the points had been covered in a telephone conversation with Mr CASANOVA, in the Annual Report, and in his letter (with accompanying

translation into English). Mr DAUDELIN asked Mr ALVES-NETTO for advice on whether the Spanish text was easier to understand than the English which was confusing in parts, especially when referring to other Mexican organisations concerned with film. Although they had signed a formal letter of cooperation with CN, Mr CASANOVA was very critical of them by telephone, claiming they "no longer exist" and are "not serious".

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that on the other hand the letter from CN, signed by Mr Alberto ISAAC, a well-known director and the new General Director of Mexican Cinematography, was very positive. Mr ALVES-NETTO felt it was incorrect to state CN did not exist. The new Headquarters was in an old four-storey building because the budget for reconstruction after the fire had been cut because of the government's overall financial problems. As Mr ISAAC was expected at the Congress, he suggested discussion should be held over till after his arrival. Although it was difficult to get clear information, they nevertheless did exist and were functioning. The main confusion seemed to be above the working level, in the political area. Mr DAUDELIN felt the confusion was typical of the Mexican situation over the years; he himself had spent hours with friends trying to understand the set-up.

Mr ALVES-NETTO pointed out that at least the new General Director, Mr ISAAC, had connections with the film industry and was not an outsider so in fact the situation was rather better than in previous years. Mrs WIBOM reported that CN had changed the name of the representative coming to the Congress three times: from Salvador ALBERES to Alberto ISAAC and now Fernando MACOTELLA. Mr CINCOTTI reported that he had been with Mr MACOTELLA on the Berlin Festival jury and believed he was connected with the film school.

Mrs ORBANZ felt there was no problem with UNAM: nothing seemed to have changed, they were short of cash but were doing the same work and had better premises. Mr DAUDELIN was not so sure: he had found it very shocking to discover that the people we had been working with at the Congress were fired the next morning.

MM DAUDELIN and ALVES-NETTO both mentioned the problems state institutions had when they were so easily affected by government intervention. After the fire, the CN could well have been shut down by the government altogether. As with Greece, FIAF should seek to work with the archives that existed, in spite of any shrtcomings.

Mr KULA asked if in fact there was any evidence they were failing to perform as archives. There was confusion certainly because of government and staff changes but, as far as he could see, nothing had changed substantially since we decided to admit them both in 1976.

Mr DAUDELIN said that if we confirm CN we should put in writing our hope that their preservation activities should resume as soon as possible. Mr FRANCIS pointed out that with the involvement of Mr ISAAC we had the opportunity to expand more fully as he at least would be able to understand; MM ALVES-NETTO and DAUDELIN agreed with this point.

DECISION by show of hands: UNAM 9 YES, 1 abstention  
CN 8 YES, 2 abstentions



Mr DAUDELIN to write letters of confirmation, including EC comments as indicated in the discussion.

#### 4.3 ISTANBUL - SINEMA TELEVIZYON ENSTITUSU

Mr DAUDELIN referred to page 9 of the Madrid EC Minutes and read out to the EC his subsequent letter of January 31 to the Turkish Archive. As there had been no reply, the EC had to proceed with suspension as set out in Articles 21, 22 and 23 of the FIAF Rules.

Mr FRANCIS queried whether the Madrid Minute implied there should be discussion at the GM before proceeding with suspension. Mr KLAUE felt the EC was bound by Article 21 and had to make a recommendation to the GM who had the right to approve or reject suspension; in addition, the EC had to make recommendations regarding future relations with the Archive.

Mr KLAUE stressed that it was important for Mr DAUDELIN to spell out the details at the GM as it was a unique situation.

The EC agreed with Mr CINCOTTI's suggestion that one year's suspension was long enough before proceeding to expulsion or readmission.

With reference to Article 23 (limits of relations), Mr KULA pointed out that there was no possibility of banning contacts but that members should be aware that all future relations with the Turkish Archive would be on the basis of dealings with any other "non-member" and accordingly at their own risks and discretion. Mr KLAUE added that members should be reminded that there was no basis for film exchanges if one party was not bound by FIAF Rules.

Mr KLAUE suggested members should be invited to inform the Secretariat if they received new approaches from the Turkish Film Archive. Mr TOEPLITZ felt it was sufficient to make a statement that contacts would be at their own risk but that FIAF was available for support in case of difficulty.

#### DECISION

The EC to recommend to the GM a period of one year's suspension.

Later in the day

Mr KLAUE read out a telex just received from the Director of the Turkish Archive, regretting that he could not attend the Congress and reporting that he had just become aware the subscriptions had not been paid. The 1983 subscription had been paid that day and that for 1982 would follow as soon as possible.

It was regretfully decided that the response from Turkey had come too late as suspension had already come into force (ie 60 days after 31 January 1983).

#### 4.4a Reconfirmation of Observers LIMA - CINEMATECA UNIVERSITARIA DEL PERU

Mr DAUDELIN opened the discussion by saying that their Annual Report was embarrassing in that it was simply a list of programming activities and had

only 3 lines on archiving. He had sent them a long letter reminding them of the importance of preservation and asking for more information but this had been ignored. He asked Ms ORBANZ and Mr ALVES-NETTO if they had any information.

They both reported that the Annual Report represented the true situation and the Archive did almost nothing on the preservation side. Mr ALVES-NETTO added that the lack of preservation was beginning to worry people in Peru and there will probably be a new organisation set up in Lima to preserve the national heritage which would approach FIAF when ready, maybe in one year. He would be visiting there in 3 months.

#### DECISION

Reconfirm but with letter repeating need for preservation.

#### 4.4b Reconfirmation of Observers CAIRO - AL-ARCHIVE AL-KAWMY LIL-FILM

Mr DAUDELIN and Mr KLAUE reported what they knew of the situation. There had been no Annual Report and no subscriptions paid for two years.

Mr KLAUE had written to Mr Mustapha Mohamed ALI (whom he had met at Leipzig) as promised in the Madrid EC Minutes (page 10), but had received no reply. However, he had asked for the Stockholm papers and might be attending. As Under-Secretary of State for Cultural Matters, he was responsible for the Egyptian Film Centre although not in charge of its operation.

Mr Abd el Hamid SAID, who had visited the FIAF offices in Brussels, was the person mentioned by Mr ALI as a potential candidate to run the Film Centre. Mr KLAUE said he had known him for some 20 years; he had been working in the Cairo Film Festival as an organiser and was a "real archive buff".

Mr FRANCIS suggested the decision should be postponed until after the Congress in case Mr ALI came and provided more information.

#### DECISIONS

Mr DAUDELIN to request more information

Mr KLAUE to write to Mr ALI if he does not attend and offer FIAF help. (Mr KLAUE mentioned that he might be able to go to Egypt next year under the GDR/Egypt cultural agreement)

#### 4.4c Reconfirmation of Observers BOGOTA - FUNDACION CINEMATECA COLOMBIANA

Mr DAUDELIN reported that no information had been received. Mr ALVES-NETTO had no information about them either.

#### DECISION

Mr DAUDELIN to write usual letter explaining they cannot be reconfirmed without information.

4.4d Reconfirmation of Observers  
BRAZZAVILLE - CINEMATHEQUE NATIONALE

Mr DAUDELIN reported that no Report had been received but Mr MBALOUA was expected at Stockholm. (The Madrid Confirmation referred to 1981)

DECISION

Mr DAUDELIN and Mr ALVES-NETTO to meet with Mr MBALOUA privately and report to the EC after the Congress.

4.4e Reconfirmation of Observers  
KOBLENZ - BUNDESARCHIV/FILMARCHIV

Mr DAUDELIN reported that no Report had been sent in spite of several reminders.

He referred to the note from Mr KAHLENBERG of 17 May 1983 following the discussions at Oaxtepec concerning their autonomy. Mr KLAUE mentioned that it would be very difficult to reach the ideal state of autonomy within the Bundesarchiv whose structure had been established for decades; the present document had arrived very late but it was a slow complicated matter to get agreement through the many channels involved.

DECISION

MM DAUDELIN, KLAUE and Mrs ORBANZ to meet with Mr KAHLENBERG during the Congress.

4.4f Reconfirmation of Observers  
CARACAS - CINEMATECA NACIONAL DE VENEZUELA

Under item 5, Financial Report, it was agreed that they could not be reconfirmed as subscriptions were outstanding for two years.

DECISION

Mr DAUDELIN to advise them that services would have to be discontinued unless the two outstanding subscriptions were paid within 3 months.

4.4g Reconfirmation of Observers

All other Observers were reconfirmed.

4.5a Miscellaneous Membership Questions  
APPLICATION FROM SOUTH AFRICAN NATIONAL FILM ARCHIVE

Mr DAUDELIN reported that this Archive had written to the Secretariat asking for membership information as they would like to re-apply to join. They had already applied in 1975 and, following discussion at the Belgrade EC meeting, Mr LEDOUX had advised them in November 75 that it was not possible to accept their application in view of the close relations FIAF had with other international organisations. Mr DAUDELIN had referred to this previous decision in his acknowledgment of their new letter and said the matter would be discussed at the EC meeting in Stockholm.

He pointed out the political implications, in particular the possibility that UNESCO might withdraw B Status if South Africa were to join FIAF. He personally did not feel FIAF's response should be any different this time but wanted the views of the EC.

Mrs BOWSER reported that Mr DE LANGE had visited her early in 1976 shortly after the decision, asking for further explanation and she simply confirmed the official viewpoint. He had written to her earlier this year asking if the climate had changed within FIAF and, after consulting with Mr DAUDELIN, she had written that, although we were more closely aligned with UNESCO now, nevertheless the membership of the EC was different and there might therefore be a different decision.

Mrs BOWSER explained that in 1975 she had accepted the view of the majority and recalled that only Mr LEDOUX had been against the decision, saying it was against FIAF's "non-political status". Since then, she had felt the decision had been against FIAF's principles and, even though one had to weigh the practical benefits of association with UNESCO, she personally was ready to reverse her decision and consider their application on its merits alone. This had been the only decision, as far as she knew, which FIAF had taken on purely political grounds.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that it was an exceptional situation and the highest international bodies had recommended boycotting South Africa from all cultural, economic and political relations because of their racist policies. He quoted from the relevant Resolutions:

UNO 1980 Resolution 35.206, 5 pages

... strongly urges the international community including member states and intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations to continue and intensify the campaign to isolate South Africa from economic, political, nuclear and other forms of cooperation.

UNESCO 1974

... you are expelled from all kinds of cooperation with UNESCO if you cooperate with South Africa in the cultural field.

Apart from our own relations with UNESCO, he felt FIAF was bound by these external political recommendations: if we opened the Federation to South Africa, it would be disturbing to many countries, in Africa and Asia particularly.

Mr TOEPLITZ mentioned that FIAF had also rejected South Africa's application in 1959. He proposed that the General Assembly be asked to accept the United Nations Resolution as a resolution which took precedence

over FIAF's internal principles of being "non-political". He felt this was a more dignified basis for decision than the UNESCO factor where self-interest was involved. He himself expected the UN Resolution would be accepted with a large majority and this would close the discussion once and for all.

Mr CINCOTTI felt we were not necessarily bound by UN or UNESCO Resolutions. However, he felt in such delicate political situations it might be useful to refer to precedents. He mentioned that three years ago at a World History Project meeting there had been a move to reject both S Korea (because of their intransigent attitude to N Korea) and Formosa. He and Mr POGACIC had declared on behalf of FIAF that as S Korea were members of UNESCO there was no reason to reject them and similarly as Formosa were not members they should be rejected. He felt membership of UNESCO/UNO could be the criterion in this case also.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested there were two alternatives:

i The President or Secretary General to report that in view of the UN and UNESCO rules and recommendations the EC felt there was no possibility of considering the application from South Africa. There could be a discussion and vote if requested by the members.

ii The GM could be asked to give their formal support to the UN Resolution.

Although he had proposed the second he thought that perhaps the first was more practical. Mr DAUDELIN felt there was no need to take it to the GM as the EC had the authority to take the decision as they had done in 1975.

Mr KULA felt the discussion was confusing two issues: the decision about South Africa and FIAF's relations with UNO and UNESCO.

He felt it should be clear that, although we had chosen to affiliate to UNESCO for the purposes of collaboration and cooperation in the cultural and in particular the audiovisual field, we were nevertheless still an independent organisation and not part of UNO. He was personally distressed by the increasing politicisation of UNESCO and would not be happy to see FIAF committed to following UNESCO wherever they went, outside their cultural mandate.

On the question of South Africa, he had bitterly resented back in 1975 that the EC had taken the decision without giving the GM the opportunity to participate in the decision. He would like to see the EC advising the GM that an application had been received from South Africa but leave it to the members of the GM to decide whether the application should be considered, on the basis of their own understanding, conscience and position. He felt it would be incorrect procedure for the EC to refuse to consider the application without putting it before the GM.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that many members had first heard about the South African 1975 application in Mr Ledoux's speech of resignation in 1978 and had said that they felt they should have been able to discuss it at the time.

Mrs WIBOM also felt that the GM should be invited to vote even though it would create problems for her archive if South Africa were accepted. Only

two weeks ago, her own organisation established a new rule that all proposals for contact with South Africa (eg supply of films for Festivals, etc) were to be submitted to the Board.

Mr ALVES-NETTO reported he had the same instructions from his government and he felt the position would be the same for all the FIAF members who were official government organisations: they would not be able to vote against their own government's position.

Mr KULA felt this did not alter his view that the members themselves should have the opportunity to speak and vote for their own position, whether it was based on personal conscience or their government's instructions. Mrs BOWSER agreed but felt there should be a secret ballot after the discussion.

#### DECISION

Following presentation of the background, the GM to discuss and vote on whether the application from South Africa should be considered at all. Secret ballot if requested.

#### 4.5b Miscellaneous Membership Questions

##### COMPLAINT BETWEEN MEMBERS: MILAN AND MOMA NEW YORK

Mr DAUDELIN read out relevant portions of a letter, dated 31 March 1983, from Mr COMENCINI regarding a "Circulating List of Films for Sale or Loan", issued by the Museum of Modern Art, New York. It had come into their hands via a private collector in Italy and Mr COMENCINI was distressed to note that it included some 10 films which his archive had supplied to New York on an exchange basis. He did not think it right that an Italian collector should have the right to buy from New York films originating from an Italian archive.

In reply, Mrs BOWSER showed the EC a copy of the publication in question and reported that she felt there was some misunderstanding as she believed the Italian films were only offered for loan and that it was in accordance with the exchange agreement that the films should be available for loan to the educational institutions served by MOMA.

She confirmed that within the USA they had the right to sell films which were "in the public domain" ie out of copyright. However, if asked to supply such films outside the USA, they would naturally first consult with the FIAF member in the country concerned.

She had written to Mr COMENCINI on May 3 asking for information on the films in question but had received no reply before leaving for Stockholm so could not respond further to the charges. She certainly had no wish to break FIAF rules or offend any FIAF members.

#### DECISION

Letter to Mr COMENCINI reporting the EC had discussed the matter and heard Mrs BOWSER'S explanation and willingness to make correction if in error; and hoping the two archives could resolve the matter without further recourse to the EC.

## !! FIAF POLICY ON SALE OF FILMS

As a result of the discussion above, Mr CINCOTTI asked as a point of information whether it was legitimate for archives, as non-profit making organisations, to offer films for sale, even when out of copyright.

Mr DE VAAL was reassured that films like "Alexander Nevsky" which was offered for rental on the MOMA list would not be available to anyone outside the USA. Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that he had been refused films on the MOMA list. Mr FRANCIS mentioned a case where a UK buyer had obtained a print from the US "public domain" without difficulty but had been prosecuted on arrival with it in the UK where it was protected by UK copyright laws.

Mr FRANCIS pointed out that on the question of archive's selling activities there were 3 separate issues :

- sale
- sale abroad
- sale without permission

His own Distribution Library had been generating substantial and very useful income through the sale of prints but he had been obliged to stop them because of potential problems with the film suppliers.

Mrs WIBOM felt it was not only legitimate but part of the function of an archive to make films available. However each country was bound by its own copyright laws: in Sweden a film remained in copyright for 50 to 70 years after the maker's death or longer if renewed by another person. In her case it was the Distribution Department which handled sales where rights had been obtained; the Archive itself never sold prints even though they often had better quality material.

Mr KLAUE felt it was a useful point to discuss as in many countries the copyright had expired for many films. Other members felt that very few films were out of copyright. Mr FRANCIS pointed out that the concept "author" had not been legally defined, which meant that almost all films in the UK were still within copyright.

Mr CINCOTTI intervened to say that his original question had not been concerned with copyright matters but with the basic principle of whether archives, as non-commercial organisations, should engage in selling.

Mrs BOWSER agreed this was a useful question. For instance, they did not consider the sale of prints a commercial activity as it was not profitable. She asked members to consider what differences there were, if any, between selling and supplying prints to television for a fee. She felt most archives were being asked to supply television very frequently and suggested that on occasions films were supplied even though they had been unable to trace the owners of the rights. In MOMA's case, she considered the supply of films to TV was saved from being considered as commercial by the fact that they put the money into their Film Preservation Fund. She also cited the fact that they had contracts with independent film makers to distribute and/or sell their films for them and give them a royalty; she did not consider this "commercial" either.

Mr ALVES-NETTO did not see that there was a problem. Many archives were

selling tickets for showing films from the archive, which could be considered commercial. In his country, the legal definition of commercial was not the fact that money changed hands but the destination of the money afterwards. If the money was used for the future activities of the archive, then the activity was not commercial.

Mr FRANCIS felt the provision of films to television was an interesting point. In his case, they insisted that the film supplied should be destroyed after use so there was no possibility of it being used elsewhere as a rival to the archive.

Mr KULA pointed out that they could not protect the film from being copied on to video during transmission. Mr ALVES-NETTO agreed that this happened every time but there was no way to control it.

Mr KULA felt the situation was complicated and should be debated at length on another occasion. He cited another factor, that of the "life of print" lease, which allowed multiple use but was not an outright sale. Mrs BOWSER said this was the kind of sale MOMA offered; they did not have any problems with suppliers as in the US all films made for government were automatically supplied to the archives and became part of the "public domain" and thus available for sale to the public; this was accepted by everyone in the industry, including the producers.

Mr KLAUE suggested the matter should be raised in Open Forum so see if members wanted to study it further and perhaps develop guidelines. As an example, he mentioned that it might be difficult for outsiders to accept that Cineteca Uruguaya's activities were "non-commercial" when they sold thousands of seats daily through their 5 cinemas.

Mr KULA thought the matter could usefully be proposed as a study project to UNESCO, relating the questions of copyright and national legislation as applied to audio-visual materials.

#### DECISION

Mr CINCOTTI to raise his question in Open Forum to see if members were interested in further study, via a questionnaire or a position paper.

#### 4.5c Miscellaneous Membership Questions SEOUL - KOREAN FILM ARCHIVE INC FOUNDATION

Mr DAUDELIN quoted from the Madrid EC Minutes, page 22, and confirmed that they certainly seemed to be more serious as an Archive than previously. They had even responded to the questionnaire about apparatus with some Polaroid pictures and he believed this was the first time they had responded to a FIAF questionnaire. He referred to the letter from Pyong Yang sent to the President and other members of the EC (January 8), warning against Seoul's candidature and suggesting they were not serious.

It would be necessary to arrange a visit with very careful guidelines, particularly as it was such an unfamiliar culture, quite apart from the touchy situation created by the hostility between the two neighbouring countries. He asked if anyone would be able to go in the next 6 - 8 months.

Mr KLAUE suggested the matter should be discussed after the Congress as



perhaps the visit could be combined with the proposed SE Asia seminar. Mr TOEPLITZ asked if it was necessary for an EC member to go as a representative from a neutral country might be preferable. Mrs WIBOM said that if she were re-elected to the EC, she could visit Seoul after her planned visit to Tokyo in the autumn.

DECISION

Mrs WIBOM to visit subject to her re-election, with funding from FIAF for the additional travel and staying costs.

4.5d Miscellaneous Membership Questions  
NETHERLANDS INFORMATION SERVICE, AUDIO-VISUAL ARCHIVE

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned a new letter from this archive which had already written in June 1978, 1981 and 1982 and Mr DE VAAL supplied additional background.

DECISION

Mr DAUDELIN to reply, stressing need for autonomy, cooperation agreement with existing national Member and other additional information before the application could be considered. Mr DE VAAL to see draft.

4.5e Miscellaneous Membership Questions  
BERKELEY - PACIFIC FILM ARCHIVE

Mr DAUDELIN reported that nothing further had been heard since their request for information on Observer status in February.

4.5f Miscellaneous Membership Questions  
NAMIBIA, SW AFRICA

Information had been sent in response to an enquiry.

4.5g Miscellaneous Membership Questions  
TOKYO - FILM CENTER

No further news since the last meeting of the EC.

4.5h Miscellaneous Membership Questions  
STATUS OF VISITORS

Mr KLAUE asked the EC for comments on the paper prepared primarily by Ms ORBANZ (see Annex 1) and two minor changes were proposed by Mrs BOWSER:

- para 3.2

the charges should be "the same as Observers" rather than a specific amount, to emphasise the agreed principle and avoid the need for future updating.

- para 1.3

replace "taken" with "decided" for better English.

Mr FRANCIS felt the item should not be discussed in the Members Only session as Observers should be present during the discussion, especially as

this new category of Visitor would be paying the same fees as they were.

#### DECISION

Submit the amended text to the GM under item 9.

#### 5 FINANCIAL REPORT - INTERIM REPORT January - May 1983

Mr DE VAAL gave details of those archives which had not paid the 1982 subscriptions:

##### MEMBERS: 6

Istanbul (2 years), Madrid, Mexico UNAM, Rio de Janeiro, Washington Library of Congress, Warsaw

##### OBSERVERS: 6

Bois d'Arcy, Bogota, Brazzaville, Caracas (2 years), La Paz, Lima

Reminders had been sent out from Brussels in September, January and May. Warsaw had explained their situation and would be paying later. Following Istanbul's cable that 1983 was paid, they would be advised that the sum would be set against 1981, the earliest year outstanding.

In response to a question about voting rights, Mr DAUDELIN referred to Article 36 which indicated voting rights were valid if subscriptions had been paid up to and including the last financial year. Mr FRANCIS asked for clarification of the cut-off point as some archives might bring the money with them; Mr DAUDELIN confirmed the cut-off point was the opening of the first day of the Congree when voting rights were confirmed.

Mr ALVES-NETTO reported that in his country the Film Institute often paid bills one or two years late and there were similar delays in Mexico. It would be easier if they could pay in their own currency. Most Latin American countries had difficulties in exporting money but, when archive staff travelled abroad, they could bring some out and pay gradually.

Mr FRANCIS referred to Article 79 and the possibility of an extended period for paying subscriptions but it was pointed out by MM TOEPLITZ and DAUDELIN that the Treasurer could extend "in exceptional circumstances" only to the end of December in the year the subscription was due. Beyond that, the decision passed to the EC and, if the EC thought fit, the GM.

Mrs WIBOM suggested a note should be included with the subscription reminders asking archives to advise the Treasurer if they had difficulties. It was not reasonable to expect the Treasurer to grant an extension if the archive supplied no information.

#### DECISIONS

The EC to delegate to the Treasurer the responsibility of meeting with the archives concerned and deciding whether a further extension was justified. The Treasurer to make a statement at the GM about the need to pay on time or to submit a written request for extension within the first six months of each financial year.

The Accounts for 1983 to date and the draft Budget for 1984, with comparative figures for 1982 (actual) and 1983 (budgeted) were reviewed and various minor questions answered.

Mr FRANCIS suggested we might be in danger of paying out money faster than it was coming in via subscriptions and suggested the Treasurer should mention this to the GM as a further encouragement to faster settlement.

Mr STROCHKOV joined the meeting at this point.

## 6 EXAMINATION OF MAIN POINTS OF GENERAL MEETING AGENDA

The numbers below refer to the items on the General Meeting Agenda which were discussed.

### 6.1 Official Opening

Mrs WIBOM described the arrangements for the Opening and indicated who would be present. There would be no formally established seating arrangements but there would be an opportunity for all to identify themselves as there were so many new faces. A full list of delegates and visitors would be available.

### 6.5 Report of the President on behalf of the EC

In response to Mr KLAUE's request for comments on the 13 page draft Report, Mrs BOWSER felt there should be a clear separation into two parts, that is, FIAF member activities and EC activities.

She felt the Report was too long and would prefer to see the first part deleted; Mr FRANCIS agreed as the information could be obtained from the Members' Annual Reports: as it stood, the statistics were misleading as a number of the Members' reports were missing. He felt it was important for the President's Report to give members information on how the EC spent its time on their behalf.

Mr TOEPLITZ and Mr KULA disagreed as they found the analysis interesting; Mr KULA felt that many members would not bother to do the analysis for themselves and it was therefore valuable as long as the fact that the data was incomplete was indicated.

Mr KLAUE agreed with these comments and suggested the next EC could be asked to define the statistics the Federation would like to collect and perhaps prepare a list of items to be included routinely in Members' Reports. This would make the Reports easier to read and analyse for trends and would be more informative than now. Mr KULA supported the idea of a single page checklist for Members' Reports.

Mr CINCOITI thought the first part was the best ever but agreed more prominence and details should be given on EC activities. For this year, it was agreed that both parts were interesting and useful and would be retained but with a clear distinction between the two.

In a page by page review of the draft it was suggested that mention should be made of:

- Symposium Organising Committee & value of outsiders' views (Mrs WIBOM)
- Additional regional seminar in Latin America (Mr ALVES-NETTO)
- Need to avoid late payment of subscriptions (Mrs BOWSER)
- High cost of conference organisation (Mr FRANCIS)
- Bulletin & request for more contributions (MM DAUDELIN/DE VAAL)
- Items discussed at length by EC
  - eg sale of prints, Article 104, participation of Commission Heads
- Items expected for Open Forum (Mrs BOWSER)
- PIP and FIAF publications: appeal for publicity

#### DECISION

Mr KLAUE to amend with stylistic support from Mrs BOWSER.

#### 6.6 Report of the Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU invited comments on his draft Report and the following points were discussed:

##### a Preservation Manual

On the question of updating, Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that two copies of the manuscript were already with UNESCO and as far as they were concerned, it was routine updating. Mr TOEPLITZ stressed that all documents needed updating but it was necessary to make a cut-off point.

Mr KLAUE stressed the importance of a dialogue between Mr SCHOU and Mr VOLKMANN concerning possible changes to the manuscript to ensure that the latter was aware that FIAF was respecting and appreciating his contributions.

Mr FRANCIS asked that a few moments should be spent at the second Stockholm EC meeting reviewing the quotation from Focal Press in case UNESCO were unable to guarantee publication within a reasonable period.

##### b Report from Mr VOLKMANN "on behalf of the Preservation Commission"

The EC considered how to handle this unsolicited Report and Mr DAUDELIN suggested it should be included in the Historical Section of the next Bulletin under the heading "The first twenty-five years of the Preservation Commission" as a personal document from Mr VOLKMANN.

##### c New Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU reported that he had a working group of 6 people including himself and had satisfied himself that all had the necessary drive, energy and time. He hoped to reschedule his planned visit to Gosfilmofond.

MR KLAUE asked that after the first meeting of the new Commission M SCHOU should make available to the EC a detailed working programme with indications of objectives and timescales. The new EC should have the opportunity for a dialogue with the new Commission.

## 6.7 Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Mrs HARRISON as Head of the Commission asked the EC to review two Reports, one for the General Meeting and one for the EC (see Annex 2).

The Report for the General Meeting was accepted without change. Three items from the Report for the EC were discussed at length:

### a Item 2: Centralised Catalog of FIAF Member Holdings

The purpose of the Catalogue was to assist in identification of films in order to avoid duplication of preservation resources; it was not intended to be used for programming or initiating requests for exchanges. Mrs HARRISON stressed the outline format was only provisional and suggestions from the EC were welcomed.

The main discussion concerned the supply of information and the need to keep it to the minimum needed for identification in order to reduce the burden on the contributing archives.

The following suggestions were made:

- Longer introductory document indicating how much information was required.
- Possible restriction of scale of project to:
  - sound films only (Mr KLAUE)
  - films made outside one's own country (Mr FRANCIS)
  - both the above (Mr KULA)
- Use of machine-readable forms for possible future input (Mr FRANCIS)
- Submission of entire catalogue instead of forms (Mr KULA)

Mr KULA said that early sound films were becoming a source of anxiety for all concerned with preservation and it would be particularly useful to have information on examples of national product held elsewhere. Mrs HARRISON mentioned that archives without country indexing might have difficulty identifying non-national material.

### DECISION

Mrs HARRISON to present the written proposal together with verbal report on some of the discussions in the Commission and the EC, inviting comment from the GM.

### b Item 3a: New Projects: Cataloguing Pamphlet

Mrs HARRISON reported that the proposal for an introductory pamphlet to be published in different languages had been originated by Dorothea Gebauer of Wiesbaden as most cataloguing documentation was in English only.

Mrs BOWSER supported the proposal but felt it would be useful to have a pamphlet in English as well as many people failed to appreciate the importance of cataloguing and the need for skilled interpretation of data.

Mr KLAUE hoped a draft could be presented to the EC early in 1984 although the deadline should be at the Commission's discretion.

### c Item 3b: New Projects: Unidentified Films

There was continued interest in workshops to try and identify films. Mr FRANCIS felt it might be useful to make video copies but Mrs BOWSER felt there was no possibility of working without the film itself.

It was hoped that the Identification Workshop planned for the 1985 New York Congress would lay the foundations for identification methodology.

#### DECISION

Mrs HARRISON to mention the matter in Open Forum.

#### 6.8 Report of the Documentation Commission

Mrs STAYKOVA presented the written report prepared for the GM and added information concerning subsequent developments:

a Item I.1: Microfiche service of PIP

The service began in March as scheduled and was progressing smoothly with the third monthly batch ready to go out.

b Item I.4: Microfiche of first 10 years

They had required 133 instead of the estimated 87 microfiches so two or three extra buyers would be needed to cover costs. Plastic folders would be available at £12 for the 3 binders.

c Item I.2 & 3: Film & TV Volumes

Mrs STAYKOVA reiterated her thanks to MOMA and AFI for their support. The AFI had now undertaken to promote the first TV Volume (copy shown to the EC). Production of the 81/82 volume at the end of 1983 was subject to availability of a grant or loan.

d Item I.5: Promotion

Mrs STAYKOVA regretted the Report did not mention the £1000 promised by FIAF for 1983: she had mistakenly thought it had to be approved by the GM. Four leaflets had already been mailed to 800 key institutions and the FIAF money would be used for producing and mailing better quality brochures to the same 800 and a further 1000 addressees.

All publications would be on display during the Congress and she would be encouraging participants to place orders for them, paying in advance if more convenient.

e Item I.6: Meetings of PIP Indexers

Mrs STAYKOVA thanked Mr KULA for hosting the May meeting in Ottawa of 7 indexers and mentioned that she would appeal to archives to send their indexers to the October workshop in Berlin.

f Item I.7: Budget

The Budget would be discussed with the Supporters only but a copy would be distributed to all members.

g Item IV: International Directory for Film & TV Documentation Sources

Mr KULA reported that FIAT would be happy to cooperate to ensure that some of the organisations omitted would be included in the new edition. All FIAF archives would be listed.

#### h Item V: Meetings

The joint meeting with the Cataloguing Commission was now scheduled to be held in Sofia immediately before the 1984 Vienna Congress. The Cataloguing Commission had already drafted a list of possible joint projects.

At the end of Mrs STAYKOVA's report, Mr CINCOTTI said there was a possibility that his archive could provide the loan for the next TV volume.

#### 6.9 Projects and Publications Underway

Reports were available for items 1 - 4, 6, 7 and 9. No information was available from UNAM on item 10 and Mr KLAUE would report on item 11. The other items were discussed as below:

##### a Item 5: 9.5 mm Encyclopedia

Mr FRANCIS had brought a video cassette of the two authors at home being interviewed about the project together with a 3 minute film of the Pathe 9.5mm factory in action, which he hoped could be shown to members. Unfortunately, the technical facilities in the GM room were not suitable so he would be preparing a written statement.

The Budget was virtually unchanged. As the US contributor had volunteered his services free, it was hoped to use the \$500 for the authors to visit the newly discovered catalogues in France (Mr Olivier, Chateau-Thierry). Apart from the possible inclusion of new titles from this source, the publication was ready except for the Introduction which could only be prepared once the sponsoring organisation was identified.

The main problem was financing the publication. Mr FRANCIS suggested that £25 was a realistic price per copy which would attract the individual enthusiast as well as organisations. He thought it would be possible to obtain 400 pre-publication orders but not the full 1000 used to estimate printing costs. He would not like to solicit orders "on spec" and then fail to publish as this would be damaging for FIAF.

Mr FRANCIS spoke very strongly in favour of FIAF risking some money to subsidise this publication as he felt it would provide important knowledge about the world's cinematic heritage. A number of films had been made in 9.5 mm only and some shortened versions of longer films were valuable sources of information, particularly as 9.5 had always been on safety stock so had a high survival rate.

Mr TOEPLITZ agreed it was an important project and felt FIAF should be ready to risk some money on a market survey, either through direct approaches to 9.5 groups or through advertising. He asked how much money would be needed.

Mr FRANCIS replied that it would be difficult to estimate the market because of the difficulty of identifying potential buyers outside the 9.5 groups. A simpler solution might be to ask a publisher to share the risk with FIAF by offering a subsidy which would help cushion possible losses.

There was a lengthy discussion about alternatives and the difficulty of asking the GM for money when it was not certain if the project could go

ahead or how large the potential loss might be.

Referring to the publishing costs quoted at Madrid (page 31: 1,300,000 Belgian francs for 1000 copies), Mr FRANCIS pointed out that this included £500 promotion and £500 editing to FIAF standards which could perhaps be lost in other budgets (FIAF or BFI).

NOTE from transcriber of Minutes

Total Cost	£16,700	1,300,000 Belg fr for 1000 copies
LESS	10,000	400 sales at £25 (conservative estimate)
LESS	1,000	promotion/editing costs absorbed
At risk	5,700	covered by further 228 sales at £25

Sales above the first 628 copies would generate profit  
 If all 1000 copies sold, profit would be £9,300  
 (Authors' market estimate: 3000 copies).

Revenue if sold at £30 per copy:

400 copies	= £12,000	At risk	£3,700
600	= £18,000	Profit	£1,300
1000	= £30,000	Profit	£13,300

Mr DAUDELIN referred to page 33 of the Madrid Minutes to ask what other sources had been pursued: Mrs ORBANZ reported that Ligorni had been unable to help; Mr KLAUE asked for samples and photographs for the Munich publisher; it was not known if Mr BORDE had contacted CNC before his accident. Mr DE VAAL asked if the Gulbenkian Foundation had been approached.

The Treasurer reported that \$500 to 1,000 could be found from FIAF budgets (either Special Publications or Reserve Fund) for some market research, if required.

The Madrid Decisions were then amended as follows:

- Mr FRANCIS to make a verbal report at the GM, provide sample pages for each delegate and encourage them to view the video and film.
- The GM to be invited to approve that \$1000 be spent on a market survey on the understanding that the money would be lost if the project did not go ahead
- All members to be encouraged to identify possible buyers and potential sources of funding
- Mr KLAUE to try to interest the Munich publisher
- Mr FRANCIS to manage market research among collectors and clubs
- FIAF as an organisation to approach other national and international organisations for possible funding assistance.

b Item 9: International bibliography on the cinema (Bucharest)

Mr KLAUE reported that no information had been received from Rumania but their Annual Report mentioned work was continuing on the project.

DECISION

Mrs VAN DER ELST to copy relevant portion for reading out at the GM.



c Additional Projects

At this stage various items were raised by different members of the EC for mention under this item or Open Forum:

i PIP foreign language thesauri of subject headings

Mr DAUDELIN reported that at the indexers' meeting in Ottawa it had been agreed that the Cinematheque Quebecoise and the Cinematheque de Lausanne would cooperate to produce a French version. Mr MOULDS had discussed the project in Montreal with the CQ Librarian.

Mr ALVES-NETTO mentioned that the Portuguese version produced by Cinemateca Portuguesa was available.

ii Guidelines for shipping 35mm acetate film: Portuguese

Mrs BOWSER mentioned that the Cinemateca Portuguesa had produced a Portuguese version; file copies had been supplied to the Secretariat and members should be told of its availability.

iii World Film History Project (Bulgaria)

Mrs ORBANZ suggested that members of the GM should be advised that the World Film History Project had been abandoned. Other members, in particular Mr KLAUE and Mr DE VAAL, pointed out that it was already a closed project. If anyone asked about it, then the Bulgarian archive representative should be asked to comment.

Note from transcriber: see page 37 Madrid Minutes

iv Annual bibliography of members' publications (Ottawa)

Mr KULA mentioned that they planned to produce a complete retrospective of all films produced by archives using archive material including those produced for television.

DECISION

Include as item 9.12.

6.10 Future Congresses

i Vienna 1984

Mr KLAUE welcomed the representatives of the Austrian film archives and Mr BIENERT outlined their proposals:

- Dates

EC: arrive Tuesday April 3; meetings 4 & 5

GM: arrive Thursday 5; meetings 6 - 10; depart Wednesday 11

- Hotel & other costs

All participants would be housed in new central hotel, the Etape.

Rates for room, bath & breakfast \$40 and \$56 (single/double)

Meetings at the Hilton Hotel

The archives will pay for all EC meals; and for 2 lunches and 2 other functions for all participants. Participants to pay for all other meals during GM and Symposia. A hotel subsidy was offered to Eastern countries. It might be possible to provide staying costs, but not travel, for delegates from developing countries.

- Symposia

Filmarchiv: The beginning of film in Central Europe till 1914 (to include Austria, Germany, Italy, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland)

Filmmuseum: The preservation of non-industrial (independent) films

- Timings

The EC asked for the proposed timings to be extended to allow 17-18 hours for the EC and 7 hours per day for the GM.

- Budgets and Subsidies

The simultaneous translation estimate was 150,000 A.sch/400,000 Belg frcs. Mr BIENERT reported they had already received 800,000 A.sch and expected a further 400,000 in January 1984 to cover the total estimated (\$75,000). Mr KLAUE proposed that 370,000 Belg frcs should be made available to the organisers from FIAF funds; FIAF would also fund Mrs VAN DER ELST's travel and staying costs.

When asked what support was required from FIAF, Mr BIENERT mentioned that both archives would like help in identifying guests for the Symposia.

Mr KLAUE was concerned that one and a half days had been devoted to tourism which meant delegates would have the expense of staying longer but Mr BIENERT thought delegates would want to relax and see Vienna after the hard work of Stockholm.

Mr DAUDELIN asked that the archives should provide the GM with as much detail as possible about the Symposia.

Mr KLAUE closed the discussion by mentioning that the new EC should be advised to invite the Vienna representatives to the next EC meeting after Stockholm.

He noted that Dr SCHWANDA, from the Austrian Ministry of Education and Culture, would be at the Stockholm congress, which indicated how seriously the authorities viewed their country's hosting of the 40th Congress.

ii New York 1985

The EC reviewed in detail the 3 page progress report prepared by Mrs BOWSER. It was decided that official invitations should not be issued until next year but with a request for delegates to be nominated as soon as possible to give plenty of time for visa problems to be sorted out.

On a point of order, Mrs BOWSER was advised that her progress report was subject to EC approval only; at the GM she would simply be supplying information and answering any questions arising.

iii Australia 1986

The EC checked the Oaxtepec Congress Minutes (pages 24-26) which confirmed that the GM had unanimously approved that the Congress should be in

Australia, provided "substantial financial aid was available".

Mr TOEPLITZ who had organised the 1982 Film School Congress in Australia pointed out that a precedent had been set as the National Library had obtained government funding to pay the staying costs of all the delegates. He mentioned that although Qantas had promised substantial fare reductions they had failed to deliver to delegates had used cheaper airlines.

Mr FRANCIS thought it was important to get the fares question in perspective. For many countries it would be just as cheap to go to Australia, or cheaper, than it would be to come to Stockholm. Mr DAUDELIN supported this view, saying that several archives had not attended Mexico simply because they had not properly investigated alternative fare possibilities. Mr KULA noted that fares from Canada to Australia had dropped by 20% in the previous few months because of competition; he could have travelled to Australia for less than his return trip to Stockholm via Paris and Amsterdam.

#### DECISION

MR SCHOU to report back that the decision for 1986 was firm and that Mr EDMUNDSON should come to Vienna with detailed plans for all aspects of the Congress (using Mrs BOWSER's report for guidance).

iv 1987 +

Mrs ORBANZ said Berlin would be happy to be hosts in 1987 but were flexible if other candidates emerged.

Mr KULA asked if it would be possible to consider a Congress in Africa in 1988 that could be sponsored in part or in full by FIAF, UNESCO or some other organisation rather than a specific archive.

Mr DAUDELIN welcomed the idea and thought that in Tunisia (which had already organised a large African Film Festival) the authorities would be happy to have their country associated with a movement to stimulate archive activities in Africa, even though there was as yet no formal link with FIAF.

Mr KLAUE suggested it would be useful to sound out the idea both at the Stockholm meeting with the less developed countries and with UNESCO.

Prompted by Mr SCHOU, Mr FRANCIS confirmed that Mr KULA's proposal was the sort of thing he had in mind when he had suggested FIAF should endeavour to ensure funding for a Congress every 5 years or so in some part of the world that would not otherwise be covered. Mrs BOWSER agreed with the idea but felt it should not be a fixed rule.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that there had never been a Congress in Asia or South America (as opposed to Latin America).

#### DECISIONS

Mr DAUDELIN to ask for firm invitations for 1987.

The possibility of a 1988 Congress in Africa to be explored.

## 6.12 Relations with UNESCO

Mr KLAUE reported that Mr ARNALDO, Division for Development of Communication Systems, would represent UNESCO at Stockholm and be given the floor at the GM.

Mr KLAUE reported that he had eventually (28 February 1983) received a reply to his letter of 30 August 1982 from Mr J TOCATLIAN, Director of the General Information Programme (PGI). He felt it was important to pursue contacts with PGI, especially regarding the RAMP project, and quoted from the UNESCO 1984/85 draft budget point 3.6. Section 3 concerned "Communications in the service of man" and Section 6 included:

- \$30,000 for future orientated studies concerning preservation of audio-visual material
- \$116,000 for development of audio-visual archives and training of archivists.

The Group of 5 International Organisations would be discussing RAMP projects at their June 83 meeting.

Mr KULA stressed that RAMP covered all categories of archives, not just paper. He provided a copy of his own paper, produced under an ICA contract from UNESCO, to be published in English, French and Spanish in 1983/4; he asked for comments to be addressed to Mr Frank EVANS, PGI.

Arrangements were made for meetings with Mr ARNALDO (before the GM) and Mr NAIR (Poona Seminar).

### IPDC Programme

Mr FRANCIS reported on the UNESCO meeting held in Paris, February 1983 to discuss establishment of an international network for exchange of TV films and documentaries. The meeting had been organised by Mr ARNALDO and was opened by Mr BOLLA, Assistant Director General, responsible for the Communication Section. Participants were drawn from radio and TV broadcasting organisations, minor film producing organisations, distributors, archives (including FIAT) and researchers.

There were 3 major consultants:

- Dr ROADS, well-known to FIAF members; freelance consultant to UNESCO but recently appointed Head of the UK Institute of Recorded Sound
- Roland TRISCH, Director of the Leipzig Festival
- Rene BASSIER, International Radio and TV University; the main contributor.

The IPDC Programme (International Programme for Developing Communications) was a two-year programme covering 1983/84 but entry could be at any point. Projects could be proposed via national commissions and joint projects to bridge the gap between developed and developing countries were likely to be encouraged. Unfortunately the master document, code name C4, was available for consultation only at the national commissions.

The Conference and the Programme were not concerned with archiving matters but with setting up mechanisms for exchanges, primarily for TV programmes. They initiated the setting up of a world-wide directory of producers and

exchange centres. Mr Enric DE PEDRO had introduced the APEX programme, an exchange programme designed to serve 38 Asian countries.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that since that meeting he had been approached by Mr ARNALDO to provide bibliographic help with a small study on why the world film heritage is disappearing. He was not sure that FIAF could usefully contribute to the IPDC programme but in general felt that Mr ARNALDO was sympathetic to FIAF and wanted to arrange mutual cooperation.

Mr SCHOU mentioned that Mr LYNSKEY had a different impression of the meeting, particularly the APEX project which suggested they were concerned with establishing archives but at a "degraded" level.

Mrs WIBOM said that Mr ARNALDO had mentioned to her the possibility of a UNESCO archive for documentaries from Third World countries but it was obvious he had no budget as yet.

Mr FRANCIS said that UNESCO were finally addressing the question of archives and PGI and Communication Divisions had just had their first joint meeting on the subject; they both referred to "audio-visual" whereas Heritage Division talked only of "film". We should meet with Mr ARNALDO before considering further activity.

#### 6.13 Membership Questions

This would include discussion of Article 104, including Mr NAIR's comments. Mr DAUDELIN would formally announce the names of Observers admitted at Madrid.

#### 6.16 Open Forum

Delegates would be asked to submit topics in writing to simplify organisation.

7 1984 CONGRESS see item 6.10

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

#### 8.1 Meeting with FIAT

Mr KULA was asked to arrange final Symposium planning meeting. Mr DE VAAL suggested the two ECs should meet but other members felt this was not necessary and there was no time. They would however find time to discuss the Symposium together and prepare final joint Statement.

#### 8.2 Meeting of new EC

The Working Meeting was provisionally scheduled for June 2 with a brief meeting immediately after the elections to appoint Officers of the Federation.

There being no further business, Mr KLAUE closed the meeting two hours ahead of schedule. As it was the last meeting of the present EC, he formally thanked them for their contributions over their two years of office. All joined with him in thanking Mrs WIBOM for all her work as host