

# FI AF

## MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Paris, 29 - 31 May 1988

Members	Anna-Lena WIBOM	President
	Guido CINCOTTI	Secretary-General
	Raymond BORDE	Treasurer
	Wolfgang KLAUE	Vice President
	Hector GARCIA-MESA	Vice President
	Eva ORBANZ	Vice President
	Eileen BOWSER	
	Robert DAUDELIN	Deputy Secretary-General
	David FRANCIS	
	María Rita GALVAO	
	P K NAIR	
	Luis DE PINA	Deputy Treasurer
	Bob ROSEN	
Commission Heads	Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing
	Henning SCHOU	Preservation
	Michelle SNAPES	Documentation
	Michael MOULDS	Editor of PIP (for item ? only)
Executive Secretary		Brigitte VAN DER ELST
Interpreter & Minutes Secretary		Jill JOHNSON

## FINAL AGENDA

Item		Page
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Approval of the Minutes of the Havana Meeting	1
3	Report on Preparations for the Paris Congress	1
4	Membership Questions	
4.1	General discussion on membership of cinema museums and specialised collections	4
4.2	Observer candidates	
	a Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum	7
	b Jerusalem: Jewish Film Archives	9
	c Bogota: Fundacion Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano	11
	d Bologna: Cineteca Comunale	12
4.3	Reconfirmation of Members	
	a Ottawa: Moving Image & Sound Archives	14
	b Reconfirmations to be discussed in Montreal	15
4.4	Reconfirmation of Observers	
	a-c Cairo, Managua, Manila	15
4.5	Miscellaneous	
	a Cinémathèque Française	16
	b Other correspondence	17
5	Review of Agenda for the General Assembly	18
6	Any Other Business	
6.1	Documents prepared by Mr KLAUE	33
6.2	Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	34
6.3	Agenda for the second EC Meeting in Paris	35

# MINUTES

Mrs WIBOM, President, formally opened the meeting and was pleased that the entire EC was able to be present in Paris for the 50th Anniversary Congress. Later in the meeting, she conveyed warmest greetings from Mr LAURITZEN who was sad to miss the occasion but was unable to travel because of his wife's health; the EC sent him a card in greeting.

## 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was formally adopted.

## 2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE HAVANA MEETING

Mrs WIBOM warmly thanked Mr GARCIA MESA for the excellent arrangements he had made for the meeting in Havana.

The following corrections/comments were made:

- i page 24, 4.1 should refer to the US \$ (not the Swiss \$)
- ii page 55, 10.2 should refer to the artist Emile Cohl (not Col)
- iii page 35 Mr SCHOU mentioned that he had represented FIAF at the IASA conference in Amsterdam, June 1987.

Mrs WIBOM thanked Mrs VAN DER ELST and Ms JOHNSON for their work on the Minutes.

## 3 REPORT ON PREPARATIONS FOR THE PARIS CONGRESS

### Membership status of Cinémathèque Française

Mrs WIBOM opened with a reference to a letter received from Jean Rouch of the Cinémathèque Française in which they asked to be admitted as Founder Members. Mr DAUDELIN mentioned Rouch had raised the matter in a phone call and he had advised him to write formally; however, he felt it was certainly not appropriate to create a special category of membership for them.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned she had encouraged Mr Rouch to have the CF participate in the anniversary celebrations and they had finally responded by contributing to the preparations, providing staff and objects for the exhibition, organising relevant screenings and hosting a reception.

**Action:** MM CINCOTTI, DAUDELIN and BORDE to draft a reply for later decision by the EC in Paris.

### **Special Edition of VARIETY**

Mrs WIBOM reported that the edition contained some 36 pages on FIAF including some 17 pages of paid advertising. Variety staff had contacted archives all over the world and all costs had been covered by the advertising so FIAF's guarantee (120,000FF) was not required. FIAF had the option to purchase additional copies of the FIAF pages with a new cover, as follows:

1000 copies for 20,000 FF

5000 copies for 38,000 FF

**Decision:** After publication, at EC2.

Transcriber's note: Variety staff later said that articles which were not published because there was insufficient paid advertising could be included in the separate volume if required.

### **Livre d'Or: 50 ans d'archives du film**

Mrs VAN DER ELST described the final contents which presented a comprehensive overview of FIAF and its members. The book listed Thailand and Luxembourg as Members: the first was a mistake, the second was in anticipation of their approval by the GA in Paris.

2,000 copies had been printed with the help of sponsorship financing obtained by Mr SCHMITT. Free copies would be provided to member archives and to selected newspapers and cinema publications; additional copies would be sold by If Diffusion at 110 FF.

The design and general appearance of the book was greatly appreciated by the EC who expressed thanks to Mrs VAN DER ELST for her successful coordination of the project.

### **Press & Media Coverage of FIAF**

Mr BORDE mentioned that at the request of Variety he had contributed an article on the history of FIAF which he had called "De la méfiance à la confiance".

(Translated by Variety as

"Archivists and the Industry aren't always in step, but they're learning to tango")

He had also contributed a long article to Positif.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that two long programmes about archives had been made for French television (FR3) and transmitted on May 12 and 26. Video cassettes would be available.

### **Participation at Congress**

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned there would be very few absences:

2 Members: Tirana (reason not known) and  
Bruxelles (Mr Ledoux seriously ill)

7 Observers: Cairo, Dhaka, Hanoi, Jakarta, Manila, Montevideo, Perth

Mr POGACIC suggested a message should be sent to Mr Ledoux and Mrs WIBOM reported he had been awarded the prestigious Erasmus Prize (previous recipients: Buber, Jaspers, Henry Moore, Chagall; only award for cinema in 1965 jointly to Chaplin & Bergmann). Mr Hubert Baals of the Rotterdam Film Festival had nominated him and she had suggested they should mark the occasion in October with a new ballet in his honour by Maurice Béjart (a favourite of Ledoux's), complemented by a film programme chosen for him by FIAF archives.

**Action:** Suggestions to Mrs WIBOM by July 1.

### **Review of Congress Timetable and Arrangements**

With the arrival of Mr SCHMITT of Bois d'Arcy, the EC reviewed the arrangements for the Congress, the official opening and the opening of the Exhibitions.

All the main events were to be held at the Musée d'Orsay: the GA and the Symposium (in the auditorium), the evening cocktail (to be attended by the Minister of Culture, Jack Lang) and the exhibitions.

Other activities included:

- receptions offered by Madame Malthête-Méliès (on a boat, with buffet, magician, music and film show) and the Cinémathèque Française (buffet, museum Henri Langlois and film show at the Palais de Chaillot)
- visit to Bois d'Arcy archive (afternoon, day 2 of Symposium)
- special issue of the Bulletin
- André Gaudréault presentation of films illustrating his research at Laval (day 3 aft of Symposium: 1/2 hour)
- excursion to Versailles (or EC2 meeting) & lunch at Joinville (Sun, June 5)
- Unesco Round Table on Survey on 1980 Recommendation (Mon, June 6) (following 2 years' work coordinated by Mr KLAUE with help from the Secretariat; the meeting was to consider the report and the implications for Unesco's long-term plans)
- ad hoc meetings: PIP Supporters; Lisbon Conference working group.

Mrs WIBOM asked for volunteers to review/edit the draft President's Report she had prepared. It was agreed that she and Mr DE PINA would meet with CNC and Musée d'Orsay to check final arrangements, particularly who was to be present at the Opening and during the President's Report.

### Day 3

Mrs WIBOM reported on the meeting with Madame Boussière, Public Relations CNC and someone from the Musée d'Orsay. At the GA there would just be one representative from CNC and probably one from the Musée d'Orsay. For the

French, the big occasion was the evening Reception at which they expected some 600 people, half from FIAF, CNC and film personalities and half other cultural personalities, press, radio and TV journalists. They were still not sure if Jack Lang, the Minister of Culture would attend.

The Press Officer had advised against a special press conference or invitation to the opening of the GA. However, 400 press kits had already been distributed and she had been in touch with numerous publications many of which were already planning to publish something. French TV did not come to film ministers saluting gatherings of this kind.

#### **Other events associated with the 50th Celebrations**

Mr BORDE reported on the programme on the theme "Du passage du muet au parlant", prepared for the Avignon Festival in July, comprising 50 films in 35 sessions and 5 Round Table discussions, together with a 120-page catalogue which would be available at the end of June. He thanked the 18 FIAF archives which had contributed to the programme.

## **4 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS**

### **4.1 General discussion on membership of cinema museums and specialised collections**

Mr FRANCIS regretted that he and Mrs ORBANZ had not yet had a chance to meet with Mr ROSEN, the third member of the Working Group.

Mr FRANCIS began by recalling that at the formal level there was no specific problem with regard to cinema museums: they could be admitted like any other organisation if they complied with the "preservation" requirements and, as there was no requirement for Members to exchange or provide films to Observers, it was up to individual Members to deal with each Observer as they chose. However, as there were so many cinema museums being established, the Working Group had been charged with considering the possible implications for FIAF's future membership policy. Even though a separate organisation for film museums was likely to be set up shortly, with European if not international coverage, he thought that a number of film museums would also want to join FIAF to obtain more ready access to first class copies of films for presentation purposes.

He and Mrs ORBANZ suggested that, rather than taking each application case by case within the EC, under the present Rules, it was time to stand back and take a more philosophical, long-term approach on how FIAF might and should

develop. They thought it would be useful to have a small ad hoc Membership Commission of say 5 or 6 people, meeting 3 or 4 times during 1988/1989, in order to prepare a position paper for open discussion during the Lisbon Congress. This would include suggestions for possible policies for the future general expansion of FIAF, taking into account the probably significant expansion of groups like film museums with special interests wanting to join FIAF. They could try to forecast the possible composition of FIAF over the next 50 years, perhaps with sub-groups representing different specialities of Observer members (programming, preservation, documentation, cinema museums, etc).

They stressed that their underlying belief was to provide a framework whereby FIAF could be opened up as far as possible to bring help and support to all who needed it rather than remaining closed to all except those who already had the resources and knowhow to meet FIAF's high standards.

Mr ROSEN noted that under the present Statutes the net was quite wide as candidates could become Observers provided "preservation was one of their objectives". The relationship between archives and museums was complicated as it was both cooperative (shared cultural and intellectual concerns; possibility for museums to promote need for preservation through their own exhibitions; own film holdings needing preservation) and competitive (relationships with donors and depositors; issues of government and funding; access to films for programming). He felt they should confine themselves at present to perhaps just 3 recommendations:

- set up formal link with the new museums organisation because of the numerous common issues
- keep on annual agenda (Open Forum?) time for specific questions on the relationships with museums
- take a longer term view of FIAF's membership composition.

Mr NAIR suggested that as film archives were already too busy trying to preserve film, they should welcome the arrival of the film museums which were springing up to fill a gap and take care of the preservation and display of film-related artefacts which required a different expertise. FIAF should support and encourage them and give them access to its film preservation expertise. He also suggested that, although FIAF's priority was concern for the preservation of national collections, it should nevertheless welcome and encourage organisations with other collections, including those holding foreign films shown in the country or other specialised collections.

Mr KLAUE reported that the European film museums would be meeting in Dusseldorf in early December with the intention of setting up their own organisation. They had invited existing international organisations (eg ICOM,

FIAF and FIAT) to send representatives to contribute to the discussion on their attitude to the proposed organisation and the possibilities for cooperation. He agreed that FIAF should not give the impression it was a "closed" organisation but they should welcome museums within the terms of their existing statutes and rules, in particular that they were engaged in film preservation work. They could also of course be admitted as Subscribers.

He agreed FIAF should consider its longer term policies, perhaps also deciding whether it was time to decentralise to enable organisations to participate in more activities at regional level. He felt the discussion should not be extended to the full membership until the EC had discussed specific proposals from the Working Group.

Mrs WIBOM suggested it was important to set a time limit as they could not hold applicants at bay indefinitely. In setting the time scale, it was felt changes to FIAF membership could not be finalised so quickly but they could certainly discuss the cultural role and possible implications for FIAF in time to have an open discussion in Lisbon in April 1989.

Mrs WIBOM asked if it might also be possible to discuss FIAF's membership status within Unesco and the possibility to get more support for archiving generally. She recalled that FIAF could not help developing archives without Unesco support and yet archiving was not even mentioned in the new Unesco long-term programme, although Mr KLAUE suggested there might be possibilities to influence the programme following the Round Table on June 6.

On the composition of the Working Group, Mr FRANCIS said they wanted to include Mr LEDOUX and Mr MONTY to represent as wide a range of viewpoints as possible. Mrs ORBANZ pointed out that they would need funds to help support their travel and meetings (see later, 5/GA6 Financial Report). It was agreed the Group should be appointed for one year at a time and they should elect a Chairman as soon as possible.

**Action:**

- Mr KLAUE, Mr FRANCIS and Mr Luis DE PINA, planning to attend the Dusseldorf meeting anyway, would represent FIAF.
- Working Group to meet and present proposals for discussion by EC and subsequently in open discussion in Lisbon, April 1989.



## 4.2 Observer Candidates

### 4.2a Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum

Mr CINCOTTI referred to their letter of 23 March in response to the EC request for clarification on the 3 points below.

- links with other archives and the Deutscher Kinemathekenverbund

The signed letter of cooperation was enclosed, together with an intention in the letter to participate more actively in the DKV.

- details of the collections

the list of 2000 films would be made available; nitrate films were sent to Koblenz.

- information on the budget and the proportion spent on preservation

Budget figures were supplied, from which it seemed only 3.1% (30,000 out of total 900,000 DM) was allocated to "preservation of collection" and a further 135,000 DM, 15%, to "purchasing of machines".

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr Jürgen Berger from the archive would be available to meet the EC in Paris the next day if required.

Mrs ORBANZ reported that she had made a point of visiting the archive since the last EC meeting. She had seen the new vaults but understood that of the 2000 films, nearly all were prints, with less than 1% negatives. There was simply not enough money to do preservation: they had just one person responsible for the collection, including administration of the lending activities both for the cinema and for outside users.

Mr FRANCIS queried the "restoration" of the Prince Achmed film mentioned in the letter: as far as he understood, they had simply taken a copy of the UK negative and provided a musical score for performance.

Further discussion was postponed until the arrival of Mr Berger.

### Day 3

Mr Jürgen Berger was invited to join the EC meeting for questions. Meanwhile the list of films had been provided to the Secretariat and was circulated around the table.

Several members of the EC sought clarification on the amount of preservation that was being done or planned by the archive, as this was a fundamental task of archives admitted to FIAF.

In response to Mr FRANCIS, Mr Berger explained that the "restoration" of the Adventures of Prince Akmed had included the provision of musical score for

orchestral accompaniment and new intertitles but no restoration of the image. Mr CINCOTTI asked if their only interest was in projection copies and Mr KLAUE suggested the budget allocation to preservation seemed relatively small, especially as it included work on other museum items besides film.

In describing restoration projects, Mr Berger referred particularly to the fact that they were working closely with Marcel Ophuls in getting his films restored; some documentaries had only previously been screened in cut versions; all feature documentaries restored in original language with subtitles and held in their archive. They also kept the Oskar Fischinger's negatives and nitrate negatives, donated by Frieda Fischinger.

In addition, they had a number of unexamined nitrate films from 1910-20 for which they hoped to be able to make preservation and viewing prints. He mentioned that although the list of films provided included many viewing prints, about 50-60% of the items were still not catalogued and they hoped to find some more interesting films that could be preserved and have film prints made available in the future.

He confirmed that the budget for film preservation and archiving activities would be increased. Previously the films had been held in air conditioned vaults in the basement but now they had new vaults providing some 1000 square metres for colour and black and white outside the museum.

Several EC members were interested in why they wanted to join FIAF and asked about the extent of their cooperation with other German archives, particularly through the Deutscher Kinemathekenverbund. To Mrs BOWSER, he said they had hitherto worked on a bilateral basis but hoped to contribute to FIAF as a whole. To Mr NAIR, he confirmed that they did discuss intended preservation work with other archives to avoid duplication. To Mr DAUDELIN who referred to his letter of March 23 acknowledging lack of active interaction with the Verbund, he implied it was not useful.

In response to Mr DE PINA asking about their Documentation Centre, he referred to the large library of books (some 60,000 titles), magazines, posters, stills etc, within the associated organisation, the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde, which was open to the public as a study centre.

In response to Mr FRANCIS, he explained that the sums for machine purchase covered devices for electronic screening and fault detection for checking 16 and 35 mm; they already had machines for other formats and viewing machines.

The discussion continued in his absence.

Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that they never attended the Kinematekenverbund where the German archives decided priorities for purchase and restoration so it was not surprising he did not find it useful. All members had the same rights but Frankfurt, like Dusseldorf and Munich, were co-opted members because their federal states had made no contribution.

In response to Mr DAUDELIN, Mrs ORBANZ felt they did not qualify as they were really simply a museum, not concerned with film preservation, except incidentally. She had not been aware they had some many unidentified films but understood the collection was primarily prints of films already held elsewhere.

Mrs BOWSER recalled that traditionally they had applied the Rules differently in countries where there was no other activity and they wanted to encourage something. This would not be appropriate in a country like Germany where there was a lot of archival activity already. Mrs VAN DER ELST asked what Alger and several other Observers did that was different from Frankfurt's position. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that many had no nitrate to work on.

Mr KLAUE agreed that they had given many archives the chance to develop within FIAF though not qualified when adopted as Observers and they should try to apply the rules impartially. In this case, there was a collection, some preservation activity and a promise to extend it. The fact of providing good storage conditions was surely part of preservation. They were certainly not qualified to become Members but he felt they should be encouraged as Observers. Mr CINCOTTI agreed that they had a sincere and serious interest and there was no basis in the Rules for excluding them.

**Decision:** Voting by show of hands indicated 11 in favour, nil against and 2 abstentions.

In conveying the decision to Mr Berger, Mrs WIBOM said FIAF's letter of confirmation would formally encourage them to cooperate more actively with the Verbund and develop a preservation programme.

#### **4.2b Jerusalem: Jewish Film Archives**

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that discussion had been postponed at the last meeting because the dossier lacked the agreement letter from the existing archive.

The existing Member had written (February 1, 1988) suggesting the candidate should become a Subscriber, pointing out that the collection was very specialised and that "they do not preserve Israeli cinema". They also had a further letter from the candidate, confirming they had met the existing Member on March 15, heard the suggestion they should be Subscribers but not

received copy of the February 1 letter. In support of their candidature as Observers, they claimed that

- they held "the largest collection of documentary films related to the Jewish/Israeli experience in the 20th century",
- it was a " 'national' collection as we are the official depository of those pre-State organisations...." and
- "The Archive's major work is the preservation and documentation of Israel's documentary film heritage and history".

They enclosed a letter of support from the President of the Hebrew University (March 30), mentioning in particular the University's "full support to this institution", in particular in international fund-raising "for the preservation and documentation of this national film heritage".

In the discussion, several points were raised:

a Article 3: commercial use of collection

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned it seemed they were similar to the Istituto Luce in Italy, a state organisation which held and hired out Italian newsreels, but was not eligible to join FIAF. Mr BORDE suggested they excluded themselves as the collection was being used to generate revenue from TV. Mr ROSEN, Mr FRANCIS and Mr CINCOTTI all disagreed and stressed that the wording of Article 3 (which had been left unchanged in the recent revisions) only restricted generation of funds for private profit; it did not restrict activities which raised money to be used for the benefit of the collection.

b Rule 13: Agreement of existing Member

Mr NAIR felt they should obtain more information on the situation and the extent of overlap between their activities, and not necessarily accept the opinion of the existing Member. Mr KLAUE agreed that Rule 13 provided for a candidate to be accepted without the agreement of the existing Member but he and Mrs BOWSER both stressed that the Federation needed to be very sure it had a true understanding of the situation before risking antagonising the existing Member. Mr FRANCIS felt they had a duty to seriously consider all candidates, including those opposed by an existing Member: one practical way to clarify the situation would be to examine the exact nature of the collection.

c Nature of the collection

In view of the contradictory statements from the two archives, it was agreed that the obvious solution was to await the list of films to see the extent to which the candidate's holdings were unique or whether they were simply prints of material already held elsewhere, for instance by the existing Member.

d Preservation activities

Mrs ORBANZ pointed out that in the Questionnaire responses there seemed to be no money spent specifically on preservation. Mr FRANCIS confirmed that the UK laboratory Henderson's was certainly in process of transferring nitrate films to safety stock for them. However, no-one was clear whether there was any preservation programme or whether this was a one-off project (thanks to the gift of \$50,000 mentioned in the President's letter).

e Legal status and Autonomy

Mr KLAUE asked if the Archive had any independent legal existence. There seemed to be involvement of the World Zionist Organisation, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Institute of Contemporary Jewry and the University's Faculty of Humanities but he could not see which of these wanted to become the FIAF Observer. He felt it important to see the legal documents setting up the archive which would clarify the situation and in particular define the archive's purpose.

**Decision:** Mrs VAN DER ELST, with the help of the Secretary General and/or the Deputy Secretary-General, to write explaining a decision could still not be made because the following questions were still unanswered (c-e above):

- the legal status and autonomy of the archive in relation to other bodies,
- the exact nature of the collection (was it really unique or simply prints held elsewhere)
- the budget being devoted to preservation and information on the preservation programme (apart from the one-off Henderson project).

**4.2c Bogota: Fundacion Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano**

Both archives had replied to the identical questionnaires prepared following the meeting in Cuba. Mr CINCOTTI noted that the situation still seemed confused and it was not clear whether there was any justification for having both archives within FIAF and, if not, which one it should be. However, for the present, they were only concerned with the Fundacion and Mrs Triana's letter of April 19.

Mrs GALVAO reported that she had visited Colombia and confirmed that the Fundacion was very definitely engaged in archive activities: it had some 6000 films already, was campaigning actively for funds to build new vaults, was working with US help to restore films, was engaged in historical research and was funding preservation, documentation and cataloguing activities with revenue earned from exhibiting films in a very fine cinema which they had recently purchased. For legal reasons to do with the municipality of Bogota, it seemed that the Distrital collection (of some 500 films) would not after all be transferred to the Fundacion. She said that Mrs Triana had a wonderful

capacity for raising funds for archive work and was also an excellent Curator from the technical point of view. She felt the Fundacion should certainly be welcomed to FIAF.

The Cinemateca Distrital remained as it was although the new Curator did not have the same personality, power and political support as Mrs Triana. As part of the municipality, they were subject to more bureaucratic constraints than the newly created private Fundacion.

Mr GARCIA MESA supported Mrs GALVAO's report which they had discussed together; they felt both archives could belong within FIAF. Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mrs Triana's visit to the Paris Congress was funded by Unesco who had invited her to the Round Table.

Mr FRANCIS was unhappy to note that the byelaws referring to the functions and areas of responsibility of the two archives were overlapping and this would surely create problems. Mr DAUDELIN felt this was explained by the statement that there was "no legal restriction which prevents natural persons or entities from forming film archives". Mrs GALVAO mentioned that the two archives in Brazil also had the same objectives and saw no problem. Mrs WIBOM felt FIAF should not meddle in a national situation and they were both qualified.

Mr NAIR was concerned that the agreement between the two archives had not been signed and at the idea that a private collection might be forcibly taken over by the state with no guarantee that the films would be properly protected. However, it was pointed out that this was a private matter between the archives and FIAF itself required no agreement of cooperation between Observers.

**Decision:** By show of hands: 13 in favour, none against, 1 abstention.

#### **4.2d Bologna: Cineteca Comunale**

Mr CINCOTTI reported they had just received an application from one of the many local archives in Italy, many of which were merely cine clubs concerned only with the cultural aspects of projecting films, in some cases mixed with commerce and politics. Some of them wanted to join FIAF for reasons of prestige but also for easier access to films, perhaps by-passing the need to ask the national members for permission to obtain films from abroad.

Bologna was probably the oldest established, the best organised and the largest. Their dossier met all the conditions required by FIAF except that they were only just beginning to do something on the preservation side and

planned to build vaults. They had considerable achievements in organising congress, symposia and historical and political research activities and their work was serious and ambitious. They had not yet obtained formal agreement from the existing Member archives but he did not think there would be any objection except perhaps from Milan because of cases where Bologna had negotiated with foreign archives without prior permission.

However, if FIAF accepted Bologna, he feared this might be the signal for a deluge of applications from organisations throughout Italy which were far less qualified to join.

Mr BORDE shared the same fear for France and suspected the situation was similar in Spain. He understood there were some 30 similar organisations in Italy and 11 in Spain, which had emerged partly because of administrative decentralisation with major budgets controlled at regional level. In France, they hoped to control the situation by inviting the local organisations to affiliate themselves to the nearest FIAF archive; for example, Montpellier was attached to Toulouse, Brittany attached to Bois d'Arcy.

Mr DE PINA reported that Porto and Madeira in Portugal wanted to set up as "archives" so that they would have access to the international programmes which were shown in Lisbon but they were not interested in doing any of the preservation or other activities associated with an archive. He supposed the situation was the same in the three other countries.

Mr KLAUE recalled that FIAF required that Member archives worked at national level which he felt provided a tool against the explosion of local archives. They should continue to study the desirable composition of FIAF's membership in the future but for the moment consider each case on its merits.

Mr FRANCIS was very concerned and wondered whether they should immediately postpone consideration of all new applications until FIAF had redefined its policy. He felt they were making judgments too subjectively. Mr ROSEN had been studying the statutes and felt there were certainly problems; for instance, in the USA there were many regional archives which served national interests and this might well be the case elsewhere.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested they should reply to Bologna that FIAF had just set up a Working Group to re-define its membership policy, with particular reference to candidate organisations with film holdings which did not yet meet its preservation requirements. In the meantime they should recommend them to cooperate closely with the existing FIAF members.

Mr CINCOTTI accepted this solution although he had been ready to accept

Bologna subject to the signing of the cooperation agreement; as they were coming to Paris for the Symposium, they could have liaised with the three existing archives to obtain the necessary signatures. Mr DAUDELIN admitted that, if FIAF refused or attempted to delay Bologna, they would find it difficult to justify why they had admitted Wisconsin, except that this was an example of the now urgent need to set up the Working Group.

Mrs WIBOM pointed out that, on the face of it, Milan, one of FIAF's earliest Members, could be classified as a regional archive; similarly Toulouse might be seen to an outsider as only regional and her own archive had certainly not been nationally recognised for its first 40 years.

Mr BORDE explained that when Toulouse became a full Member of FIAF, it was the only French member (as the Cinémathèque Française had already resigned) and was immediately accepted as the French representative worldwide; it was funded from the national budget in the same way as the Cinémathèque Française and the Cannes Festival, recognised by the state since 1971, and was currently involved in 15 events throughout France.

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that in Italy many regional archives also had state subsidies to encourage their regional activities (research and acquisition of regional documents and films).

Mrs WIBOM suggested that in the meantime all the waiting candidates could be invited to become Subscribers. Mrs BOWSER was not happy that such an invitation be offered to all-comers, in particular not purely commercial organisations. Already "Subscribers" in the United States were boasting that they had become "Members" of FIAF and she was at a loss to know how to counteract that.

**Decision:** Mr CINCOTTI to write and explain decision had to be delayed until FIAF's Working Group on membership had reported.

## **4.3 Reconfirmation of Members**

### **4.3a Ottawa: Moving Image & Sound Archives**

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier and Mr DAUDELIN reported on some changes which had occurred since Mr KULA's absence on secondment to the Canadian Centre for Advanced Film Studies. Following administrative changes in the larger organisation, there was a certain loss of the autonomy that had been fought for and secured in the past (for instance, some staff had been redeployed to other divisions) but it was not a fundamental change affecting



the relationship with FIAF. In addition, it was unfortunate that the archive projections presented at the Canadian Film Institute, were now associated with two self-proclaimed "enemies of FIAF" as the Canadian Film Institute itself, run by Peter Morris, had recently merged with the Conservatoire d'Art Cinématographique in Montreal, run by Serge Losik, the "Canadian representative of Henri Langlois". During the Paris Congress, Mr DAUDELIN would discuss with Mrs Vosikova the implications for the future of the retrospective programmes, hitherto planned jointly by the two FIAF archives in Canada. He was concerned that films from other FIAF archives might be shown by Losik in Montreal outside the "archive" context and in direct competition with his own archive screenings. In addition, the new organisation might be competing with the two existing archives for national and regional fundings.

Mr BORDE agreed the situation was complicated and suggested discussion on the reconfirmation of Ottawa should be postponed till the EC meeting in Montreal but Mr DAUDELIN felt the situation in no way affected Ottawa's eligibility for reconfirmation.

**Decision:** Reconfirmed unanimously.

#### **4.3b Reconfirmations to be discussed in Montreal**

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the following 9 dossiers would be before the EC in Montreal: Bois d'Arcy, Athens, Rochester, Mexico (2), London, New York, Bruxelles, Kobenhavn.

### **4.4 Reconfirmation of Observers**

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that all Observers who had submitted their Annual Reports and paid their subscriptions could be routinely confirmed. There were 3 archives which required comment.

#### **4.4a Cairo**

The subscription remained unpaid for 1986 and 1987 so they would have to be advised that their Observership had automatically lapsed. Mr KLAUE asked that contact should be made via the Egyptian Embassy in Belgium to the new Minister of Culture and he wasn't sure if the archive still existed.

**Outcome:** Unconfirmed; letter as above inviting them to rejoin.

#### **4.4b Managua**

They were also behind but it was understood a representative, Rafael Vargas, would be coming to the Congress with the money and the outstanding Reports.

**Outcome:** Could be confirmed later.

#### 4.4c Manila

They had paid for one year of arrears (1986) and sent a Report but nothing for the Livre d'Or.

**Outcome:** Could be confirmed.

### 4.5 Miscellaneous

#### 4.5a Cinémathèque Française (see also Item 3, page 1)

Mrs WIBOM asked for help in compiling a letter in reply to Mr Jean Rouch which would show cordial appreciation of their contribution to the Anniversary but explain that they could not sidestep the Statutes as far as membership was concerned. The EC would review the dossier in November and take a decision which would be put before the GA in Lisbon.

#### 4.5b Other correspondence

Mr CINCOTTI invited Mrs VAN DER ELST to report on membership enquiries received since the December meeting:

1 South Africa

Copies of Mr CINCOTTI's letter, sent as agreed in Habana, would be circulated to the EC.

2 Washington: National Archive

William Murphy had been sent information and would be attending the Paris Congress. They were very keen to join.

3 Wellington: National Archive of Wellington, New Zealand

Clive Sowry, former representative of the New Zealand film archive.

4 Dar es Salaam: Audiovisual Institute

Mr Mbungira Said was ready to submit their dossier, subject to formal local approval.

5 National Archives of Zimbabwe

They had come to Stockholm and had a fairly well established archive.

6 Paris: Vidéothèque de Paris

Specialists in the Paris region and in video.

7 Les Archives de la Publicité

They had some 30,000 advertising films.

8 New York: Museum of Jewish Heritage

They would probably be happy to be Subscribers.

9 Paris: Musée National d'Art Moderne (Centre Georges Pompidou)

They had been reminded that they needed the agreement of the existing FIAF Members.

10 Lima: Fimoteca de Lima

Mr Isaac Leon Frias was very keen to join FIAF. Mrs GALVAO had recently visited Lima and reported that the Cinemateca de Lima no longer functioned

and its 120-200 films would probably be deposited with the Filmoteca de Lima which was cooperating with the Cinemateca Universitaria de Lima. They thought the only one likely to survive was the Filmoteca which had some private funding from the Banco de la Cultura as well as the Museum of the municipality to which it was attached. At present, they only had the very small municipal collection and a large projection theatre. The other two cinemathèques were founder members.

Other EC members contributed information as below:

11 Tokyo

Mrs BOWSER reported that Mr Maruo had retired and been succeeded by his former assistant who was interested to rejoin FIAF if he could influence the government authorities.

12 Bucharest

Mr KLAUE thought it would be helpful to write to the Roumanian Minister of Culture and express interest that the archive should rejoin as Observer. He was willing to draft the letter. They were in a very difficult situation, short of funds and had also lost staff as a result of their enforced move to the suburbs.

Mrs BOWSER mentioned that she had difficulties getting the touring show (social documentaries) returned to New York and had no response to correspondence.

**Action:** Mr KLAUE to write and try to obtain information for Mrs BOWSER.

13 Irish Film Archive

Mr FRANCIS reported his archive had been training two trainees from the embryo archive for 3 or 4 months and, as they had been unpaid, his archive had funded their trip to attend the Paris Congress. He asked if after meeting with them FIAF could give them some letter of support to the archive or some higher authority to help get the archive launched.

14 Torino: Museo Nazionale de Cinema

In reply to Mrs WIBOM, Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that Madame Prolo was still Honorary Director but there was a new President, Luciano Ventavoli, President of the Piemont Association of Cinema Owners. Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed that Madame Prolo would be coming to Paris with Amanzio Borio who works in the archive.

*End of Day 1*

## **5 REVIEW OF AGENDA FOR THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

### **GA1 Official Opening**

See item 3 page 3 and item 5, GA5 below.

### **GA2 Confirmation of Status and Voting Rights**

Mrs VAN DER ELST would read the archive names and check who was voting. It was confirmed that all full Members had paid the 1987 subscription and were thus eligible to vote.

### **GA3 Adoption of the Agenda**

The draft Agenda was agreed by the EC with item 14 being renamed "Open Forum" and some Reports brought forward to the First Session. Item 11 would be amended to include "New Projects" for this and future occasions.

Mrs ORBANZ and Mr FRANCIS were unhappy at the idea that the Commission Reports should be too short as their work was central to that of the Federation. Mr DAUDELIN suggested the Commission Reports should be split so that they were not all at the same time. Under item 12, Mr KLAUE asked if representatives from Unesco and the other NGO's were to be invited to address the Assembly but it was felt there would be no time.

It was agreed that the 3 sessions would be chaired by Mrs WIBOM, Mrs ORBANZ and Mr KLAUE respectively.

### **GA5 The President's Report on behalf of the EC**

(discussed out of sequence after GA8 and again on Day 3)

Mrs WIBOM's draft Report was circulated during the meeting and Mr DAUDELIN suggested they should postpone discussion till the next day so they could consider it overnight. He had expected something different for the 50th Anniversary and thought it might need rethinking.

Mrs WIBOM said she had drafted it on the assumption that there would be various visitors at the opening of the Congress, including the press. However CNC had not prepared anything for the formal opening, using the excuse six months ago that they did not know who the new Minister would be but they had still prepared nothing, even though the Minister had been appointed over 3 weeks ago. It seemed they had not thought to invite anyone which was rather surprising as previously they had claimed it was a very important occasion.

Mr FRANCIS thought the problem was that there was no host archive. CNC had provided the money but they were not the hosts. Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr SCHMITT had insisted repeatedly to the CNC that they should issue the

invitations as he had no authority to do it; he would have been happy to invite people like Alain Resnais, Carné, etc. Mr BORDE said they had had no cause for anxiety as Mr Auclair of CNC had repeatedly said that he would be responsible for the officials who would open the session.

It was decided to prepare the President's Report on the assumption that there would be no outsiders. Mr POGACIC thought it was important to stress the happy celebration aspect. Mr DE PINA felt it was important to talk of the function of archives in relation to cinema in the future and he agreed to help draft the Report. Mr POGACIC suggested that Mrs WIBOM should speak in French, out of politeness; she was very willing to do this but thought there would be very few French listeners.

### **Day 3**

The final text was not ready in time for discussion in the EC meeting. Mrs BOWSER said that as the Report was made in the EC's name, the EC needed to formally approve it or at least be aware of the main contents.

Mrs WIBOM reported that as they had now established there would be very few outsiders at the GA, they planned simply to thank all who had helped prepare the Congress, list the planned Congress activities and talk of the future direction of FIAF work, closing with a quotation from Henri Langlois.

In response to comments from the EC, she would not talk about the past, except to mention the original 4 founders.

Mrs BOWSER recalled that they needed to make a summary of the year's activities and it was agreed that she would join Mrs WIBOM and Mr DE PINA in completing the draft later that afternoon.

### **GA6 Financial Report**

Mr BORDE said he would be making a very brief report and the GA would then be formally invited to adopt the 1989 Budget. He commented to the EC as follows:

#### **- 1987: Final Accounts**

The actual figures for income and revenue were both approximately 3% below forecast. The EC expenses had been lower than anticipated thanks to the generosity of the Cuban archive. He recalled that they had planned for a deficit for the year rather than increase the subscriptions, especially as the strength of the Swiss franc meant an effective increase for many archives. The reserves were very healthy.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that a number of archives were bringing their subscriptions to Paris.

### 1989: Budget

For this year also, they had agreed on no increase in subscriptions. At present, forecast revenue was lower than in the previous years for a number of reasons (no Unesco contract as yet; the 1989 Congress would be less expensive than Paris; inflation in Belgium around 0%). There was a forecast deficit of about 8-10% of the Federation's total reserves.

Later in the meeting (item 6.1), the EC discussed a paper prepared by Mr KLAUE on the proposed Development Fund for young archives.

### 1988: Interim Accounts

For the 1988 Congress, FIAF had contributed 150,000 French francs and the French Ministry of Culture had contributed the 2 million francs promised. He mentioned that more than half the budget had been spent on the 3 exhibitions (90,000 for the poster exhibition and catalogue; 70,000 for the preservation exhibition of Bois d'Arcy; over 1 million French francs for the main exhibition).

Mrs WIBOM agreed that the costs of the main exhibition had exceeded their plans but suggested it was in line with their intention to give FIAF a higher public profile. In the discussion, it was noted that FIAF was no longer liable for the guarantee to Variety as sufficient advertising space had been bought. For the Livre d'Or, Mr Schmitt had obtained 75,000 FF of sponsorship money and in addition FIAF would receive a royalty on sales.

### Fund for Working Group on Membership

Mrs ORBANZ reported they would need money for up to 4 meetings (primarily for travelling and reports). Mrs VAN DER ELST said she would be happy to host a meeting in Brussels. It was suggested the budget should be similar to that for the other Commissions, ie 120,000 Belgian francs. This would be added to the 1988 and 1989 budgets.

### Fund for Set & Costume Designers Directory Project

Mr KLAUE recalled that it was agreed that this should be a project separate from the Commission, needing separate funding (for one meeting per year and staying costs for 3 people). The EC needed to decide if this sum should come from the central budget or be subtracted from the Documentation Commission budget.

Mrs BOWSER and Mrs HARRISON felt very strongly that, now the project was clearly separated from the Commission, it should have no effect on the Commission's budget. Mrs HARRISON felt it would be preferable for the three Commission budgets to remain in line with one another. Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested the Project should be included under Special Publications for 1989.

### **GA7 Membership Questions**

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled the items to be covered:

- New Membership application from Luxembourg: a vote was needed
  - New Observer: Fundacion Cinemateca Patrimonio Filmico de Colombia: report that the EC had accepted them.
- Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed Thailand had already been announced in Berlin.
- Honorary Membership: by secret vote.
  - formation of new Working Group on Membership:
- Mr FRANCIS felt it should only be mentioned in passing without inviting discussion at this stage. It was agreed to include in the President's Report, putting it in the context of the Federation's future development after its first 50 years.

### **GA8 Documentation Commission Report**

(Discussed out of sequence after GA10)

Resuming after lunch, Mrs WIBOM welcomed Mrs SNAPES, President of the Documentation Commission, to her first EC meeting together with Michael MOULDS, Editor of the PIP.

As described in her letter to the EC, Mrs SNAPES nominated the following:

- Karen Jones                      Danske Filmmuseum
- Ron Magliozzi                    Museum of Modern Art, NY

and two new Members,

- Noelle Giret                      Cinémathèque Française
- Rene Beauclair                  Cinémathèque Québécoise

and asked that Michael Moulds become, ex officio, Observer.

They had had a preliminary meeting that morning of both former and new members. She had planned a series of visits to various Documentation Centres in Paris as well as discussions to review work in progress and identify new projects.

Mrs GALVAO put forward two suggestions:

- Ronald Monteiro                Rio (suggested by Mr ALVES NETTO)
- Teresa Toledo                    Cuba (suggested by herself)

Mr GARCIA MESA confirmed that Ms Toledo was very active and expert in Documentation but he would have to check whether the archive could fund her participation. Ms SNAPES was very pleased at the idea of having representatives from Central and South America. She asked Mr KLAUE if he had ideas for someone from an Eastern European country.

Mr ROSEN noted from the membership lists of all 3 Commissions that there was only one representative from outside North America and Europe and

wondered if there were issues that required broader representation.

**Decision:** The EC confirmed the Chairman, the 4 members and the Observer mentioned above.

Mrs WIBOM suggested that, when the Secretariat invited nominations for the EC Committee for the Lisbon elections, they should at the same time invite nominations for the Commissions.

In response to Mr FRANCIS, Ms SNAPES said that, following their meetings in the next few days, they would produce a brief report for the GA by Wednesday morning.

Mrs WIBOM recalled that the theme for the 1990 Congress in Cuba was "Archiving in Developing Countries" and asked all Commissions to work to this theme. As example, she mentioned that in Thailand they had a mountain of 40,000 newsreels with no cataloguing or documentation and no trained staff and they might like to consider how to help in such situations.

#### **GA8b      PIP**

Mr MOULDS referred to his written reports and added that they had unexpectedly received \$3,000 from St James's Press together with the list of standing orders which was shorter than he had expected. They had received one new subscription from Poona and a cancellation from the UK.

The main problem for him now was lack of time to access the computer for editing as it was being used most of the time by the two part-time assistants (for input, security back-up copies, sorting, outputting). He had therefore just bought himself a personal computer (£200 for 32 megabyte "hard card").

#### Indexing

The most important point in his report was the urgent need for more indexing help from archives: they were having to divert a third of their time to do indexing work themselves which was never intended to be part of the role of the PIP staff. At the same time, indexes were coming in from minority publications that they did not have time to process. He suggested it would help generate interest if they could have another meeting of indexers.

In the review of the publications requiring indexing, Mr BORDE volunteered to start indexing *Les Cahiers de la Cinémathèque* again and could also take on *Positif*. Mrs Vosikova had lost her two librarians so no longer had resources to index *Cinema Canada*. Mr POGACIC mentioned he worked for another publication which was better than *Ekran* but he would talk to the librarian at Jugoslovenska Kinoteka. Mrs WIBOM promised to talk to someone about the Oslo publication.

Transcriber's Note: Decision about Australia lost in laughter.



Mrs ORBANZ said they had only one person who was already indexing six publications so could not take on any more. Mr ROSEN would talk to the AFI or do it at UCLA. Mrs SNAPES explained that the BFI had got a year behind following two moves, to Berkhamstead and within London. Mr FRANCIS suggested they should get a definite decision from Ms Thorpe.

Mr NAIR confirmed they were willing to index *Cinema in India* and were waiting for confirmation that it could be included. Mr MOULDS said he had received the information and would include it.

Mr DE PINA volunteered to provide indexers but was advised that although work had started on *Cinema Nuovo* it had been decided it was not worthwhile. He offered to do *Films & Filming* (but the BFI might still do it) or *Revue du Cinéma* (but Madame Toulet of Bibliothèque Nationale was allegedly doing it). Mr Moulds pointed out the *Revue* was a big job and appeared monthly but Mr DE PINA thought it could be done with 2 or 3 people. He was obviously willing to take it or something else on.

Mr ROSEN also volunteered to try and find indexers but asked how much work was involved. Mr MOULDS said it depended on the number of articles, the thoroughness, etc.; the *Film Quarterly* would probably take about 2 hours for someone experienced.

Mr KLAUE recalled once again the offer made by IFLA and ICA to publish information free of charge in their Newsletter about PIP and confirmed that he would transmit the information if Mr MOULDS would send it to him (basic factual information on what was available, price, ordering address, etc).

Mrs WIBOM encouraged all members of the EC to help find volunteers for the periodicals listed which still needed indexers.

**Action:** EC to help in search; Mr MOULDS to follow up as appropriate.

#### Finances

In reviewing the cash forecast and budget, Mr MOULDS explained that in 1988 they would be receiving income for 2 volumes, giving some £3,000 surplus. For 1989, the accountant had allowed an increase of 10% on most items (which was perhaps higher than necessary given current inflation at about 5%) and forecast a loss of £3,000. Mr MOULDS said he did not think they could ever break even unless there were unexpected increases in subscriptions and sales of new volumes. There were no comments.

At this point Mrs WIBOM thanked Mrs SNAPES and Mr MOULDS for their Reports and Mr MOULDS then left the meeting.

Mr FRANCIS asked for confirmation that, by making no comment on the budget, the members of the EC were acknowledging that FIAF could meet an average annual deficit of £3,000. He personally thought it was acceptable. Mrs WIBOM understood a decision had been made at the crisis time to continue for a given number of years but she was not sure of the dates. Mr FRANCIS thought there were 2 more years to go.

Mr FRANCIS recalled they had identified and made attempts to solve specific problems:

- accommodation: this was now more satisfactory financially and physically
- computerisation: they had not managed to find a sponsor so had to pay for the computer and regrettably, in the urge to economise, had perhaps bought one that was not as powerful as would be desired.
- distribution: the out-of-pocket costs per book were now much more attractive but it did of course mean an extra load for the London team.

The PIP team were very heavily loaded, beyond the original intentions, not only in transferring to new technology and taking on the distribution, but also because they were spending so much time (one-third of their time) on indexing which had never been intended as part of their responsibilities.

Great efforts had been made and he would like confirmation that FIAF was willing to accept the predicted level of outgoings on this project.

Mr DAUDELIN asked if the £3,000 required for 1989 had been included as an expenditure under Projects or Publications in the 1989 Budget. Mr BORDE said the budget could be updated to include it, although he personally would prefer to abandon the PIP project.

Mr DAUDELIN thought the £3,000 was an acceptable annual investment if PIP was covering the ground but had been very disturbed to discover so many major publications no longer had indexers "in the field". Mr FRANCIS agreed this was disturbing and suggested that, if the indexing burden could be removed from the London team, then they would have a much better chance of coping. Mr CINCOTTI felt the financial situation was now under control and thought it would be absurd to abandon such an important project for such a small sum. The money could surely be found. Mr ROSEN suggested that, with the increase in the number of "serious" film museums, there were surely hopes that some at least were serious enough to want to subscribe to PIP.

Mr KLAUE agreed that they had already lived with the project for many years and should try to find the money but wanted to know where it would come from: if there were really no possibilities of increasing sales or getting

money from elsewhere, then they should at least calculate how many years it would take to use up the reserve fund. Whatever happened, he thought they should in no circumstances increase the membership subscription which was already high. In his own case, an increase would mean they would have to revert to being Observers and, if other archives had to do likewise, the overall effect of a subscription increase would be to decrease the Federation's income. Alternatively, they could actively seek outside sources of finance, sponsorship, international foundations, joint projects, etc., bearing in mind that there was little chance of getting more from Unesco.

Mr BORDE acknowledged that the Budget could tolerate the £3,000 for 1989 but felt it was impossible for the project to be allowed to take 10% of the reserve fund each year. He asked again whether it should continue to be supported, especially as the number of periodicals indexed was diminishing.

Mrs WIBOM said they had worked hard to save the project and was pleased that they now knew what was going on and were not in danger of getting SOS calls for more money. She too felt £3,000 was not much money. She thanked Mr FRANCIS for his contribution to putting order into the project.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was unreasonable to expect Mr MOULDS to start off a new year with a forecast deficit rather than a breakeven situation. Mrs WIBOM agreed and thought the supporters should consider in Paris ways to find additional funding from within or outside the Federation.

Mrs ORBANZ counted up that there were 28 publications that were not indexed and thought they should seek indexers outside the existing group of supporters. The supporters had agreed to give additional financial support but they could not be expected to take on the full indexing load as well. All agreed that this was a very important issue that needed urgent action.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested that Mrs SNAPES should make an urgent appeal for indexers in the GA.

Mrs SNAPES said the Documentation Commission felt it was absurd to expect someone who was simply appointed as an Editor to take on so many extra tasks which were outside his brief, not only indexing but also the problems of finding offices and all the administrative and financial problems of the project. It was an important project and she hoped the Commission, which had not met for two years, would in the next two years be able to give him much more support and in particular make a more active contribution to pushing the project, both in identifying indexers and in promoting sales. This was on their Paris agenda.

## GA9 Cataloguing Commission Report

Mrs HARRISON reported they had not met since Habana so her Report was similar to that already presented there; they were looking forward to meeting in Toulouse after the Congress.

The Technical Guidelines and the Cataloguing Brochure were nearly ready for publication. The basic Rules were now in draft form (130+ pages) for testing with examples and discussion within the Commission and then later circulation to all archives and the NGOs for comment.

Roger Smither had prepared a 24-page paper of guidelines on obtaining computer software with some relevant bibliographies. Mrs VAN DER ELST had reported that the Secretariat had completed its preliminary work on setting up the Union Catalogue and had asked if and how it might be expanded (see below).

She was happy with the work of all the Commission members and her letter of May 19 was a formal request for reconfirmation of all. They had one vacancy now and one expected with the forthcoming retirement of Dorothea Gebauer.

**Decision:** Formal reconfirmation of the Commission Chairman and Members.

### New Standards Publication

Mrs HARRISON informed the EC of a new publication defining terms, prepared by a new committee, "National Standards for the USA", edited by the chief cataloguer at UCLA and published by the Library of Congress at \$20.

She would try to obtain free copies for Commission members and for anyone in the EC who was interested.

### Development of Union Catalogue

Mrs HARRISON invited suggestions from the EC, for example perhaps to include earlier non-feature silent films or post-nitrate colour features, or the Commission could bring suggestions to Montreal. The idea was that it should continue to be only of non-national holdings.

Mr FRANCIS thought newsreels would be very interesting (especially as Dr Kahlenberg's suggestion had not been followed up). Mr KLAUE agreed a limited category would be preferable, either by specialism (newsreels, animation films) or by decade, as otherwise it would cause too much work.

### Publications in other languages

Mrs HARRISON mentioned they would like to have the Rules available in other languages but had no resources to prepare alternative language versions, certainly in the draft stage. Mrs GALVAO said the Latin American archives had agreed to try and have all FIAF publications translated into Spanish.

### National filmographies

Mr Luis de Pina reported they were just completing a 5-year project to prepare a national filmography covering their whole history from 1893-1988.

Mrs WIBOM closed the discussion with a message of thanks to Mrs HARRISON and all members of the Commission.

## **GA10      Preservation Commission Report**

### Membership

On the reconfirmation of the Commission, Mr SCHOU reported that Mr Konlechner was resigning because he had accepted a teaching post at the University of Vienna; otherwise he would like the membership to remain unchanged. He had revised his views on the status of "Consultants" and would like Mr Konlechner to join Mr Brown as a consultant to the Commission. In addition, he had invited Mr Tony Cook and Mr Harald Brandes as Observers. He was disappointed he had not had more positive response in writing to requests for indications of interest in contributing to Commission work.

Mr KLAUE suggested they should set a time limit to the Gosfilmofond offer as a place could not be held indefinitely. Harald Brandes had already been on several technical missions for Unesco so would be an asset to the Commission.

Mr SCHOU said he enjoyed the work and would like to continue it but as the archive was expanding, there were increasing calls on his time as well as more competition for travel funding.

**Decision:** All Members reconfirmed.

### Projects

In addition to his Reports, Mr SCHOU circulated some supplementary information updating the status of various projects in progress. He was pleased that some Commission work had the seal of approval of the SMPTE; they had a membership of some 8000 and publication in their journal meant that they reached a much wider audience and he had already received some useful letters from readers. He also drew attention to the useful RPS Symposium in Oxford for which tapes were available (point 1.8) and the new papers being prepared for inclusion in the Technical Manual (point 3.5).

Under point 3.9, vinegar syndrome, he would reiterate an appeal for assistance for continued research into this important area. The work was funded by the Manchester Polytechnic under contract from the National Film Archive. Mr FRANCIS reported on the status of the project, confirming he had already signed a new contract for the study of polyester-based tape and

video-tape and hoped a number of organisations would be able to join in making a contribution, especially manufacturers.

Unfortunately, the original researcher had now obtained her doctorate and they were likely to lose her; however, as her work was outstanding, they would like to find a way to retain her services, perhaps through international cooperation. However to do this over a 3-year period, they would have to expect to pay an additional salary of some £17,500 per annum in addition to the institutions's expenses.

Mr CINCOTTI hoped he could obtain some funding from Italy. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that in Sweden they had BITC (Bureau for International Technical Cooperation) which might help, and Mr DE PINA suggested that, in countries where there were no manufacturers, laboratories might help. Mr ROSEN suggested the National Science Foundation in the USA; Mr SCHOU said the Rochester Institute of Technology had already put forward a similar proposal so may have already scanned likely US funding sources. Mrs WIBOM suggested Unesco could also be asked for help and asked Mr SCHOU for a one-page project description (where, why, how much) that could be used in seeking funding from various sources. Mr FRANCIS felt the project description should be placed in its total context of assessment of the stability of nitrate and safety based film.

To avoid creating alarm in this very sensitive area, Mr FRANCIS suggested the Preservation Commission should prepare a formal statement for archives to use in response to enquiries about the vinegar syndrome. He was anxious that there should be no press statement at this stage to avoid difficulties similar to those experienced in America last autumn.

**Action:** Mr SCHOU and Mr FRANCIS to work together at their London meeting on June 21.

Mr SCHOU personally thanked Mr FRANCIS for his initiative in getting the research started at Manchester and Mr DE PINA for translation of the Basic Film Handling chapter into Portuguese.

He was seeking a host for the next Preservation Commission meeting, either in December or at the time of the next congress in Lisbon.

Mrs WIBOM asked if the Commission would be interested in two more projects:

i acetate film shrinkage In Sweden, they had found little signs of the vinegar syndrome but considerable shrinkage (0.8%) and dry-outs. The acetate seemed to behaving like the nitrate films, though not disintegrating. She was interested to know if other archives had a similar experience.

ii alternative and cheap solutions for tropical climates

In connection with the forthcoming Habana Congress, she felt it was urgent for FIAF to find solutions for young archives working under difficult conditions. Mr SCHOU felt they were faced with a physically inescapable fact of nature and one should perhaps think of storing masters in more suitable environments and keeping only copies locally. Mrs WIBOM felt manufacturers and producers should be encouraged to get involved in such problems.

Mrs WIBOM expressed warm thanks to Mr SCHOU and his Commission Members and confirmed that they would personally thank Mr Gilmour for his support. Mr SCHOU thanked Mrs BOWSER, Mr KLAUE and other archive heads for the support they were giving to Commission members from their archives.

**GA II Projects and Publications underway; new projects**

The EC reviewed the list of projects to check who, if anyone, would report to the GA on each item.

On Project 4, Old Equipment, Mr DE PINA asked if something would be available for the Dusseldorf meeting of film museums. Mr DAUDELIN suggested checking with Mr Veronneau.

On Project 6, Glossary of Laboratory Terms, it was agreed to ask Mr Spehr and Mr Schou to sort out any possible confusion between two projects.

On Project 12, Cinematographers, Set & Costume Directory, Mr KLAUE mentioned he would be asking the EC for guidance on the continuation of this project, based on a document prepared with Dr Krautz.

Mrs BOWSER would like members to be advised that the Slapstick Symposium proceedings were published and available from the Secretariat.

Mr BORDE said they intended to publish the Proceedings of the Paris Symposium: they had 9 written communications out of 22 and assumed everything would be recorded. Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed that it was not necessary to itemise it in the 1989 Budget. Mr DAUDELIN would be Editor.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said that Mr Opela had asked for 10 minutes to speak about his new project on film identification by production company logo's.

Mrs HARRISON said it was a Cataloguing Commission project and they were not ready to have it talked about.

## GA12      Relations with Unesco & other international organisations

Mr KLAUE listed the items he would cover.

### NGOs Round Table

He mentioned for the EC that the members of the NGO Round Table had unanimously agreed that it was not appropriate for IFTC to continue to attend as they were not involved with archiving of audio-visual materials, a point which Dr Roads accepted.

The Round Table was very appreciative of the Berlin Joint Technical Symposium and agreed that the new Coordinating Committee of Technical Commissions would be responsible for planning future ones, preferably in Europe. In addition to work on the training programme for audio-visual archivists, they supported the idea of a basic manual for audio-visual archives: IFLA felt it was important to make basic information and advice available to libraries. They would spend half a day at their next meeting planning the Table of Contents, covering film, television and sound materials.

They were also interested in the legal problems of audio-visual archives and he had prepared a preliminary paper as agreed in Havana. Within the NGO context, IFLA and IASA had agreed to prepare a discussion paper, with FIAT and FIAF help, for discussion with Unesco and Copyright Convention representatives to try and find solutions that were more favourable to the archives.

FIAF was invited to attend the NGO congresses as follows:

- FIAT: June, in Hilversum  
Mr SCHOU would be there one day only; Mr FRANCIS couldn't go at all.
- IASA: September, in Vienna  
Mr Konlechner would be asked to attend some of the time.
- ICA: end of August, in Paris  
There would be 3-4,000 archivists meeting for 5 or 6 days.  
The theme was "New Media for Archives". Mr KLAUE would be attending for about 3 days as a speaker and would like some funding support if he was to represent FIAF.

### *End of Day 2*

Mr DAUDELIN invited EC members to attend a screening that evening of a film he had made called "Cornets"; Mrs BOWSER gave it a warm recommendation.



## GA13 Future Congresses

### a 1990: Lisbon

Mr DE PINA commented the documents he had circulated. In addition to the regular Congress meetings, his archive was hosting 3 Commission meetings as well as a meeting of the Portuguese-speaking archives and Domitor.

The EC meetings and Symposia would be at the Callouste Gulbenkian Foundation but the General Assembly would now have to be at the Hotel Altis as the Foundation did not have a room large enough for 150 people.

In response to Mr CINCOTTI, Mr DE PINA said the Sunday had been left free to leave time for informal meetings and preparations before the GA.

Mr DE PINA had originally proposed that the Commission meetings should be in parallel with the EC meeting but this was not satisfactory for the Commission Chairmen. Mr SCHOU and Mrs HARRISON were both in favour of having the Commission meetings after the Congress. Having them before the EC was convenient for the Chairs, but possibly not for the Commission members who would have a gap of 3 or 4 days before the GA and the Symposia which could cause funding and scheduling problems. Mrs VAN DER ELST asked if perhaps the Commission meetings could be held elsewhere in Portugal and organised by someone else so that Mr DE PINA did not have to be responsible for thinking about them as well as the Congress. It was agreed that the Commission meetings should be held from April 23-25 (Sunday through Tuesday).

NB Easter in 1989 is March 24-26.

### Budget

Mr DE PINA reported that the total budget was US\$73,000, including 500,000 Belgian francs (ie US\$ 12,500 @ 40 Belgian francs = \$) from FIAF, US\$9,000 from their own archive and a grant from government funding via the Minister of Culture. The remainder would be sought from various sponsoring organisations.

His pack included information about hotel prices, receptions offered by the Portuguese tourist organisation together with various tourist brochures.

### Symposia

Mr DE PINA would bring more detailed programmes to Montreal.

The EC expressed appreciation to Mr DE PINA and were all looking forward to meeting in Lisbon.

**b**                    **1990: Habana**

Mr GARCIA MESA presented a written report. The dates were provisionally set to start on April 19 but it could be a week earlier if more convenient but it was found this would clash with Easter (Easter Sunday was April 15).

As the Commissions were needed to help in planning the Symposia, he had proposed that the Commission meetings should precede the Congress but they could decide finally nearer the time.

Mrs ORBANZ recommended he should set up a Working Group to be responsible for planning the Technical Symposium in detail.

Funding for developing country delegates

He was concerned with the question of funding for guests from developing countries, especially those contributing papers and wondered how much support he could count on from the new FIAF Development Fund and from Unesco. Mrs GALVAO said she was hoping to meet with Mr Arnaldo in Paris about many Latin American questions and it could be raised then.

Symposia topics

Mr GARCIA MESA thanked Mr FRANCIS for his previous suggestion that they should include a cultural topic and they were already getting excited at the idea of tackling "The cultural significance of Latin American films of the 1930's to 1950's. An Argentinian researcher was already working on the theme and had been asked to be the coordinator.

Mr DE PINA was very interested in the topic and reported that in the 1940's and 50's Mexican films had been extremely popular in Portugal and they could contribute useful bibliographies, photographs, etc.

Mrs WIBOM welcomed the idea of having the Congress in a Latin American country and the symposia topics, especially the plans for discussing archiving in tropical climates. It was felt many people would obtain a better travel package if they could extend their stay before or after the Congress either as tourists or, as Mr GARCIA MESA suggested, to see more early Latin American films, and he confirmed he was negotiating to obtain attractive package prices.

**c**                    **1991: ??**

Mr KLAUE pointed out they needed to put a proposal to the GA for 1991.

Mr NAIR said his authorities agreed in principle that there should be a Congress in Poona in 1991 or 1992, but they needed to sort out the budget and whether they had the infrastructure for things like simultaneous interpreting.

He would prefer the former as he was due to retire in 1991. He hoped to have a clearer picture in time for Montreal. He hoped also to get some help from Unesco as it was the first time they would be holding a Congress in a developing country.

Mrs ORBANZ confirmed that they had provisionally set 1992 for Madrid and 1993 for Uruguay. Mrs GALVAO thought that Uruguay would be willing to take 1991 if there was a gap.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that they had decided that they would not decide more than three years in advance but they were not bound to make decisions three years in advance.

**Decision:** Mr NAIR to have final decision for Montreal.

## 6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### 6.1 Documents prepared by Mr KLAUE

Through delays in photocopying, the 4 documents prepared by Mr KLAUE were not distributed in time for EC members to consider them seriously. He suggested three of them be postponed for detailed discussion in Montreal but some interim action was required:

#### - Continuation of Mr Krautz' project

The EC approved the document with the following amendments:

- Point 4: Mr KLAUE to be the EC contact.
- Point 5: Mr DAUDELIN suggested the board should report to the EC only (in writing) although they would of course have the chance to speak to members under Projects and Publications.

#### - Guidelines for Development Fund

Mr KLAUE noted that they did not have time to discuss and make a decision before the GA but he thought the basic thinking behind the Fund should be mentioned at the GA under Financial Report and then details circulated to members after discussion in Montreal.

In response to Mr DAUDELIN, he thought it was not necessary to amend the 1989 budget. The Fund would be recorded as existing and they would think about sourcing finance later, either from the regular FIAF budget or from outside.

- 100th Anniversary of Cinematography

Mr KLAUE suggested this should be mentioned at the Round Table as 1995 was within both the Unesco Medium Term Programme and their World Decade of Cultural Development. The most crucial activity was to create awareness at high government level of the importance of setting up and supporting archives for long term preservation. In addition to the international conference suggested under point 1, he hoped there could also be several regional ones.

The other points could be postponed to Montreal where they could perhaps consider projects to be raised in Lisbon, including ideas they had had for their 50th Anniversary but not had the resources to follow up.

- Legal Problems of Archives

Mr KLAUE had hoped there would have been time to give him input to the IASA paper mentioned in point 2. He was willing to continue some preliminary thinking but it would be more effective to set up a small working group for discussion.

Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that Olli Alho was doing some work at European level and Mr FRANCIS said he had recommended Neville March Hunnings as the Council of Europe Adviser. Mr KLAUE agreed that the paper prepared by Hunnings some 20 years ago was still valid and he could be a useful adviser for FIAF.

## 6.2 Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique

During the last morning, Mrs WIBOM received a telephone call from the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique regretting that no-one could attend the Congress as Mr Ledoux was very ill, and that they were cabling a message that they would like read out to the GA.

Mrs WIBOM suggested the EC and GA should send a personal message of good wishes to Mr Ledoux, together with warm thanks for the completion of the Silent Film Catalogue.

**Action:** Mr DAUDELIN and Mr BORDE prepared a text which was approved by all.

When the message arrived, it turned out to be a strongly-worded objection to the candidature of Luxembourg alleging that they were a projection not a preservation organisation and did not respect FIAF Rules. Mr Ledoux went into considerable detail and asked the EC to reconsider and reject the candidature or amend the FIAF Rules.

There was considerable discussion on how to handle an objection made at the last minute, after the EC had made its decision and a full 12 months after Mr Ledoux had known of the candidature. Mr DAUDELIN suggested it was

sufficient to mention that the objection had been received and mention key points, otherwise the debate could go on for several hours; Mrs ORBANZ and Mrs BOWSER said that, if Mr Ledoux had been able to attend, he could have taken the floor to make his points so it was only fair to read it out in full and/or distribute copies to the Members.

Mr ROSEN said that, however they decided to advise the Members of the objection, they should make the reasons for the procedure extremely clear: on the one hand, they should indicate the grounds for the EC's recommendation in favour of accepting Luxembourg; on the other hand, they should indicate that Mr Ledoux's last minute objection was being presented to give him his democratic voice and that the final decision rested with the GA.

It was agreed that the GA could invite Mr Junck to come in to give his point of view and that he should be given a copy of the letter so that he might be aware of its contents in advance.

Mrs WIBOM recalled a similar situation in 1959 when Mr Ledoux himself had been accused on similar grounds and summoned to Stockholm to explain the situation; at that time, Henri Langlois had left the GA in a fury never to return.

**Decision** (taken before the GA after meeting with Mr Junck):

Mention to the GA that Mr Ledoux had sent a letter opposing the candidature.

### **6.3 Agenda for second EC meeting in Paris**

Mrs ORBANZ asked for two points to be added to the Agenda:

- the autumn meeting of the EC
- her report on the Coordinating Committee

Mrs WIBOM formally closed the meeting and opened the celebration lunch (champagne and Swedish smoked salmon) held to honour and thank Mrs Brigitte Van Der Elst, together with Mrs Chantal Van den Berghe, for all the work involved in preparing the Congress.

# MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Board Meeting, August 3, 1966

President	WINDY LANE WIRBY	President
Secretary	FRANK COLE	Secretary
Treasurer	WALTER BORG	Treasurer
Vice President	WILLIAM K. ALE	Vice President
Vice President	WALTER SANCIA MESA	Vice President
Vice President	WALTER ANZ	Vice President
Member	STEVEN SWISER	
Member	WALTER DAUDELIN	Deputy Secretary
Member	DAVID FRENCH	
Member	MARIA RITA SALVAD	
Member	P. K. NINE	
Member	LUCAS RICH	Deputy Treasurer
Member	BOB ROSEN	
Committee	HERBERT HARRISON	Calendar
Head	WALTER SCHUY	Preservation
	NICHOLE ONAPER	Documentation
Host Affairs		FRANZ SCHUY
Executive Secretary		BRYANT WALTER
Administrative Secretary		JIM DEBOW